

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 1 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, December 19, 1970, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2626. A letter from the Director of Science and Education, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report for fiscal year 1970 of Department of Agriculture assistance to the States in providing additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations, pursuant to section 10 of Public Law 88-74; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2627. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report for fiscal year 1969 on the extent and disposition of U.S. contributions to international organizations, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 806, 81st Congress (H. Doc. No. 91-432); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 380; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-1785). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ULLMAN: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 14873. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of just compensation received from the United States with respect to property taken under the act of the Congress which established the Redwood National Park; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1786). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 19909. A bill to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 to provide that the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction of renegotiation cases, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1787). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 19333; (Rept. No. 91-1788). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 19978. A bill to establish a National Cancer Authority in order to conquer cancer at the earliest possible date; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROTH (for himself and Mr. WYATT):

H.J. Res. 1418. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide maximum age limits for certain officers of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENDEL:

H.J. Res. 1419. Joint resolution authorizing the acceptance, by the Joint Committee on the Library on behalf of the Congress, from the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, of preliminary design sketches and funds for murals in the east corridor, first floor, in the House wing of the Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Con. Res. 792. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to U.S. policy toward political refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H. Res. 1316. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the traffic in obscene and pornographic material by means of the U.S. mails and otherwise; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 19979. A bill for the relief of Ed Benavides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 19980. A bill for the relief of Ruben P. Red; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OPERATION NOEL

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, recently I was privileged to be invited to attend the second annual Operation NOEL—no one ever lonely—Christmas party held for wounded veterans hospitalized in Washington area military hospitals.

As many of my colleagues know this party is sponsored by Capitol Hill secretaries who personally see to it that hundreds of GI's are not forgotten during the holiday season.

The idea for Operation NOEL was conceived last year by Joe Westner of Western Gear Corp. Joe enlisted the help of his wife, Fran, legislative assistant to Representative THOMAS S. KLEPPE, Republican, of North Dakota, Kathy Pierpan, secretary to Representative OTIS G. PIKE, Democrat, of New York, and Jayne Gillenwaters and Pat Rinaldi, both secretaries to Representative JOHN G. SCHMITZ, Republican, of California.

The unheralded workers of the Operation NOEL staff who handled the less glamorized tasks such as wrapping 1,500 gift packages, decorating the Longworth Cafeteria, and worrying about a myriad of details included Chris Negley, receptionist for Representative BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL, Democrat of New York, Bill Westner, a Capitol policeman, and Joe

Dougherty, another Capitol Hill policeman who brought cheers from the guests because of his portrayal of Santa Claus.

Although the guests of honor included many Congressmen, Senators, Cabinet officers and some of the Nation's highest ranking military officers, it was clear that the VIP's honored at the party were the wounded GI's who have sacrificed so much for our country.

One Army private, recuperating from shrapnel wounds caused by an enemy mine, told me, "This is one of the best nights of my life."

We are to be proud of the many fine young ladies who work as congressional secretaries, case workers, file clerks, and stenographers who acted as hostesses and made sure that each one of the military guests had a night they will never forget—a night when no one was ever lonely.

I would like to share with my colleagues the following story which appeared in the Cleveland Press on Operation NOEL, written by Alan Horton who was recently appointed to the Washington staff of the Ohio Scripps-Howard newspapers:

HONORED GUESTS: VIET VETS

(By Alan Horton)

WASHINGTON.—Washington Society can keep its Perle Mesta, Gwen Cafritz and other highfalutin party givers if thousands of wounded Vietnam veterans in the area have their way.

They'd rather go to the Operation Noel party a former Ohioan gives in their honor each Christmas. The holiday heroine is Mrs. Fran Westner, secretary to Cong. Thomas S.

Kleppe (R-ND) and foster daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Clifton T. Lawson of Willowick.

Fran and her husband, Joseph Westner V., are vice president and president of a non-profit corporation, Operation Noel (No One Ever Lonely), which gives one of Capitol Hill's biggest Christmas parties.

Last year was the party's first, but it was attended by Mamie Eisenhower, Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird, most of the military's top brass, hundreds of congressmen and many more hundreds of "military patients." That's what Fran calls the men for whom she plays Santa.

"We want the fellows to have the most fun they've ever had," Fran said. "There will be no midi-skirts. Only minis.

"There will be plenty of champagne, plenty of dancing, plenty of luscious lady lovelies."

Mrs. Kathy Pierpan, lady lovely and secretary in New York Cong. Otis Pike's office and co-chairman of the party with Fran, added, "There's something special about a soldier who has been wounded being greeted by the Secretary of Defense with a 'Hi, I'm Mel Laird.'"

This year's party is set for Wednesday, from 6 to 10 p.m. Teams of pretty girls will take invitations to the six Washington area military hospitals from 2 to 4 p.m. Six hundred wounded servicemen and 300 congressmen and senators will attend, in the cafeteria of the Longworth House Office Building.

Washington businessmen have donated watches, cameras, transistor radios, dinners-for-two, wallets, ashtrays, books and scores of other gifts.

Fran and Kathy already have collected \$2,000 for other things. Some 2,000 gift packages will be distributed at the hospitals. Each package will contain razors, blades, lighter, shave cream, aftershave lotion, tooth paste and brush and playing cards.

Kathy even solicited a nice donation from her doctor who in turn canvassed his doctor friends. Scores of congressmen have sent nice checks.

Fran and Joe and their two children, Joseph VI who is 4 and 3-year-old Sharon, live in Silver Spring, Md. He is assistant to the Washington representative of a large West Coast manufacturer. Joe got the idea for a party last fall.

"One thing for sure," Fran said, "we're going to have at least 30 cases of champagne. The fellows are tired of beer."

SOVIET JEWISH POLITICAL PRISONERS: BACKGROUND REPORT

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, apparently the Soviet Union is about to begin a new series of trials of Jewish citizens charged with attempted hijacking of aircraft.

There is ample evidence that these impending trials are but another step in the mounting anti-Semitic effort in the Soviet Union.

I share the views of the Jewish Community Relations Council for Alameda and Contra Costa Counties in California that this ominous threat can be blunted by exposure of this treatment to the world.

Thus, it is my privilege to insert in the RECORD a recent Jewish Community Relations Council publication on this matter:

SOVIET JEWISH POLITICAL PRISONERS: BACKGROUND REPORT

Thirty-four Soviet Jews, arrested and held incommunicado within the past six months in Leningrad, Riga, Kishinev and Tbilisi, face the imminent prospect of political trials that can lead to life imprisonment, and even the death penalty.

The weight of evidence, filtered out to the outside world by close relatives and friends, leaves little room for doubt that regardless of the legal specifications that may be brought at the trials their thrust will be anti-Jewish.

In the larger context of recent Soviet policy, it is clear that the immediate purpose of the arrests and any accompanying trials is to stifle the voices of the scores of Jews who, in the last year, have undertaken to struggle to leave the USSR for Israel, where they can maintain their Jewish identity. The long-range objective may be to crush a larger-scale renaissance Jewish national consciousness among many thousands of Soviet Jews.

All the available information leads to the conclusion that last spring a high-level policy decision was made to initiate a nationally coordinated, concerted secret police (KGB) action against militant Jews which used entrapment and provocation and involved large-scale searches and seizures, confiscation of printed matter, interrogations and, ultimately, forced confessions that can be used as incriminating evidence in public trials.

The known facts are these:

At 8:30 A.M. on June 15, 1970, nine Riga Jews were apprehended at Leningrad's Smolny Airport as they were walking from the terminal to an airplane. That afternoon, *Vecherny Leningrad*, the main afternoon paper, carried a brief announcement of the action, indicating that those arrested had planned to hijack the plane out of the coun-

try. The same item appeared the next day in *Leningradskaya Pravda*, the main morning newspaper.

As a matter of policy the Soviet press rarely publishes crime news, and even then it is not until long after the event. The fact that these papers carried this report within less than twenty-four hours suggests that they were alerted in advance. The fact that the Jews were arrested while walking on the ground is a sure sign of the KGB's advance information and planning.

The probability of a meticulously coordinated police provocation is enhanced even further by the virtual simultaneity of other actions that day.

At about the same hour of the arrests at Smolny Airport, eight Leningrad Jews were arrested in scattered places—at work, at home, on assignment some distance from the city, and even on vacation as far away as Odessa. Within a few hours searches were carried out in dozens of homes in Moscow, Leningrad, Riga and Kharkov; scores of people were detained for questioning and then released. Since June there have been more arrests in Tbilisi, Kishinev, Riga and again in Leningrad, bringing the number of Jewish political prisoners at this date to thirty-six, including two sentenced prior to the new arrests.

The man in charge of "the Leningrad case," involving at least the prisoners from Riga and Leningrad itself, is the chief city prosecutor, S. Ye. Soloviov, well known to local Jews as an anti-Semite.

In 1961 he served as a judge in the city's criminal court, and presided over two notorious trials involving Jews. In one case, he handed down a series of death sentences for alleged economic crimes to a group of Jews. In another, he sentenced Leningrad synagogue leaders, including an 84-year-old man, to lengthy prison terms on charges of subversion. The charges were due to the defendants' determined efforts in behalf of Jewish religious observances, and their active contacts with synagogue leaders in other cities.

I

The new arrests and the ominous possibility of trials must be understood within the larger context of official policy, as reflected in the massive winter propaganda campaign against Israel during January-March 1970. What began as a concerted nationwide chorus of condemnation of Israeli policies swiftly degenerated into a general anti-Jewish campaign. Publications in the thousands all over the country, through articles, editorials, pamphlets, letters to the editor, and caricatures, assumed an anti-Semitic tone and character.

The campaign itself was an expanded but more intensified, version of the Soviet propaganda line that now views Judaism as the ideological progenitor of Zionism, and Zionism as the equivalent of Nazism. The whole amalgam is a key element in the doctrine of "International Zionism" as the Jewish ally and servant of Western imperialism—an updated and refurbished adaptation of the discredited Tsarist "Protocols of the Elders of Zion."

A number of Jews, both prominent and obscure, were pressed into service in this campaign, to proclaim their loyalty to the Soviet Union, to reiterate official apologies about Soviet Jewry, to sign attacks on Israel and world Jewry, and to brand as betrayal any desire to leave for Israel. The apex was reached at a Moscow press conference on March 4, when 52 prominent Jews were brought together by the Foreign Ministry to speak to the world and, indirectly, to Soviet Jews.

What must have shocked the authorities, however, was the instantaneous reaction of dozens of Soviet Jews, as individuals and in groups, in Moscow, Leningrad, Riga and elsewhere, repudiating the assertions of the

"house-broken" Jews and their right to speak for all of Soviet Jewry. It was very likely in reaction to this unprecedented audacity that the regime decided to intensify anti-Jewish pressures.

Of course, the authorities have been aware for some time of the growing frustration and resentment of many Soviet Jews at the discrimination they face in higher education and employment, the widespread anti-Jewish propaganda, the hostility they and their children frequently encounter in the streets, at school or at work, and, not least, at the deprivation of their cultural and religious rights, foreclosing the possibility of perpetuating their heritage and maintaining their group identity.

Furious with official anti-Semitism, and inspired by the spiritual self-regeneration which Israel represents to them, a rising generation of young Soviet Jews rejects this situation as intolerable. Tens of thousands have applied for exit permits to emigrate to Israel. With few exceptions, their applications have repeatedly been turned down.

Several hundred of the more daring have circulated appeals and open letters addressed to the Soviet leadership, to the UN Human Rights Commission, to UN Secretary General U Thant, to the International Red Cross, and also to President Richard Nixon and Israel Premier Golda Meir. In effect, they have appealed to public opinion and to the conscience of the world. Such letters have been written by individuals and by groups in every major city.

This wholly unanticipated upsurge of pride and national consciousness has manifestly so upset the regime that it has resorted to severely repressive measures. The striving for Jewish national identity has begun to be treated like a criminal or anti-social act, with procedures of intimidation used against many who applied for exit permits, including interrogation by the KGB, expulsion from the Party, suspension from the university, discharge from employment, and general social hostility at work.

II

But, what of the imminence of a trial of those arrested since June?

In order to better understand what may happen, it must be borne in mind that there are basically two separate groups involved in "the Leningrad case."

We know precious little about their fate. No indictment has been issued. The prisoners have been kept incommunicado. Relatives, friends and even potential defense counsel have been forbidden to visit them, and they have evidently been under intensive interrogation. Since we have no precise idea of how they will be charged, it is only possible to speculate on the circumstances in which they will be tried, and the penalties they are likely to incur.

According to law, conspiracy to hijack an airplane is considered treason and is therefore subject to the death penalty. Even knowledge of such a plan and failure to report it can be subsumed under a charge of anti-Soviet activity and entails life imprisonment. Attempted hijacking can be treated as a plot to damage or steal State property, and may also entail the death penalty.

About the Riga group, relatives and friends living abroad but in the closest feasible contact at home believe that the Riga Jews were entrapped by someone in their midst.

We have learned, in a letter from the wives, mothers and sisters of eight of the Leningrad group, that police interrogators informed the women that the prisoners confessed to "anti-Soviet activity" and the attempted hijacking of a plane. The women made it clear that they believe these were forced confessions.

Forced confessions raise the ominous spectre of show trials. Such staged trials, using forced confessions as decisive evidence, are no innovation in Soviet law and public

life, even though they have been in disuse in the last few years. This sad tradition goes back to the early 1920's and culminates, of course, in Stalin's notorious Great Purges of 1936-40, with their anti-Jewish component.

For Soviet Jews, this form of terror as an anti-Semitic expression began in earnest only after World War II, in the last five years of Stalin's death, known to them as "the Black Years." Those years witnessed a series of grim experiences: a massive anti-Semitic campaign of propaganda and purge against "unmasked cosmopolitans" (a thinly veiled and well-understood euphemism for Jewish intellectuals, large numbers of whom publicly "confessed" their sins); the liquidation of Jewish cultural institutions and the arrest and execution of hundreds of Jewish cultural leaders; a series of anti-Semitic show trials, replete with confessions, of the top leadership of Communist parties in the Soviet satellites, especially the infamous "Slansky trial" in Czechoslovakia, plotted by Stalin in 1952.

The wave of terror culminated with the announcement, in January 1953, of an alleged "plot" by which Soviet Jewish doctors had murdered, or were planning to murder, Soviet political leaders at the behest of an international Jewish conspiracy in league with Western imperialism—a charge that is closely akin to the present Soviet trilogy of Judaism=Zionism=Nazism! Only the death of Stalin, in March 1953, ended what most observers believed was going to be a vast new purge, with an emphasis on trials and the deportation of Jews.

It is also essential to recall the experience and the lessons of the more recent widespread economic crimes campaign of 1961-64. This was another of those nationally coordinated enterprises which the police authorities stage so well. All of the institutions of Soviet power were used to expose and eradicate those accused of alleged large-scale economic offenses, such as theft of State property, embezzlement, dealing in foreign currency, counterfeiting, and bribery.

The Communist Party apparatus, the Komsomol (Young Communist League), the militia, the secret police, the regular police, local prosecutors and courts, and the national and regional press were brought into service. Crude propaganda material, overtly anti-Jewish, blanketed the country and mass trials were staged in which the accused invariably confessed and were given stiff penalties.

For the purposes of this campaign, the death penalty was reinstated after a lapse of many years. Of the several hundred executed, more than fifty per cent were Jews, who constitute just over one per cent of the total population. Just six years ago the International Commission of Jurists, in a meticulously detailed study, pointed up the anti-Semitic taint of the campaign. Certain Soviet jurists themselves, in a moment of criticism, noted its legal excesses.

More immediately and directly relevant to our present concern is the case of Boris Kochubiyevsky, the first of the Soviet Jewish political prisoners—a 33-year-old electronics engineer from Kiev, in the Ukraine.

Kochubiyevsky was arrested in December 1968, and five months later he was tried and sentenced to three years of forced labor for "anti-Soviet slander." His "slander" consisted of a public defense of Israel in June 1967, and his public assertion in September 1968 that Babi Yar—the ravine outside Kiev where the Nazis slaughtered scores of thousands of Jews in 1941—was a tragedy for the Jewish people. Also included were his statements, in a November 1968 letter to the Soviet leadership, that it was impossible for him to live as a Jew in the USSR since there are no Jewish educational, cultural or communal institutions, and that he consequently wanted to go to Israel.

In short, the accusations against Kochubiyevsky were essentially identical with the regime's real grievances against its present Jewish prisoners. His trial is now being viewed as a harbinger of gloom for additional trials, and as a foreboding precedent.

In the Kochubiyevsky case, *Khronika*, the generally reliable "Chronicle of Current Events" disseminated by the Soviet democratic underground, reported segments of the trial transcript as well as reports by persons present at the trial which painted the following picture.

Some prosecution witnesses were provocateurs. Several repudiated the testimony they gave at the preliminary hearings; one admitted to having given his testimony while drunk; others said they testified under pressure from the KGB interrogators. The general public was kept away.

Not even friends or relatives were permitted inside the courtroom. At the same time, the KGB packed the courtroom with its own members, as well as with citizens who were mobilized and instructed to act hostile to the defense. Witnesses were sent out of the court immediately after their testimony, which is against Soviet legal procedures. The judge acted like a prosecutor, indulging in remarks that were hostile to the defense in tone and substance, and generally permitted anti-Semitic and hooligan behavior in his court. At the same time the defense counsel assumed the role of assistant prosecutor, not only accepting the basic validity of the charges against his client but actually indicating his disbelief of Kochubiyevsky's own defense.

It is, of course, entirely conceivable that Soviet authorities will attempt to underplay or even avoid, in any direct way, the essentially anti-Jewish, political character of the new case. Very likely apprehensive about protests in the outside world over a mass anti-Jewish trial, they may seek to divert attention to the narrow legal question of a hijacking plot through an emphasis on forced confessions. This would serve them especially well at a period when much of the civilized world has gone through a period of shock with regard to airplane hijackings.

But regardless of how the trial is conducted, and how Soviet propaganda handles it, it will be difficult to shift the focus from the fact that people are on trial for their convictions, and that Jews are being persecuted as Jews. The defendants had no desire to attack, change, subvert or overthrow the Soviet system. On the contrary, their only desire was to leave that system altogether, and to exercise their elementary human right to leave their country of origin and to settle in Israel, which they now regard as their ancestral homeland and as the sole place where they can live as Jews.

The materials confiscated from those interrogated and arrested demonstrate conclusively that this will be a Jewish case. Among the items seized were Hebrew grammars, Jewish history books, open letters of appeal for help to leave, postal cards from Israel, and Jewish encyclopedias. In short, as some have written, everything with the words "Jew," "Jewish," "Judaism" was confiscated.

Within days after the June 15 action a young Leningrad Jew, Viktor Boguslavsky, wrote an impassioned letter pleading the innocence of his friends. He noted that "a lively interest in the fate of one's people and love for one's people cannot be considered an offense. Their only crime was that they were born Jews and they sought to remain Jews."

In July, Viktor Boguslavsky was arrested.

TRIED AND SENTENCED

(Ukrainian SSR): Boris L. Kochubiyevsky, 34 years old. Engineer. Married. One child: a year-old daughter. Former address: Kiev, Ukraine SSR. Charged with anti-Soviet

slander December 1968. Sentenced May 1969 to three years at hard labor.

Lilya A. Ontman: Married; family includes a sister and an adopted child. Former address: Chernovitz, Ukraine SSR. Charged with anti-Soviet slander. Sentenced January 1970 to two and a half years in prison.

AWAITING TRIAL

(With arrest dates indicated*)

(Georgian SSR): Abraham Danilashvili, June 1970*. Biniamin Dzhanelashvili, June 1970*.

(Leningrad, Russian SFSR): Vladimir Osheroich Mogilever, June 15, 1970*. 30 years old. Engineer. Wife: Yulia Issavena Mogilever. One child: a two-year-old son. Address: Ul. Telmana D. 36, korp. 1, kv. 209.

David Iserovich Chernoglaz, June 15, 1970*. 30 years old. Agronomist. Wife: Berta Petrovna Veinger. One child: an eight-month-old infant. Address: Pr. Maklina D. 26, kv. 25.

Grigory Ilya Butman, June 15, 1970*. 37 years old. Engineer. Wife: Yeva Shmulevna Butman. One child: a four-year-old daughter. Address: Vitebsky pr. D. 23, korp. 4, kv. 33.

Lassal Kaminsky, June 15, 1970*. 40 years old. Engineer. Wife: Serafima Mayerovna Kaminsky. Two children: ten and seventeen. Address: Ul. Vosstaniya D. 6, kv. 4.

Lev Leibovich Kosenblit, June 15, 1970*. 48 years old. Mathematician. Wife: Reveka Moiseyevna Korenblit. One child: a daughter. Address: Ul. Vereiskaya D. 12, kv. 10.

Solomon Dreizner, June 15, 1970*. 38 years old. Engineer. Married: wife hospitalized. One child: a five-month-old son. Address: 19 Olega Koshevo, Apt. 23.

Anatoly Moiseyevich Goldfeld, June 15, 1970*. 24 years old. Engineer. Unmarried. Mother: Liya Samsonovna Shimanovich. Address: Pr. Shaumyan D. 58, kv. 18.

Lev Naumovich Yacman, June 15, 1970*. 30 years old. Wife: Musya Khaim-Leibovna Yagman. Two children: 2 and 6 years old. Address: Ul. Karbysheva D. 6, korp. 1, kv. 80.

Viktor David Boguslavsky, July 12, 1970*. 30 years old. Unmarried. Mother hospitalized. Address: Pr. Shaumyana 47, apt. 25.

Hillel Zalmanovich Shur, September 5, 1970*. 34 years old. Marital status unknown. Sister: Kreina Zalmanovna Shur. Address: Ul. Zhukovskogo D. 20, kv. 20.

Viktor Shtilbans, November 16, 1970*. 28 years old. Physician. Married.

Mikhail Korenblit, November 16, 1970*. Brother of Lev Korenblit.

(Riga Latvian SRR): Leib G. Khanokh, June 15, 1970*. 26 years old. Address: 21 Millsnas Street.

Merl Mendeleovich Khanokh, June 15, 1970*. 20 years old. Wife of Leib G. Khanokh. Same address.

Yosif M. Mendeleovich, June 15, 1970*. 23 years old. Brother of Mary M. Khanokh. Address: 176/44 Lenin Street.

Edvard Kuznetsov, June 15, 1970*. Address: 45 Vaidenbaum Street, apt. 22.

Silva Zalmanson Kuznetsov, June 15, 1970*. Wife of Edvard Kuznetsov, Same address.

Isak Zalmanson, June 15, 1970*. 26 years old. Brother of Silva Z. Kuznetsov. Same address.

Wolf Zalmanson, June 15, 1970*. 31 years old. Brother of Isak Zalmanson and Silva Kuznetov. Same address.

Anatoly A. Altman, June 15, 1970*. 38 years old.

Boris Pestner, June 15, 1970.

Mendel Bodnia, July 1970*. 33 years old. Wife: Zelta Bodnia. Address: Shkolnaya Street 7, apt. 2.

Arkady Shpilberg, August 4, 1970*. 32 years old. Engineer. Wife: Margarita Mikhailovna Shpilberg. One child: a daughter. Address: Lenina Street 205, apt. 6.

Boris Maftsier, August 4, 1970*. 23 years old. Wife: Genia Moiseyevna Maftsier. Address: Siltsema Street 15, korp. 5, apt. 61.

Ruth Aleksandrovich, October 7, 1970*. 23 years old. Nurse. Address: Suvorova Street 16, apt. 20.

Mikhail Shepshelovich, October 16, 1970*. 27 years old. Address: Yuglas Street 5, apt. 42.

(Kishinev, Moldavian SSR): Aleksander Galperin, July 24, 1970*. 24 years old. Unmarried. Mother: Makhlia Yefimovna Galperina. Address: 37, Ul. Tesbashevskaya 11-13.

Arkady Voloshin, August 15, 1970*. Address: Ul. Kievskaya 41, kv. 5.

Gari Kirshner, August 15, 1970*.

David Rabinovich, August 15, 1970*.

Abraham Trakhtenberg, August 15, 1970*. Semeon Abramovich Levit, November, 1970*. Address: Ul. Svoboda 8.

WHO MAKES WAR?

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. JAVIRS) recently delivered an excellent speech at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.

As a long friend and colleague of Senator JAVIRS and as a member of the advisory committee of the Woodrow Wilson School, I was particularly impressed by the speech.

I believe it will be of interest to the Senate; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHO MAKES WAR?

A great Constitutional issue before the nation today concerns the exercise of the nation's war powers. The struggle over the war powers, has been somewhat dormant in the past few months, following the spotlight attention it received at the time of the President's Cambodia "incursion" in May and the historic Senate debate in passing the Cooper-Church amendment. It has been now revived by the latest bombings of North Vietnam, the abortive attempt to rescue prisoners of war by a commando raid, and the President's request for a large military assistance program for Cambodia. The Administration has accompanied its bombing and commando raids on North Vietnam with new assertions about the nature of the President's Commander-in-Chief's powers. In a significant related action, however, the Senate Appropriations Committee last week voted tight new prohibitions on the use of regular Defense Department funds in Cambodia.

In his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on December 1, Defense Secretary Laird maintained the position that the President, as Commander-in-Chief, has the right and the duty to stage rescue forays for prisoners of war held in foreign countries with whom we are not at war in a *de jure* sense—and without any advance consultation with the Congress. If, hypothetically, one of these commando rescue teams should itself become trapped, is it the implication of Secretary Laird's testimony that the President has the right to send in even bigger rescue forces, until we reach the stage of an invading expeditionary force?

I have chosen as the title of my remarks this evening the question: "Who Makes War?". That question is pertinent in a

double sense, for much of the present Constitutional confusion over the delineation of the respective war powers of the Congress and the President dates back to the action of the Constitutional Convention in changing its original draft, which gave Congress the exclusive power to "make war," to state that Congress has the exclusive power to "declare war." There is no doubt in my mind that the Founding Fathers very clearly intended the phrase "declare war" to mean "authorize war" in 1787—an age of declared wars. The lack of verbal clarity in drafting the final revisions of the Constitution has contributed greatly to the present confusion in this age of undeclared wars.

The main focus of my remarks concerns the legal and constitutional process of how this nation gets into war. The corollary to this—how does the nation get out of war—is an equally pertinent question at this time. On this aspect of the problem, I would like to call your attention to the opinion expressed by the most famous member of the Princeton class of 1771—Mr. James Madison, fourth President of the United States. Madison is widely regarded as the "Father of the Constitution" and any rereading of the record of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 shows how commanding his ideas dominated that historic session.

Although his motion did not carry, I think it is instructive to note that in the debate on Friday, September 1, 1787, Madison moved to authorize two-thirds of the Senate to make treaties of peace without the concurrence of the President.

"The President," he said, "would necessarily derive so much power and importance from a state of war that he might be tempted, if authorized, to impede a treaty of peace."

Our experience in Vietnam has shown how much harder it is to get out of that kind of war than it was to get into it. Now, how can effective checks be reestablished with respect to the Presidential initiation of undeclared wars? In this thermonuclear age, it may well be unlikely that we will be faced again with "declared" wars.

The area of contention between the Congress and the President over the war powers is centered on the question of "undeclared" war. Our bitter national experience in Vietnam has brought this issue urgently to center stage. The danger of the war expanding to Cambodia has heightened our anxieties. Congress has learned from experience that it must devise practical new means for exercising, in relation to "limited" and "undeclared" wars, the war powers reserved to it in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution. The essential object is for Congress to devise ways to establish its authority at the outset of military hostilities which, in the absence of a declaration of war, heretofore have left Congress behind at the starting gate. Yet, Congress must assert itself in a manner compatible with the President's exercise of his Constitutional responsibilities as Commander-in-Chief. We have learned that the power of the purse, alone, is not an effective instrumentality for asserting Congressional authority in undeclared wars.

Our national experience has demonstrated right from the beginning that there are situations in which military hostilities may have to be initiated in the absence of a Congressional declaration of war—such as the undeclared naval war against France in 1798-1800 and President Jefferson's actions against the Barbary Pirates beginning in 1801. Throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries a body of precedents evolved concerning limited hostilities without a declaration of war. This evolved on an *ad hoc* basis essentially from a case-by-case exercise by the President of his discretionary executive authority as Commander-in-Chief. While our Presidents have shown great vigor and genuineness in adapting and expanding the Commander-in-Chief function to deal with undeclared war and limited hostilities, the Congress has done little or nothing to adapt

its "declaration of war" power, and its other major Constitutionally-specified war powers to deal with the exigencies of our national history.

It is clear from the debates of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 that a major objective of the Founding Fathers was to devise a system of government which would prevent the Executive authority from initiating, or involving the nation in, war without the approval of the people as represented in the Congress. The power reserved to Congress to declare war was meant to be the power to authorize war. The Constitution—quite explicitly and in some detail—gives the *policy* war powers to the Congress. It gives to the President the command or executive authority as Commander-in-Chief, and the Constitution defines the executive capacity of the President to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

While a member of Congress, Abraham Lincoln summed the situation with the characteristic succinctness:

"The provision of the Constitution giving the war-making power to Congress, was dictated, as I understand it, by the following reasons: Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This, our Convention understood to be the most oppressive of all Kingly oppressions; and they resolved to go frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing oppression upon us."

The expectation of the Founding Fathers, on the crucial question of war powers, has not worked out in practice. Congress has underexercised its powers while the Presidents have developed the Commander-in-Chief function in novel and vastly expanded ways never contemplated in the Constitution. Undoubtedly, there was an historical logic behind this turn of events and even today I know of no Senator who questions the need for vigorous, vigilant and decisive exercise of the Commander-in-Chief function. Our national security requires it.

But the unilateral expansion of Presidential power in war-making has now reached dangerous limits and could undermine the whole system of checks and balances underpinning our constitutional system of government. The point has been reached where any effort simply to check the further expansion of Presidential war power is regarded by some defenders of the Presidency as an encroachment on the Office of the President. Many advocates of Presidential prerogative in the field of war and foreign policy seem to be arguing that the President's powers as Commander-in-Chief are what the President alone defines them to be.

The implication that the Presidency is beyond the power of Congress to check in the exercise of war powers raises a constitutional danger. It could leave the nation solely dependent on the good judgment and benign intent of the incumbent President. While we have had a high standard for eminence in the Presidency throughout our history, experience has shown that our liberties require firmer institutional safeguards if they are to survive.

There has been considerable public note of recent efforts, particularly in the Senate, to reassert the war powers of Congress specified in the Constitution. What has not been noticed is that this reassertion of Congressional authority has been met by a countervailing hardening and intensification of assertions of unilateral and unfettered Presidential prerogative. Our action has stimulated a reaction. The situation is now one of dynamic tension. It is impossible for us to stand still; if we back off we may not be able to preserve even the position we now hold.

Within this very year it has been asserted in the Senate that the President has the power to acquire foreign bases by executive agreement without reference to Congress;

that he has the power to deploy the armed forces abroad without reference to the Congress; that he has the duty to take whatever action he deems necessary to protect the armed forces, wherever deployed, without reference to Congress. Moreover, it has been asserted that pertinent information required by the Senate to exercise its constitutional function of advice and consent can be withheld on "security" grounds—indeed, although details may be communicated to foreign governments who are not a party to the negotiations in question.

The situation requires a remedy and I believe there is a simple and effective one within Congress' own reach. What is most needed is new legislation which provides a contemporary delineation of the war powers of Congress and the President and which codifies the rules and procedures to be followed in circumstances where military hostilities are to be initiated in the absence of a Congressional declaration of war.

I have introduced a bill (S. 3964) to accomplish this objective.

It specifies four broad categories, derived from historical experience, wherein the President, as Commander-in-Chief, may initiate military action in the absence of a declaration of war. It requires the President to report fully and immediately to the Congress the circumstances and details of the military action he has initiated. His authority to sustain such military actions terminates within thirty days unless affirmative legislative action is taken by Congress to sustain for a longer period the action initiated by the President.

The four categories in which the President may act are:

First, to repulse a sudden attack against the United States, its territories and possessions;

Second, to repulse an attack against the Armed Forces of the United States on the high seas or lawfully stationed on foreign territory;

Third, to protect the lives and property, as may be required, of U.S. nationals abroad;

Fourth, to comply with a national commitment affirmatively undertaken by Congress and the President.

Under my bill, even the 30-day period may be shortened by joint resolution of Congress.

The bill also contains provisions assuring action can take place in Congress within 30 days avoiding the danger of overly extended debate or filibuster.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is proposing to hold hearings on my bill, and the general subject of the exercise of the nation's war powers, early in the next session of Congress. In this connection, I feel that there is a major role to be played by the great universities. I would like to call upon Princeton, and specifically the Woodrow Wilson School, to make a contribution to the Foreign Relations hearings. I hope other universities will join in also, for this is a question in which universities are uniquely equipped to help out through research and scholarship, and by the direct testimony of academic authorities. I shall be in further contact with Dean Lewis on this matter as soon as the dates of the Foreign Relations Committee hearing have been established.

A TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HOLLAND

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, recently Dixie Business magazine reprinted from its July 1940 issue, an article re-

porting SPASSARD HOLLAND as the Democratic nominee for Governor of Florida. In view of Senator HOLLAND's forthcoming retirement from the Senate—and we shall all miss him greatly—I found the article to be memorable. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

SPASSARD HOLLAND, FLORIDA'S MAN OF DESTINY,
ELECTED

(By Hubert F. Lee)

Emerging the victor from one of the hottest campaigns in Florida's political history, Spassard L. Holland, State Senator from Bartow, on May 28 became the Democratic nominee for Florida's Governor, which is tantamount to election.

With his unruly shock of iron-grey hair, his piercing brown eyes, and his tall, straight figure, Spassard Holland is a striking personality. His long reputation as a man of unquestioned integrity and sincerity of purpose commands respect. His enviable record of public service culminating in his eight year tenure in the State Senate, of which he was an acknowledged leader, eminently qualifies him for this higher office.

He has a lovely wife, the former Mary Groover of Lakeland, and four children, two boys and two girls, ranging in age from seven to nineteen, who will lend charm and grace to the Governor's mansion.

Holland is young (48), vigorous, intelligent, and with his great statewide popularity promises to bring an administration that will be an epoch of achievement and progress for all Florida.

REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS, NOVEMBER 23, 1970

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, Congress has moved into its first post-election session in some 20 years with a spectacular lack of enthusiasm. It is apparent that little more than the essential legislation will be enacted in this interim session.

Even as the session began, the leadership was voicing pessimism about its success. Senate Minority Leader HUGH SCOTT predicted it would be an "unmitigated disaster," while Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD expressed the hope that it would be at least, "mercifully short".

The uncertainty about the productivity of the post-election session stems, too, from the after effects of one of the bitterest congressional election campaigns in recent years. And among those having a say in the passage of these 11th-hour bills are 11 Senators and 49 Representatives who will not be returning for the 92d Congress.

Among the "must" items for enactment in the coming days are seven appropriation bills, totaling some \$110 billion. Also on the agenda is the trade bill, welfare reform, manpower training, occupational health and safety, and consideration of the President's veto of the political broadcast spending bill, among others.

The leadership announced at the time of recess last month that Congress would return to closeout its post-election business in a 2-week session. That optimistic estimate has been revised, however, and now it appears that Congress will be in session up to a few hours before Christmas.

Hopefully, Congress post-election exercise will impress upon its leadership the fact that the operation of Congress is a year-round business, requiring the same attention to workload scheduling and planning which is given to private business. The day of adjourning Congress at midyear is gone. The scope and complexity of the legislative calendar no longer permits haphazard scheduling or half-year sessions.

Several changes in scheduling would, in my view, vastly improve the operation of the Congress. Among them:

A schedule which sets up 3 weeks of legislative business in Washington—from Monday through Saturday, if need be—and 1 week to permit legislators to return to their States or districts.

This arrangement would, first of all, end the "Tuesday through Thursday Club" in Congress—the practice of bringing up important legislation only on those days, permitting legislators long weekends away from Washington.

It also would give legislators more productive use of their time in their States or districts, permitting them to schedule weekday meetings or conferences. It would help to stop the endless and hectic weekend flights to and from congressional districts.

A congressional vacation during the month of August should be continued, and definite holiday breaks should be announced.

Congressmen who are diligent about returning often to see to the needs of their districts and constituents do so at the expense of their family life. Like any other employee, they deserve a respite, and should be able to plan on a definite vacation period.

The primary need is for an element of certainty in scheduling Congress business. Members do not know from week to week, even from one day to the next, what is in store. Commitments for meetings or appearances must be made with the understanding that a last-minute decision by the leadership for an extended session will cancel a weekend meeting in the District.

Many individuals and many groups are inconvenienced because of the uncertainty of the congressional schedule. They deserve better treatment.

CONSUMER PAYS LESS AND LESS FOR FOOD

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, during the past decade, we find the consumer paying less and less of his take-home income for food.

In 1950, American families were spending about 25 percent of their take-home pay for food. A decade later it had dropped to 20 percent.

In 1965 it reached the then all-time low of 18.5 percent.

Continued advances in production and marketing efficiencies brought further cuts in family food outlays so that now only 16 percent of the take-home income goes for this purpose.

While the consumer has been paying less and less of his disposable income for food, retail prices of food products originating on American farms have been climbing much of the time since World War II.

The prices farmers receive for most of their food products are among the lowest in years while marketing charges have steadily increased. While at-the-farm prices are way down, marketing charges have increased over 42 percent since World War II days. Retail prices of farm-originated food averaged over 18 percent higher in 1969 than in the 1947-49 period.

The farmers' share of the consumer food dollar fell from 51 percent in 1947 to 41 percent today.

This is just another example of the economic squeeze in which our food producers find themselves. They get a smaller share for producing the food than the processors and distributors get for putting it in the hands of the consumers and the consumer is getting the greatest food value in the world.

CONGRESS: THE HEAVY HAND OF SENIORITY

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the fundamental truth about the seniority system in Congress is that it is antiquated and unrepresentative and sacrifices both democracy and efficiency in order to insure gerontocracy. The December 14 issue of Time magazine includes a feature story by Gerald Clarke entitled "Congress, the Heavy Hand of Seniority," and expresses in capsulized form the burden of seniority on Congress. As Clarke states: "The congressional seniority system is thus the last and most important stronghold of a near-medieval system of fealty."

I hope as we get ready to end one session of Congress and to begin another, that my colleagues heed Mr. Clarke's words. I insert the following article in the RECORD:

CONGRESS: THE HEAVY HAND OF SENIORITY

"All things are changing," Republican Leader Hugh Scott told his Senate colleagues not long ago. "And we are changing with them. *Omnia mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis.*" Right on, Senator Scott! Congress may be changing, but at what a pace. About as often as the planet Pluto swings around the sun, Congress does indeed bestir itself, examines the archaic rules by which it conducts the nation's business and gently blows away some of the accumulated dust of more

than 180 years. But never enough to disturb one tradition—the hallowed rule of seniority—that has often prevented Congress, whether liberal or conservative, Democratic or Republican, from working effectively to represent the will of the electorate.

The effect of the seniority system on the Federal Government can be explained by three facts: 1) most of the real work in Congress is done in and by committees; 2) the chairmen of these committees have vast, often dictatorial influence over the legislation that falls within their realms; 3) with almost no exception, these chairmen have gained their exalted positions for the simple reason that they have been on their committees longer than anyone else in the majority party, which, of course, always controls the committees. The seniority rule thus gives the U.S. the peculiar distinction of having the only legislative gerontocracy on the globe.

A Greater Degree. Consider the results: twelve of the 16 Senate committee chairmen are 65 and over; five of these are in their 70s, and one is 80. Fourteen of the 21 chairmen in the House of Representatives are 65 and over, seven in their 70s, two in their 80s. The figures are comparable for the Republicans and will be about the same in the new Congress, despite the death, retirement, or defeat in the recent elections of several powerful patriarchs.

Admittedly, age is not an automatic disability. Some statesmen—like Churchill or De Gaulle—come into their own when those around them are heading for the nursing home and the checkers table. But one does not have to join the youth cult to suggest that length of tenure should not be the sole criterion for choosing the men who help determine the country's future.

Despite some restraints instituted in recent years, chairmen on many committees still control the agenda and can bring up a bill at their own convenience. In some committees a chairman can refuse to bring up a bill altogether. Mississippi's James Eastland, 66, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee and one of the most notorious racists in the upper body, has often ignored and sometimes killed civil rights bills by that method. Through similar control procedures, Wilbur Mills, the Representative of a rural Arkansas constituency, has as much as or more power than the President in determining changes in tax, welfare and Social Security laws, simply because primogeniture has given him the chairmanship of the House Ways and Means Committee (even his opponents, however, concede that he is able and conscientious).

Control of the agenda is only the beginning of the chairman's powers. He rewards his supporters and punishes those who vote against him by granting or withholding favors. He can even reward or punish their constituents by influencing the allocation of federal grants and the placement of installations. Since charity begins at home, he can almost always point to the many benefits seniority has brought his own district.

Marginal Role. The congressional seniority system is thus the last and most important stronghold of a near-medieval system of fealty. The House Armed Services Committee, for example, is subdivided into 21 other committees, each with great if somewhat lesser power than the whole, and each with a great if somewhat lesser chairman. While he owes allegiance to his chairman, the head of a subcommittee still has considerable power of his own and considerable authority over those under him. As a result of so much power being concentrated at the top, there is virtually none at the bottom. In the House, where the seniority system is most oppressive, a new member is virtually impotent. Whatever his talent or promise, he must resign himself to a marginal role in Congress for his first few terms. "The damage you never see

is the worst," says Columbia University Philosopher Charles Frankel, who watched Capitol Hill from 1965 to 1967 as Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs. "Young, bright Congressmen come to Washington full of ideas and interest, and shortly become discouraged."

Many of the men who run Congress are stodgy and opposed to new ideas. But their age is only part of the problem. To get to the top they must be elected over and over again; generally those constituencies that give such automatic approval are in rural, one-party districts or are dominated by big-city machines. In either case their Congressmen are unlikely to be responsive to change and sensitive to the strong currents that buffet junior and more vulnerable colleagues from swing districts.

There are, to be sure, significant arguments in favor of seniority. It provides stability and expertise, it eliminates the possibility that outside pressure groups or cliques could elect complaint chairmen, and it guarantees access to power to representatives of minority groups—if they will only wait their turns. Without the seniority system, for example, it is doubtful that Harlem's flamboyant Adam Clayton Powell could ever have become head of the powerful House Education and Labor Committee. Moreover, it is by no means true that senior Congressmen are all incompetent or senile. One case in point is Carl Hayden, who was an able chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee for most of his 14-year tenure, until his retirement in 1968 at the age of 91. Sometimes, too, a good chairman, secure in his fortress of seniority, can use his position to kill or modify a popular but unwise measure that colleagues support. Over the years, New York's Emanuel Celler, 82, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, has quietly smothered several injudicious anti-subversive and anticrime bills.

Still, the price of these booms is exorbitant. No other American institution respects seniority the way Congress does. "Of all the institutional failings of American Government," says Political Scientist James MacGregor Burns, "the seniority system of Congress is by far the most serious."

Several Alternatives. Paraphrasing Churchill, House Majority Leader Carl Albert admits that the seniority system may be "the worst possible system—except for all the alternatives." Albert notwithstanding, several alternatives have been proposed by angry congressional juniors. One plan would give a party caucus the authority to choose a chairman (or for the minority party, the ranking member) from that party's three most senior members on a committee. Even such a limited change might have dramatic impact. Thus Stuart Symington, a Viet Nam dove, could be chosen to replace the hawkish John Stennis as chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and James Eastland could be bumped for Sam Ervin Jr., a scholarly constitutionalist, as head of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Obviously, the system would not always benefit one faction; it could work to advance conservatives as well as liberals.

The proposal would probably have less impact on the House, however, where committees are much larger and where the Democrats have no fewer than four of the 65-and-over set patiently waiting to take the place of Chairman L. Mendel Rivers, 66, on the Armed Services Committee. But the plan would at least give the rank and file some leeway in picking its leaders. More important, it would put a chairman on notice that he held his post by approval and not by right.

A second proposal would give the Speaker of the House authority to choose chairmen from the entire membership of the majority. Since he is chosen by all members of his

party, the theory goes, the Speaker would be sensitive to their needs and demands. Instead of the system of divided responsibility that now prevails, one man could be charged with leadership. In fact, this was the system used by the House until 1910, when Congressmen revolted against the autocratic rule of Speaker Joseph Cannon. Better 21 dukes than one monarch, opponents might well argue.

A third suggestion would put the choice of chairmen up to the caucus, which could choose from any of its members. This would be the most democratic method and, in theory anyway, would allow choices to be made on merit alone. The principal objection to this plan is that it could lead to all sorts of unseemingly plotting and bargaining: conceivably, it might take Congress weeks to organize itself after every election.

Still a fourth plan would either set an age limit, 65 say, for any chairman, or limit his tenure in the post. (A dethroned chairman could still remain in Congress, of course, since the Constitution, which sets a minimum age of 25 for Representatives, 30 for Senators, does not provide a maximum.) Most other institutions have mandatory retirement ages; only last month Pope Paul VI ruled that cardinals over 80 could henceforth neither hold "Vatican Office" nor vote in a papal election. If chairmen were forced to step down at 65, three-fourths of the Senate chairmen and two-thirds of the House chairmen in the current Congress would have been replaced. William Colmer, 80, an un-reconstructed Southerner, for example, would have given way to Richard Bolling, 54, a liberal from Missouri, as head of the House Rules Committee. The same plan, however, would have pushed aside George Mahon, 70, the able chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, for Jamie Whitten, a Mississippian who is best known as a regular sponsor of anti-Negro measures.

Other Faults. In both House and Senate, younger members are vigorously pressing for changes in the seniority system in the 92nd Congress. Indeed, Republican House elders, who have no chairmanships and no immediate prospects, are likely to acquiesce to the recent recommendation of a G.O.P. study group. Under this scheme, the Committee on Committees would nominate top-ranking committee members and the caucus—all the Republicans in the House—could either accept the choice or demand another. The Democrats however, have yet to come up with a reform plan that would appeal to their veteran Congressmen.

An end to the oppressive rule of seniority would not cure all the ills that plague Congress; to a great extent, Congress is still the legislative body designed for and by the 18th century rural gentry. Research staffs are often inadequate. There is far too much duplicated effort and far too little concern for even the rudimentary lessons of modern management. While it has appropriated millions for computers for the executive agencies, the House is only now buying itself one so that it can understand where all the federal billions are going. The Senate apparently feels that adding machines are enough. Compared to the seniority system, however, other faults seem small. No great improvement can be expected so long as power is placed in the hands of men for no other reason than that they endure.

LAST ELECTION NOT A DISASTER TO THE REPUBLICANS

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, contrary to the partisan prognosticators of the left

who lead the Democrat Party, this last election was not the disaster to the Republicans they have attempted to portray. In fact, the growing trend favors the cause of the minority party and suggests a definite rejection of the policies promulgated by the majority party which, although losing the White House in 1968, still retains a diminishing lead in both the House and Senate.

Indicative of this growing Republican trend are the statistics for the U.S. Senate since 1962. In that year the Republican Party held only 32 seats in the Upper House. This margin grew to 33 in 1964, 36 in 1966, and 42 in 1968 with the election of President Nixon. In this past election, the minority party added two more seats to their growing total plus one ally in the gratifying election of Senator-elect JAMES BUCKLEY of New York, the Conservative Party candidate. With the antics now taking place in the other body, the majority party's loss of 13 seats since 1962 should continue in a downslide with the result being the gain for all Americans.

It would appear that President Nixon and Vice President AGNEW did score some gain in the past election through their combined efforts. Is it not strange how many Monday morning quarterbacks there are?

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION INEQUITIES

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, many years ago and in the hills of Kentucky I had as a geometry teacher Mrs. Leona P. Young, nee Pardue. She has continued in the teaching profession and is one who is dedicated to teaching the youngsters not only the basic studies, but also the principles of successful living.

Federal aid to education has brought about many problems, many inequities, and has resulted in much waste in certain instances. I supported this program, but feel it is necessary for efficiency and saving that it be restructured.

I enclose two letters from Mrs. Young which disclose certain inequities in the present program and insert them in the RECORD.

HORSE CAVE, KY.,
November 14, 1970.

HON. TIM LEE CARTER,
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: Congratulations upon your many achievements since those Tompkinsville High School days of 1927 when we studied geometry together. I probably did more studying and learning than did any of you students. I remember you and Kathleen most pleasantly. Right in the beginning. I want to send greetings to her.

While my successes have been low keyed, I have for the most part enjoyed the passing years. My late husband was with Burroughs Adding Machine Company for sixteen years. We were frequently transferred. I was busy during those years with housekeeping for my husband and two daughters. However, I found time for church and club work. I did not return to the school room until several

years after my husband came back to Kentucky to enter the motel business.

Previous to 1958, I taught for four and one-half years in Memorial High School in Hart County. That year my husband bought a motel in San Bernardino, California. Soon afterwards I accepted a position in Upland's excellent school system. My husband was wounded, Christmas Eve, 1959, in a holdup and passed away a week later. I continued to teach in Upland, California, until I met mandatory age retirement in June, 1968.

I was asked that year to return to Hart County, Kentucky, to teach. This leads to the factor that is causing me to write to you. I know how valuable your time is. Thus I will present my observations as briefly as I can. I feel that they concern our state and our country. If you wish for further particulars, you may write to me.

I am teaching four classes of language arts and two classes of social studies in Le Grande School, a school of 224 students, grades one through eight. This school is located three miles from the home where Governor Louie B. Nunn grew up, and is an above-the-average rural neighborhood.

At present in this school there are eight teachers, a teaching principal, two aides, and a part-time librarian. The instructor of physical education is under the federal Title I Program. For both seventh and eighth grades there are two forty-five minute periods of physical education. Two of our teachers of reading are also under this program. For each of their classes they have full-time aides and a class limit of fifteen students. Our principal teaches two classes. All the remainder of his time is spent on state and federal reports.

Our reading teachers are not limited to slow readers. During the forty-five minute periods they and their aides teach fifteen for each reading teacher, I am scheduled to teach reading, grammar, composition, spelling, and handwriting to classes of mixed ability, ranging in size from twenty-five to thirty.

I realize the scheduling is largely a matter for our state department. I am presently writing our assistant superintendent about this matter.

The next complaint is entirely federal. All of our children are served breakfasts for five cents each at the federal government's expense. At noon many of them get free lunches. I have thirty in my home room. Sixteen of these are on the free lunch program. The government pays the school forty-two cents each for these lunches while the others buy theirs for twenty-five cents. All get as much milk as they will drink, which is paid for out of federal funds. During the afternoon break, most of the students who get funds for free lunches spend from ten to twenty cents for cokes and popsicles.

Last week a number of federal inspectors were at our school. They approved the building of two additional classrooms, a library, and a remedial reading room. Right now the reading teachers under the federal program have costly reading equipment, which is not available to the rest of us teachers of reading. Last spring very costly kitchen equipment was bought with federal funds.

I have been outspoken about the unnecessary expenses necessitated by these federal programs. My principal tells me that if our school does not avail itself of these funds, others will get them. Without them I am sure our educational program would be as good. Certainly we teachers would have better balanced schedules. As a result we would be happier and more successful.

Right now N.E.A. is inspecting Kentucky schools. Taxpayers are not going to vote for higher school taxes as long as the present waste of money continues. Upland, California, had good schools and teachers were well paid. They had almost none of this Title I Program.

Use your influence to fight this "two-headed monster", and I shall be in Monroe

County four years from now, supporting you. However, you never seem to need any additional help in getting votes.

Sincerely yours,

LEONA PARDUE YOUNG
Mrs. Paul L. Young.

HORSE CAVE, KY.,
December 14, 1970.

HON. TIM LEE CARTER,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: Thank you for your kind letter in reply to mine in regard to the discrimination in our school system in favor of those employed under Title I. You may feel free to use any or all parts of it in any way you may see fit in working to cut down waste in Federal appropriation for education.

It is a deplorable situation when a principal is necessitated to spend most of his time, counting and making state and federal reports of money as is needed under present federal aid programs. Equally unfortunate is the situation where a first-grade teacher has thirty-seven pupils, and in the same school a teacher under Title I program is limited to fifteen students. The former teacher does not have an aide and the latter does. This happened in our school last year.

The above is a problem for local school officials, but such would not happen if Federal legislation did not furnish the setting for it.

I appreciate your interest in educational matters.

Sincerely yours,

LEONA P. YOUNG
Mrs. PAUL L. YOUNG.

RED CHINA ADMISSION INTO UNITED NATIONS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a letter addressed to the editor of the Washington Evening Star in response to a recent article by Clayton Fritchey which appeared in the same newspaper on the same subject: admission of Red China into the United Nations.

The letter follows:

NOVEMBER 30, 1970.

EDITOR
Evening Star
Washington, D.C.

Sir: Clayton Fritchey, in his desire to win support for admission of Red China to the U.N., is doing what seems to be popular these days in journalistic tactics. It is the deliberate slanting and falsifying of information—selectivity in the choice of facts—truths and falsity are relative factors to be exploited in whatever way that helps their side—stressing the appeasement line now being pressed upon us for a settlement for our Asian problems.

No better example was provided in his column of Nov. 14, "China Should Speak For 800 Million Chinese."

He said, "Many historians feel there might not have been a Korean war if the United States had recognized the mainland government rather than Chiang's. In any case, it is improbable that China would have come into the Korean war if the United States had not marched to its borders." Well, quite

naturally, there would be peace, no war over all the world, if we could settle for peace the Orwellian way. The truth though is, that, Red China was condemned by the United Nations in 1951 for its aggressive armed intervention in Korea. The United States militarily participated in the U.N. peacekeeping action to prevent the takeover in South Korea.

Further in the Nov. 14 column Fritchey stated, "The present argument at the United Nations is not, as most think, over admitting China, for 'China' is already a member. In fact it is a founding member and is one of the five permanent members of the Security Council." He goes on, "The issue is over who is entitled to occupy China's seat—mainland China (Pop. 800 Million) or Taiwan China (14 Million). It is in short, a representative question." Clarification should be made of the fact that it was not the communist government of Mainland China that was seated in the United Nations at the time of its founding in 1945, but the Government that existed there before the communist takeover a few years later. The communists no more represented the Chinese people then, than do the Black Panthers represent the Americans in the United States, now.

Fritchey is concerned about Chiang Kai-Shek's Government in Taiwan referring to that rule as a military dictatorship in which the people have no voice. While this may be technically correct, no reference is made to the fact that on the mainland China the people have no voice in anything, just as in the Soviet Union, where 97% of the people who are anti-communists live under absolute totalitarianism having no freedom of speech, religion or right to elective government. Parenthetically, Chiang-Kai-Shek tried to set up a constitutional form of government in China in 1946 before the communists came to power. He failed in this attempt by the United States error of denying him the aid he needed to resist the communists. The same techniques applied then are now being used to build the image of the communist leaders as one of benevolence and the opposite of such being made of the anti-communist leaders—Chiang-Kai-Shek.

The real question is should the Chinese people be allowed to continue to be represented by those leaders who desire their people to live in freedom, which is technically what the majority of Chinese want, or should they be represented by those who desire to continue their illegal oppressive rule of communistic-socialism of a one-party system of tyranny. To have them represented by the latter, amounts to nothing more than a betrayal of the free Chinese who have remained loyal to us in spite of our mistakes that have caused endless grief. It would provide our enemies with a means of our conquest by the socialistic-communistic complex.

DOROTHY COFFMAN.

DUNDALK SOLDIER DIES IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Leonard P. Kunsman, Jr., a courageous young man from Dundalk, Md., was killed recently in Vietnam. I should like to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

DUNDALK SOLDIER DIES IN VIETNAM

An infantryman from the Dundalk area has been killed in Vietnam, the Army announced yesterday.

The youth from Dundalk was PFC Leonard P. Kunsman, Jr., 19, of 7805 St. Fabian Lane, in North Point Village.

He was killed last Wednesday when a booby trap detonated at a night defensive position, according to information from the Defense Department received by his family.

He had served with the Americal Division and had been in Vietnam since September 2, his father said.

PFC Kunsman's father said his son had attended Our Lady of Hope Elementary School, in Dundalk, and had been graduated from Sparrows Point High School in 1968.

After graduation, he worked as an apprentice electrician on various construction jobs in the area.

In addition to his mother and father, he is survived by two sisters, Mrs. Linda Elliott and Susan Kunsman.

THE PRESIDENT AND JUSTICE DEPARTMENT PROCEDURE

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in his press conference last Thursday, December 10, the President was asked his view of the accusations reportedly made by FBI Director Hoover against two men. The President replied in part:

The Justice Department is looking into that testimony that Mr. Hoover has given, and will take appropriate action if the facts justify it.

Passing the suggestion, undoubtedly not intended, that facts can justify any kind of action other than appropriate, we are compelled to consider actions that might be warranted by one of two possible factual discoveries by the Justice Department: One, that there is at present no demonstrable evidence to sustain the referenced charges; two, that there is such evidence. In the latter case appropriate action would consist of a timely filing of official charges. In the former, appropriate action would consist of a public retraction, apology, and reaffirmation of our respect for our rule of law, and administrative proprieties that reflect it.

A number of colleagues and constituents have expressed dismay at the President's overall response to the inquiry. Some say he was too noncommittal. Others express regret that by implication he appeared to chastise the Nation's FBI Director. The record shows that the President acknowledged that Mr. Hoover made the referenced charges; that the Justice Department was looking into "that testimony"; and, that he, the President, "generally approved" of the Director's actions. The ambiguity of the latter two observations has caused the concern. People wonder if the Justice Department is looking into "that testimony" from the point of view of implementing it, or retracting it. They wonder also if the President's asserted, "general approval" implies disapproval in this instance. "General approval" is too faint Presidential praise for the Nation's chief investigator at a time when total confidence in the bureau is essential to national harmony.

We do remember well how quickly the White House moved this past fall to counter the impression that the President's comments on the Tate trial were intended to prejudice the issues. Moreover, in last Thursday's conference the President, himself, candidly admitted the inappropriateness of those and other similarly spontaneous remarks. Yet nearly 3 weeks have now passed since the Director's charges were made, and no public explanation, implementation, or retraction has been forthcoming.

We have been asked if the President feels bound by a standard of accountability higher than that to which he would hold the Director or the Attorney General. What is to be our reply?

The President has amply demonstrated his willingness to differ publicly with other appointed officials. It would not be a healthy thing for the public to be encouraged to surmise that this independence of mind is inversely proportionate to the seriousness of the issue or the vulnerability of the official in question.

What is at stake is not simply the Nation's continued high esteem for the FBI and its distinguished Director, but its confidence in the steady application in our highest councils of the principle of procedural due process and assumed innocence until guilt be proven.

In the meantime the charges hang heavily not only over the heads of the two accused men, but over the entire system through which they have received justice, and must continue to receive it, over the entire fabric of codified laws and uncodified trust that binds us together as a nation, over us all.

PROGRESS IN CONSERVATION

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 15, 1970

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 years the Department of the Interior has made great strides in the field of conservation and the environment. Among their major decisions are their policies designed to protect eight species of whales by banning importation of their oil, meat, and other products and to ban billboards from certain public land. Considerable question arose after the departure of Secretary Hickel as to whether or not these orders would be rescinded. I am pleased to have learned today that Acting Secretary Fred J. Russell has announced his intention not to change these policies. Mr. Russell also announced his plans for deferring to the new Environmental Protection Agency possible modification of oil-spilling regulations, since such matters will now fall under the jurisdiction of the new organization.

This decision by Mr. Russell is indicative, I feel, of the continued progress in conservation and the environment which we can expect under his leadership and after January under ROGERS MORTON. For the interest and information of my

colleagues in this area of critical concern to us, I am submitting the Department's press release in its entirety:

CONSERVATION ISSUES

Some confusion has arisen regarding the Department of the Interior's position on three major conservation issues: Protection of whales and other endangered species; ban on billboards on public lands; and new regulations on oil pollution.

Here are the facts:

Whales: The move to safeguard eight species of whales by banning importation of their oil, meat, and other products was announced originally November 24, 1970, in a press release. The ban became effective when the order was published in the Federal Register December 2, 1970. (See page 18319, et seq. of volume 35, No. 233 of that date).

Ban on billboards: The final adoption of strong, new regulations to ban billboards from public lands managed by the Department of the Interior was announced by the Department on December 7, 1970. See the Department's press release of that date and the formal regulations that were published in the Federal Register December 9, 1970. (See page 18663, et seq. of volume 35, No. 238 of that date.)

New oil pollution regulations: The Department of the Interior has deferred to the new Environmental Protection Agency regarding possible modification of oil-spill regulations, since EPA became the responsible organization in this area on December 2, 1970.

In line with the above, Acting Secretary Fred J. Russell has stated that he has no intention of changing any of the Department of the Interior policies on conservation or environmental matters which were in effect or in process on November 25, 1970, when he assumed his present duties.

OUTSTANDING PROGRESS ON COAL MINE SAFETY THROUGH RESEARCH AT BRUCETON, PA., EXPERIMENTAL COAL MINE

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call the attention of the Congress and the American people to the progress in coal mine safety being made at the experimental coal mine in Bruceton, Pa. The Bureau of Mines of the Department of Interior is to be complimented on their outstanding research in this important area.

I insert the following news release:

AMMONIUM SALT SPRAY CHECKS COAL DUST EXPLOSIONS

The explosion hazard posed by coal dust on shuttle-car roadways in mines can be controlled by application of an ammonium phosphate solution, the Interior Department's Bureau of Mines reports in a new technical publication.

Some coal dusts can spread the force of a mine explosion, when an explosion of gas disperses the dust into the air and then provides flame to ignite it. Wetting the coal dust, or covering it with incombustible rock dust (usually limestone) are methods currently used to prevent dust explosions from propagating. The Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 requires mine operators to minimize the dust explosion hazard by methods no less effective than rock dusting and wetting.

The disadvantages of using these two methods where shuttle cars operate, how-

ever, prompted the Bureau to investigate possible alternatives. Too much water can make the roadways slippery or muddy. Rock dust alone can be stirred into the air by the passage of shuttle cars, exposing miners to the danger of breathing the rock dust, which can be a respiratory irritant. Rock dust and water combined can be especially slippery.

According to the Bureau, tests in its Experimental Coal Mine near Bruceton, Pa., showed that the ammonium phosphate spray is 3 1/2 times more effective than rock dusting for arresting floor dust explosions. In addition, the spray keeps shuttle cars from stirring up airborne contaminants.

Compared to explosion control by wetting, the addition of ammonium phosphate cuts by 11 percent the amount of water needed. Roadways are then less muddy, and the possibility of accidents from falls and skids is reduced. While other flame-inhibiting salts would probably be effective also, the ammonium phosphate is nontoxic and causes little corrosion.

Included in the new report are results of tests on inerting floor dusts with water alone, water with a wetting agent, dry limestone dust, and combinations of wetting and rock dusting. A commercial latex solution was also tested as a way of keeping the dust from being dispersed, but adequate binding of the dust could not be achieved on a large scale. In all tests, roof and wall dusts were inerted by rock dusting.

Full details of the tests are presented in "Control of the Dust Explosion Hazard on Coal Mine Shuttle-Car Runways," Bureau of Mines Report of Investigations 7446, by John Nagy, Edward M. Kawenski, and Edward A. Barrett. Single copies of the report can be obtained free from Publications Distribution Center, Bureau of Mines, 4800 Forbes Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa. 15213.

IN PRAISE OF DOGS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a notable tribute to the dog as man's best friend was published December 9 in the Herald-Whig, Quincy, Ill., written by the farm editor, Keith L. Wilkey. Because Quincy is situated between two places in the Midwest where dogs are memorialized it is appropriate that this exceptional article, even though dealing with two historic points beyond my district, be entered in the RECORD:

LET US PRAISE THESE FAITHFUL FRIENDS!

(By Keith L. Wilkey)

"Dog is man's best friend," is an old and familiar adage.

Few people are opposed to dogs, or really classified as "dog haters." As family pets, stock dogs around the farm—even racers for gamblers and betters at racetracks, the dog has many friends. Some ardent dog lovers insist that "some dogs have more sense than some people."

Dogs are found in every country in the world. According to the World Book Encyclopedia, there are about 25 million dogs in the United States.

Dogs have been immortalized in song, poetry and art and some have been perpetuated in granite and cement. Recently I had occasion to observe two statues of dogs one in Fulton County Illinois and the other in Johnson County Missouri.

Unfortunately not much is known of the Fulton County dog, who died almost 70 years

ago. For many years he has reposed in concrete on top of his master's grave, even as he did in real life. I was unable to find anyone who knew the dog's name.

In the city cemetery at Cuba, Illinois, located seven miles north of Lewistown, seven miles southwest of Canton and 33 miles east of Macomb, is a granite monument bearing the name, "Thomas A. Cather." The deceased was born on Jan. 24, 1879 and died at the age of 23 in 1902. Behind the tombstone lies the concrete dog, the marks of more than a half century apparent by the patches of green moss that appears in the more secluded areas on the inanimate body.

The dog's head is resting on his front paws and the soulful expression in his eyes has been remarkably transferred into the mixture of sand and cement. Few people, especially on their first trip through the cemetery, pass the place without stopping and reflecting on the scene.

According to local legend, young Cather loved the dog very much and the faithful pet returned the affection. When the young man sickened and died, the dog could not be consoled. He reportedly made daily trips to the cemetery and lay, just as he is in the statue, with his sorrowing head between his front paws, as close to his master as he could be.

Not too long after his master's demise, the dog died. The family and neighbors were moved by the animal's faithfulness and devotion to his young master, so a craftsman fashioned the likeness of the faithful dog into a mold which was filled with concrete. After the mixture hardened it was placed on the grave, where in life, the dog mourned his loss.

It has been a long time since the incident of the concrete dog. It is significant that the episode happened in the very neighborhood where the famous writer, Edgar Lee Masters, wrote of a Fulton County cemetery in his immortal "Spoon River Anthology." Date of the Anthology's publication was 1915, but local residents are unable to fix the exact date of the dog's placement in the cemetery. The consensus was, however, that the locating of the concrete dog preceded Master's epic of the long-dead voices relating their experiences from the graves of the Spoon River burying grounds.

It seems to many visitors of the cemetery that some note should be taken by the busy world of this rather touching scene. Yet, according to citizens of the community, no "write-ups" have appeared in public print that anyone could recall.

I was unable to locate anyone who knew whatever happened to the Cather family, though there may be relatives living in the community of which I was unaware. But anyone, and especially dog lovers as well as those who appreciate the finer virtues and beauty of life as expressed by loyalty and devotion, who will stop and meander through the cemetery when passing through Cuba on Route 97, will find the experience, as have many over the years, impressive.

Two weeks ago there was a bouquet of artificial flowers behind the monument, right near the dog's nose. Someone remembered.

The other dog monument and the story that goes with it has received world-wide attention. It was not so much the killing of the dog, but the moving and eloquent tribute to man's best friend given by the prosecuting attorney, Senator George Graham Vest, at the trial for damages brought by the dead canine's owner.

Even older than the incident of the Cuba dog, the killing of a black and tan hound named Drum, occurred more than a century ago. On the night of October 28, 1869, old Drum, the property of a Johnson County (Missouri) farmer named Charles Burden, was shot and killed. Burden charged his brother-in-law, Leonidas Hornsby, with the foul deed. Some dog, or dogs, had been killing Hornsby's sheep, though Drum was

never proven to have been involved. Burden sued for \$50 damages, a fair amount in those post-Civil War days.

As a result of various appeals and-or mistrials, four trials were held before a final verdict was reached and appeals denied by the higher courts for re-trials. Burden won the case, as he had in the lower courts. In the long and involved legal battle, some of the most imposing legal talent in Missouri's history was involved.

At the first trial in Warrensburg, the county seat, Hornsby was represented by David Nation, who was later a newspaper editor. His greatest claim to fame, however, was due to his wife, the famous hatchet-swinging Carrie Nation, who broke into saloons wielding her famous hatchet during the early prohibition wave that shook neighboring Kansas.

Burden was represented by Elliott and Blodgett. Elliott was later judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Johnson County and Blodgett served with distinction in the Missouri state Senate.

Other attorneys involved in the trials included the firm of Crittenden and Cockrell. T. T. Crittenden was later Governor of Missouri and his partner, Francis Cockrell, represented Missouri in the United States Senate for 30 years.

In the final and most famous trial, Burden was represented by the firm of Phillips and Vest. Phillips in later years was United States District Attorney and Vest, who delivered the eloquent oratory, was a U.S. Senator from 1879 until 1903.

On September 23, 1870, Vest made his final plea to the jury. His words were so eloquent that they not only won the case for his client, but won the hearts of millions over the years. The speech has become recognized as one of the literary gems of American literature.

For many years the story of Senator Vest and old Drum lived in the community only from court records and classical literature. In the fall of 1956 the citizens of Warrensburg, under the direction of the local Chamber of Commerce, decided to perpetuate the memory of the principal character in the drama. An appeal was made for volunteer funds and the response came from dog lovers everywhere.

Today, in the southeast corner of the courthouse lawn in Warrensburg, is a large granite base, adorned on the top with the life-sized statue of a hound, as near an exact replica of old Drum as historians were able to find. A local black and tan coon hound served as a model.

Attached to the front of the pedestal is a bronze tablet inscribed with Senator Vest's moving plea.

Though the trial actually took place in the old courthouse, located several blocks west of the present structure, the statue is located at the present site. At the time it was erected, the long-neglected old courthouse was a private residence. It was completed as a courthouse in 1842 and served the county until 1878, when it was sold at a sheriff's sale. This of course, occurred after completion and occupancy of the present structure.

However, during the last year or two, much of the old courthouse has been restored. A grant of federal funds has been applied for and local enthusiasts hope that when restoration is complete, perhaps the statue can be moved to the original site of the famous oration.

Senator Vest's plea to the jury, immortalized on the bronze tablet affixed to the base of the monument, follows:

"Gentlemen of the jury. The best friend a man has in this world may turn against him and become his enemy. His son or daughter that he has reared with loving care may prove ungrateful. Those who are nearest and dearest to us, those whom we trust with our happiness and our good name, may become traitors to their faith. The money that a man

has, he may lose. It flies away from him, perhaps when he needs it the most.

"A man's reputation may be sacrificed in a moment of ill-considered action. The people who are prone to fall on their knees to do his honor when success is with us may be the first to throw the stone of malice when failure settles its cloud upon our heads.

"The one absolutely unselfish friend that a man can have in this selfish world; the one that never deserts him and the one that never proves ungrateful or treacherous is his dog.

"Gentlemen of the jury, a man's dog stands by him in prosperity and in poverty; in health and in sickness; he will sleep on the cold ground, where the wintry winds blow and the snow drives fiercely, if only he may be near his master's side. He will kiss the hand that has no food to offer. He will lick the wounds and sores that come in encounters with the roughness of the world. He guards the sleep of his pauper master as if he were a prince. When all other friends desert, he remains.

"When riches take wings and reputation falls to pieces, he is as constant in his love as the sun in its journey through the heavens. If fortune drives the master forth an outcast in the world, friendless and homeless, the faithful dog asks no higher privilege than that of accompanying him to guard against danger, to fight against his enemies, and when the last scene of all comes and death takes the master in its embrace and his body is laid away in the cold ground, no matter if all other friends pursue their way, there by his graveside will the noble dog be found, his head between his paws his eyes sad but open in alert watchfulness, faithful and true, even to death."

THE PENNSYLVANIA AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION AND THE PENNSYLVANIA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, December 10, the Pennsylvania Delegation to the Congress had the honor of lunching with Dr. Russell E. Larson, Dean of the College of Agriculture and Director of the Agricultural Experiment Station at the Pennsylvania State University.

Dean Larson reported to the delegation on the work of the Agricultural Experiment Station at Penn State. He told of the efforts of Cooperative Extension to bring the results of that work into all sections of Pennsylvania. Since other land-grant colleges throughout the country do similar work, I wish to enter Dean Larson's prepared remarks into the Record. I think the efforts of the College of Agriculture at Penn State are a good example of the effective use of Federal funds for the benefits of our whole society:

THE PENNSYLVANIA AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION AND THE PENNSYLVANIA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

(By R. E. Larson)

I am greatly appreciative of the privilege of meeting with you today and for the opportunity to discuss the Pennsylvania Agricultural Experiment Station and the Pennsylvania Cooperative Extension Service, both

of which are responsibilities of the College of Agriculture of The Pennsylvania State University.

Food production in the United States runs so smoothly that people tend to lose sight of how it achieved this condition and the factors that are basic to the continuation of its efficiency. The thought of going without food in the United States seldom occurs to anyone.

Recently, however, something happened that made many people conscious of the fact that we could be subject to a food problem of serious proportions and we were very close to such a happening.

A serious corn leaf blight disease surfaced in southeastern United States and moved from there to the Corn Belt and on into the northern states. Fortunately the disease did not spread into the Midwest or North until August and unlike the losses in the Southeast, the reduction in corn yields was limited to about 15 per cent in the Corn Belt and to less than 5 per cent in Pennsylvania and New York.

USDA figures show a national loss of about 720 million bushels. We can weather this without catastrophic disturbance although Commodity Credit Corporation corn reserves have reportedly been cut from 275 million bushels to 140 million bushels.

Knowledge based on previous research will make it possible to reduce this threat in 1971 and essentially to eliminate it in 1972.

I relate this situation to you because I am an administrator in a publicly supported College of Agriculture with responsibilities for education and research in agriculture. We are dependent upon federal and state resources for our support, and it is men such as you who make the decisions concerning a substantial part of the budgets of the state agricultural experiment stations and the state cooperative extension services.

The corn situation illustrates that even in the United States we live on a "thin line of abundance" and even deducting for my biased view of the importance of agriculture, unless this country and the Commonwealth continue to provide adequate support for agricultural research and training, we could be subject to food problems of crisis proportions. And this is not a problem of farmers but rather of over 11.6 million consumers in Pennsylvania and 204.7 million in the United States.

Your predecessors developed a concept and you have retained what has been described by many as the greatest educational system of all times. That is the Land-Grant Agricultural Colleges with its Resident Education, Research, and Extension. Many countries throughout the world have attempted to emulate this system.

I appreciate that you are aware of legislative history, but permit me to very briefly review the evolution of these classical Federal acts.

1. The Land-Grant Act written by Senator J. S. Morrill establishing unique Land-Grant institutions to provide formal education in agriculture and the mechanic arts was signed into law by President Lincoln in 1862. The General Assembly of Pennsylvania designated The Agricultural College of Pennsylvania on April 1, 1863, to carry out the provisions of the Morrill Land-Grant Act.

2. In 1890 the Morrill-Nelson and later the Bankhead-Jones bills were enacted to provide Federal appropriations for "further endowment" of instructional programs at Land-Grant institutions.

3. The Hatch Act was passed in 1887 and Federal funds were made available to establish and incorporate an agricultural research function in the Land-Grant idea.

The Pennsylvania General Assembly acted by establishing the Pennsylvania Agricultural Experiment Station in the College of Agriculture at Penn State in 1887.

4. The Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, provided matching funds to establish and maintain an educational outreach to offer practical knowledge to all people. The Pennsylvania General Assembly assigned the agricultural and home economics extension function to the College in 1915.

5. The McIntire-Stennis Act of 1962 is the most recent legislation making funds available for research in forestry.

Most of these funds are made available to states on the basis of a formula calculated from rural populations, geographic size, and other factors.

Pennsylvania ranks 14th among states in importance of agriculture and forestry.

Let me present a few interesting statistics: In 1969, Pennsylvania farm and forest sales exceeded one billion dollars. There were 128,000 people employed on farms and 210,000 employees in food and fiber processing industries. There were 3,925 agriculture-related manufacturing firms and raw product sales and the manufactured product value of agriculture and forest output in Pennsylvania exceeded \$8 billion per year.

The economic values of raw and manufactured products are shown in Table 1. The diversity of Pennsylvania's agriculture is also illustrated in Table 1.

Few people realize that the agri-business complex in Philadelphia, Delaware, Montgomery, Chester, and Bucks Counties annually employs 42,000 people and pays \$300 million in salaries and wages; or that Allegheny County has 244 manufacturing firms processing food products; or that Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton have 73 food processors employing 3,718 people.

Anyway, although the amount of funds provided for agricultural research and education is not great, the economic and social returns from these investments have become legend. The return to the consuming society far exceeds that to the aggregate farm producing sector. Let me give a few brief examples:

1. The return on investment which re-

sulted in the discovery of the role of molybdenum and zinc in plant nutrition probably exceeds 800 per cent/year since the discoveries were made.

2. Hybrid corn has had an estimated return of better than 700 per cent/year since its development and adoption.

3. The control of *Bovine vibriosis* in Northeastern United States—an accomplishment of cooperative regional research—is estimated to save almost \$39 million per year. In this case, the expenditure of \$1 million Hatch funds has saved \$500 million to date for the dairy industry and the consumers in the Northeast.

Your Pennsylvania Agricultural Experiment Station, other state stations, and the USDA were instrumental in some way in each of these developments. Penn State has also been responsible for a multitude of other contributions from the development of improved crop plants ranging from Pennmead Orchardgrass to Penngift Crown Vetch to the developments in reproductive physiology leading to superior sire selection and artificial insemination to produce superior dairy cattle.

TABLE 1.—Economic values of agricultural and forest products in Pennsylvania

[Millions of dollars]	
Farm and forestry raw products sales—1969*:	
Dairy products	\$424
Poultry products	165
Meat animals	154
Cereal and feed grain crops	53
Horticultural specialties	43
Mushrooms	43
Vegetables	40
Fruits and nuts	38
Forest crops	15
Tobacco	11
Miscellaneous	18
Total	1,004

*Source: Supplement to *Farm Income Situation*, July, 1970.

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES RELATED TO AGRICULTURE, 1969¹

Industry	Establishments (no.)	Employees	Wages	Value of production
Food and kindred products.....	2,252	115,000	\$741,000,000	\$4,621,000,000
Lumber and wood products.....	1,006	12,000	67,000,000	278,000,000
Leather.....	209	27,000	129,000,000	393,000,000
Tobacco.....	55	8,000	35,000,000	221,000,000
Paper and allied products.....	403	48,000	362,000,000	1,515,000,000
Total.....	3,925	210,000	1,334,000,000	7,028,000,000

¹ Source: Pennsylvania Department of Commerce, Industrial Census Series, data in press.

As I have stated, there have been innumerable pay-offs but the point I want most desperately to make is that "agricultural research and extension are not expenses; they are investments of proven high return."

We are not concerned solely with economics or the production of adequate quantities of food, however. Our prime responsibility has always been to the people and the better life which they seek.

A capsule look at some of the present day programs in the College of Agriculture gives evidence that People problems have a high priority. We have, for example, greatly increased research and Extension emphasis in such areas as: (1) environmental quality; (2) consumer health, nutrition, and well-being; and (3) raising the level of disadvantaged people.

Nutrition Aides—Nutrition aides, trained and supervised by Penn State's Cooperative Extension Service, are reaching families from center city to mountain shacks. This unique program was launched in January 1969 with special funds allocated by the USDA for "hiring and training aides to help improve the diets of low-income people and families through education."

Today in Pennsylvania we have 208 nutrition aides working with 14,716 program families in 29 counties. The number of families being reached is expected to double within the year.

Youth—As has always been true, our country's most precious crop is youth. The choices these young people make, the careers they pursue, and the knowledge and skills they gain, will determine this nation's future. Extension's 4-H programs reach more than 100,000 young Pennsylvanians annually, nearly half of them as regular members and the rest through special youth projects such as the TV science and action programs.

Rural Development—40 per cent of the nation's disadvantaged persons live in rural areas. Our Commonwealth has many hard-pressed rural communities facing declining job opportunities and tax bases on one hand, and the need and demand for improved quality of public services on the other. Our Rural Development programs, in the simplest terms, are aimed at making rural areas a better place to work and a better place to live.

Our Rural Development Agents, backed-up by University-based specialists, are

working with township and community governments; planning and zoning commissions; authorities and boards; and regional economic development associations to help them evaluate their situations and to develop progressive courses of action. In some cases it is seeking an orderly pattern for growth; in others it is attempting to attract industry to expand job opportunities. Problems of environmental pollution; wise use of land; training programs for youth and re-training programs for unemployed adults; the impact of new highways, such as Interstate 80; the potential for tourism—all are in the realm of rural development. Sometimes it is simply creating an awareness that a problem exists—and that something can be done about it through cooperative effort. Sometimes it is simply advising people where they can find help.

Environmental Concerns—In recent years it has become apparent that much of our own technology, developed for the benefit of mankind, may be creating an environment that is unsuitable for man. . . . as well as other forms of life. It will require great wisdom and much future effort to correct the problems technology has created. . . . while retaining its gains.

A considerable amount of Penn State's agricultural and forestry research is directed toward waste management and pollution control as well as other problems affecting the quality of our Pennsylvania environment. Let me give you a few examples:

RECYCLING WASTES

1. For a number of years, Penn State scientists have been pumping sewage effluent onto the land . . . using the soil as a "living filter" to remove the plant nutrients and to restore clean, pure water to the ground table. We know that sewage effluent can be utilized both as a fertilizer and as irrigation water to greatly increase crop and forest yields. (Under conditions of the studies made, 129 acres of land can handle the 1 million gallons of effluent water produced daily in a community of 10,000 persons.)

Recently, a Penn State Forest Hydrologist has applied aspects of this research to another Pennsylvania problem—the revegetation of spoil banks. He has proven that grasses, legumes, and trees can be grown on harsh spoil bank sites by irrigation with municipal sewage effluent and sludge.

2. We know that the nutritive values of much of Pennsylvania's horticultural wastes (684,000 tons produced annually) are such that they might be effectively incorporated into livestock feed rations. These wastes, now a serious problem of the processing industry, could provide a substantial part of the ration for many thousand head of finishing cattle annually. Systems approaches are needed to make such a program feasible.

Other preliminary studies involve the use of aerobically digested soft city garbage; wastes from milk and paper plant operations; utilization of energy and nitrogen from cooked poultry waste; and use of sawdust and similar wood wastes as roughage substitutes in high-energy livestock rations.

3. Pennsylvania, with poultry product sales totaling \$165 million last year, has concentrated poultry operations in excess of 250,000 birds. The poultry waste from the Commonwealth's 18 million birds amounts to more than 815,000 tons annually. Penn State research has shown that this waste can be dried and processed for use as a practically odorless organic fertilizer.

Our researchers are working in numerous areas, other than those I have cited, to obtain the answers needed to solve Pennsylvania's waste management problems. What we are developing, and what we will have as soon as the resources are made available, is an Agricultural Waste Management Center. We plan a full-time continuing staff of qualified people assigned to this Center,

whose total responsibility will be to work on the problems of waste management and waste utilization.

FOOD SAFETY RESEARCH

When we talk about improving the quality of our environment, we sometimes forget that man's closest link with the environment is the food he eats. We are concerned about possible health hazards that may accompany our food supply.

A cooperative program with the Pennsylvania Department of Health centers on work with egg, poultry processing and dehydrated foods industries. Products from these areas have been responsible for certain food poisoning outbreaks in the past and they have been unfairly accused in other cases.

In 1963-64 some Pennsylvania milk was dumped because the DDT levels were above the FDA's legal tolerance levels of 1.25 parts per million. Within two years, research and educational programs virtually eliminated the problem and most Pennsylvania dairy producers now have levels below 0.5 ppm.

MOTHER'S MILK UNSAFE

So cows' milk is safe, but what about human milk? With the cooperation of the Greater Philadelphia Childbirth Education Association, we have one of the few studies underway in the country to test pesticide levels in mother's milk. More than half of the 48 mothers being tested (75 percent of whom are from the Philadelphia area and 25 percent from Central Pennsylvania) are lactating milk with pesticide levels in excess of the FDA tolerance level. Two of the women showing high pesticide levels reported eating "primarily organic or natural foods" having no chemical sprays or fertilizers. Women who have nursed several children seem to have lower pesticide levels, indicating they are passing the residues on to their children. Needless to say, more research is needed in this area.

POPULATION CONTROL

For almost 25 years, personnel at Penn State's Dairy Breeding Research Center have been studying certain aspects of male reproductive physiology related to artificial insemination of dairy and beef cattle. In addition, current research with bulls and rabbits is directed at one of our major world problems—The Population Crisis. Our scientists hope to develop a reversible prevention of sperm maturation within the male reproductive system as a promising approach for an urgently needed *male contraceptive*.

NEED FOR CONTINUING RESEARCH

The need for continuing research and educational programs . . . and public support for these programs . . . is reflected in three current problems facing Pennsylvania agriculture.

1. **Corn Blight**—This disease which I discussed earlier is a mutant of Southern corn leaf blight. It swept through the South and the Midwestern Corn Belt this year. It eventually reached fields in the southern two-thirds of Pennsylvania. Up to 90 per cent of our U.S. corn hybrids are susceptible to this fast-spreading fungus. Corn is a major crop in the United States and the problem is frightening.

The nation lost an estimated 14 per cent of the 1970 corn harvest. Yes, we have corn and feed grains in reserve—certainly enough to counterbalance the 1970 losses. Our agricultural economists tell us we could absorb a 20 per cent loss in 1971 but beyond that we could be in serious trouble.

Pennsylvania corn growers, as a group were not hit as hard as their southern and midwestern counterparts. But we feed more grain than we grow and, of course, the buyer of feed, as well as the eventual consumer of livestock, poultry, and dairy products would eventually be affected by price increases.

You probably noted that news media coverage of this agricultural problem emphasized the "fear" of price increases, not the "fear" of lack of food. In many countries, a crop shortage of real magnitude would mean considerable hardship—perhaps hunger and famine.

When it was evident that Southern Corn Blight could become a major problem, the state agricultural experiment stations and extension services and the USDA responded quickly and effectively. For example, forty scientists and seed producers from New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania met at Penn State to discuss aspects of the disease and its possible impact. Fortunately we have a pool of germ plasm from which we can immediately transfer resistant genes to the inbred corn lines. This is in progress at Penn State and elsewhere. However, even by rushing into emergency winter production of blight-resistant seed corn in Hawaii, Mexico and South America, U.S. growers figure only 21 per cent of the seed corn available to farmers next spring will be of the resistant type. (A full supply of resistant seed is expected to be available in 1972.)

Make no mistake about it; this was a "close one" and we are not out of the woods yet. The history of agriculture is full of documented biological changes which have decimated crops and changed the course of man and nations. The Irish of Boston might still be the Irish of Dublin without the "late blight" of the potato crop. We are also aware of what happened to our fine stands of American chestnut trees . . . and what is happening to our American elms. These biological changes have occurred in the past, are occurring now, and will occur in the future.

2. **Stone Fruit Disease**—Stem pitting has caused severe losses to nurserymen and producers of stone fruit in Pennsylvania and throughout the stone fruit production areas of the East.

It is estimated that Pennsylvania peach growers alone have lost 75,000 trees with a dollar value of \$500,000 and that growers of other stone fruits have lost 30,000 trees valued at approximately \$200,000 since the problem was first noted in the mid 1960's.

Pennsylvania nurserymen who supply trees to a wide geographic area have also suffered such severe losses that it is now questionable if it is economically feasible for our nurseries to continue propagating stone fruit trees. Direct losses in discarded trees and in trees given to growers as replacements have varied up to 25 per cent with individual nurseries. These losses have been at least \$150,000 since 1967 and continue at a rate above \$40,000 annually.

We established a broad based program of research at the fruit research laboratory in Adams County in 1967. We must determine the cause of this disease, its method of spread, and develop control measures if this important Pennsylvania agricultural industry is to survive. A fruit tree nursery improvement program has also been established in cooperation with the USDA with a goal of producing virus-free trees.

3. **Gypsy Moth**—The gypsy moth is the most destructive forest pest in the eastern United States and now infests nearly one-half the land area of Pennsylvania. Trees have been defoliated in urban, suburban and agricultural areas as well as in forested areas. Watersheds are damaged and the forest ecology is extensively disrupted.

Gypsy moth infestations in Pennsylvania were reduced below detection levels by 1951 using aerial applications of DDT. This pesticide was outlawed for gypsy moth control by the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture in 1963. The substitution of the carbamate "Sevin" has resulted in only limited control in areas placed under treatment.

By 1970, ten million acres were infested in the Commonwealth and approximately 11,000 acres of forest land were completely

defoliated in Monroe and Pike Counties. There is a good probability of a ten-fold increase in defoliation to more than 100,000 acres in 1971.

Hope for control rests in research leading in development of new biological and non-chemical control techniques. The gypsy moth sex attractant has been synthesized in the laboratory. It is extremely effective in pulling male moths into traps where they can be destroyed. Also, this female sex odor may possibly be used to saturate the habitat and thus make the male unable to orient to find the female.

A polyhedrosis virus is also known to occur in nature that is lethal to the larvae. However, considerable research needs to be done to develop efficient technics for use.

CONCLUSION

Agriculture and rural areas have many other problems, some of which are indicated in Table 2, but agriculture is nonetheless "the strongest weapon in the U.S. Arsenal."

We are capable of maintaining the dynamic nature of our programs providing that influential men like you and your associates will help to make the necessary resources available.

Thank you.

TABLE 2.—Some of the Problem Areas in Pennsylvania Requiring Early Agricultural Research and Education Attention.

- Agricultural waste management.
- Low income and development problems of rural Pennsylvania.
- Gypsy Moth.
- Pesticide replacement by biological or other control means.
- Improved timber production.
- Nutrition expansion.
- Food contamination control.
- Southern corn blight.
- Stone fruit decline disorder.
- Expansion of youth programs.

A NATIONAL LAND USE PLANNING POLICY

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported S. 3354 with amendments, a bill sponsored by Senator JACKSON and others to expand the Water Resources Planning Act to provide for a national land use planning policy.

The bill is of such major importance to the Nation—and to each of the individual States, including my own—that I intend to introduce an identical measure when the 92d Congress convenes next month. I hope that many of my colleagues will join me in so doing.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would set up the machinery needed to establish a national land use planning policy, and would authorize for State and interstate agencies \$100 million a year for State-wide land use planning grants. To administer the program and make possible contractual studies an additional \$16 million would also be authorized.

States would be required to submit within 5 years of the effective date of the law a land use plan, drawn under the terms of the act, or face the loss of existing or proposed Federal grants for projects with substantial environmental impact.

Federal projects and agencies also would be required to comply.

Administering the program would be the Land and Water Resources Council, an expansion of the existing Water Resources Council. Represented would be six Cabinet agencies and the Army, the Federal Power Commission, and two environmental quality agencies. The Vice President would head the Council.

Today land ranks as one of the Nation's fastest dwindling resources in terms of available privately owned supplies. The demands of technological advances, population growth, and social change are bringing about conflicts over the use of land and in maintaining the quality of that land and the natural resources it bears.

There is little land, there are few resources in the Nation today which are not subject to conflicting uses—existing or planned.

We have watched the development of summer communities on the cool shores of manmade lakes in Northern States—and we have watched those waters fouled by inadequate sewer systems or the installation of septic tanks in inadequate soils.

In Arizona we have watched tracts of winter estates carved out of our State, roads and driveways gouged out of the land without sewer or water facilities available or planned—and sold through the mails and through advertisements in the back pages of the Nation's magazines.

The result of such poor development practices has been the pollution of our countryside, and of our waters, the waste of our limited resources, and the pollution of our society as a whole.

The problem reaches farther than that, however. It reaches to the suburbs and beyond, with the perceptible shift being felt in many States of urban workers moving back into the countryside to raise their children. Among the farms that their parents left not many years ago, many families are now seeking their education and their recreation.

With farm next to homesite, with fields cut by the modern highways being constructed to bear the added traffic to the cities, problems ranging from solid waste disposal to erosion controls are being forced on the States and localities in areas untroubled a decade ago.

Industries and utilities, taking our timber and dumping their wastes in our waters, have at last been confronted by those citizens whose rights to a liveable environment are being violated.

The choice facing such States—and my State is among them—is between planned growth to preserve those rights, and chaos.

These conflicts are joined with the clash over land use plans, and the results can be seen on our communities. The results include a polarization of community sentiment, costly court battles, and economic instability in many regions.

The bill I will offer, Mr. Speaker, approaches the need for a national land use planning policy as a tool of protecting the environment, and focuses that task at the State level. Provisions are in-

cluded for local and regional involvement.

It combines incentives, guidelines, and requirements aimed at achieving that environmental quality, economic growth and the conservation of our natural resources.

It adds to the concept of existing "701" local planning grants a broader horizon, stretching to long range goals while maintaining the essentially urban emphasis, and immediate aims of the "701" grants.

Through the creation of a Land and Water Resources Council, Mr. Speaker, and the State services that will be provided through the Federal Planning Information Center called for under the Council, we will add a substantial weapon in the fight to protect our environment through a national land use policy.

YOUTH AND DEMOCRACY

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I feel that any time during the year is appropriate to reflect upon our country and what it means to be an American. The occasion is the more significant when I read the thoughts of some of our younger citizens whose faith and belief in our way of life are the real cornerstones of any plan to build a better tomorrow. The following thoughts are those of a young man, Jack C. Kerlin, who at 23 has already served his country well in the U.S. Navy. I think you will be interested in what he has to say about "Democracy":

The very life's breath of America is contained in the single word DEMOCRACY, defined as . . . "A government that is run by the people who live under it" . . . "Treatment of others as one's equals". The treatment of others as equals must be the spiritual bond of a self-governing people. As Theodore Roosevelt wrote, "Ours is a government of laws, but . . . no law is worth anything unless there is the right kind of man behind it". He wasn't talking about one man; he was talking about American citizens, millions of individuals, white or black, rich or poor, who as rational human beings must together give meaning to the word JUSTICE.

As I watch my children grow, I realize that even though they are my children, they are also America's children. My hope for America . . . America's hope for America, lies within its children, and our (America's) ability to instill in their hearts the love of freedom and patriotism which gave birth to our great nation. We must fill them with the compassion of a Lincoln, the wisdom of an Eisenhower, the valor of a Nathan Hale, the wit of a Benjamin Franklin, the vitality and courage of a John F. Kennedy, and the spirit of '76. We must hand them our flag with the knowledge that they will fly it proudly throughout the land, long after our passing. We must prepare them to seek peace, but to defend and preserve their freedom at all costs.

During a speech in Chicago (September 29, 1952), Adlai Stevenson said, ". . . as citizens of this democracy, you are the rulers and the ruled, the lawgivers and the law-abiding, the beginning and the end". It is the responsibility of each of us, as Americans, to see

that there is no end to the democratic freedom we cherish, and to insure that our children and our children's children are able to preserve it. Their minds must be sound, their bodies strong and their faith boundless . . . Only then will they be able to shoulder the responsibilities of a nation.

On June 14, 1954, the late President Dwight David Eisenhower added two words to the Pledge of Allegiance . . . "Under God". Since then these words have (regretfully) been dropped from the school systems, but to prosper as we have and to maintain that prosperity, we must truly be . . . "one nation, under God". The cornerstone of our country is faith; without it the pioneers of our history would never have beheld the vastness and beauty of the land we call our home, nor could Nell Armstrong have stepped onto the surface of the moon and planted our flag in its crust.

I hope and pray that long after I die, my children, America's children, will continue to make their homeland . . . "one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all". Perhaps with what they learn from us and from our efforts to uphold these ideals, they will be able to insure liberty and justice for all mankind. They are our hopes, our dreams, and our future . . . God gave us the wisdom to guide them, for without them we are lost.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE
ROBERT W. LISHMAN

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the death of Robert W. Lishman comes as a severe loss to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. His service as Chief Counsel to the Special Subcommittee on Investigations has been invaluable, and it was the nature of his work for the subcommittee that much of it remain uncompleted. It was also the investigative nature of his work that much of it necessarily took place behind the scenes, so that only those who worked closely with the affairs of the special subcommittee could be aware of his diligence, competence, and effectiveness.

Bob Lishman devoted a number of the most productive years of his life to direction of the special subcommittee staff and was instrumental in bringing to a successful conclusion a number of investigations of national importance, including exposure of television quiz program scandals and lobbying improprieties. He served as chief counsel from 1958 to 1961; he returned to a lucrative private practice until 1966, when he answered the call to return to the subcommittee.

His earlier career was also devoted to private practice alternating with periods of public service. He was a native of Boston and a graduate of Harvard College and Harvard Law School. In 1934 he began a period of public service as assistant corporation counsel of the city of New York. During the war years he served in Washington with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

His latest work for the special subcommittee involved investigations of television news staging and improper transfers

of broadcasting licenses, as well as probes of improper influences on the staffs of the regulatory agencies. Other investigations and studies he initiated now must go forward properly, for he regarded his mission with the subcommittee as serving the highest national interests.

As one who worked with him on many occasions, I agree. Under his staff direction I believe the subcommittee has been able to make major contributions to the important work of the Congress and the Nation. He shall be sorely missed.

OKLAHOMA 4-H CLUBS LEAD THE
NATION

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. Speaker, Oklahoma frequently scores first, and many times you have heard me take this floor to speak with pride of these Oklahoma "firsts."

This is my purpose for speaking today, but today I speak with a very special pride because a group of Oklahoma's outstanding young people scored a spectacular first last week in Chicago.

Oklahoma's representatives to the National 4-H Club Congress received more national honors and brought home more money in scholarships than the representatives of any other State. Twenty-one Oklahomans were called to the platform during the congress to receive recognition for excellence at everything from veterinary science to home food preservation.

These 21 winners earned scholarships worth a total of \$12,200, and every one of them plans to use the scholarship to go on into higher education.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all of us know the value of the 4-H Clubs of America. These clubs give our rural young people outstanding training in meeting citizenship responsibilities, in addition to developing the kind of technical skills which enabled one of these young Oklahoma winners to exhibit pigs which have earned four grand championships, three reserve grand championships, 13 breed championships, six reserve breed championships, and 25 first place ribbons over an 8-year period.

Mr. Speaker, these young people are champions themselves, and I salute them for bringing this honor to Oklahoma. They are Randy DuBois, Grove; Ted Weber, Carmen; Cathy Bennett, Guthrie; Clayton Taylor, Oktaha; Alane LeGrand, Stillwater; Yvonne Moore, Ninnekah; Denise Nelson, Carrier; Jimmie Williams, Smithville; Vicki Hutchens, Tishomingo; John Roush, Cherokee; Jane Mayer, Hooker; John Lawler, Orlando; Tony Engelke, Amber; Janet Johnson, Mulhall; Larry Shockey, Chickasha; Latriece Baker, Carter; Gwen Shaw, Burlington; Roellen Gentry, Shawnee; Lou Ann Schiltz, Ponca City; Lanny Bates, Ada; and Bill Stasyszen, Tecumseh.

PANAMA CANAL SOVEREIGNTY AND
MODERNIZATION: ACTION BY THE
CONGRESS NEEDED

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most brilliant achievements in the history of our country was the construction of the Panama Canal. Located on the strategic Isthmus of Panama its control by the United States is indispensable for the security of the entire Western Hemisphere. The net investment by the American taxpayers in that project, including its defense, from 1904 through June 30, 1968, totals more than \$5,000,000,000; which sum, if converted into 1970 dollars, would, of course, be far greater.

On December 1, 1970, the final report of the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission under Public Law 88-609 was filed with the President. This action closed a 5-year inquiry that cost \$21.4 million out of a total of \$24.0 million appropriated.

The latest significant contribution to the cumulating canal literature is an illuminating letter to the editor of the Manchester Union Leader, a leading New England newspaper, by Capt. Franz O. Willenbacher.

An experienced naval officer and able lawyer, Captain Willenbacher, while on duty in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations in the Navy Department, was a participant in the formulation of some of the defense provisions of the 1936 Hall-Alfaro Treaty between the United States and Panama. Conversant with the problem of the canal through his many transits of it on naval vessels, he has followed subsequent developments concerning it with interest and understanding.

Captain Willenbacher's letter follows:

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader,
Dec. 2, 1970]

TIME FOR ACTION NOW ON IMPROVING
PANAMA CANAL

To the Editors: Recently (Nov. 13 and 14), major segments of the United States news media, based upon an obvious leak from the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, announced that the commission's report favoring the construction of a new canal of "sea level" design will be submitted to the President on Dec. 1.

The site selected is in the Republic of Panama, approximately five miles west of the U.S. owned Canal Zone. Its initial estimated cost goes as high as \$3.5 billion for construction by conventional methods. This does not include the cost of acquiring the right of way and the inevitable huge indemnity that would be demanded by Panama.

Nuclear excavation is eliminated because of the danger of contamination of surrounding populated areas and the restrictions of the test ban treaty.

Apparently mentioned in this report is the problem which has been raised concerning ecological hazards in constructing a salt water channel to connect the two oceans, seemingly dismissed by the commission as matters of little consequence.

Respected independent marine biologists have warned that the opening of such salt

water channel might result in biological catastrophe in both oceans, including danger of invasion of the Atlantic by poisonous Pacific sea snakes, related to the cobra, which might spread as far as the coasts of Virginia and Brazil. These biologists urge retention of the fresh water barrier provided by the existing high-level lake and lock type canal.

The plan for increased transit facilities, favored by many independent engineers and by defense and other canal experts, is the enlargement of the existing Panama Canal, as provided in the celebrated Terminal Lake-Third Locks Plan, developed in the Panama Canal organization during World War II. This can be accomplished with every assurance of success at "comparatively low cost" and does not require a new treaty with Panama. Moreover, it would retain the fresh water barrier as well as provide the best canal for navigation at least expense.

Rep. Daniel J. Flood, one of the nation's leading authorities on interoceanic canal problems, when testifying Aug. 3, 1970, before the House Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs, stressed that there are only two major issues: (1) safeguarding our indispensable sovereignty over the Canal Zone and (2) the major modernization of the existing canal.

As to the super vessels that the proposed sea level canal would accommodate, they would not use it for the reason that it is more economical to route such ships around Cape Horn than to pay transit tolls—and they are built with that in mind.

The canal subject has been actively studied since 1945. Much time has been lost in making new additional investigations. Moreover, \$171,000,000 already has been expended toward the major modernization of the existing canal and channel improvements—too large a sum to be thrown away and which has been expended in furtherance of the construction of the Terminal Lake-Third Locks Plan.

Without further delay, Congress should act on the program outlined by Representative Flood. Since the recommendations in the forthcoming report hinge upon surrender of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone to Panama, and do not mention the only common sense solution of the canal problem, the Terminal Lake-Third Locks Plan, the report of the Presidential study group should not be allowed to divert attention from what is needed at Panama in the way of increased capacity and operational improvements of the existing canal.

The time for further procrastination is over.

The time for action has come.

FRANZ O. WILLENBUCHER,
Captain, USN (Ret.).

CORBIN, KY., MAN HONORED

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, today I am including in the RECORD the article from the Lexington Herald, Lexington, Ky., dated December 9, 1970, concerning Robert A. Blair of Corbin, Ky.

Mr. Blair is well known for his work in forestry and conservation. He is one of Kentucky's finest conservationists.

CORBIN MAN HONORED

ENVIRONMENTAL MEASURES URGED BY FORESTERS

WINCHESTER, KY.—Members of the Kentucky-Tennessee Section of the Society of American Foresters urged passage of bills

calling for state systems of "natural areas" and stronger regulation of strip mining at their annual meeting held in Nashville.

Charles J. Crail, Winchester, public affairs officers for the group, said two resolutions dealing with natural area systems and strip mining were adopted.

The first resolution urged support of legislation leading to the establishment of state systems of natural areas in Kentucky and Tennessee. The resolution stated: "Members of the Kentucky-Tennessee Section of the Society of American Foresters have long recognized the scientific, educational and esthetic importance of formally designating appropriate tracts of wild land as 'natural areas,' and maintaining them free of human activity which may disturb native plants and animals."

The second resolution, which dealt with strip mining, expressed concern from the group for the "environmental effects of strip mining."

The resolution recommended additional state legislation to prevent lasting damage to natural resources and to insure rapid reclamation of the land, a strengthening of the existing enforcement organization through adequate financing, additional professional staffing, and firm support by the governor, and long-range planning leading to future productive use of reclaimed lands.

A RESOLUTION COMMENDING THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, the oldest regulatory agency of the United States—the Interstate Commerce Commission—has recently come under sharp attack by a number of Members of the other body. I call your attention to the attached resolution passed by the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners commending them for their diligent activities and attention to duty since 1887.

NARUC ANNUAL CONVENTION ADOPTS RESOLUTIONS RE AEC, WATER UTILITIES, MOTOR CARRIERS, ICC, INTERSTATE RAIL RATES, OZARK PLAN, PROMOTIONAL PRACTICES, AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

The NARUC, assembled in its 82d Annual Convention on November 19, 1970, in the vicinity of Las Vegas, Nevada, adopted the following resolutions:

RESOLUTION RE PRESERVATION OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION AS AN INDEPENDENT REGULATORY AGENCY

Whereas, the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners was established in 1889 and is dedicated to serving the public by engaging in the study and discussion of subjects concerning the regulation of public utilities and carriers, promoting the uniformity of their regulation among jurisdictions, encouraging cooperation among the Federal and State governmental members of the Association, and advocating courses to improve the quality and effectiveness of public regulation in America; and

Whereas, certain members of the Congress of the United States are now giving consideration to the abolishment of the Interstate Commerce Commission through the transfer of its regulatory functions to the Department of Transportation or to a single Federal transport regulatory agency to exercise

jurisdiction over air, surface and maritime transportation; and

Whereas, the Interstate Commerce Commission was established by the Interstate Commerce Act in 1887 and is the oldest of the several independent Federal regulatory agencies; and

Whereas, the Interstate Commerce Commission, as an arm of the Congress of the United States, is insulated from political influence to the maximum extent practicable; and

Whereas, the basic concept of the regulation of surface transportation in the public interest, as defined by the National Transportation Policy and the Interstate Commerce Act and as administered by the Commission, has proven to be sufficiently flexible to meet the needs of both consumers and regulated industry; and

Whereas, the Interstate Commerce Commission has advanced the welfare of people in all parts of the Nation and has strengthened and unified the economy of the various regions of the Nation by preventing or eliminating unreasonable preferences and advantages to any persons, points, regions or commodities; and

Whereas, the preservation of this regulatory function is vital to the future growth of the Nation and to the continued promotion of economic opportunity to people in all parts of the Nation; and

Whereas, the users of surface transportation in particular have benefited from the Commission's ability to maintain transport rate levels significantly below the general indexes measuring the inflationary spiral of our expanding economy, with some rates today being below comparable levels of the 1950's; and

Whereas, the transfer of the regulatory functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission to a massive bureaucratic organization would adversely affect the public interest because the welfare of the users of surface modes of transportation and the modes themselves would receive less consideration and promotion in the government process; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, assembled in its Eighty-second Annual Convention in the vicinity of Las Vegas, Nevada, hereby supports the continuation of the Interstate Commerce Commission as an independent regulatory agency exercising jurisdiction over surface transportation, and hereby opposes legislation or other proposals to transfer its regulatory functions to another Federal agency, or to significantly diminish the Commission's regulatory authority over surface transportation; and be it further

Resolved, that copies of this resolution be furnished by the General Counsel of the Association to the President of the United States.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 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?

DANGER IN U.S. NUCLEAR POLICY

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the discussions at the SALT talks continue and I am hopeful that they will culminate in a limitation of nuclear weapons.

With all of the discussions about nuclear weapons some basic points are often overlooked. In a recent article, "Danger in U.S. Nuclear Policy," Herbert Scoville details the horrible consequences of a nuclear confrontation. It is important that the essential human tragedy that would result from a nuclear exchange be constantly stressed.

I commend the reading of this brief yet important article to my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD.

DANGER IN U.S. NUCLEAR POLICY

(By Herbert Scoville)

The rumblings of a fundamental change in U.S. nuclear strategy are beginning to be heard outside the confines of our national security structure. Deterrence, the cornerstone of our strategic policies for many years, is now beginning to be decried as deficient. Nuclear "sufficiency" would be extended to include forces to fight a nuclear war, not merely to prevent one.

For the past two years Secretary Laird has justified his strategic weapons programs by invoking the need to maintain the security of the deterrent. The Safeguard ABM, he said, was required to defend Minuteman against the Soviet SS-9 missiles. U.S. MIRV's were needed to increase the retaliatory warheads against Soviet targets.

Now, arguments for new weapons to preserve the deterrent have begun to wear thin. People remember that only a few nuclear weapons launched in retaliation would cause tens of millions of Russian casualties. McGeorge Bundy pointed out in the October 1969 issue of Foreign Affairs that no political leader would launch a nuclear attack knowing that in retaliation even a few of his cities might be hit by hydrogen bombs.

Under Congressional and public scrutiny it has become increasingly difficult to defend the need for new weapons. SALT could reduce further the requirement for new weapons since it might freeze the existing state of mutual deterrence. New weapons programs might wither on the vine unless supporters could create new justifications.

The first public hint of a new approach to strategic policy was the trial balloon in President Nixon's State of the World message on Feb. 18, 1970:

"Should a President, in the event of a nuclear attack, be left with the single option of ordering the mass destruction of enemy civilians, in the face of the certainty that it would be followed by the mass slaughter of Americans?"

With this question the doctrine of flexible nuclear response was reborn. This was a return to the discredited notion of the early sixties that limited strategic war was practical; counterforce nuclear weapons to destroy aseptically military targets without endangering populations would be in vogue.

The following scenario has recently been given considerable public attention: Soviet SS-9's carrying MIRV's would destroy our Minuteman force. Their submarine missiles would knock out U.S. bombers on the ground. The President should have weapons capable of surviving this attack and then to eliminate remaining Soviet missiles so that he would not be forced to initiate population warfare.

In other words, the U.S. should be prepared to fight a circumscribed nuclear war, restricted to a duel between opposing weapons while the people were spared.

Unfortunately, the objective can never be realized since at the very least Soviet submarine missiles will be immune from attack. To attain partial success our forces would have to be vastly improved and expanded. New highly invulnerable missiles with many accurate MIRV's would be needed.

Such sophisticated weapons could not be distinguished from first strike weapons. This would develop strong pressures for further escalation of the arms race. This new counterforce strategic policy would justify expensive advanced weapons programs directed toward invulnerability, mobility, high accuracy, multiple MIRV's, and retargeting with continuous instantaneous intelligence. A meaningful agreement at SALT would probably be foreclosed or be restricted to a ceiling on offensive missiles with free substitution to allow new deployments. An agreement of this sort would only legalize an expanded arms race.

But what an unreal world it is in which these strategists live! To knock out the Minuteman force, the Soviets would have to fire at the U.S. 1,500 or more multimegaton nuclear weapons. Not only would many Americans be killed by blast and fire, but hundreds of thousands of square miles would be contaminated by fallout. Remember, in 1954 one fifteen-megaton bomb produced lethal fallout over 10,000 square miles in the Pacific. Destroying our bombers would require many additional nuclear explosions and produce many more casualties. The combined attack would kill millions of Americans and devastate large areas.

But assuming complete Soviet success, the U.S. would still have 41 Polaris submarines with a total of 656 missiles and 1,400 warheads. When Poseidon is deployed, we would have about 5,000 warheads, each with an explosive power several times that which devastated Hiroshima.

Can a sane man believe that the Soviets would launch such an attack on the chance that the U.S. would restrict its retaliatory attack so as to avoid Soviet cities? Even the most careful retaliation would inevitably kill millions of Russians.

To believe that the Soviets would run the risk of national suicide on the gamble that the U.S. would exercise such superhuman restraint is pure fantasy. Those who postulate such scenarios have lost touch with the realities of the world.

To attempt to give the President the option to wage a bloodless nuclear war is only to increase the risk that a nuclear disaster will occur.

DRAFT STATEMENT ON "SHOW TRIALS" OF JEWS IN RUSSIA

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the "show trials" of some dozen Jews accused of plotting to hijack a commercial airliner last June began this week in Leningrad.

The phenomenon of international piracy manifested in airline hijacking has occupied world attention in recent months. Along with a number of my colleagues I have introduced resolutions designed to deter and punish persons who violate the rights of peaceful air travelers.

But the issues in the Leningrad trials

go beyond the matter of punishing hijackers to larger questions of systematic anti-Semitism and the rights of citizens to free and unhampered emigration.

Since the 1967 Middle East War, political and physical harassment of Soviet Jews has increased. Propaganda against Israel has escalated into a general anti-Jewish campaign which considers Judaism the father of Zionism, and identifies Zionism with Nazism. This tenuous logic is most obvious in the Soviet refusal to allow Jews to emigrate to Israel. For indeed, this desire to avail themselves of their right to emigration seems to be the root cause of the charges against the alleged hijackers.

These trials—instances of the Soviet Union's system of "exemplary justice"—are related to the case of Leonid Rigerman, arrested on November 9, 1970, while trying to enter the U.S. Embassy in Moscow to establish his American citizenship. Mr. Rigerman was involved in protests against restrictions on emigration to Israel. Why the Soviet regime would wish to corroborate former Premier Khrushchev's inference that Russia itself is a prison is difficult to understand.

This is not a case of Russian rights, or Jewish rights; it transcends both; it is a question of basic human rights. For a denial of the right to emigrate contradicts the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights—vested with the same mandatory legal force as the United Nations charter to which the Soviet Union subscribes.

The U.S. position, as a leader in the cause of human rights, would be strengthened, however, if—beyond the declaration on human rights—we were to ratify the International Covenants on Human Rights adopted by the United Nations in 1966, but never transmitted by the President to the Senate. If we are to stand in judgment on Russian violations, U.S. consideration and ratification of these U.N. covenants would be a meaningful step toward enhancing our own credibility and dedication to the principle of universal human justice.

A PIKE COUNTY CHRISTMAS TREE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, with the Christmas season upon us and in the absence of our poet laureate, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, now Judge Charles Joelson, I would like to offer a Christmas poem.

A PIKE COUNTY CHRISTMAS TREE
I ricollect a Christmas tree that onct we had
in Pike;
There was me and Minky Peters, Joe Bowers,
his brother Ike,
And haff a dozen other ducks as constitooted
then
The "Bible Class" in Sunday school and
helped to grunt "Amen!"
When the parson prayed partic'lar—we-alls
chopped a cedar tree
And stuck it up inside the church ferninst
the jubilee.

We'd done the same a dozen years and
helped the gals to trim
Them trees with Christmas fol-de-rols on
every bloomin' limb.
There was popcorn balls and candy bags for
Jim and Jess and Nell,
And mother Goose's poetry for kids that
couldn't spell,
And skates and tops and jumpin'-jacks, and
dolls and hoods and caps,
With here and there a Testament for solemn
little chaps.

When Christmas Eve was on the slate we'd
all collect in there,
And Parson Jones 'uld cut the stack and
start the game with prayer;
And then we'd yank the curtain back and
show that blessed tree,
Lit up with teeny candles that 'uld fill the
kids with glee;
And while the organ played a chune some
awkward guy would come
A-plagiarizing' Santy Claus—and every kid
was dumb!

The porest child in Sunday school was little
Jennie Kerr;
She didn't have no Santy Claus to put things
on for her,
So Minky Peters, or Joe Bowers, his brother
Ike or me
Would always buy some trick for her and
sneak it on the tree
And write her name acrost the card, so
when the deal begun
That little orphant tuck a hand and mingled
in the fun.

When Marthy Simpson run away from Kerr
some years before
Old Simpson turned agin his gal and tuck
his oath and swore
He'd never lift a hand to help his darter—or
her brats—
Which same I 'low was middlin' mean; for
Simpson—dog my cats!
Had money to incinerate; he kep' the village
store
And run a bank, and had the scads to start
a dozen more.

When Kerr himself skinned out one day and
shook his wife and kid,
Old Simpson kep' his word intact, and nary
thing he did
In all them years to aid the gal, who had to
work and slave
With one foot on the porehouse stoop and
t'other in the grave.
So little Jennie's pathway wasn't filled with
dolls and things—
Exceptin' when us grown-up guys got sorter
soft, by jings!

Well, this partic'lar Christmas tree we'd
started in to pick,
And Santy—allas Joseph Bowers—was doin'
of the trick.
He'd yank a present off a limb and sing out
whose it wuz,
And somewhere back among the pews there'd
be a kind of buzz,
And then some bashful boy or gal, a-sportin'
of a smile,
To rake that Christmas present in would
mosey down the aisle.

The kids had mostly tuck their tricks, and I
must shore confess
Of that there sanctuarium they'd made a
holy mess!
For there was 'lasses candy on the cushions
of the pews,
And half the hymn-books in the church was
smeared with it, profuse.
But what's the odds? for all the kids was full
of Christmas cheer,
Exceptin'—I regret to state—exceptin' Jennie
Kerr.

There sot that little orphant on her shrinkin'
mother's knee,
Away off in a corner, and the sight frustrated
me,

For all at onct I tumbled that we'd clean
forgot that night
To put a present on the tree and make her
Christmas bright;
So I winked at Minky Peters, and he winked
at Santy Claus,
And Santy winked at Isaac, who enlisted in
the cause.

We-alls went behind the scenery and held a
short confab,
The result of which my aim on this occasion
is to blab.
Joe Bowers—which was Santy—was to enter-
tain the gang
With some most amusin' antics and some
edifyin' slang
'Bout chimbley-tops and reindeers, and Kris
Kringle and his packs,
While the rest of us for Christmas goods to
Simpson's store made tracks.

Old Simpson waited on us. When he axed us
what we'd like
We said we'd buy a present for the porest
child in Pike;
Then his hard face sorter sof'ened, and he
hung his ornery head
As he handed me a letter, and this is what
he said:
"I guess you-alls' mistaken if you speak of
Jennie Kerr;
You needn't buy no present, boys—jist put
this on for her."

We-alls was somewhat doobious, but we
tuck the letter in
And sneaked it on the Christmas tree, while
Bowers drowned the din
And read the name of Jennie Kerr, who
toddled down the aisle
As gay as any young 'un there, though some-
what out of style.
She tuck the mall from Bower's fist and in
her mother's lap
Deposited that envelope from Marthy's
ornery pap.

When the widder read the contents of old
Simpson's envelope
She up and fainted dead away, as if she'd
swallowed dope.
Then Minky Peters scowled at me, and I
scowled back at him,
And we-alls started for the store to douse a
certain glim—
A-countin' on a present on a Christmas tree
outside,
With the devil's name writ on it acrost old
Simpson's hide!

We'd swiped a rope from Simpson's barn,
when Bowers called us back,
And likewise called us several names—in
language which I lack;
And when we got to church agin he read that
letter out,
And every lung among the crowd was bustin'
with a shout.
Was it an insult to the kid? Not on your liver-
pads!
He's sent that little gal his check for twenty
thousand scads!

(From "Poems All the Way From Pike.")

—Robertus Love.

"PERIL ON THE JOB"

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, the House has recently considered and passed an Occupational Health and Safety bill in response to a long-recognized need to better protect workers who are exposed to often times deadly hazards arising out

of the new technology. During the debate necessarily we could touch on only some of the real horrors experienced by many of the country's workers in the course of their day-to-day employment.

An old friend of mine, Ray Davidson, editor of The Oil, Chemical and Atomic Union News, has published a book, "Peril on the Job," which dramatizes some of the daily dangers faced by men and women on their jobs. Ray has put together an important book from the graphic accounts told by the workers themselves. It certainly deserves wide circulation.

I want especially to call attention to the contribution made by Mr. René Dubos, professor of environmental biomedicine at the Rockefeller University at the beginning of the volume.

Dr. Dubos' views follow:

VIEWS OF DR. RENÉ DUBOS, PROFESSOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL BIOMEDICINE AT THE ROCKEFELLER UNIVERSITY

Many readers of Peril on the Job will probably find the book frightening. But I found it reasonable and constructive.

The facts reported by Ray Davidson are indeed frightening; if they did not frighten me it is simply because I was aware of most of them. Indeed, I suspect that the problems of industrial disease will probably soon become even more alarming than appears from what Mr. Davidson reports and postulates. It is fairly easy to estimate the numbers of workers killed or made obviously sick by industrial poisons. But this is only one part of the story. Levels of toxic materials so low that they do not cause health disturbances exert in many cases deleterious effects that become detectable only long after initial exposure—often after many years. This is well recognized with regard to ionizing radiations and cigarette smoking. It is certainly true also for a host of substances widely used in industrial processes. Many chronic and degenerative diseases that now plague our society—the so-called diseases of civilization—can probably be traced to increase in the prevalence of chemical pollutants. From this point of view, it is surprising and indeed disturbing that the campaign for a better environment has placed so little emphasis on the fact that a large percentage of industrial plants—as well as offices—expose workers to highly objectionable environmental conditions—not only unpleasant, but potentially dangerous. All over the world, millions upon millions of workers are the guinea pigs of the technological environment.

I found Peril on the Job a reasonable book because it acknowledges the social complexities of the problems posed by health protection in industrial plants. Concern for efficiency and the economy must of course prevail at all levels of management; this is true irrespective of political system—capitalist, socialist, or communist. As stated by Mr. Davidson, "Most managers assert that they are deeply concerned with the health and safety of their employees. Most of them are undoubtedly sincere. But for a manager to take really effective action to protect his employees puts him squarely into conflict with his basic role in the profit system"—and indeed in any social system.

When a decision has to be made between safety and production, safety is in almost all cases the loser. This is not because of criminal neglect, as Mr. Davidson acknowledges. "There probably is not a manager in North America who would knowingly cause or permit a death even to save a million dollars. But the financial incentives pressing on managers to take risks leading to possible illness, injury or death are overwhelming. Management spokesmen testifying before legislative bodies assert that they have financial

incentives as well as humanitarian reasons for maintaining safe and healthful work places, but this is not quite true. By and large, it pays to operate equipment until it collapses rather than keep it in constantly good repair. To make repairs for health and safety sake is a nonproductive cost item."

In most cases, furthermore, the supervisor is incapable of making health judgments; he has been trained primarily to keep production going and is acquainted only with primitive safety measures. Finally, few are the situations where there is enough knowledge of health effects to permit adequate medical management. And this brings me to the constructive aspects of the book.

So little is known of industrial medicine that vast research programs are needed to determine the potential dangers of the various types of working conditions. Some of these programs must be focused of course on the development of medical techniques for the treatment of the disease after it has become manifest. But equally or perhaps more important is the search for causes of disease, since only this kind of knowledge can provide a basis for the formulation of preventive measures. In other words, the environment must be studied as much as the disease. Another requirement is to learn to incorporate environmental knowledge in the design of plants and processes. At present, "metallurgy and fluid dynamics get more attention than men . . . cryogenics are better researched than emphysema. . . . Precise design of the shipping drums will be specified, but nothing is said about the man to fill the drum or what the material in the drum will do to him." Clearly the time has come to give as much thought to working conditions and health hazards as is given to engineering design and to purchase specifications.

There are, furthermore, important psychological aspects to the formulation and application of safety rules. The worker does not like to be talked down to; he wants to be "taken into partnership in a manner which reveals no condescension by the other party." Effective application of safety rules calls for more than a simple enunciation. It requires explanation, discussion, and participation. This is particularly true with regard to health matters less obvious and more complex than traumatic accidents.

In my opinion, it is unrealistic to hope that safety measures could completely prevent industrial diseases, even if they were based on much greater knowledge than we now have. New procedures and substances are continuously being introduced into industrial operations, so rapidly that there is no chance to evaluate their potential dangers to health. The only way to deal with this unhappy but inevitable state of affairs is to carry out on samples of the working population a variety of simple clinical tests, to the end of detecting as early as possible any change in the state of health. This approach could be called prospective epidemiology or medical alarm system.

Maintaining adequate health policies and medical alarm systems will be costly. But the cost, however great, will be small compared with the medical load now created by the chronic disabilities resulting from industrial exposure—let alone humanitarian considerations. In a truly civilized society, protection of the worker should be regarded as the most essential, irreducible aspect of production cost. Technology is constantly creating new environments, but modern men still have the anatomical and physiological needs and limitations our caveman ancestors had. We have no instinct to warn us of dangers that lurk in a new kind of vapor or in an invisible beam of radiation. The worker cannot possibly take responsibility for his health in a complex world which he does not control and which the experts themselves do not fully understand. Technological societies can sur-

vive and remain successful only if they learn to take into account in the price system the protection of the labor force engaged in the production of economic wealth, as well as the environment in which they live.

The problems posed by *Peril on the Job* are not peculiar to the chemical industries; they apply to all aspects of technological civilization. We shall experience human and ecological disasters unless we learn to give as much attention to man and the environment as we do to the production of goods. This requirement need not interfere with the efficiency of the technological enterprise and the maintenance of high living standards. Anyone familiar with the history of science and technology knows that progress has always resulted from the necessity to meet reasonable constraints and regulations. Scientists and technologists are so inventive that they can and will improve technological efficiency even as they develop working conditions compatible with the maintenance of health.

CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON FISH

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday's Washington Star contained a column by Alan Emory commenting on the service in this House by our distinguished colleague from New York, HAMILTON FISH. As you know, he is the third Hamilton Fish to serve in this Chamber.

I take this opportunity to congratulate HAM FISH on the contribution he already has made to this House, his district and State, and to the Nation. Certainly, the 70 percent election margin he received last month attests to the acceptance of his efforts by those he represents. From my own observations, I believe we can expect even greater success by him in the future.

Mr. Speaker, so that we all might give recognition to HAM's accomplishments, I insert Mr. Emory's article at this point in the RECORD:

"HAM" FISH—THE THIRD
(By Alan Emory)

A Fish in the House of Representatives is definitely not out of water. In fact, he is in his element.

The third of three Congressmen named Hamilton Fish from upstate New York is completing his first term, and his moderate views on issues are about as far removed from the staunch conservatism of his father—the famed anchorman of Franklin D. Roosevelt's "Martin, Barton and Fish"—as those of the vociferous left are from most Congressional liberals.

Just how much of a generation gap exists in the Fish family is open to question. The lanky, broad-shouldered man who now upholds a family public service record covering nearly two centuries rarely discusses politics with his father.

They did discuss the Cambodian invasion on the telephone last spring, and former Rep. Hamilton Fish—noted as an isolationist—told his son he felt the Nixon Administration would accept the Cooper-Church amendment to block future moves in the same direction. He said he would have voted for the amendment, and his son did—contrary to most Republicans.

Despite his substantial background for congressional service, 44-year-old "Ham" Fish still reacts strongly to its satisfactions

and frustration. Understaffing and the need to devote 80 percent of his time to responding to constituent requests and publicizing his positions on issues hamper "getting a handle" on the big events that go on every day, he finds.

"Unless a bill comes out of your committee you don't have a lot to say about it," Fish observes. "Your choice on the floor is frequently not what shape the bill should take, but whether there should be any bill at all."

Fish finds, however, that there is more activity for a freshman congressman than he had expected. On his committee, Judiciary, senior Republican Rep. William McCullough of Ohio asks all members to participate in debate and become a specialist on at least one section of each committee-approved bill.

Among his top activities of his first term, Fish says, was the voting rights extension, where a good bill eventually triumphed over a bad one originally passed by the House, and hearings on electoral reform, with a parade of prominent witnesses, 80 different proposals and two weeks of closed-door-working sessions.

"I looked around, and all we needed were white wigs," he recalled, "because we were rewriting the Constitution and every word counted."

Fish is unhappy, however, about the lack of before-the-fact consultation between the White House and Congressmen. Sometimes, he says, it looks like the Republican leadership is going down the line for something the White House has decided on, but the legislators never were briefed on the decision.

"We are following, rather than participating in, the decision," he said. "When James Madison mentioned checks and balances he didn't mean you don't even talk to each other."

He also deplores the lack of regular social contact between younger lawmakers with persons in their own age group in the executive branch of government or the press, "a situation that tends to isolate us."

Times have changed significantly from the days when his father had only two secretaries. Fish can easily be on the telephone to his district eight times in a single morning.

He makes sure he gets back to his sprawling Hudson Valley constituency every weekend, holds regular district meetings with residents and three times a month goes on radio for hour-long "call-in" programs.

His attention to his constituents pays off, and, he says, "you have to like being responsible for people's problems. Then there is a sense of satisfaction in breaking a bureaucratic logjam."

Although he lost his first race for the House—he is the fifth generation in the family to run for Congress—he squeaked through by 5,000 votes in 1968, then collected a whopping 70 percent of the ballots in November. He ran ahead of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller in seven of his district's nine counties.

His major political concern seems to be with the Nixon administration's "playing footsy with the Southern strategy."

"I objected violently to that," he says, "and I hope we never try it again."

For the future, he is concerned with such large issues as health and growing unemployment. He has sponsored a solid-waste disposal plan that earned him the endorsement—one of 12 so honored—of the Sierra Club's political arm. "Every time you pick up a paper you read about a trash problem. A solution cannot be delayed," he says.

In his district he is working on the problem of high dams in the Delaware River Valley and making the home of President Martin van Buren in Kinderhook a historic landmark.

Fish was born in Washington. A Harvard graduate with a touch of the Ivy still in his speech, Fish served in the Navy in World War II, was a vice consul in the Foreign Service

in Ireland from 1951 to 1953 and has served as a lawyer with the state assembly's judiciary committee and as civil defense director of Dutchess County.

He and his three sons and daughter were struck by tragedy in March 1969, when his wife was killed in an automobile accident.

Fish refuses to appear on the same speaking platform with his father.

Says the congressman, "He has 40 years' oratory over me. I made the mistake once. It doesn't make any difference whether you follow him or precede him."

This year Hamilton Fish Sr. supported James L. Buckley for the Senate, while his son backed Sen. Charles E. Goodell. The father's problem was more acute than just the split, though.

Buckley was running as the Conservative candidate, and the Conservatives also were running a candidate against Hamilton Fish Jr. The father found a solution by urging Buckley votes on another line on the ballot, and both his favorites wound up winners.

FRIEND IN NEED

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to relate to this House a true story about the people that comprise the district I represent, Westmoreland County, Pa. I believe that my colleagues and all who hear this story may find the same warmth in it that I did.

The Greensburg Tribune-Review, the only countywide newspaper in Westmoreland County, initiated a special column entitled a "Friend in Need." This section introduces the needy families in the county to the reading public, so that concerned citizens may help in any way possible, which is a commendable gesture in itself.

Mr. and Mrs. Hyczyk's problem, which was printed in this column, was so unique that the response was such that I have seldom witnessed in my 38 years of public service. And this response merits the repetition of this story in this chamber.

Mr. and Mrs. Hyczyk's young son was born almost 6 months ago without two vital bile ducts, the absence of which was causing the baby to be poisoned by his own liver. The only course of medical action that could save his life was a kidney transplant and the only facility possessing the necessary equipment for this delicate operation was in Denver, Colo.

Mr. Hyczyk could neither afford the medical costs nor the trip to Denver. And he also has the problem of making some financial arrangement for his two older children who would have to remain home while he and his wife went to Colorado with the baby. I suppose the parents resigned themselves to the fact that their baby boy would almost certainly die within the next several months. Therefore, in their despair they permitted their desperate situation to be printed in the Tribune-Review's "Friend in Need" column.

Mr. Speaker, their pleas for help were answered overwhelmingly.

Mr. Speaker, special commendation should be made to the Tribune-Review, the Greensburg Fire Department, Boy Scouts, and literally hundreds of young people who went door to door soliciting funds for this family; and especially to all those generous citizens who contributed. Because, you see, Mr. Speaker, these wonderful people solicited and donated over \$18,000 for this family, and donations are still coming in.

This action has demonstrated again that the passion for brotherhood has not been diffused by our increasingly pragmatic way of life, as many scholarly reports would tend to indicate; but instead, is as intense as it always has been.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to know that I represent these people. And if I may, I would call on all my distinguished colleagues to join with me in saluting the people of the 21st Congressional District of Pennsylvania, for their unselfish act of kindness.

Perhaps, just perhaps, this country, which is being condemned from without and within for its faults, injustices, and inconsistencies, is not diseased as many think. I submit to this legislative body, that as long as there are people inhabiting this country such as the type I have described we may be optimistic in looking toward our future.

U.N. DISASTER RELIEF EFFORTS TO BE REVISED

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I was quite distressed by the Pakistani cyclone disaster. I have also been quite distressed by the inadequacy of the relief efforts connected with that disaster. There is an obvious need for general restructuring of present worldwide disaster relief programs. The following Christian Science Monitor article by Bertram Johansson describes a positive suggestion to meet that need. I recommend it to my colleagues and the article follows:

UN PLANS AGENCY—DISASTER-RELIEF EFFORT
(By Bertram B. Johansson)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Initial steps are being taken here toward establishing within the United Nations an international disaster-relief agency.

It would have the stature, equipment, and personnel, eventually, to deal as quickly as possible with calamities such as the recent tidal-wave disaster in East Pakistan, earthquakes in Turkey or Peru, floods in Tunisia.

The intent of the effort under way here is to add to the UN another arm that will strengthen its ability to become the international humanitarian organization, among other functions, it was intended to be.

The effort, spearheaded by Turkey, Pakistan, and other delegations, is gaining widespread support. The enormity of the relief and reconstruction problem in East Pakistan, where an estimated 500,000 persons were killed, is being impressed on the international community here. Several million East Pakistanis still are in need of food, housing, clothing, and economic reconstruction over a wide area.

A resolution, already sponsored by some 50 nations among the current 127-nation membership, is being drawn up in the Third (social) Committee of the General Assembly, to implement establishing the disaster-relief agency. It is recognized it may take several years to form it.

The first step would be to have Secretary-General U Thant engage in a study of the concept before the UN committed itself to such an ambitious undertaking.

Turkey's Ambassador Umit Haluk Bayulken, who is shepherding the resolution through the committee work, acknowledges that while the UN has done much in the past, it is not enough.

He urges that strengthening the international machinery for the coordination and effectiveness of assistance in cases of natural disasters is necessary.

The comprehensive study that the Secretary-General is to be asked to undertake and report on to the next General Assembly in the fall of 1971 is expected to involve:

Organizational arrangements for a permanent office in the UN responsible for action relating to natural disasters and similar emergency situations and the resources required for this.

An invitation to UN members and specialized agencies to communicate to the Secretary-General information on the kinds of facilities and services they might be in a position to provide immediately—such as the number and type of vehicles or other means of delivering supplies to disaster areas by air, sea, and land.

Predisaster planning at the national and international levels, including the definition of machinery and contingency arrangements capable of coping immediately with disaster situations.

The stockpiling of emergency supplies, including medicines, nonperishable foodstuffs, blankets, clothing, etc. and the earmarking of other facilities, such as logistical equipment and helicopters.

Ways to ensure better mobilization and coordination of the assistance to be provided through the UN, as well as the league of Red Cross societies and other nongovernmental organizations.

The application of technology to and scientific research for the prevention and control of natural disasters or a mitigation of the effects of such disasters, including developing and improving early warning systems.

The creation of such a UN disaster relief agency is not meant to discourage bilateral aid to affected countries. Nor is it conceived in such a way as to replace the aid that an affected country provides for itself. The latter type of aid is usually much larger in quantity than that which comes from outside.

Long-term plans for reconstruction and development of disaster areas are to be included in the study.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), which already is planning a large rehabilitation outlay for East Pakistan, will be asked to give special consideration to requests for assistance from governments of countries affected by disasters.

CONGRESSMAN CLAY ASKS FOR INVESTIGATION INTO ATTEMPTED ASSASSINATION

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the letter which I directed to Col. James

Sanders, president of the board of police commissioners in St. Louis concerning the shooting of Police Officer Steven Georgeff. The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 9, 1970.

Col. JAMES SANDERS,
President, Board of Police Commissioners,
St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department,
1200 Clark Avenue, St. Louis,
Mo.

DEAR COLONEL SANDERS: I have sufficient reason to believe that an effort is being made to "white wash" the case involving the shooting of police officer, Steven Georgeff. This incident evolved out of the arrest of Wesley Copeland at the George Washington Hotel. Information available to me indicates that the case, presently under investigation by the Inspectors Office, may be affected by influential persons who are interested in protecting the accused police officers.

Therefore, I request that the Board of Police Commissioners hold a full and open hearing in this case. The highly questionable circumstances surrounding the shooting of Officer Georgeff, dictates that the public interest would be best served by an open hearing. Many citizens, elected officials, and some of the news media harbor the opinion that these men were attempting an assassination.

The only way to dispell this cloud of doubt is by publicly disclosing all pertinent data relative to the case. Anything short of this would leave a lot to be desired.

I further request, in line with the stated policy of the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department, that you conduct "an evaluation of the mental fitness" of the officers involved in this incident.

Additional information received by my office indicates that Sergeant Lodi, who was at the scene of the shooting of the policeman, has been accused by more than 30 citizens of abusive acts, some criminal in nature. Thirty individual accusations on separate occasions, ranging from charges of "police brutality" to "planning an armed robbery" certainly ought to demand a re-evaluation of this officer's fitness for duty.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. CLAY,
Member of Congress.

ADDRESS OF W. B. CAMP

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest agriculturists and conservationists of our time is Bill Camp of Bakersfield, California. Mr. Camp is a graduate of Clemson University in my congressional district and is a member of the board of trustees of that great land grant university. Mrs. Camp is a beautiful, charming and talented lady from Edgefield, also in my district. Mr. Camp delivered an outstanding address recently to the annual meeting of the South Carolina Soil and Water Conservationists. Mr. Camp's address is particularly timely in view of the recent efforts to curb our great soil and water conservation program. I commend Mr. Camp's splendid address to the attention of each Member of Congress and to the American people: Talk by W. B. Camp, farmer, Bakersfield, Calif., before the Annual Meeting of the South Carolina Soil and Water Conservation Commission, Columbia, S.C. Dec. 8, 1970

THE EXPANDING ROLE FOR SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION A MUST FOR AMERICA

It is indeed a signal honor to be invited to speak to the South Carolina Soil and Water Conservation District Commissioners today. Nineteen years ago, I was the keynote speaker at the annual meeting of the South Carolina Soil Conservation Districts at Myrtle Beach.

Most of you are too young to have attended the Myrtle Beach meeting! I remember how pleased and thrilled I was on learning that you and the State Chamber had been given government permission to use a postage meter carrying the message, "Soil Conservation, the Key to Better Living." My comment then was: "This is mighty fine, but it doesn't go far enough—it doesn't say a word about water conservation,—without which soil is worth very little!"

It is my understanding that following this meeting your people decided that water should be added to the overall name of your organization. So, now you have "Soil and Water Conservation Districts." A most appropriate name for the great work you are doing.

Many important things have happened in the world since that Myrtle Beach meeting. Scientists in all fields, including agriculture, have made many discoveries. If we are intelligent enough, and morally courageous enough, we can make use of these discoveries for the benefit of all mankind. It is your responsibility and mine to work diligently toward that goal.

If I were to be asked to list, according to basic importance, the many organizations working in South Carolina today, I would have to place "Soil and Water Conservation Districts" at or near the top. Your work is the foundation necessary for other groups to build on. I am sure your organization will be called upon to take a leading part in the tremendous job of cleaning up the ugly, and much too long overlooked, pollution, which we find everywhere.

I have been a booster for the work you folks do right from the beginning. For years you labored almost alone in your endeavor to reclaim or restore much of our badly abused land and water resources. However, leaders all over America now know you have come of age, ready and capable of doing the full job, if given the freedom to do it. The task ahead is big—very big. It will require a lot of time, manpower, money and full understanding and cooperation on the part of all our people—in all businesses.

My brother, Willie, was an active cooperator in the upper part of the state from the very start of this organization. Recently you named one of your watershed districts—"The Willie C. Camp Watershed Conservation District." For myself, his family and all the Camp clan, I thank you.

Also, Mr. Ed McArthur from Gaffney, the first National Chairman of the Soil and Water Conservation Association, was a cousin of ours. His sister, "Miss Nancy", was my teacher at Possumtrot School!

Before I go further with what I came here to talk about, let me say this: It has been my privilege to see most of the United States and much of the other countries, and I don't believe there is a finer place in the world than South Carolina in which to really live and enjoy the beauties of life. You have an excellent climate, rich soil, bountiful natural resources—and a wonderful people.

I like your project "SCORE" in South Carolina.

Demonstrating to young leaders and workers that they should remain in South Carolina.

Now, back to Soil and Water Conservation.

Recently I read a statement attributed to an enterprising young man who said: "You can't do today's job with yesterday's methods and be in business tomorrow."

In other words: "There is nothing so constant as change." This is particularly true

in American agriculture. We are in the middle of an agricultural revolution all over America.

Today,—less than 5 per cent of our people—live in the country. Less than half of these depend solely upon farm income for a livelihood for themselves and their families.

This shrinking farm population has been a sign of strength, rather than weakness—the inevitable consequence of rapidly expanding agricultural efficiency.

In spite of this dwindling farm population, farming remains our biggest industry. Nearly 40 per cent of all workers in America are employed directly or indirectly by agriculture.

However, the proportion of people who understand agriculture is small and continually declining. Even so, it is important to remember that farmers, and the farms, are absolutely essential. Food and fiber must be produced if the people are to live and work. They can do without television, fancy automobiles and modern conveniences, but they must be fed and they must be clothed.

Rising productivity characterizes most of our overall economy, but farm productivity has risen fastest of all.

Man hour productivity in nonfarm industries has increased about 50 per cent since 1950, but it has increased 164 per cent in agriculture.

In 1940 one farm worker could produce only enough food and fiber for 11 people. Ten years ago this had risen to 25 people. Today one farm worker grows enough for himself and 50 other people.

In spite of this efficiency on the part of the farmer, some alarmists predict that soon we will run out of land on which to produce enough food and fiber for our increasing population. This is not so, and will not be so in the foreseeable future. By merely doing a better job, using only our present knowledge of scientific agriculture, we can again more than double the production we are now getting from the farms presently under cultivation.

Research and education are the fundamental bases for all progress, and the progress made in American agriculture up to now is but a stepping stone to what we may expect in the future. We have hardly scratched the surface.

Twenty-five years ago the percentage of cotton grown under irrigation was small, but last year much over one-half of the total cotton produced in the United States was grown under irrigation, or with the aid of supplemental irrigation. These yields were big and the quality high.

What does this mean to the older cotton belt? Simply this, our farmers have got to produce more cotton to the acre, and produce it cheaper—or else. It means that soon their operation has got to be large enough and the farm productive enough to permit complete mechanization.

At this point I wish to say that if the boll weevil is eliminated, and I believe it will be, cotton growers in these Southern states will definitely be able to produce cotton cheaper than California and Arizona. Then much of your lost cotton acreage will come back home. Of course, I mean you must have water available to irrigate if need be.

It is my conviction, based upon my own personal experience and observation, that supplemental irrigation is the most important single thing now offered for the improvement of agriculture in the Rainfall Belt, and especially so in the Southern states. Supplemental irrigation is the best and cheapest form of "Crop Insurance obtainable.

Mrs. Camp and I, also our three sons, own and operate farms in California, South Carolina and Washington states. We are prepared to irrigate everything. In my opinion, the time is not far distant when all the better farmers across the country will accept irrigation just as readily as they accept milk-

ing machines, tractors and electricity today. Certainly a revolutionary change!

Right here I wish to pay special tribute to my good friend, and your good friend, Jim Eleazer, retired Information Specialist at Clemson, for the very vigorous and continuing crusade he waged in South Carolina and throughout the Southeast. Jim did a fine job acquainting farmers and others, with the great potential of Supplemental Irrigation. Southern agriculture owes much to Jim Eleazer for the great work he has done in this field.

We do have abundant water in the course of a year all over the South. But the trouble is it doesn't all come exactly at the right time. Until your organization started conservation work much of the surplus water had about all gone when drought struck.

However, thanks to your fine work, our farmers are now practicing water conservation—along with soil conservation. Ten years ago you had already built 25,000 ponds in South Carolina—and heavy equipment was busy everyday building more. You have a lot more now. A similar program is underway in other states.

We can't say enough about the good work already done by the Soil and Water Commission. This is fine for a starter, and does help tremendously with immediate needs. But for the much bigger and long-range program, we must arouse everybody concerning the needs and the opportunities of soil and water conservation development on a statewide—yes, Southwide basis.

There is now a new irrigation project in California nearing completion. It has been many years in the planning and building. It is a good water project for California. Originally estimated to cost 3¼ billion dollars to carry water from the northern part of California to the Southern end, a distance of 1,000 miles. This calls for building many dams, and the boring of many very large and long tunnels through mountains, and on and on through open ditches. The cost may double before finished. It is a gigantic project but water for irrigation and for domestic and industrial use is the life blood of that area. Water is the life blood of all other areas too—including South Carolina.

I hope you realize that some of your Federal tax money is helping to pay for the project I have just mentioned.

This is why I say we must demand of our lawmakers and government agencies that if Federal tax money is to be spent to provide water conservation and distribution for anyone in agriculture, proper consideration should be given to conserving and distributing water to our long-established families of drought distressed people in South Carolina and throughout the rainfall area.

It may surprise you to know that the first official meeting ever called by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, for the purpose of discussing Supplemental Irrigation in the Rainfall Belt, was held in Washington, D.C. in the summer of 1951. And this conference came about as a result of an irrigation article appearing in one of our leading farm magazines. This showed a South Carolina farm being irrigated. I don't like to be personal but it was our farm—though we didn't sponsor the article.

Not long ago I was again called to Washington by the Secretary of Agriculture to confer and argue with a small group of agricultural people from other parts of the country, for the purpose of studying the department's overall conservation program. I shan't try to tell you of the many things that were studied and discussed. However, to me, the most significant single thing that came out of the deliberations was a unanimous recommendation to the Secretary that hereafter his department and the Department of Interior should make sure that in studying irrigation it be considered from a national standpoint rather than just the West-

ern states, as has been the case for much too long.

Twenty years ago the U.S. Department of Agriculture was opposed to spending money for such a "foolish notion" as irrigation in the Rainfall Belt. They told me so themselves. However, ten years later the Department said in an official bulletin, and in the 1958 yearbook: Quote, "Perhaps because of the experience in the West, we have become accustomed to link irrigation with lack of rainfall. The greatest potential of irrigation in the United States lies not in reclaiming the deserts, but in correcting the seasonal deficiencies of moisture in the sections where we used to consider the rainfall to be adequate." End of quote. So, again I can speak of a "change"!

Many newspaper cartoons still picture farmers wearing patched overalls and seedy straw hats. We don't mind this too much.

Though for a long time I have argued that farmers must not be considered a separate or a special class of the American society. No longer should we use the term, "Farmers and Businessmen". It should be "Farmers and other Businessmen."

Awareness of the mutual interdependence of agriculture and industry is growing generally. This interdependence is due primarily to the development of a more fully mechanized commercial agriculture. And while increasing commercialization has at times brought more prosperity to the farmer, it has also made it possible for him to go broke much faster. Before 1930 it took 8 or 10 years for a farmer to go broke—while today the job can be done in 8 or 10 months! Everyone knows it now takes a lot of money to buy, equip and successfully operate a modern farm.

Again I speak of "change". For the country as a whole, the tendency over a period of years has been toward the consolidation of small farms into larger farms. That tendency will continue, if we are to have the greatest advance in economic production. We must recognize this as a normal result of progress, and as a perfectly natural outgrowth of our changing times. This does not mean that these larger farmers are not still family farmers—most of them are.

Nine years ago in this city, I had the privilege of speaking to the annual meeting of South Carolina young farmers. I pointed out to them the farms that are disappearing in South Carolina are largely small, inefficient farms—whose operators have never made an acceptable living—even with good farm prices—they merely existed. These people have not been liquidated. They are being elevated to a new and a higher standard of living. New industries, including agricultural industries, afford much greater opportunities for many of these families.

I wish to congratulate the people of South Carolina for recognizing this problem and for the official action taken by your General Assembly in appropriating money to build the dozen or more Technical Educational Centers in the state. These have already trained thousands of workers for important jobs. South Carolina leads the nation in this field of advanced thinking, planning and doing.

The most important single ingredient in the success story of the American farmer has been that of freedom. Yet, we have in parts of this country, including some in Washington, a bunch of irresponsible do-gooders, many of whom know little or nothing about agriculture—some of them don't know the difference between a steer and a bull—yet blindly arguing for programs that would be utterly destructive. They advocate higher and higher wages for everybody. We farmers would all like to pay high wages—actually we do. But the farmer's ability to pay is determined by what he gets for his product. These do-gooders also yelp for cheaper food. I'm for that too, provided there is profit left

to provide a decent living for the farmer and his family.

These people insist that all this be done on small family farms where efficient mechanization is not possible.

This type of loose-lipped mouthing has its appeal to many unthinking people, but the cold facts are: these three things—higher and higher wages, cheap food and very small inefficient farms—never have gone together, do not now go together and never will go together. We all know that a pair of shoes, a tractor or an automobile would cost a great deal more if they were made in thousands of little shops, and—if present high rates of pay maintained, I insist that farmers are entitled to just as good wages and just as good living as anyone else.

Progress marches on. We cannot and should not attempt to reverse a natural economic trend. We should not by legislation, try to artificially prevent the shift of crops from one state or area to another.

These shifts are often very disturbing to the persons involved, and unfortunately, sometimes disastrous to entire communities. However, I have always been one of those who feels that just as surely as water runs downhill, crops and livestock are also going to flow, or migrate toward those areas in this country where they can be most economically produced and marketed. This same reasoning also applies to industrial plants. If this were not so, South Carolina would not now have the hundreds of new businesses that have come here during the past thirty years. This is as it should be—though it can only happen under a free economy. This is not the way they do it in Russia!

There are some things that continually bother me when I try to project my thinking into the future to see what the farming pattern is going to be when the time comes for my eleven grandsons to take over. I am by no stretch of the imagination an alarmist, some call me an optimistic pessimist. I prefer in this case to think of myself as a realist, willing to acknowledge the facts and then to face them. Be that as it may, I have had certain personal experiences that just can't be lightly dismissed from my mind. For several years I sat across the table from communist agents in Washington and watched them and their fellow travellers move with incredible skill—through the farm areas, doing their dirty work.

If I could bring myself to believe there is no longer danger from these internal enemies I have known so long, I would not ask you to listen. But, I do know there is a definite long-time program being vigorously pushed by these termites, looking to the day when they will "bury" American agriculture in a "planned economy." You and I have simply got to be on our guard, day and night, to prevent these vicious agents of the "Welfare State" from taking over.—So, all the good things I have said about the future of agriculture, depend entirely upon our keeping America free.

Freedom is no a physical object. It is a spiritual and moral environment, and it is *this* that our Constitution was intended to protect. The constitutional integrity of the states is our best defense. That is why the communists, at home and abroad, are dedicated to the complete destruction of our States' Rights.

Unfortunately, too many Americans are still unaware of the evil forces trying, by devious means of one sort or another, to shape their future for them. Some are losing sight of the human values upon which our democratic society is based. Efficiency in our agricultural operations will mean little to us—if we fail to preserve our liberty.

When the farmer is told how much acreage he must plant—when the laboring man is told he must join a union in order to work—when the merchant or manufacturer is told how much he can charge for his product—

then we are dangerously close to a controlled economy.

When the power to tax is used to redistribute our wealth—then we are dangerously close to socialism.

It is my opinion, that if America is to be saved from the horrors of communism, it will be because of the convictions, courage and good sense of the God fearing people in our Southern States.

Abraham Lincoln said: "You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot further the brotherhood of men by encouraging class hatred. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves." Unquote.

More than 100 years ago, a great French liberal politician and writer wrote in his "Democracy in America"—Quote:

"I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her commodious harbors and her ample rivers, and it was not there. In her fertile fields and boundless prairies, and it was not there. In her rich mines and her vast world commerce and it was not there.

"Not until I went to the churches of America and heard her pulpits aflame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her genius and her power.

"America is great," de Tocqueville concluded—"Because she is good, and if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great." End of quote.

You and I are dedicated to the conviction inscribed on our coins: "In God We Trust." The question is: What are we doing about it. It is urgent that every red-blooded, loyal American stand up and be counted.

It is not enough to have convictions; one must have the courage to defend those convictions.

We must recognize and acknowledge that the moral purposes of our society are not manmade, but come from God, who is the sole source of goodness, and the final judge of our performance.

Let us, then as good citizens, recognize the challenge before us. Let us as Christian businessmen and statesmen, prove to all the world, and particularly to the weak among us, that the soul of America is still good—because—there are so many good Americans.

Let me underpin all that I have been saying by again pointing out that the productivity of the farms of America is a bulwark of strength for our country in this troubled world. For this, we should all be sincerely appreciative and grateful.

The history of civilization is the history of agriculture. Just as we recognize that it's the mainspring that causes a watch to tick—so, we must recognize that agriculture is the "mainspring" in the overall economy of any nation.

If we will read our histories, we will find that the independence of the farmer is basic to democracy. A dictatorship cannot succeed where the farmer is free and independent. Every dictator has recognized this. The first act of the dictators in Russia was to destroy the freedom and independence of the farmer. This was done in Red China—it was done in Cuba—my fear has been that here in the United States we may accomplish the very same thing under the guise of helping the farmer.

Thomas Jefferson said: "If we let Washington tell us when to sow and when to reap, the Nation shall soon want for bread."

Summing up, then we might ask: What do our farm and other environmental problems mean to each of us as individuals here today? Or what do they mean to the man behind an assembly line in an auto factory? To the man behind a desk in a New York skyscraper? To the salesman behind a counter in a Columbia Supermarket?

Or to the South Carolina Soil and Water Conservation Commission?

Not much? Only the breath of economic, as well as physical life—only the difference between hunger and plenty—only the difference between success and failure—that much and nothing less.

Thank you very much.

MIKE CASTLEBERRY: ALTHA'S
FIRST EAGLE

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I had the privilege of participating in a program in Altha, Fla., as Mike Castleberry was awarded his Eagle Scout badge.

With some pride I point to the fact that Altha is my home town and that I was formerly a member of this troop.

The Methodist church, where the ceremonies were held, was filled with friends from the community who were genuinely proud of the accomplishments of this young man. Mike is the first member of troop 136 to attain the rank of Eagle.

His advancement was a particular source of pride to my good friend, Pack Bowden, who serves as scoutmaster of the troop. It was his dedication and inspiration that encouraged Mike to excel.

In paying tribute to them, I pay tribute to the Boy Scouts of America. I consider this to be an organization which molds character in American youth and deserves the support of all of our people.

I might add that Mike's older brother, Tommy, was a contemporary of mine and is now a scoutmaster in Pensacola, Fla.

Mike is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Castleberry of Altha and has three older brothers, two older sisters and a younger sister.

Scout Castleberry is a member of the Altha United Methodist Church which he has attended regularly. He is presently the church music director and active in the Methodist Youth Fellowship.

He will graduate from Altha High School in May 1971, where he is active in many school positions, a member of the Beta Club and selected for the honor roll most of the time.

He was a Cub Scout for 3 years prior to beginning his scouting career, having attained the highest rank in the Cubs, the Webelos Award. He has been a very active member of Scout Troop 136 since March 1964.

As a member, he has served as troop scribe, bugler, senior patrol leader and junior assistant scoutmaster. Other achievements include Philmont Scout Ranch at Cimarron, N. Mex., in 1968, four summer camps, Brotherhood member Cowikey Lodge Order of Arrow, 26 merit badges, six NRA awards, the 50-miler Award and Camp Rifle Range Award.

Mike's interest in humanity has caused him to plan a career in the field of medicine for his life's work.

It is a privilege to pay tribute to this fine young man and in so doing, to commend all of those who are genuinely interested in the youth of our Nation.

The people of Altha and Calhoun County are truly proud of Mike's accomplishment in becoming the first Eagle Scout from an Altha troop.

RANGERS WHO CARE ABOUT
OUR NATIONAL PARKS

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, all too often the people who work for the U.S. Government in our various facilities, national parks, and other installations, are forgotten. Those of us on the committee who have been cognizant for so many years of the tremendous job that our National Park Service is doing are only too happy when we note that others are observing the kind of people who are making these parks a joy to visit day after day.

I am delighted to place in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post of Sunday, December 13, "Clean Parks, and Rangers Who Care":

SOMETHING TO CONSERVE—CLEAN PARKS
AND RANGERS WHO CARE

(By Hal Willard)

It took us a long time to put a mountain goat in our bag. You have to travel high and look sharp and quick to see one because they are among the rarest and most elusive wild creatures in America. They inhabit the most inaccessible areas of the country: the tops of mountains.

So perhaps you taxpayers will excuse me tromping on your grass in my eagerness to keep my binoculars on four mountain goats cavorting atop a peak at the Continental Divide, in Logan Pass of the Rocky Mountains in Glacier National Park, Mont.

We had emerged from the visitor's center in the Pass and started across a large meadow, following asphalt walkways to the area from which we had been told we might be able to spot the goats. And there they were, grazing on greenery surrounding patches of snow.

They were far away and high, and difficult to see even with binoculars. So I moved off the walkway a few feet to lean against a boulder to steady myself as I held the binoculars up.

"Sir," I heard a voice saying, "you are doing something highly detrimental to this park and the ecology of the area. You must not do that."

I wonder what some poor dolt is doing, I thought, but was reluctant to turn around and look for fear of losing the goats.

"I'm sorry, sir, but you'll have to return to the walkway." The voice was more insistent this time, and closer. I turned and discovered the speaker was a park ranger, and the dolt was me.

"What's the matter?" I asked as I scurried back to the asphalt.

"Look where you were standing and where you had to walk to get there and back here," he said with considerable feeling.

I looked and what I saw was grass, acres of it in all directions, and a bare patch about a foot square in front of the boulder. I looked back at the ranger in disbelief that he could be worried about this bit of grass on a vast meadow.

"If everybody (and he swept his arm around at the dozens of people moving up and down the wide walkways) did what you have just done we soon would have no grass here at all," he said.

"Okay," I said. "I'm sorry. I won't do it again."

As the ranger moved off to look for more culprits, I said to my wife: "That guy's a nut. He's let this ecology thing go to his head."

"No," she said, "he's just protecting the park." She was right.

This story illustrates the fact that National Park rangers really care about National Parks. The parks show it. The people who use the parks get the idea almost immediately and soon are as protective as the rangers.

I say this after visiting eight national parks, six national monuments, two national historic sites, two national memorials and one registered natural landmark—all run by the Park Service—in the course of an 11,000-mile tour of the Northwest by pickup truck/camper.

We had thought trash would be a problem in the parks, what with millions of people traipsing through, but we quit worrying about it after carefully studying every inch we could see of Rocky Mountain National Park (the first National Park on our trip) for most of two days and spotting only one item, a beer can bobbing in a mountain stream.

That was the pattern for the other park areas. Well, we did see some candy wrappers and other waste paper blowing about near Old Faithful in Yellowstone National Park, but two park employees were chasing after the trash with spiked sticks.

The National Forests were much the same as to cleanliness and the attitude of rangers and tourists toward natural resources. At the ranger station in the Salmon National Forest in Idaho, just south of the border with Montana, a ranger suddenly broke off giving information to tourists and hurried outdoors to prevent three young men from carrying away armloads of large rocks gathered from the edge of the woods, for whatever purpose.

"You can't take those rocks," the ranger said. "They help prevent erosion along that bank there," and he pointed to where the forest's edge dipped down to the highway.

The universal concern of rangers about keeping the areas under their charge free of trash and in their pristine state to the extent possible is, of course, magnified by the tremendous increase in the numbers of people trooping through the parks, forests, monuments, etc.

While the people increase, the sizes of the parks stay the same, although every once in a while a new park is added to the nationwide system. The latest is North Cascades National Park in Washington state, north of Seattle near the Canadian border.

The droves of visitors have caused the National Park Service to consider closing some parks to automobile traffic and requiring tourists to either ride shuttle buses through the park, or walk or ride horseback in. As an experiment, a portion of heavily used Yosemite Valley in Yosemite National Park, California, has been closed to cars.

From my observation, there is no question that there are large numbers of people battling about in the parks, but the crowds are not excessive or depressing or oppressive—and we made our tour in July and August, at the height of what was regarded as the most crowded season in history.

The National Parks recorded 157 million visits in 1969. The estimate for fiscal 1971 is 186 million.

Ending our trip, we felt that the millions of park users should be congratulated for their neatness, their courtesy to each other and the care with which they treated the parks—and for their willingness to follow instructions of the rangers.

I would like to admit here that before I left on the trip I expected to write after-

wards about the population explosion, man's destruction of nature and inhumanity to himself in the National Parks. The facts did not bear out the preconception and did not support the scare-stories I had read. Yosemite Valley, for example, certainly was jammed, but the Valley area is about six-tenths of 1 percent of the park's total area. Most of the rest of the park was like Wall Street on Sunday afternoon: deserted.

Why not open a little more of Yosemite to the public? It wouldn't have to be made as fancy as the Valley, but enough facilities could be put in to enable more people to more conveniently see one of the great scenic wonders of the world.

The same goes for the rest of the parks, specifically including Yellowstone, which is so big it took us about 2½ days just to drive around in it, stopping only briefly to examine various natural wonders. But the actual area to which the public has easy access is but a fraction of the total. Yellowstone is almost as big as Rhode Island and Delaware combined.

In addition to the National Parks, we have vast sections officially set aside as forest and wilderness areas, with limited access. Why not provide a few facilities to make parts of these areas possible to visit without the visitor having to be a latter-day Kit Carson?

Just to give you Easterners a little idea about the vastness of the open spaces out West, Montana has 147,138 square miles of territory and Prince George's County, Maryland, has 496 square miles. Both have about the same population: around 700,000.

And there still are quite a few areas of Prince George's County where you can wander around for a considerable time without seeing anyone.

"Easy access" to parks and wild areas doesn't have to mean roads. The Department of Interior's publication "Park Road Standards" points out that research is being done into the possibilities of using tramways, monorails, rail conveyor systems, buses, helicopters and hydrofoils.

My only lament about our past experience was that there weren't enough rangers. They can be so helpful to the visiting public, but there are so few of them. The parks, without exception, were noticeably understaffed. By "noticeably," I mean we hardly ever saw a ranger.

Yellowstone, for example, has hundreds of dangerous geysers and other thermal marvels. Most of them are marked with signs warning people to stay on the walkways, but the signs are small and unobtrusive and there were no rangers anywhere in the vicinity of the geysers we saw.

A 9-year-old boy fell in one last summer and was scalded so badly he died a few days later.

While we and several score other persons were sitting on the benches safely out of range waiting for Old Faithful to spout off, two middle-aged women wearing high heels approached the steaming geyser, apparently intent upon peering into it. They finally turned back after many of us whistled and yelled at them that the geyser was due to blow any minute. (Old Faithful isn't precise. The periods between blows vary by several minutes.)

We watched many young and middle-aged people stop along the road to feed the famous black bears, which are notoriously unpredictable, and get out of their cars to photograph them. We saw people walk across large open fields to take pictures of bull moose and bull elk grazing.

We didn't see anyone killed or injured and I can't figure out why.

The Park Service issued warnings through a few signs and in brochures, but there were no rangers present at any of the above incidents and I saw none patrolling the park.

Other dangers include no railings or even warning signs around the rims of precipitous canyons. You can't build a railing around a whole canyon, but one could be placed along the edges where people go to gawk, near parking lots.

Another failing at Yellowstone and Glacier, for example, was the lack of rangers to check people in and out of campgrounds. The only way to find empty sites was to drive through and look over the entire campgrounds. At Yosemite, rangers checked people in and out of sites on a master chart.

To pay for our campsite in Yellowstone, it was necessary to find the right ranger at the right time of day, and I failed in three attempts during two days. I finally gave up and left owing Uncle Sam \$4.

The rangers who were on duty were magnificent, everywhere—particularly the ranger-naturalists and ranger-historians. They are genuinely dedicated to helping visitors gain as much from the park experience as possible.

But where was the ranger-money collector?

THE GHOST OF KATYN CONTINUES TO HAUNT THE KREMLIN

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the continuing outrages being committed by the Soviet Union against all those who seek the truth must sooner or later arouse the conscience of the free world.

The latest such outrage comes to light in an Associated Press dispatch from Moscow which appeared in the Washington Evening Star calling attention to a number of trials and convictions recently held in the Soviet Union.

Among these trials was one of Svetoslav Karavansky, who was convicted for anti-Stalinist activities 21 years ago. Recently, Karavansky received a 5-year extension of his 25-year sentence for smuggling out a manuscript calling for reconciliation between East and West, and an eyewitness account of "a mass execution of Polish troops by the Soviet military during World War II."

This reference to an eyewitness account of a mass execution of Polish troops by the Soviet military during World War II has reference to the infamous Katyn Forest massacre in which the Soviets methodically destroyed 15,000 Polish Army reserve officers because they feared that after the war these Polish officers would constitute the core of opposition to the Communist takeover of Poland.

A select committee of the Congress of the United States headed by our distinguished colleague RAY MADDEN in 1952 conducted a very extensive and exhaustive investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre.

It was my great privilege to serve as chief investigator for this House committee and at that time, based on indisputable evidence, we concluded that the Soviet Union was responsible for this monstrous crime.

The conscience of the world will not be able to rest until the Soviet Union and

those responsible for this mass murder are brought to the bar of justice. There is no statute of limitation for murder.

The fact that the Soviet Union would tack on another 5-year sentence to Svetoslav Karavansky for trying to smuggle out an eyewitness account of the Katyn massacre is yet another proof of how desperately the Soviets have tried over the years to conceal their guilt for this crime.

The Polish army officers were taken to three Soviet camps near Smolensk, Russia, ostensibly to help regroup the Polish armed forces which had been routed by the invading Nazi forces during the first 3 weeks of September 1939 when Hitler started World War II.

While the heroic Polish armed forces were fighting against enormous odds to hold the line of the invading Nazi hordes in 1939, on September 17, 1939, the Soviet Union told the Polish Government that it was coming to the rescue of Poland and that Soviet troops were crossing the eastern borders into Poland in an effort to help the Poles hold off the Nazi invasion.

The enormity of Soviet deceit is best exemplified by the fact that the Soviets did not tell the free world they had signed the secret Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement on August 26, five days before the Nazi invasion of Poland, and that they were moving into Poland on September 17 as part of this secret agreement with Hitler.

The agreement provided for the division of Poland, with eastern Poland going to Russia and western Poland going to Germany.

To compound this scandalous deceit, the Soviet high command rounded up the 15,000 Polish army officers and transported them to the three camps near Smolensk under the guise of having them reorganize the Polish armed forces. It was only after the Polish army officers arrived at these three camps that they realized they had been duped and that they were being held prisoners by their ostensible ally.

The mass executions of these Polish army officers, ranging from the grade of lieutenant to general, began in the winter of 1939 and spring of 1940. The systematic destruction of these Polish army officers constitutes one of the most brutal crimes of history and is a violation of every agreement ever enacted in the history of conflicts between nations.

This horrible crime was carefully concealed by the Soviets until 1944, when German armies occupying the territory of Smolensk and finally the Katyn Forest, which was a rest camp for the Soviet high command, near Smolensk, deep within the borders of Russia, uncovered the huge mass graves into which the Polish army officers were dumped after being shot through the head by Soviet bullets fired by the Soviet NKVD.

The Soviets denied this crime and in a most clumsy manner tried to say that the Polish Army officers were killed by Nazi soldiers invading the territory. This Soviet claim was so preposterous that the free world could not help but reject it. Nevertheless, in the name of military expediency and allied solidarity, the free world, including the United States,

brutally closed its eyes to this monstrous atrocity.

It was not until the congressional committee of 1952 that we finally laid the bare facts before the conscience of the world.

We apparently now have a new standard and concept of international justice.

The United States did nothing more than issue a slap on the wrist to the Soviet Union when in 1953 the American Ambassador to the United Nations merely reported the findings of the congressional committee to the United Nations.

Today, 18 years later, we are watching an American soldier being tried for the Mylai massacre involving somewhere around 100 civilians killed in Vietnam.

I wonder where are those who have voiced such outrage over Mylai in demanding a similar trial of the Soviets for Katyn.

I wonder where are the voices of outrage in demanding that Svetoslav Karavansky be brought before an international tribunal to tell his eyewitness account of the Katyn massacre.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that man is motivated by many standards.

I can only say here today that it is crystal clear the Soviet Union continues to fear the exposure of its diabolical responsibility for the murder of the Polish officers at Katyn.

It is significant that even at this late date the Kremlin would add another 5 years' prison sentence to Karavansky, obviously hoping that in these next 5 years he will die and carry with him to the grave his eyewitness knowledge of the Katyn massacre.

The Soviet Union can use every device at its command, as it has up to now, but it will never be able to purge itself as the architect of mass destruction. The Katyn massacre shall withstand time itself as a living reminder of the brutality of the Communist mind.

We have heard a great deal about de-Stalinization. On a number of occasions the present Soviet leadership would have you believe that somehow things have changed in the Kremlin and that we are dealing today with honorable people.

Mr. Brezhnev and Mr. Kosygin can demonstrate the sincerity of this claim by releasing Svetoslav Karavansky from prison, permitting him to tell the world of what he saw, and then at least try to make up to the families of the victims of Katyn in some small measure the enormous loss they have suffered.

The ghost of Katyn will continue to haunt the Soviet Union into perpetuity. Only a soul cleaning and frank admission by the Soviets will help put that ghost to rest.

EAST-WEST TRADE

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, the promotion of increased east-west trade should be an important goal for us and our Western allies. A healthy eco-

nomie relationship is the cornerstone of a viable and peaceful political relationship among nations. In this spirit I am pleased to include in the RECORD a thoughtful paper on the subject by a consultant to Senator JAVITS, Mr. Arthur Ross of New York, which was presented at a meeting of the North Atlantic Assembly in The Hague last month. I enthusiastically commend this paper to the attention of my colleagues:

"EAST AND WEST: THE TIES THAT BIND"

Introduction

1. The most promising opportunity for easing the strains between the NATO countries and their Eastern European counterparts lies in accelerating the growth of trade between these two great areas. Trade intertwines the self-interest of each and promotes that interdependence which is such an important bulwark of stability.

2. Russia, with its population of 239 million, and the other Eastern European countries, with a combined population of 120 million, provide a well-organized market of 360 million people who are well-educated and many of whom have backgrounds not unlike their counterparts in Western Europe. Eastern Bloc countries have a good record of fulfilling their contracts with Western corporations. Business law and ethics in the Communist World are surprisingly similar to those in the West, despite the fundamental structural differences in business organizations and the differing theoretical assumptions regarding the social functions of business activity and commerce. These countries exceed the Common Market's population of 200 million and are not far behind it in productivity and consumption. Nevertheless, only 4% of all the foreign trade of the members of NATO is with this great trading area.

3. Trade among the nations of the Free World is expected to continue to grow at close to the 10-15% rate that it has averaged over the last fifteen years, but such trade is well-established and relatively mature. In contrast, trade with the Eastern Bloc is only marginally familiar to most business and government exporting organizations in the West.

This brief review of the current state of trade between NATO and the East and of the areas where a fresh approach might increase that trade is presented in the firm belief that such an increase should be an important NATO goal.

I. BACKGROUND

4. There are three major structural differences in the circumstances governing NATO's trade with Communist Bloc countries from those governing the balance of its trade with other countries.

(1) Eastern Bloc business transactions are consummated by government organizations, and their buying and selling decisions are often affected as much by political as by economic considerations.

(2) Communist nations are not members of the General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade (GATT). The most important results of this are that: A. a Western country may have a bi-lateral trade agreement with a Communist country; and B. a Western country need not grant Communist countries Most Favored Nation status in its tariffs.

(3) Trade with the Eastern Bloc countries for most members of NATO is governed by the Coordinating Committee (COCOM) list of some 160 strategic commodities that may not be exported from NATO countries to Communist countries. Items embargoed from export to Communist China are in the so-called CHINCOM list.

5. Within this institutional framework, trade between NATO members and the East has grown at a rapid percentage rate from an extremely low base.

TABLE 1.—NATO TRADE WITH EASTERN EUROPE
[U.S. dollars in billions]

	1968	1962	1957
Exports to the Eastern European Bloc.....	4.1	2.2	1.1
Imports from the Eastern European Bloc.....	3.9	2.2	1.1
Total NATO-Eastern European trade.....	8.0	4.5	2.3
Total NATO trade.....	257.0	154.1	107.3
NATO trade with Eastern Europe as percent of total NATO trade....	3.1	2.9	2.2

¹ Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia.

Sources: OECD, Foreign Trade Statistical Bulletin, Series I, 1957-60; OECD, Foreign Trade Statistical Bulletin, Series A, 1961-68; IMF, International Financial Statistics.

NATO members are taking some steps to encourage their trade with the East. In the light of the special circumstances affecting this trade, some of the trade promotion measures being taken are worthy of note.

II. CREDIT

6. Practically all trade involves credit arrangements, and without such arrangements it will advance little beyond the level of barter. Internal trade involves difficulties and risks that make credit to either the buyer or seller, or both, and some kind of insurance to the seller almost essential. An international transaction involves an extended period of time to complete. Circumstances of either the buyer or the seller may change during that time; or the political or economic conditions in the buyer's or seller's country may change. The risks are well-known: insolvency of one party; devaluation; confiscation; war; revolution; changes in import regulations; and loss or damage to goods in transit. The longer the time during which the transaction takes place, the greater the risk, so all of these factors bear most acutely on the export of specially ordered and manufactured capital goods.

In addition, and again particularly with capital goods, the buyer by necessity wishes to defer payment. To meet these needs, all governments, I believe without exception, have set up agencies that will either grant credit directly to exporters or will rediscount a major part of the credit granted by banks or other private financial institutions to exporters. They have also established official or quasi-official agencies to insure export credits.

7. Financing is such an important competitive tool in promoting exports that the major industrial countries, through the Berne Union, have set up guidelines limiting the amount of government-supported financing. However, the line between commercial export financing, which is subject to the limitations set up by the Berne agreements, and the financing of development projects, which is not, is not clear.

The following table shows official domestic and export interest rates. There is little doubt that on major projects interest rates are modified, and repayment schedules are extended well beyond the five-year limit set by the Berne Union.

TABLE 2.—MEDIUM TERM INTEREST AND REDISCOUNT RATES* (SEPT. 1, 1969)

	[In percent]			
	Central Bank		Commercial Bank	
	Domestic	Export	Domestic	Export
United States.....	6.0	6.0	8.5	9-11.0
France.....	7.0	4.0	7.5-9.0	4.3-4.8
Italy.....	3.5	2-6.5	8.5	5.5-6.9
United Kingdom..	7.0	5.5	8.0	5.5
West Germany....	6.0	4.5-6.25	6.7-8.25	4.5-7.5

*Source—U.S. Department of Commerce, as quoted in "Report on Preferential Interest Rates within Export Credit Schemes of Major Trading Competitors", U.S. Chamber of Commerce, August 1970.

8. The importance of credit as a competitive tool in promoting exports is hardly open to question, yet little statistical evidence has ever been put together to support it. The fact that the U.S. Export-Import Bank does not participate in financing trade with Communist countries provides an opportunity of comparing trade levels where there is government-supported credit and where there is not. Such figures can at best provide only tentative evidence, but they indicate that government-supported financing can as much as double exports of major capital goods.³

9. There are also indications that either direct government grants of credit or government guarantees or rediscounting of credit generates additional, unsupported export business. The following table compares exports to Eastern countries of heavy machinery and electrical machinery (Group 7 in the U.S. Department of Commerce commodities classification) of thirteen Western industrial nations (excluding the U.S.) with the government-supported credits of over five years that were granted by these same countries. The correlation is that most export credits of over five years will be for capital goods of the Group 7 variety. As can be seen, there are about \$3 of exports for each \$1 of credit.

TABLE 3.—EXPORT CREDITS AND EXPORTS OF HEAVY MACHINERY

	[U.S. dollars in millions]			
	1966	1965	1964	1963
SITC 7 exports to Communist countries ⁴	1,208	899	922	NA
Officially supported credits of over 5 years covering exports to Communist countries.....	446	294	224	45

⁴The exporting countries include are Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, West Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom.

Source: Hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on International Finance, of the Committee on Banking and Currency on S.J. Res. 169 (1968).

Clearly, continued improvement of credit, insurance, and guarantees of export financing can be an important factor in promoting trade with the Communist Bloc—as well as with the rest of the world.

III. TAX INCENTIVES

10. One of the problems in promoting exports is that it is more attractive for a company to sell in its home market than to cope with all the problems of language, foreign regulations, currency, credit checking and the like that are involved in export operations.

An important way of making exporting more profitable is to exempt export profits from certain taxes. One of the great beauties of the Value Added Tax is the nearly automatic way taxes can be refunded on exported goods. All indirect taxes have similar advantages as compared to income and other direct taxes. Among NATO countries, the U.S., Canada, and the U.K. rely most heavily on direct taxes. The U.K. has made a series of complicated exceptions and adjustments to its tax schedules to promote exports. The U.S. and Canada have thus far done very little. In fact, the U.S. tax system in some ways

³Prof. Robert Hawkins and Thomas Wolf of the New York University Graduate School of Business are studying comparisons of U.S. exports of consumer goods versus capital goods versus capital goods to Communist and to non-Communist countries, and comparing those ratios with similar ratios of Western countries that do not differentiate between Communist and non-Communist countries in offering their credit support to exports. The study is still in progress, and the results can only be tentative; but the preliminary indications of the significant effect of governmental credit support are most interesting.

discourages exports: by deferring income tax liability on certain foreign profits, it encourages U.S. corporations to set up manufacturing subsidiaries abroad rather than to export U.S. made goods.

11. This spring, however, the Treasury proposed to allow U.S. corporations to set up a new type of subsidiary to be called a Domestic International Sales Corporation (DISC). To qualify as a DISC company, the subsidiary would have to derive at least 95% of its income from the export sales or activities ancillary to such sales, including interest received on any credit extended to finance its export sales; also, 95% of the DISC company assets would have to be related to export activities.

The profits of a DISC company would not be subject to U.S. income tax until they were distributed to the parent. In addition, where the U.S. parent company manufactures the products that the DISC company exports, the Internal Revenue Service would allow a greater allocation of profits to the DISC company than the present arms-length allocation rules allow. The Treasury estimates that under its proposal, DISC companies could defer all their income taxes for a minimum of ten years and that DISC companies whose profits were growing could defer all their income taxes for longer than that.

12. Other countries have authorized similar tax-favored entities to promote exports, and a further use of tax-forgiving measures can help encourage all overseas trade, with particular benefit to trade with the East, which has been so neglected.

IV. BILATERAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

13. GATT, to which all NATO members belong, forbids any member to enter into a trade agreement with any one member nation that it does not offer to every other member nation. There are few exceptions, but that is the basic element in the system of multi-lateral trade that GATT is designed to encourage. However, the Communist countries are not GATT members, and a major part of the trade of NATO members with Eastern Bloc countries is carried on under bi-lateral agreements.

Such agreements are so varied in form and substance that they lend themselves to few generalizations. Some are specific contracts covering one carefully-described and enumerated exchange of specified amounts of goods. At the other extreme, some are little more than statements of intent to exchange a certain value of goods over a certain period of time. Most lie somewhere in between and enumerate kinds of goods that each party intends to ship and agrees to accept; sets forth the general rules for pricing; and often sets up an arbitration procedure.

Such agreements are not much better than extended barter agreements. As a prevailing way of doing business they are primitive, cumbersome, inflexible, and far less economic in their use of productive resources than a multi-lateral trade system. Nevertheless, since the Communist countries have so far not chosen to join the complex of treaties that make up the trading system of the Free World, such bi-lateral agreements must provide the basic framework for trade with the East.

14. A recent trend in such agreements combines trade with financing. Probably the best publicized is the agreement between West Germany and the Soviet Union under which West German manufacturers are supplying the Soviet Union with large-diameter steel pipe, delivery of which is to be completed by 1972. A consortium of German banks is financing a major part of the purchase price, and the government is guaranteeing the loan. Payment will be made by delivery of natural gas to Germany from 1973 to 1993. It appears that the pipe, with its financing supported by the German Government, will be used to transport the gas that will pay for the pipe.

In a similar transaction, English contractors have undertaken to build a \$3 million irrigation project in Rumania. It is being financed by British banks, with the financing guaranteed by the Export Credits Guarantee Department of the government. Payment is to be made over the next ten years with agricultural products expected to be grown at the irrigation project.

15. Clearly, there are opportunities for creative salesmanship and financing on a bilateral basis, and perhaps the surface has just been scratched. But note again the cumbersome nature of having to work out a deal like this for each transaction as compared to the simplicity of the normal money contract that is basic to a multi-lateral trade system.

V. IMPORTS, TARIFFS AND QUOTAS

16. One of the factors inhibiting trade with the Eastern Bloc countries has been their tendency to try to keep their trade with each individual country in approximate balance. (Another example of bi-lateralism and another example of the way the multi-lateralism of Free-World trade, despite the stresses to which the system is so frequently subjected, generates a more productive and efficient economic result.) It appears, however, that country-by-country balanced trade will remain one of the adverse conditions that traders with the Eastern Bloc countries will have to accept.

17. Since the Communist countries are not members of GATT, their exports to GATT members do not automatically receive Most Favored Nation tariff treatment. The difference can be significant. In the U.S., for instance, imports from countries not receiving Most Favored Nation status are subject to the rates of the Smoot Hawley Act of 1930. On a representative group of commodities,⁵ the Smoot Hawley rates average 2.6 times the Most Favored Nation rates. The Communist nations also set tariffs at differing rates for different countries. However, individual bi-lateral agreements can modify the tariff rates for individual commodities in particular instances. Also, since Soviet purchasing policy is often governed by factors other than economic, prices can be set to effectively increase or reduce any given tariff rates.

18. It is difficult to document, but trading patterns suggest that Eastern Bloc countries trade more with countries with lower tariff barriers against their commodities. This is, of course, to be expected. Its significance is that, as in all other commercial relations, foreign trade with Communist countries is a two-way street and must be approached with the expectation of, and planning for, increased imports as well as exports.

In practice, this planning has sometimes appeared to be negative. There are several instances where countries, including members of NATO, have negotiated bi-lateral agreements with Communist countries providing for the exchange of groups of named commodities, where such countries have subsequently placed a quota on one of the commodities that it was to import under the agreement. Such quotas appear to have been imposed to protect the importing country from becoming too dependent on one source of supply. Perhaps such actions do not violate the letter of the preceding trade agreements, but they certainly put a severe strain on their spirit. Future trade would be better served by recognizing the limitations in the original agreement.

CONCLUSION

19. Before closing I would like to call special attention to developments indicating that the U.S. Government is taking steps to-

⁵ Cheese, carpets, glassware, typewriters, motorcycles and parts, footwear and still cameras.

ward a more positive attitude toward trade with Communist countries. The Export Administration Act of 1969, which replaces the Export Administration Act of 1965, directs the Secretary of Commerce to review the list of prohibited commodities and to remove those items the export of which may no longer present a threat to the national security. In making such determination, the Secretary is to consider whether such commodities are available to Communist countries from other non-Communist countries. That consideration was explicitly excluded from the predecessor act. Less tangible, but possibly more significant, the promotion of foreign trade is emphasized as the goal of the legislation, and the limitation of that trade to protect the national security is stated second and as an exception.⁶ Furthermore, in September, 1970, the United States Treasury ceased requiring foreign subsidiaries of U.S. corporations to obtain a Treasury permit for an export to a Communist country in addition to the basic Export Control permit.

20. Although this paper concerns itself primarily with the NATO trade opportunities with Eastern Europe, nevertheless it is interesting to note that the United States has begun to substantially readjust its posture in connection with trade with Communist China. Thus within the past year, the ban on all material transactions of a commercial or financial nature between the U.S. citizen and his agent has been modified. This ban had been in effect since December 1951. The first exception was made in July 1969, when the State Department announced that an American citizen traveling abroad could bring home with him up to \$100 worth of Chinese merchandise, so long as it was not intended for resale or for commercial use. On December 23, 1969, the ceiling of \$100 and the requirement that the goods enter the U.S. with the traveler were removed. In addition, certain tax-exempt organizations such as museums were allowed the same import privileges. More important, the foreign branches and subsidiaries of U.S. firms were allowed to trade with China, so long as Chinese goods to the U.S., and foreign branches of American firms could deal "presumptively" Chinese goods, but not import them into the United States. Each such change in itself may not be dramatic, but overall they reflect important policy changes.

21. The last three decades of the twentieth century are now unfolding before us. Despite discord and differences in many parts of the world, the forces that bind Eastern Europe and the NATO countries together should be greater than forces that are divisive. It is incumbent upon government leaders at all levels to energetically exploit all means available to bind together and build bridges amongst our member nations and their Eastern European counterparts. Trade, with its many collateral advantages, is the single most effective channel on which to concentrate our thoughts and energies to meet this end.

THE DOUGLAS INVESTIGATION

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the nearly 1,000 pages of Celler Subcommittee report of a purported investigation of complaints of a lack of judicial good behavior on the part of Associate Justice William

⁶ Export Administration Act of 1969, Section 4(c).

O. Douglas are labeled on the front cover as a "final report." From a review of the contents of the document it becomes apparent that no witnesses were called and no testimony was taken under oath and subject to penalties of perjury.

The Celler report is more significant for the extent of the questions it acknowledges remain unanswered, than for its purported explanations of the Justice's activities. It is clear that a truly meaningful investigation in response to the constitutional obligation of the House of Representatives in such cases has not yet taken place.

In this connection the following column by James J. Kilpatrick appearing in the Washington Star of December 15th is of interest:

WHY DOUGLAS OUGHT TO BE TAKEN OFF THE COURT

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The judges of the United States Supreme Court, says the Constitution, "shall hold their offices during good behavior." The plain implication is that judges shall no longer hold their offices if their behavior is not good. By this standard, Justice William O. Douglas ought to be booted off the court.

Yet the odds are 10,000 to 1 that the House Judiciary Committee, when it meets this week, will accept the recommendation of a subcommittee that charges against Justice Douglas be dropped. For the time being, at least, the whitewash job will be complete.

What does the Constitution mean by "good behaviour"? The term defies precise definition. Manifestly, it means something less than—or more than—the provision that impeachment shall lie for "treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors."

The requirements of good behavior, as a condition for continuance in office, applies specifically to judges. A fair reading is that "good behaviour" embraces simply that high standard of propriety which the nation has a right to expect from its federal judges in their official or public lives.

Such an interpretation has nothing to do with a judge's opinions. It excludes inquiry into his wholly personal life. The rightful concern of the people, through their Congress, is with the conduct of judges as judges, and with the contribution they make toward the public image of justice.

Whatever the standard may be for lower judges, surely a pattern of impeccable rectitude is demanded of a man who sits upon the U.S. Supreme Court. This is the pinnacle.

It is ludicrous to say of such a judge merely that he has done nothing for which he might be indicted, that he has not engaged in treason, or taken bribes, or committed high crimes or misdemeanors, and therefore may not be impeached. The constitutional requirement is that his behavior be "good."

Former Justice Abe Fortas understood this clearly. His acceptance of a large fee from the Wolfson Foundation was not an impeachable offense, but it tarnished the image of the court. It was not good behavior. And Justice Fortas resigned.

The distinctions between the Wolfson Foundation and the Parvin Foundation would not appear to be vast. But over a period of years, Justice Douglas accepted more than \$100,000 for vague and undefined services to the Parvin Foundation. Was this, in Justice Douglas, "good behaviour"?

When Justice Douglas writes for Playboy magazine, he writes under the identifying byline of "Associate Justice, U.S. Supreme Court." The same high title appears in his free-lance contributions to *Avant-Garde* and the *Evergreen Review*.

Regardless of the literary merit of his writing, these articles, so identified, tend to

lend the respectability of the court to publications that may not be actionably obscene but surely are offensive to many Americans. Is this casual commerce, in these cases of Justice Douglas, "good behaviour"?

Some of these extracurricular involvements have directly affected Justice Douglas's work on the court. Since the term began in October, he has disqualified himself from participating in the consideration of at least 21 cases.

Several of these, especially in the law of free speech and free press, are of major importance. A California case, Shaffer vs. Valtierra, raises grave questions under the 10th and 14th Amendments. But Justice Douglas is out of these cases.

The subcommittee's report was prepared without one word of sworn testimony, without one moment of public or private hearings. At this late date, the report can only be interred with the 91st Congress. The incoming 92nd Congress, if it wishes, can insist on something better than has been provided by Chairman Celler and his whitewash crew.

DE FACTO RACIAL STATUS IN SCHOOLS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most complex domestic problems in our land is the matter of de facto racial status in our schools. This is an emotional issue with some individuals. Attempts to solve the problem have included many unworkable formulas prescribed by members of the judiciary and politically motivated plans advocated by pressure groups. If there is a problem that requires understanding and patience, it is the entire subject of racial factors in school attendance.

A very timely editorial discussing recent figures published by the huge Chicago public school system emphasizing the complexity of the matter appeared in the Monday, December 14, Chicago Tribune. The problems faced by the Chicago system are by no means unique and would be comparable to the situation in most major cities of our country. I insert the following editorial in the RECORD:

FACTS ON DE FACTO SCHOOL SEGREGATION

The recently released annual count of black students and teachers in individual Chicago public schools illustrates yet again the stubborn facts that impede progress toward de facto racial integration in the public schools.

By assignment on new and newly certified teachers on a racial basis, the Board of Education has increased faculty integration within the last year, as the federal government has been pressing it to do. But the number of schools meeting federal guidelines for integrated faculties has risen from 33 to 67, that is out of 609 schools. As long as the Chicago Teachers Union prevents mandatory transfers of certified teachers, faculty integration will be a long time coming to most schools.

Pupil integration is not advancing at all. Some individual schools, as others before them, are moving quickly from integrated toward all-black, with such shifts within one year as from 20 per cent black to 67, 33 to 73, 47 to 92. In District 13 [Du Sable High School], of 19 schools the lowest

proportion of black enrollment is 99.4 per cent; in District 20 [Parker High], the lowest is 99.5 per cent. At the other extreme, in District 5 [Foreman, Kelyvn Park and Schurz], the highest percentage of black enrollment in any school is 4.2. Within a few exceptional districts, one elementary school may have 100 per cent black pupils and another may have none at all. The number of Chicago public schools with black enrollments stabilized between 20 and 80 per cent is very small. De facto racial segregation is a fact in Chicago public schools.

The schools are powerless to eliminate singlehandedly anything so largely beyond their control as de facto racial segregation. De facto segregation is rooted in housing patterns, which in turn are influenced by other considerations beyond the authority of the Board of Education. Only mandatory pupil and teacher assignments and long-distance busing of large numbers could conceivably accomplish integrated classrooms for most now in Chicago public schools. Where is either the money or the popular support for that? Chicago whites are not rallying in substantial numbers to that cause, and Chicago blacks are far less interested than they were a few years ago in pursuing the objective of school integration.

We suspect that principled, sound rejection of de jure school segregation has in recent decades carried many Americans, both black and white, into an unrealistic and unwarranted confusion of de facto school segregation with de jure segregation. De jure segregation was found unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court and was found indefensible by the minds and hearts of millions of American citizens. Such imposed segregation constituted action by government in matters within government's power to decide. But attempts to eliminate de facto segregation have led government to pursue unattainable objectives, sometimes at the expense of optimum education for pupils.

Moral imperatives often cause people to attempt the impossible, but neither individuals nor government agencies should pursue impossible objectives under the delusion that they are embarked on projects that can succeed. By now all of us should recognize that the elimination of de facto racial segregation in Chicago schools must await social developments beyond the power of the Board of Education to bring into being.

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS AND RETIREMENT PAY BILLS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, though there has been some dispute on the manner in which the Department of Transportation has handled the dispute involving the Federal Aviation Agency and its air traffic controllers, there is little dispute that the controllers have one of the most difficult and taxing jobs of any in this highly technical age.

The pressures that face air traffic controllers daily are debilitating and bring emotional and physical hardships on controllers many years ahead of men their own age working at less taxing jobs.

It is for this reason that air traffic controllers are seeking passage of H.R. 18311, rather than the Department of Transportation-Federal Aviation Agency-sponsored H.R. 19415.

In order that the views of air traffic controllers might be better understood, I am placing the comments of some 90 controllers in the form of a petition in the RECORD.

I would urge my colleagues in the Congress to give consideration to the arguments of the air traffic controllers in this matter.

The petition follows:

A PETITION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

We, the undersigned, are Air Traffic Controllers and Supervisors currently employed at the Oakland Air Route Traffic Control Center in Fremont, California. We all share in a commonality of purpose and that is to reveal our united opposition to the so-called "retirement bill" (H.R. 19415) submitted to Congress by the Federal Aviation Administration.

We feel that this bill is submitted by the Agency under the guise of a retirement bill. In actuality, even under the most conservative interpretation, it could be used as a legal method of taking away our present retirement benefits and even to remove us from our profession at the administrator's discretion. The F.A.A. bill, does in fact, take away a great deal of job protection afforded us by Civil Service Commission rules and regulations. The above would not only be detrimental to the Controllers at present but to our posterity as well.

We also take the liberty to ask our Congress to give their complete support and immediate attention to the retirement bill submitted to them by the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization (H.R. 18311). This bill was drafted by and submitted by Controllers; it shows our true needs.

Congress, we are sure, is aware of the tremendous pressures and responsibilities that the Controllers must contend with in their jobs. It would not be unrealistic, and could be medically proved, to say that due to these pressures, the Controller puts sixteen months of wear and tear on his heart and mind in a matter of twelve months. To dramatize this point may we call your attention to our facility record. Being one of the largest in the nation, handling more than one million operations per year, we have not had a man yet live long enough to enjoy a normal retirement. The few retirements that we have had have been medical. We had one supervisor, in his mid fifties, die two days before he was forced to retire. The records are yours to analyze gentlemen, please do so.

The reasons for Controller's early retirement are obvious. One good reason would be to look at the retirement record and see how very few controllers in these United States have actually retired. The second and most important would be the safety of the Air Traffic System in this nation. A man over forty-five in our profession is all but "washed up". He feels the strain of his job ten-fold to that of the man of twenty-five. The Agency suggests by their bill to cast him aside like a piece of used tissue; we say no, that is not right. This man has done one of the most strenuous jobs his nation has developed and he should be rewarded for doing it safely rather than being punished by being demoted.

We humbly request your attention to the above described and anxiously await your decision.

We remain,

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES A. HIATT,
Controller for Oakland Center Controllers.

LIST OF NAMES

Domenic V. Torchia, George A. McComichio, Joseph R. Pepe, James E. Doyle, Myron L. Zhomsen, Roberts J. Toney, Mariano

Balanzine, Stuart D. Dodge, Floyd C. Bishop, L. D. Thompson, Kenneth W. Barton, Charles A. Hiatt, Don L. Weller, Laurence Branch, Carl A. Dickson, William E. Luxburg, Edmund A. Chadwick, Harley H. Jones, John D. Conrad, and Thomas J. Martin.

Melvin R. Dierks, Harvey Johnson, Harry D. Spangle, Harley Bugles, John F. Linut, E. J. Bowman Jr., D. O. Solomon, James Welker, Joe I. Secura, Paul Lodin, Landon Fickel, Thomas W. Hopson, Glas, Juan, Jr., Charlotte Kostich, Leroy D. Falk, Gerald A. Dickson, Robert L. Stonz, Earl N. Holliday, Daryl L. Finch, and Stephen R. Lowens.

Delbert K. Morris, Walter L. Slack, James E. Fahey, Martin McCain, Robert G. Zimmerman, Elijah I. Miller, Charles M. Olsen, James C. Heath, Forrest E. West, Gerald D. Gibson, Frank R. Taylor, Edward L. Ferguson, Harold B. Choate, Pedro B. Roman, Stephen J. Brashear, Joseph Ellingsworth, Stephen L. Bradley, Frank R. Micco, Robert C. Veagey, and Daniel Tellez.

Charles F. Abele, Robert W. Egan, Victor T. Parker, P. W. Hartman, George E. Wright, James A. Point, Richard K. Trewitt, John F. Dodson Jr., Davy Jones, Roy B. Blood, Owen R. Kane Jr., James A. McRory, H. J. Turner Jr., Wilton F. Maddox, Edward DeVillie Jr., Frank B. Wilcoxon, John H. Kerr, Paul L. Clements, Warren J. Kresch, and Thomas E. Kutsch.

R. F. Bowen, Larry L. Scheuffle, Terrance L. Duffy, Donald M. Sherborne, Larry W. Swanson, Harry M. Hempy, Charles S. Alain, Charles H. Hobbs, Raymond H. McKinney, and Thomas A. Hager.

THE LAW OF FRANCHISING

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 17, 1970

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, while all of us are aware of the profusion of hamburger stands along American roads, few of us have any idea of the enormous growth of the marketing concept behind those hamburger stands. The franchise system of distribution has emerged as a major factor in American business; it is an "industry" soon to reach the \$100 billion per year level; there are already 600,000 franchises in operation and well over 1,000 franchisors.

Because of the unique aspects of the franchise as an investment or a form of corporate growth, it has a widespread appeal and application to millions of Americans who are not generally considered a part of the business community and who are not protected by existing law and regulations. Although measures have been proposed before this Congress and a number of State legislatures, franchise law is far from catching up to the franchise boom. In the current "consumerism climate," it is imperative that it does.

Perhaps the clearest statement of the current state of flux of the franchising industry and the effects of existing and proposed legislation on franchisee and franchisor, is made in a new book, "The Law of Franchising", by Coleman R. Rosenfield, published by the Lawyers Cooperative Publishing Co. of Rochester and Bancroft-Whitney Co. of San Francisco. Mr. Rosenfield, a practicing attor-

ney in Miami, Fla., with a long record of successful management in franchising, points out the dangers, difficulties—and promises—of franchising as an investment and a form of business growth.

Mr. Rosenfield recognizes that the relatively small initial investment required—plus the lure of quick profits promised by many advertised franchise offerings—attracts thousands of retired couples with their hard-earned savings and hundreds of thousands of skilled and unskilled workers seeking self-employment and an entrance into the mainstream of the American economy. Too often they are ill- or misinformed and their dreams end in disaster, a fate also reserved for underfinanced or ill-equipped business enterprises seeking to expand with or capitalize upon the franchise system.

"The Law of Franchising" deftly describes the lawyer's key role as an advisor to franchisee or franchisor; it shows how to analyze the franchise offering as an indication of the company's integrity, sufficient funding, proper allocation of funds and fees; it details the precautionary steps a company should take when it is considering the decision to franchise. Most important, it explores and explains the franchise agreement, step-by-step and clause-by-clause, indicating traps to avoid, performance guarantees to seek, and how to insert important modifications for the parties' protection. In the absence of specific franchising law, this contract is the heart of the franchise and practically the only safeguard of the parties' rights.

Mr. Rosenfield discusses the history of the franchise concept and the current state of reform legislation, in a most helpful way both for legislators and for those involved in franchise operations: Franchisees, franchisors, and associated third parties, such as banks or owners of commercial property.

Mr. Rosenfield has "told it like it is" from the growing dangers of the "celebrity franchise" to the serious question of the franchise as a security; it is now up to us to do something about it.

RETURN OF LITHUANIAN SEAMAN ANGERS MANY

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 17, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic case of the Lithuanian seaman who was denied in his attempt to defect to this country has stirred the anger of many Members of this body. Thus, it was gratifying that during his press conference last Thursday night President Nixon made the strongest possible statement about this inexcusable incident.

After first noting his own shock and anger when he learned about the case, President Nixon stated:

I can assure you it will never happen again.

He then went on to say:

The United States of America for 190 years has had a proud tradition of providing op-

portunities for refugees and guaranteeing their safety, and we are going to meet that tradition.

Mr. Speaker, this bitter affair is now history. Realistically, there is nothing this country can do to convince the Soviet authorities to allow Simas the freedom he sought in this Nation.

But in the aftermath it is at least reassuring that his plight caused such an overwhelming wave of sympathy in this country. It is clear that we have not deviated and will never deviate from the principles of freedom and liberty on which this country was founded.

IMPORTS POSE THREAT TO AMERICAN MUSHROOM INDUSTRY

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 17, 1970

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, although most of the debate on the Trade Act of 1970 has centered upon textile and leather footwear products, another industry is threatened by the spiraling volume of imports—the American mushroom industry.

The agricultural economy of Berks County, in my congressional district, has been adversely affected by this wave of mushroom imports, particularly from the Far East.

Mushroom processing requires extensive hand labor. In Taiwan, for example, processors pay workers between 7 and 11 cents an hour. Needless to say, wage scales like this have placed American mushroom growers and processors at a severe competitive disadvantage.

Mushroom imports from Taiwan, which were virtually nonexistent in 1960, soared to 11.3 million pounds by 1963. Last year mushroom imports represented one-third of the total U.S. market. Imports for the first 4 months of 1970 increased sharply, from 5 million to 9 million canned pounds.

While Taiwan supplies the greatest proportion of these imported mushrooms, another Asian country, Japan, has now entered the picture and has quickly become the second largest supplier. In addition, a third Far East nation, South Korea, appears to be playing a more active role in this market.

At present the Common Market absorbs more Far East mushrooms than the United States, but despite all the rhetoric about free trade, increasing protectionism in Western Europe would seem to suggest a decline in imports. For example, a common tariff on canned mushrooms has been established and at least one country, France, is reportedly subsidizing exports to West Germany—the largest per capita consumer of mushrooms—to meet Taiwan prices.

These economic trends indicate that the United States is rapidly becoming the largest, most lucrative, and most readily exploitable outlet for mushrooms from the Far East.

Mr. Speaker, the Mushroom Producers

Association recently published a detailed report on this situation prepared by the Foreign Agriculture Service of the Department of Agriculture. I include the section of the report dealing with imports from Taiwan in the RECORD at this point:

MUSHROOM IMPORTS

The mushroom canning industry of Taiwan has expanded rapidly since its inception in the late 1950's. Within a span of only a few years, Taiwan became the world's leading exporter of canned mushrooms. A trial export of canned mushrooms was first made from Taiwan in 1958. Thereafter, exports continued to rise sharply and by 1967, movement abroad had risen to 2.3 million standard cases (24-lb. net drained weight per case). Taiwan's successful penetration of the world market can be attributed in large part to its very low production costs, at both the grower and cannery level.

The mushroom cultivated in Taiwan is of the same type as that produced in the United States. Although some modernization is evident, mushrooms continue generally to be grown in empty granaries or in self-built, bamboo-walled and thatched-roofed sheds. The mushroom beds are made of weaved bamboo splits placed on bamboo shelves, all of which involves little in the way of out-of-pocket costs to growers. Since mushrooms are grown in the winter when other crops have been harvested, growers are able to utilize their otherwise unemployed time and labor.

Although the production of mushrooms is scattered throughout Taiwan, it is concentrated mostly in the central part of the western coastal plain. The mushroom growing houses generally range from 32 to 65 feet in length, 10 to 16 feet in width, and 15 to 19 feet at ceiling height. The area of mushroom beds per grower ranges mostly from 50 to 150 pings (1-ping equals 36 sq. ft.) or 1,800 to 5,400 sq. ft.

While some production of early-type mushrooms is harvested in late October, the bulk of the crop is produced during the four-month period, December through March. Preparations for the new crop begin in September with the preparation of compost, made from chopped rice straw and chemical fertilizers. From early October through mid-November, the spawn is planted. Within two weeks the first growth appears and a layer of soil is spread over the beds. At the preparation stage, the temperature is maintained at 77° F. Within 20 to 30 days, the temperature is dropped to the optimum for mushrooms production—55° to 59° F. at 80% relative humidity. This temperature is maintained, as far as possible, through the harvest season.

Yields normally average about 33 pounds per ping (0.92-lbs. per sq. ft.). Harvesting is performed daily, or twice a day during the period of peak production. A few years ago, farmers were more than willing to produce mushrooms. More recently, however, grower interest has declined because of the attractiveness of off-farm income. During the 1968-69 season, there were 45,900 mushroom producers as compared to 50,000 producers in 1967-68, and 59,000 in 1966-67.

In order to counteract this trend, the government has introduced several new techniques to increase yields so as to make mushroom production a more profitable pursuit. These include the lining of mushroom houses with polyethylene film, the addition of an electric blower and the sterilization of compost. These devices were initiated to control fly infestation and to control inside temperatures. In the first year's trials, yields were reported to have doubled in some cases.

In addition to the many small individual mushroom growing operations, each cannery may produce up to a permitted maximum of 30% of its own requirements. This limitation was designed to protect the many small producers but at the same time, to permit canners to produce a significant share of the raw product in order to insure quality. Mushrooms produced by canners are generally of higher quality, with less insect infestation, than those produced by small growers. The annual planted area and production of mushrooms in Taiwan as well as the derived yields are shown below:

Crop year, December—March	Planted area (thousand square feet)	Production (thousand pounds)	Yields (pounds per square foot)
1959-60.....	1,620	1,587	0.98
1960-61.....	7,020	6,878	.98
1961-62.....	35,280	34,568	.98
1962-63.....	77,400	75,838	.98
1963-64.....	55,800	47,950	.86
1964-65.....	81,144	72,531	.89
1965-66.....	112,680	87,082	.77
1966-67.....	128,880	118,387	.92
1967-68.....	133,740	122,796	.92
1968-69.....	81,072	68,784	.85

The sharp reduction in the planted area and production for 1968-69 reflected in part, the large carryover of canned mushrooms (413,000 standard cases) from the preceding pack year. This excessive carryover was, in turn, a reflection of the smaller-than-anticipated exports to the United States and Western Europe. Unfavorable weather during the growing season served to further reduce output in 1968-69.

Taiwan's most recent 4-year development plan, which went into effect in 1969, calls for the following targets in mushroom production:

Year:	Metric tons	Equivalent (million pounds)
1969.....	54,000	119
1970.....	57,600	127
1971.....	57,500	131
1972.....	63,000	139

A study conducted in 1966 indicated a total production cost of about \$4.39 per ping (36 sq. ft.). Itemization of the costs elements is shown in the following:

Item:	U.S. Dollars/35 sq. ft.
Straw	1.500
Fertilizers731
Tools050
Spawn250
Depreciation (on shed)600
Interest250
Electricity019
Labor862
Other (incl. pesticides)131
Total	4.393

The 1966 study further indicates that the total revenue derived sales of the units surveyed, amounted to U.S. \$7.25 per ping, thus leaving a profit of U.S. \$2.86 per unit. (Yields were not identified).

Most of the Taiwanese farmers are members of the so-called Farmers' Associations. These associations are organized at three levels, namely—in the townships, at the county and city level, and the province. They are similar to cooperatives, offering services and materials to the farmer and provide an outlet for his produce.

Grower prices for canning mushrooms are established by the Government after con-

sultations with the Farmers' Associations and canners. In recent years, grower prices have averaged about 15 U.S. cents per pounds for No. 1 grade mushrooms and 14 U.S. cents, No. 2 grade. A deduction of approximately 1.1 U.S. cents is made by the Farmers' Associations for the so-called mushroom Fund. The grower's contribution for the 1969-70 season will be reduced to 0.8 U.S. cents per pound. Canners contribute 5 U.S. cents to this Fund for each standard case moving into export. Thirty % of the Fund is allocated for disease and pest control, 25% of research and 20% for the study of plastic covered mushroom sheds.

Mushroom growing facilities are inspected periodically by an inspection team to determine whether the sanitation practices prescribed by the Government are being followed. In addition, all nurseries producing the mushroom spawn are inspected by the Provincial Department of Agriculture & Forestry and only those nurseries receiving a certificate of approval from the Department are permitted to supply spawn to growers for the production of canning mushrooms for export. Growers purchase spawn through the Farmers' Associations at 30 U.S. cents per bottle. One and one-half bottles are required for each ping (36 sq. ft.) of mushrooms cultivated.

The number of canneries engaged in the production of canned mushrooms increased dramatically during the initial phases. According to reports of the American Embassy in Taipei, 31 canneries were operating in early 1962. Two years later, the number had increased to 78. Today, 84 canneries are operative. Only five of these pack over 100,000 cases per season, these firms accounting for one-third of the total industry output. The largest single packer—Taiwan Pineapple Corporation—picks about 10% of the total.

Wages paid by canners for women on the packing lines range from U.S. \$0.60 to U.S. \$1.00 per 9-hour day. The larger canneries have a small nucleus of permanent workers with the balance of the labor force consisting largely of young girls living in the vicinity of the cannery and subject to call whenever the produce arrives from the farm for canning. Although some of the canneries only operate during certain months of the year, year-round production as well as a diversification of operations have become common. The majority are engaged in the canning of: asparagus in the spring and autumn, pineapple, mushrooms, oranges and water chestnuts during the winter, bamboo shoots and a variety of other products during the summer.

Generally, 80% or more of the annual mushroom harvest is utilized by canneries. The annual pack of canned mushrooms for the period 1958 through 1968 is as follows:

Year	Standard cases (24-lbs.: drained weight)
1958.....	500
1959.....	2,000
1960.....	43,077
1961.....	245,900
1962.....	975,159
1963.....	1,334,313
1964.....	1,180,887
1965.....	1,941,262
1966.....	1,863,819
1967.....	2,872,604
1968.....	2,149,612

Most of the canned mushrooms produced in Taiwan move into export. West Germany and the United States are, by far, the most important markets. These two markets alone account for three-fourths or more of Taiwan's total exports. The following table sets forth the annual exports by the principal countries of destination:

[In thousands of standard cases]

Year	West Germany	United States	Canada	Netherlands	Sweden	Other	Total
1962	368	295	6	10	1	29	709
1963	754	513	9	37	19	46	1,378
1964	703	312	37	58	24	38	1,172
1965	928	489	56	50	15	68	1,606
1966	923	602	38	98	32	152	1,845
1967	1,102	706	86	49	36	324	2,303
1968	1,039	787	172	34	29	259	2,320

The rapid growth of Taiwan's mushroom industry prompted the enactment of a number of controls at the cannery level designed to prevent overproduction, price cutting amongst exports as well as insure the maintenance of a quality product in export.

Each year the Board of Foreign Trade of the Ministry of Economic Affairs establishes an annual canned-mushroom production goal for export covering the entire industry. The establishment of this goal is based on an analysis of the world market as well as the productive capacity of both growers and canners. The overall production quota is then parceled out to the individual canners on the basis of their historical performance. This procedure, in effect, imposes a ceiling on the number of mushroom canners. Any mergers or reorganization of mushroom canners is subject to Government approval. In order to qualify as a producer for export, the individual canneries must pass various types of sanitary and quality inspections. Those canners who fail to abide by the Government regulations can be dropped or penalized in their allocation.

After the production quotas have been established by the Government, the Taiwan Mushroom Packers' United Export Association (TMPUEC) determines the allocations for export. In practice, the TMPUEC, too, recommends the industry's overall production goal. The Government generally accepts such recommendations.

The TMPUEC was established in November of 1963. It is a privately owned corporation to which all mushroom canners engaged in export activity must belong. Canner membership is accomplished through the purchase of capital stock in the corporation. Its declared purpose is "to promote joint export of canned mushrooms by stabilizing prices, protecting the interest of foreign importers and fixing unified prices based on production costs."

All export sales of canned mushrooms are made at uniform prices set by the TMPUEC. This system was adopted to eliminate price competition amongst exporters. In addition to the allocation of overall shares to individual member packers, the TMPUEC establishes annual export quotas by markets.

The total export target for the 1969-70 season has been set at 2.2 million standard cases, the same as in 1968-69, but 300,000 cases below that of 1967-68. The 1969-70 target for the U.S. market is pegged at 900,000 standard cases, the same as the unattained goal of a year earlier. Actual shipments to the United States in 1968 only totaled 787,000 cases.

CONSIDERATION OF SUGAR ACT EXTENSION IN 1971

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 17, 1970

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, one of the important legislative matters to be considered by Con-

gress next year will be the extension of the Sugar Act.

Since its original passage in 1934, this act has served well in maintaining adequate sugar supplies at reasonable prices for the American consumer. While I feel that some changes are needed in the framework of the act, I also feel very strongly that it must be extended.

In a recent speech before the Red River Valley Sugarbeet Growers annual meeting in Moorhead, Minn., the distinguished Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS) did his usual outstanding job of analyzing the Sugar Act and its importance to consumers and producers of sugarbeets and cane.

Since this is such a thorough and careful review of the problems confronting the sugar industry—particularly sugarbeet producers—and because we will be dealing with the Sugar Act in the coming months, I feel that his speech will be of great interest to all Members of the Senate as well as others concerned with the sugar industry.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

SPEECH BY SENATOR CARL T. CURTIS

I am pleased that I could arrange my schedule to be here for this occasion. Perhaps I cannot tell you anything about the Sugar Act that you do not know but I assure you that it is beneficial to me to be here. I am glad for the opportunity of mingling with farmers and businessmen in this area of the country not too far from my native State of Nebraska.

It is rural America that constitutes the last great hope for these United States, which we all love. I could make a long speech about the advantages of rural America. We could talk about air and water pollution. We could talk about crime and violence. We could talk about good citizenship. In each case we would end up extolling our part of the country.

Economically, rural America has a battle on her hands and will have an increasing battle. Farmers, compared to the rest of the population, are getting to be few in number. Politicians make loud and long speeches in behalf of the consumer without always giving the consumers a full picture of where their money is going. You and I know that an inordinately small portion of the consumer's dollar is going to farmers generally, or specifically for sugar.

The Sugar Act is not without its problems and occasional criticism but it is one of the best agricultural acts that we have on the books. This Act has a threefold purpose: First, to protect the welfare of the United States sugar industry; secondly, to provide our consumers with ample sugar at reasonable prices; and thirdly, to promote and strengthen the trade of the United States. It does all three of these things.

Many of you here know the history of our present Sugar Act. It became law in 1934. Since then it has been extended and amended a number of times but the basic framework of the Act has not changed. It has worked well.

Prior to the Act of 1934, the United States had for about a century and a half regulated our sugar industry solely through the tariff. By the early 1930's, however, problems of price supply, surplus, fluctuations, and general farm depression were such that the tariff alone was not adequate. It was then that the Congress passed the Jones-Costigan Act.

"The proof of the pudding is in the eating." The Sugar Act has maintained a price for the producers of sugar beets and sugar cane that has not dipped to disastrous lows. It has been a stabilized price. Many times I have wished that the return to the sugar beet farmers was greater, but all-in-all the Act has worked well and has assured an adequate and fair return.

The consumer has been well served by the Act. Sugar is a good food and it is one of the lowest priced foods in comparison with all other foods that the housewives can buy in the marketplace. There are people who are always complaining about the price of sugar and the price of food, generally. I have two answers for those people. One is they should investigate just what makes up the price of anything and who gets the greatest portion of the price. Secondly, I contend that there is no moral or legal reason why we should expect to pay the farmers who produce our food less than a fair price than it is for us to expect that industry should sell at a loss or that labor would forego its gains and sell their services at substandard rates.

The Sugar Act has paid its own way. It has been good for the United States Treasury and the taxpayers. The one-half cent per pound excise tax on sugar consumed in this country pays all of the expense of the Act, including its administration and the payments to farmers. In addition to all of that, there has been a surplus or an excess of income to the Treasury, over outgo, of more than a half billion dollars since the Act was passed.

The Sugar Act will be up for extension by the Congress in 1971. It just happens that under the procedures in the House of Representatives, the Sugar Act is handled by the Committee on Agriculture. When the bill gets over to the Senate, it is referred to the Committee on Finance. I have been a member of the Finance Committee for many years and I have had a genuine interest in sugar legislation since I entered the Congress 32 years ago.

I also happen to be a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture. I expect to take an active part in the sugar legislation that will come before us next year. It is my hope that it will be considered early in the year. Too often it has been delayed until the closing days of the session, and this is not a good time to legislate carefully.

There will be a number of issues raised when the Sugar Act is extended. Probably there will be some people in and out of the Congress who will propose a limitation on payments that go to the farmers who produce our sugar. You will recall that in the general farm act that was passed a few months ago, there was for the first time a limitation placed on the amount of payments that any one producer could draw. For most sections of the country it was not too difficult an issue. It did involve the production of cotton. The Congress, however, will not be faced with the same problems in reference to sugar. The pressures should not be great for any drastic or disrupting limitation for two reasons. In the first place, the Act pays its own way and the general Treasury is not involved, but more importantly, the existing Sugar Act already contains a scaled down provision whereby the rate of payment de-

clines as the volume of cane or beets which is marketed from a farm increases.

Another issue that will be discussed in connection with the extension of the Act will be sugar prices. I have already stated that I believe the Sugar Act has been a protection to consumers and that the price of sugar is certainly not out of line. There will be pressures referring to price, however. There are those who cite instances where the world price for free sugar is very low at times compared to our domestic price. This is not an accurate picture. This so-called free world price fluctuates and is sometimes very low, but we must also keep in mind that most of the sugar that is sold in the world, in practically all of the developed countries, is sold under laws that regulate the production and sale of sugar, and those prices are very much like our prices. When individuals talk about the free world price, they are talking about a very small and unpredictable portion of the world's consumption of sugar.

Years ago housewives bought the greater portion of our sugar. Bakeries, confectioners, and bottlers bought the lesser amount. Now that situation is reversed. Our big purchasers of sugar are industrial users such as bakeries, confectioners, and bottlers. Those people, like all businessmen, face rising costs for their labor, both wages and fringe benefits and for their taxes, insurance, and general overhead. These problems are common to all Americans and do not give these industrial users any moral or just right to pressure for lower priced sugar. In fact, it ought to point up the need for considering increased prices to growers.

Another issue that is always with us is the allocation of import quotas among foreign countries. Every country in the world would like to get a portion of the American market. This is true of all products. It is not limited to sugar. It involves automobiles, textiles, chemicals, steel, and everything. Personally, I am for the largest domestic quota that the American farmers can handle without disruption and which can be sustained in future years. We should not lead any foreign country to believe that they have a right to a portion of our market for all the years to come or that they have a right to share in our increased consumption. If we do that then we will produce ill will when we have to make a change. We should let the whole world know that we are concerned, first about our domestic producers and that we reserve the right whenever we extend the Sugar Act or possibly even between times, to grant additional quotas to our domestic producers if it is in the best interests of our agricultural economy to do so.

Another matter that will probably come before the Congress in extending the Act relates to Puerto Rico. They have not been using their entire quota and Puerto Rico's deficit could well be used to increase the sugar beet area.

Last but not least, the Congress should give full consideration to the possibility of a provision that would enable new localities to enter sugar beet production. This was done in 1962. I had a part in the writing of that law. It was my hope at the time that my own State of Nebraska could expand its sugar beet production, that Nebraska could have some new areas of production, and some new sugar factories. Unfortunately for a variety of reasons that did not develop, I want to say to you Minnesota and North Dakota farmers and to my Nebraska farmers and to sugar beet farmers elsewhere that I still favor an increased domestic production of sugar from sugar beets.

In 1962 the Congress set aside an acreage reserved for new areas. That Act authorized the reserving each year, from the national sugar beet acreage requirement, of the acreage required to yield 65,000 short tons of raw value sugar. This made it possible for the bringing into production of sugar beet areas

in: Mendota, California; Hereford, Texas; Drayton, North Dakota; Auburn, New York; Presque Isle, Maine; and Phoenix, Arizona.

And an expanded production at: Ottawa, Ohio; Idaho Falls, Idaho; Carrollton and Crosswell, Michigan.

So long as we have general farm problems facing us, it should be our national policy to produce in the United States the full requirement of our domestic consumption insofar as possible. At the present time agriculture in the United States, generally, is faced with acreage restriction and limitation on production, which result in lesser farm income and costly programs to operate. Whenever we expand sugar beet production by one acre or a thousand acres, we are helping to solve the problems of all farmers in the United States that are faced with overproduction and depressed prices. Our continuing national policy should be one of expanding our domestic production of both sugar cane and sugar beets. I do not advocate a rash or ill-considered expansion. Our expansion should be gradual, well thought out and planned and on a basis that that expansion can be maintained in future years. I do not believe that we can maintain the respect of foreign countries when we fail to do what we can to solve our own problems. The domestic market belongs to the American farmer.

For several years now our sugar beet farmers have not been subject to an acreage restriction. This alone will not permit an expansion of the industry or the development of new areas. Sugar beet processing plants cost many millions of dollars. Farmers cannot shift from one crop to the other on a sudden and temporary basis. The cost of farm equipment and other factors make it necessary to plan for the long range. It is important that we provide for orderly expansion of the production of sugar beets in the Act itself.

A prosperous sugar beet industry contributes to a prosperous agriculture in the United States. A prosperous agriculture is absolutely necessary if we are for long to have a sound and prosperous economy in our country. Even though it is true the number of persons needed to produce our food gets fewer and fewer, agriculture is still as important a part of our economy as it ever was. Agriculture is the most important means whereby man produces new wealth. The production of our farmers must be processed, transported, packaged, labeled, advertised, wholesaled, retailed, financed, bought and sold and insured. In other words, when a farm commodity is produced, it sets in motion a whole chain of activity that means jobs and business and wages and profits for Americans. The fact that fewer individuals are involved does not lessen the importance of agriculture. It is the foundation of our economy.

Today we live at a time when there are many problems. There is crime and there are riots. There is war, and the threat of wars. Taxes are too high and our government at Washington is beset with financial problems beyond description. Many people become discouraged. It is necessary that we count our blessings from time to time. It is necessary that we turn our attention away from the ills that beset us and think about what is right with America.

There are more things right with our country than are wrong. America is still the greatest place on earth. America is the most kind, benevolent, and helpful nation that ever existed in all history. Our standard of living exceeds the standard of living any place in the world. Our basic liberties are still unimpaired. Thanks to the leadership of our great President, our involvement in the war in Southeast Asia is being wound down and progress is being made in establishing law and order.

As we approach the beginning of 1971, we

need to count our blessings and to apply ourselves to the solution of the problems we face. The greatest disservice that responsible people could render, not only to our country but to all mankind, would be to say that the United States is not worth saving and that they were ready to throw in the towel. It is the greatest place on earth and it is worth saving, regardless of the sacrifice that it takes.

THE WASHINGTON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 17, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am attaching a copy of a letter dated December 10, 1970, from Dr. Cleveland L. Dennard, president of the Washington Technical Institute, wherein he recommends that the name of the Washington Technical Institute be changed to the Washington Institute of Technology.

There is a threefold reason for this name change. First, the new name would more clearly define the educational aims and achievements of this institution. There is a desire on the part of the president and the board of the Washington Technical Institute to make this institution into a technological school which would permit at least a small percentage of students to obtain a baccalaureate degree in what is referred to in some States as the "upside down curriculum." Technical Institute is identified more with a 2-year program than is the term institute of technology as used by a number of colleges in the country.

Second, permitting the name change would more clearly identify the Washington Technical Institute as a land-grant institution which, under current legislation, it will be.

Third, this school is doing a fine job in this community of preparing its students with the technological skills necessary to obtain jobs. At the first and most recent graduation in June, 84 percent of the graduates of the Washington Technical Institute had jobs. However, at the same time, some 16 percent went on to other institutions to obtain a baccalaureate degree. It appears that because the Washington Technical Institute is a 2-year institution rather than a 4-year degree-awarding institution, it does not have the stature it might otherwise have notwithstanding the fine job being done by the President and the administration.

Accordingly, I think for all the foregoing reasons that the conferees on the District of Columbia revenue bill for 1970 should give consideration to the name change for this institution and I will so advise them of my feelings on this matter.

The letter follows:

WASHINGTON TECHNICAL INSTITUTE,
Washington, D.C., December 10, 1970.

HON. ANCHER NELSEN,
U.S. House of Representatives, Rayburn
Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NELSON: As a follow-up to our earlier discussion relative to the name change for the Technical Institute, I am recommending that the Washington Institute

of Technology be used. This institutional name is in common usage throughout the United States to emphasize that the school is technological in its mission rather than liberal arts. Neither the land-grant designation nor the name Institute of Technology would prevent the Institute from assuring that its major thrust is to train a generation of highly skilled craftsmen to assist in improving the quality of life in the physical environment of the District of Columbia. The name of the institution provides the level of social prestige that makes both students and faculty feel that preparation for a career in technology is as important as the learned professions.

I visualize an institution that would offer a baccalaureate degree to approximately 15 to 20 per cent of the student body and junior college and proficiency certificates to 80 to 85 per cent—what is referred to in the industrial states as the upside down curriculum. The idea is comparable to a big city department store having main floor basic goods, bargain basement goods and upper floor specialty shops. Regardless of what the customer purchases, when he leaves the store the package carries only one label, that of the store.

From a social factor point of view, a student knowing that he is attending a full-fledged college would not object to learning a skill offered through extension if the certificate gives his ego the same boost that the elite image institutions allege to do.

This slight modification in name of the institution and in the title of the Board should set the Institute on the course for significance both to its students and in the higher education community.

Sincerely,

CLEVELAND L. DENNARD,
President.

HOMEGROWN GOLD

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 17, 1970

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, as almost everyone knows, it was the discovery of gold at Sutter's Mill that started the celebrated California gold rush.

Little known, however, is the fact that the former owner of Sutter's Mill had sold it—to go search for gold in the Yukon.

People so many times overlook the gold lying right at hand. Like owning U.S. saving bonds, which can turn to gold in the future of their security.

But, more women than men recognize the safety factor of setting something aside against tomorrow's tide.

Safety is by far the big attraction to women buyers of savings bonds. They know that saving with safety is one of the surest ways of bolstering individual and family security.

Steady sales of "Star-Spangled Savings Bonds"—backed by the faith and integrity of the Government—indicate their public acceptance as guaranteed investments. Currently, there are total holdings of \$52 billion in the hands of tens of millions of Americans everywhere.

That figure represents some 24 percent of the privately held portion of the public debt—a sizable safeguard for the family; a bulwark against the forces of inflation.

We know that American women handle most of the family spending, directly

and indirectly. Research shows that wives write more family checks than husbands. And we have every evidence all around us that women want to save.

They want a better life for their children and they want to be able to save for it. That is why women lead the way in family purchases of U.S. savings bonds. When the man signs up at work for the payroll savings plan, he knows who pushed the idea at home.

However, on their own, there are many women among the millions who buy bonds regularly through the payroll plan. All of which makes it all the more fitting that women have become the beneficiaries or coowners of most of the \$52 billion bonds now outstanding.

Look around the country. You will find millions of new homes and household appliances that the bonds of Uncle Sam helped make possible. Also countless young Americans educated and useful and fruitful lives. Also increasing numbers of elders whose bond savings have made retirement more satisfying, more secure.

I very much want to commend the women of America—particularly those in my State of Oklahoma—who continue giving so much of themselves through distinguished service—as volunteers—to the bond program. Outstanding example is Jeanie Smith—Mrs. Ronald R.—of Tulsa, who is the current "Mrs. U.S. Savings Bonds." She travels the country as "good will ambassador" of the Treasury bond program.

In her words to group meetings—"No one ever gets back one penny less than the amount that he puts into U.S. savings bonds. Where else can you find that kind of guarantee, with interest? And the interest is now 5½ percent—when held to maturity of 5 years and 10 months—when the half percent is added as a bonus for your prudence."

By encouraging the ownership of savings bonds—the women of Oklahoma and, indeed, all America not only serve the best interests of neighbors, relatives, and friends—they are also aiding the advance of a more stable economy; a better environment to bequeath their children's children. They have discovered how to harvest homegrown gold.

A TIMELY DISCUSSION OF THE PRESIDENT'S VIETNAM POLICY

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 17, 1970

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that casualty rates have been at record lows for months and the withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam is ahead of schedule, there are some who would, nevertheless, have us believe that the President is interested in escalating the war. It is apparent to me, and I believe, to the great majority of Americans that the bold, though regrettably unsuccessful, attempt to rescue American prisoners of war in North Vietnam and the actions taken to protect

our reconnaissance flights, which are so vitally important to keep a close check on any attempt by the Hanoi regime to increase infiltration to the South, are not designed to escalate the conflict. These decisions seek only to impress upon North Vietnamese that they, too, must wind down the war and end their barbaric treatment of American prisoners of war. Station WJIM-TV of Lansing, Mich., broadcast an editorial on December 14, which provides a most timely and clear-headed discussion of the President's Vietnam policy, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

It is time for some plain talk about the Nixon policy in regard to the Vietnam conflict. The politically motivated effort of certain Congressmen to quote recent press conference remarks by the President as an indication this country plans to escalate the air war over North Vietnam, is an irresponsible action.

Clearly, those statements by the President were an honest and open attempt to avoid escalation. He cautioned Hanoi that if enemy infiltration threatens to intensify the ground fighting in the South as U.S. troops withdraw, our forces must seek to reduce . . . or eliminate . . . that danger, so that the evacuation can continue. Whether Americans agree with their President or not, he has a very plainly stated plan and to date he has operated totally within that blueprint. The plan is labeled "Vietnamization", meaning literally the gradual turning over of the war to the forces of South Vietnam as American troops continue a steady withdrawal.

By his actions in relentlessly pursuing "Vietnamization" Nixon is in a current stance that essentially dictates credibility. In other words, what he says deserves to be believed both here in American and in Hanoi.

As a recent article by James Reston of the New York Times points out . . . whatever the failing of the President's policy may be, there is a far greater danger in the miscalculation that he means anything other than precisely what he says.

Nixon has determined that precipitous withdrawal from Vietnam is not in this nation's best interests. In making that judgment he has had the widest range of advice ever offered up to an American President on a matter of foreign policy. From the campus to Congress a full range of available options has been urged. Mounting evidence indicates that the vast majority of Americans support the President's plan.

In this fragile framework, it is counter-productive for politicians in Washington or Hanoi to fill the air with self-serving alarms and pointless predictions.

THE WASHINGTON TECHNICAL INSTITUTE AS A LAND-GRANT BENEFICIARY

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 17, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, the House passed the District of Columbia revenue bill for 1970, H.R. 19885. Section 401 of title IV of that bill provides for the equal sharing of land-grant funds by the Federal City College and the Washington Technical Institute. I will not reiterate what was contained in the House report accompanying H.R. 19885 (H. Rept. 91-1672).

I think the record is clear that the congressional intent in 1968 was that these colleges would share the land-grant funds.

On Monday, I addressed myself to the matter of the land-grant funds currently obtained by the Federal City College and which under this amendment to the District of Columbia Public Education Act would be shared by the Federal City College and the Washington Technical Institute. There are 17 States with two land-grant colleges. Now it is my understanding that in these States there is but one director of extension services. I indicated in my statement on the floor in support of this measure that I did not want there to be additional administrative expense by reason of the amendment providing for the sharing of funds under the Smith-Lever Act and administered through the Department of Agriculture. Nor do I believe there is any need for additional expense.

I have received a letter from the president of the Washington Technical Institute, dated December 10, 1970, quoted in part below, wherein President Denard assures me that he, as the president, and the board of the Washington Technical Institute, would employ every method available to insure that duplication of programs and administrative expense is eliminated for the administration of funds obtained under the Smith-Lever Act:

In an attempt to assure that any problems of administrative implementation in the equal sharing of Land-Grant funds between Federal City College and Washington Technical Institute would be minimized, if not eliminated, a meeting was held with land-grant college program officers from the Department of Agriculture and HEW on Tuesday, December 8, 1970.

To assure that program duplication is eliminated, I am certain that the Board of the Technical Institute would require, as a matter of policy and operating procedure, that only one Federal Director of Extension Service would exist in the District of Columbia. The Board would seek to develop an arrangement with the Board of the Federal City College to determine a workable procedure for filling that position whenever a vacancy occurs.

THE NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE ENERGY PROGRAM AND COMMENTS ON THE BREEDER PROGRAM

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 17, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on November 18, 1970, Chairman CHET HOLIFIELD of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy addressed the annual joint meeting of the Atomic Industrial Forum and the American Nuclear Society. Chairman HOLIFIELD is completing his third term as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; and I believe that it is particularly fitting at this time to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the benefit of our colleagues,

the thoughts expressed in the aforementioned talk.

The talk essentially covers two themes. The first pertains to some extremist views about environmental considerations. The second stresses the need to get on with our National program to bring into being fast breeder reactors.

Although a few nuclear powerplants have been generating electricity during this past decade, it is only now that large nuclear units are beginning to come on the line in increasing numbers and can be expected to contribute significantly to the electric generating capacity of this Nation. It has always been recognized that present-day reactors, although economic, do not efficiently utilize the total energy content of the uranium fuel. The fast breeder reactor concept, which is now under development, will utilize fuel efficiently; it will produce more nuclear fuel than it consumes. And the operation of this type of reactor should not impose a burden on the environment. This concept is the long-range answer for fulfilling our electric generation needs.

Our supply of fossil fuels is limited. The development and demonstration of other concepts such as fusion as a source of electrical power will require, at least, several decades. It is mandatory that this country's fast breeder program be given the full support it warrants both by the administration and by the Congress. I commend to you Chairman HOLIFIELD'S remarks, which follow:

THE NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE ENERGY PROGRAM

It is a privilege for me once again to address the membership and guests of your associations gathered in annual convention.

I have several remarks relating to the need for an effective, comprehensive energy program. I am not going to justify the need; it's painfully obvious. I am going to take advantage of this opportunity to lay it on the line concerning the atomic energy portion of the overall energy program—especially the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor Program. Before I comment on some of the unpleasanties of that situation, I would like to refer to a few general developments relating to the overall energy and environment picture.

A year ago, in San Francisco, I spoke to you about the 1970's as a critical era in nuclear power. Most of the difficult problem areas I commented on then are not only still with us, but in many respects have worsened. I refer, of course, to environmental considerations, to a sensible, practical approach to power plant siting, and to the urgent necessity for proceeding without further delay toward bringing into being fast breeder demonstration reactors. I want to go into these major items in some depth tonight.

Despite clear indications for at least half a decade that this Nation would be facing serious power shortages if reasonable provision was not made for our clearly foreseeable needs, this country is now confronted with an energy crisis of serious proportions. The old adage "forewarned is forearmed," which I have always particularly liked because it is an acknowledgment of man's reasoning faculties, is apparently no longer operative. No matter that it has made simple good sense since at least as early as the Biblical period of Genesis, when Jacob interpreted a dream by the Pharaoh of Egypt to signify that seven years of famine were coming, and counseled him to appoint officers to store food, and to organize a plan for dealing with the lean years ahead.

Why are we failing to respond adequately to realistic projections of our needs? The answer, admittedly, is complex, but I think its component, inter-related parts include these features:

1. Self-flagellation: There are among our countrymen significant numbers who are firmly convinced that mankind is irredeemably bad. And that the species is getting worse because increased knowledge inevitably results in greater damage and harm, and because population expansion by geometric progression is irreversible and a destructive imposition on other forms of life and the natural resources of this planet. Mankind is seen as the cancer of earth, the dirtiest and cruelest of all the creatures on this planet, purely a garbage maker, and the despoiler of the whole environment. My friends, such a distorted sense of hopelessness is completely alien to my own disposition and faith. It is an illness which I believe is impossible to endure. It must have been just such an ailment that—according to the old vaudeville joke—made a man promptly reach for his pistol and blow his brains out when he caught himself cheating at solitaire.

2. Bad guys, good guys, and victims: There are missionaries and followers who strongly hold the belief that, like ancient Gaul, our people are divided into three parts. We are categorized as bad guys, good guys, and victim guys. Bad guys they say are epidemic among capitalists, manufacturers, ranchers and livestock raisers, engineers, and scientists—and of course politicians. They admit that few in these categories are not bad guys, and also admit that there are bad guys in other groups too. Of course, if you're an electric utility or automobile manufacturer you automatically get a black hat. By implicit definition bad guys are greedy, villainous, contemptible, and worthy of no consideration. Their prompt elimination is deemed to be a highly desirable goal. And elimination is recommended without any suggestion of practical alternative.

Apparently these self-annointed critics profess that the good guys are found among those who effectively use public forums to alarm and oppose, and among those who rigidly evangelize an individual objective without regard to other needs intricately meshed with and necessarily affected by their peculiar advocacy. For example, a good guy is a scientist who goes straight to the public to trumpet his own study and alarmist conclusions on infant mortality which he attributes to the operation of a nuclear power plant—by-passing the acceptable reporting and review processes carefully devised to assure that his scientific peers impartially consider and pass judgment on his work and observation. Good guys, according to them, are single-interest environmentalists who oppose any worthwhile activity or function that can have any effect on the environment. The latter suffer terrible pangs of conscience when they take their dogs out to respond to calls of nature. Because it is their dogs they wind up conveniently rationalizing their own contributions to contamination while loudly calling attention to their neighbors and their pets. This stance is equally applicable to the use of air conditioners, the internal combustion engine, beer in glass bottles or cans, or what have you.

Victim guys are the consumers. The fact that they buy and drive the automobiles that befoul the air, cheerfully enjoy the refrigerators, air-conditioners and other appliances and tools that are electrically driven, and use detergents, pesticides, and fertilizers that drain into our rivers and lakes and adversely affect our environment, does not militate against their victim status.

3. Doom and Doomsday: Almost equally as gross and distorted as the views in positions 1 and 2 are the occasional individual solemn pronouncements by scientist-proph-

ets directly to the public that man's degradation of the environment has now brought doomsday into the projected picture of the foreseeable future. Yet, I know of no body of reputable scientists that believe this. In our extensive hearings on "Environmental Effects of Producing Electric Power," Dr. Abel Wolman of The Johns Hopkins University made a very interesting statement from which I would like to quote. Incidentally, I cannot recommend too highly the three-volume print of these hearings. They contain a wealth of information and data on the environmental effects of all types of electric-generating facilities—fossil, hydro, and nuclear.

Dr. Wolman, in part, said the following:

"The impact of man upon his environment has existed since man himself walked the earth. Whatever man does changes the ecology of his surroundings for good or evil. As populations grow, as urbanization and industrialization move forward, and as science and technology burgeon, the potentiality for ecological disturbance and degradation increases. This is the history of the centuries and the impressive lesson of the last quarter of a century.

"Given the thesis that man creates and modifies his environment for good or evil, what are the means available to him for avoiding the bad and multiplying the good consequences of his existence?

"The most valuable tool is in his better understanding of the environment, and how his actions affect it. This awareness alone, however, does not guarantee that he will act militantly to take those measures to safeguard his surrounding. Motivation is the high ingredient necessary, followed by the availability of money and professional manpower."

I am continuing my quote from Dr. Wolman:

"I come, however, to the point which I do want to discuss with respect to electrical energy, and that is, if I may put it in its baldest terms, a suggestion which is increasingly being made, that we put a moratorium on science and technological advancement.

"I am interested in this more than philosophically. This is the most distressing symptom of both popular view and even some scientific views. The nihilists who feel that we should stop in our tracks and reverse the trend of our operations because they feel that either we have damaged the environment or we will do so, or that we cannot control or manage it to our advantage, to my mind is an extremely distressing signal for American society."

I highly commend to you all of Dr. Wolman's testimony. He did a fine job of putting into perspective the factors we are forced to consider relative to our life on earth.

4. The credibility chasm: Related to the good-guy-bad-guy syndrome is the position adopted by some of the opinion molders and those they influence that all the so-called members of the establishment are not to be believed—that they all manipulate scientific information and data to accommodate expediency or some ulterior purpose. In our print of the "Environmental Effects of Producing Electric Power" appears a copy of a letter which I found particularly apt and appealing. It was written by Dr. H. H. Seliger, who is a biology professor and Chairman of the Committee on Radiation Safety at Johns Hopkins University. He wrote the letter to the Editor of the Johns Hopkins Newsletter. Dr. Seliger said—and I quote in part:

"I personally deplore the tactic of promulgating scientific results by publishing in a Letters to the Editor column or by reporting them to one's Senator or to a newspaper reporter. The concept of publishing new and hitherto unknown results in recognized scientific journals subject to review by other scientists is too important to the continued

well-being and objectivity of science as a discipline, that the motives of anyone taking the circuitous routes above might be treated as suspect."

"It is indeed unfortunate that those of us in the scientific community who have labored (quietly) in an effort to uncover all of the available information relating to radiation effects, isotope ingestion effects, environmental effects, etc. * * * as well as the theory and practice of nuclear-powered reactors, in order to attempt to consider the concept of a nuclear power industry in the objective manner, must be placed in the awkward position of either remaining quiet in the presence of demagogic and inflammatory statements, or of speaking out and possibly being related to the herd of so-called AEC apologists.

"The AEC is not immoral. To say that it is or to say that it is not scientifically truthful is to attack the integrity of a large number of excellent and dedicated and moral scientists, many of whom I know personally. To assert that the AEC knew facts that it did not share with the public or to imply that it has 'discovered' facts recently (which have been known for a generation) in a field in which the AEC has sponsored independent unclassified university scientific research since its inception, is irresponsible and morally reprehensible.

"I can think of no better way of destroying the public confidence in independent science as an institution in this country than by impugning the morality of the scientific decision of an independent government agency whose main claim to being is the quality of its science. I believe this is a disservice to science and can only reflect on the source."

Happily, there are relatively few scientists in this category. You all know them. They advertise by intemperate and inaccurate public accusations against the motives and views of their more eminent peers and by setting off public alarms with unwarranted "scientific" pronouncements that are not supported by the facts or by reputable bodies of their scientific peers. Most of them seem to prefer bombast, rhetoric and invective to unemotional, truthful and accurate statements, and they deliberately avoid competent juries of their peers and go directly to the lay public who are really unable to make a scientific judgment on their theories. They strive to trade credible scientific scrutiny and evaluation for the opportunity to make a sensational impact on a mass lay audience.

5. Trouble-makers for profit or kicks, misguided zealots, the let's-wait-for-the-new-breakthroughs advocates, and the o.k.-we-need-it-but-why-not-put-it-somewhere-else boys: I could almost add one more to this list, which the Forum joins infrequently—namely, friends who from well-intentioned motives create potential problems. For example—with apologies to my host—I chide the Forum for the manner in which it has used in its publications an initial report by the Joint Committee which the Committee never released and, in fact, replaced with an amended version that it formally issued; and I chide the Forum for inaccuracies in its analysis and discussion of the Committee's report. Of course, I realize the handicap the Forum was under in that, for a period of time, we were not in a position to discuss background details with them or anyone else due to the delay in obtaining full Committee consideration of the final form of the report. This recently published material by the Forum cannot possibly assist the beneficial forward movement of the legislation involved—on which, incidentally, as most of you know, the Committee had labored greatly; nor can it be helpful to interested readers.

I think of an old story about two young friends—one named John who lived and

worked in New York City and the other named Sam who was in Chicago. Each year, in the fall, they would join in a hunting trip to a remote area in Pennsylvania. One year, while hunting, they were surprised by a sudden severe storm that forced them to seek shelter in unfamiliar surroundings. Luckily, they eventually came to a large clearing in the woods which set off a large impressive dwelling. They knocked on the door and were admitted by an attractive looking woman. She made them welcome, fed them, and afforded them shelter for the night. John and Sam were shown to separate bedrooms, when the young woman—who explained that she was a widow and that the servants were on a holiday—retired. John, who was very tired, fell asleep at once and never stirred until morning. Then, after a good breakfast, John and Sam thanked their hostess profusely and departed. Almost a year later, John telephoned Sam in Chicago and the following conversation ensued:

"Sam, you remember that lovely looking widow in Pennsylvania, don't you?"

"Sure, why?"

"Sam, when I went to bed that night, did you retire, or did you rejoin the widow?"

"Well, to tell you the truth, I did go back to get better acquainted. But why are you so interested now?"

"One more question, Sam, and I want the truth. In the course of getting better acquainted did you use my name as your own?"

"Gosh, John, this is embarrassing. I can't tell you why, but I did tell her I was you. I never saw her again. Can you forgive me? What's this all about?"

"Sam, don't worry about it. Everything's clear now. You did very well. A few minutes ago I received a wire from a lawyer in Pennsylvania informing me that the widow had died suddenly, soon after making her will, and that she left her sizeable estate to me."

This long story does illustrate that sometimes an inaccuracy can turn out to help someone. So, I'll add this footnote to my judgment on the Forum's premature comments on a bootlegged draft report of our Committee: If it ever turns out to do some good, I'll see that you're properly credited.

Now, the cumulative effect of the foregoing items frequently amounts to a fully orchestrated dirge of negativism that produces a high state of anxiety and fear among our concerned citizenry. I believe that professional bodies—such as the National Academy of Sciences, the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, and other generally recognized associations of scientists, engineers, doctors and other professionals—must come to the fore and see to it that their views are clearly and widely made known on esoteric issues on which informed laymen cannot possibly form intelligent judgments of their own. ANS and AIF, it seems to me, must do more, in collaboration with others, to help minimize public confusion. I hope, too, that Federal agencies such as the Council on Environmental Quality, the Office of Environmental Quality established by the Environmental Quality Improvement Act 1970, the Office of Science and Technology, and the Environmental Protection Agency which will soon come into being by virtue of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1970, will strive to disseminate promptly to the general public their findings and views on scientific and technical issues that come to the forefront of public attention from time to time. My friends, I stress these items because I believe an energy program cannot be successfully mounted and effectuated unless it includes adequate measures to deal with unfounded charges.

THE BREEDER PROGRAM—A TIME FOR ACTION

Now to turn to the principal topic—what I really wish to stress to you tonight. That topic is, of course, the breeder program—a top priority need that will be met only if we,

in the nuclear community and in the top echelons of Government, rise to our momentous responsibility to do everything we can to assure the provision of energy which this Nation must have for its survival and well-being. We must not forfeit this opportunity to solve our future needs for clean electrical energy.

In my opinion, the situation is even more critical than when I described it to you last year. I must frankly acknowledge we have not yet achieved that unity of will and action which the breeder program demands for success.

In my remarks tonight, I want to face up to this with all the candor and constructive thoughts I can summon.

In addressing this group last year, I emphasized two equally important challenges that were facing us:

1. developing a technically successful and economically useful breeder reactor; and
2. solving the problem of siting nuclear and conventional-types of electric generating plants, with particular regard for the need for power and the objective, which we all share, of protecting and enhancing the quality of our environment.

The vital importance of meeting these interrelated challenges has been underscored by events over the past year. Few can deny the present realities and the probable future consequences we now face with respect to the shortages of electric power and fossil fuels. Few will question our inability to tolerate further degradation of the air we breathe and the need to improve the quality of our environment.

These worsening trends can no longer be dismissed as the preoccupation of a worried few; they have become the abiding concern of all of our citizens. They have reinforced even further the validity of the questions which many of us have discussed year after year as to this Nation's capability to provide the energy sufficient to sustain future full employment, our health, safety and welfare, and our defense requirements—while preserving and improving the quality of our environment.

These national priority needs of energy and a cleaner environment are so closely interrelated as to constitute, in effect, a single urgent mission—and for this mission, the fast breeder reactor is indispensable.

Almost every major industrial country in the world has identified the LMFBR program as a priority national goal and is concentrating government and industrial resources on reaching this goal. If we fail to support the breeder, we will have abdicated our responsibility for international leadership in the atomic energy field. I, for one, do not propose to watch other nations proceed with their breeder programs while the United States' program is compromised or halted.

At last year's meeting, I pointed out that my Joint Committee colleagues and I were not satisfied with the progress being made in carrying out the National breeder program. Though it was scientifically well-structured and ready, management in the Executive branch was not proceeding effectively to convert the LMFBR concept to practical reality. I spelled out the challenge, urged that we keep our eye on the ball and maintain our drive toward the goal, and warned against blocking the quarterback, confusing the signals or fumbling the ball.

I further indicated my intention to propose the establishment of a three to five man Blue Ribbon Ad Hoc Committee to try and find out why we were not moving ahead more rapidly and effectively. But the more I explored these matters with other interested people, the more it became evident to me that the Blue Ribbon Committee I had envisioned was not needed to clear the air and get on with the job. As a result of some rather plain talk with key leaders in and out of Govern-

ment, I have several observations and suggestions I'd like to present to you.

I have spent much time during the past year reviewing the principal aspects of the breeder effort, keeping in mind past history, particularly the experience for over two decades in the civilian power program and the Navy's highly successful nuclear power activities. I have taken into account the extensive in-depth testimony we have received over the years in the course of comprehensive hearings before the Joint Committee and many informal, candid discussions. I visited most of the major laboratories and industrial establishments where the civilian power program is being carried forward. I have talked to energy community leaders, both from this country and abroad, in industry and in Government, in the nuclear field and the energy field generally.

I sought the views of leaders in the Congress and in other branches of the Government, and most especially, those who have demonstrated by their actions a full appreciation of the vast implications of our energy and environmental problems. And through extensive discussions with those who have had direct management responsibility for large technical development programs, I have deepened my understanding of the magnitude and complexity of the breeder program, of the organizations and the individuals involved, of the factors impeding progress, and of those that are helping to effectively thrust this important program forward.

Let me summarize some of the results of this.

The breeder program has a solid scientific base. It now has the commitment by the key laboratories and the industrial organizations presently involved in the total effort. It has the technological basis required for moving forward into the large scale engineering applications and the demonstration plant phases that must now be mounted. Additionally, it has the highly qualified, dedicated, technical management organization within the Government essential for the successful conduct of the program; the members of this organization are not only determined to achieve success, but have demonstrated their ability to achieve it—if they get the support they need. And I plan to return to that last point a little later.

In weighing the results of my review, I have concluded that probably the most important recent developments are those attributable to the strong management and organizational changes that were finally effected by the AEC during the past year. These basic changes have set the stage for the intensive actions which can and must now follow to implement the national Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Program (LMFBR) plan. The establishment of the Hanford Engineering Development Laboratory (HEDL) and the consolidation of all reactor development work at Argonne National Laboratory (ANL) into a reactor engineering research and development group will make a major contribution toward the success of the LMFBR program. One can perhaps appreciate the importance to the breeder program that we of the Joint Committee attach to these changes when one reflects on the vital role of the Bettis and KAPL laboratories in the naval nuclear power program.

In emphasizing these strengthening actions in the Commission's own laboratories, I also want to commend those companion changes that have been initiated within the three reactor manufacturer organizations presently engaged in the Project Definition Phase of the LMFBR demonstration plant program. All in all, it is evident that sweeping and beneficial changes have been brought about within the laboratory and industrial organizations participating in the LMFBR effort. It is well recognized that it

will take the cooperative efforts of all to carry this program through to successful completion.

In addition to the developments I have just described, I am pleased to report to you that I have found an increasingly favorable climate for the breeder within the Government agencies and advisory groups. Those familiar with the stormy history of major nuclear energy programs know full well of the internal opposition—sometimes massive—to developments such as thermonuclear weapons, naval reactors, and even the light water reactor in its earliest days. Often the Joint Committee has had to move deeply into the fray in order to assure that these programs moved forward in an effective manner. All too frequently, we have had to help provide a protective shield around those responsible for getting the job done—sometimes to interpose directly when others with direct responsibility failed in the effective discharge of their duty.

As you know, we started the Navy program with a multitype reactor program and continued the multitype approach in the civilian power plant reactor program. We were successful in both programs.

We are being denied, unfortunately and unnecessarily in my opinion, the multitype approach to the development of a breeder-type reactor. We must therefore concentrate available funds on the approach which seems to have the maximum support at this time.

I realize that there are those who advocate a different approach on the conduct of the program, and are even at this late date considering major deviations in the plan for fuel testing. Such an approach could be desirable if it could be financed somehow, without diversion from our meager available funds. After great efforts, the interested parties in the atomic field have agreed upon a single specific developmental program to obtain a breeder reactor. We cannot now afford to delay or jeopardize the approved program by diversion of funds.

I have noted that increased recognition has developed with respect to the interdependence that exists between commercial light water reactors and the LMFBR, particularly the vital relationship between the plutonium produced in the light water reactors and its use in the LMFBR. Literally tons of plutonium will be produced through the operation of the light water reactors in the 70's and early 80's. While much of this can be recycled to the light water reactors, we know that this plutonium should be economically more valuable as a breeder fuel than when recycled as fuel for the water reactors. This fact provides a powerful incentive for the support of the breeder by the industry and utilities and by the Government.

The interdependence of the two reactor types in terms of fuel cycle, personnel, facilities and other resources is very close indeed and is reflected by the increasing support by the manufacturers and utilities. Five major U.S. reactor manufacturers, all pioneers in the development of nuclear power in this country, have identified the LMFBR program as their priority advanced reactor program. In addition, about one-hundred major utilities in this country are also supporting this LMFBR program effort in cooperation with these industrial organizations and the Atomic Energy Commission. Thus there is an ever widening appreciation in industry and Government that failure to pursue the LMFBR program at this time could well jeopardize the massive investments and other large stakes riding on light water reactors in this country and abroad. And equally important, only through the success of the light water reactor will the breeder be permitted to play the vital role it must have in solving our energy and environmental problems.

With the existence of all the factors con-

ductive to progress, the failure to move faster on the breeder seems to present somewhat of an enigma. However, the enigma is quickly cleared up when one looks behind the priorities and the policy statements and tests their substance in the hard realities of competitive funding.

I am more convinced than ever that we have a sound plan for achieving the breeder objective, and that only the development of a suitable funding formula now stands between early progression from the Project Definition Phase into appropriate definitive cooperative arrangements for the development, design, construction and operation of demonstration plants. There is no doubt in my mind that if we adhere to our National LMFBR program plan and if the needed support from Government, industry, and the utilities is forthcoming, this program can be accomplished and a strong industrial breeder capability established by the early 1980's.

Of course, we will have to face up to the fact that we aren't going to attain our goal of getting satisfactory demonstration plant proposals by January, pursuant to the current Project Definition Phase arrangement and the present statutory framework. This is mainly due to the insufficiency of the Government's portion of the total funds which the program, both the base program and the demonstration plant program, will require. I believe developments have shown that the fears we expressed concerning the inadequacy of the Government's funding authorization were well-founded. Another reason for the failure, I believe, could be laid at the doorstep of the utility participants. I don't think the utilities have become involved sufficiently with the development of the demonstration plant proposals. More specifically I believe the utilities did not consider this phase of the program seriously enough and therefore did not develop funding plans adequate to carry out such projects.

The Joint Committee has many times pointed to the problem of inadequate funding by the Government in relation to the LMFBR demonstration program, as well as in regard to the base program. We have stressed that this whole job is just not going to be accomplished within the budgets proposed to the Congress; that overall funding must be increased, consistent with the requirements well identified in the Program Plan, if we are to achieve success.

Recognizing that I may have been too subtle some years back with the "Cowbird" metaphor, I'll now pose questions this way:

Is the LMFBR program going to be treated and supported as a headline priority program, in recognition of the great need of our country for clean energy, or is it going to continue to be a budget "shock absorber" and "an interesting project," "if only we could afford it." Will our National eye on the atomic energy program continue to be diverted by the discovery of, say, Fossilium-110, while we procrastinate on the high priority need to produce the LMFBR?

We just cannot wait any longer for the answer. During this next year we're going to have to make the decision to pursue the goal with the funding and support required, or acknowledge default. Halfway measures won't do. The Joint Committee is going to take every precaution, in line with its own statutory responsibility, to see to it that it remains fully informed and that any steps taken in implementation of the LMFBR program are realistic and potentially effective. For example, we may deem it advisable to ask Mr. Shaw, Director of Reactor Development and Technology of the AEC, to appear before the Committee on a regular basis to apprise us of the current posture of specific needs and plans. We had to resort to this technique to help Admiral Rickover get the job done.

We would hope that the Commissioners, in carrying out their responsibilities will be forthright and courageous in their support, and in their efforts to obtain adequate Government funds, for their highest priority civilian program. We would hope that the Commission will not come before us to recommend any half-way measures.

To put it simply, the breeder program should receive from the Commissioners and from the Administration the same kind of support and priority treatment that was required for the successful outcome of the Navy's nuclear power program and the nuclear weapons program. I am convinced that this type of priority attention and support will result in significantly increased support from private industry and the utilities.

This Nation needs Presidential leadership in developing electrical energy. It is the basic challenge of this decade.

Dream with me not the "impossible dream" but a "possible dream."

We should start building two liquid metal breeder plants now. It may be that one of these should be the loop type and the other the pot type in order to obtain maximum assurance of achieving our goal.

At the end of six years they should be in operation. In three or four years after the start of the initial projects, we should be able to start the third demonstration plant—a reactor which we could well expect to be successful both technically and economically.

Such a program is vital to our Nation—as vital as any other national objective. It is unworthy of this great Nation to stand irresolute, counting our pennies, as precious years rush by.

On October 4, 1968, when he was seeking the Office of the President, Mr. Nixon said: "The breeder reactor is a national priority."

In our FY '71 authorization report the Joint Committee stated:

"The Joint Committee urges the Commission to proceed forward with the first of the breeder demonstration plants without delay. The program objectives are well laid out. Delays in carrying them out will only be costly."

Action must now give effect to these words. The Administration and the Congress cannot afford to lose another year to indecision or inaction.

At the beginning of the last decade, President Kennedy set as a National goal the landing of a man on the moon and his safe return. We have achieved that goal, not once but twice. Today we need a Presidential declaration of a new National goal. That goal may not appear to be as spectacular as the moon mission, but I think it will bring mankind far greater benefits.

This National goal would have these Siamese-twin features:

1. The attainment of an adequate supply of dependable and economical electric energy from an inexhaustible fuel source, so we can serve the human and industry needs of our society.

2. The production of such energy in the cleanest manner possible, so as to safeguard the quality of our environment.

These two features are interdependent. We cannot really improve the quality of the environment in context of mankind's welfare and well-being, unless we solve the need for an adequate supply of electrical energy. Nor can we attain a truly effective solution to our energy problem unless it materially contributes to an improved environment.

We spent \$55 billion to achieve President Kennedy's moon goal.

We need to spend less than \$2 billion to achieve an inexhaustible, new, clean, and safe source of electricity.

I have devoted over two decades now to

furthering the development and beneficial employment of nuclear energy. My Joint Committee colleagues and I take pride in the role we have played in seeing to it that nuclear energy is available for the defense needs of this Nation. We have made a strong start towards the equally important mission of making sure that the full potential of nuclear energy is made available for our civilian needs. We laid the foundation for the development and application of the light water reactor. But this is only part way down the road toward realizing the potential benefits of nuclear power. The largest part and the greatest rewards lie ahead.

I am determined to do everything I can toward the success of our breeder program. All of us, our children and future generations will be deeply grateful. National leadership, and high purpose and resolve by our industrial and utility entities, simply must meet this urgent challenge.

PROF. GEORGE ANASTAPLO'S MESSAGE ON THE TYRANNY OF THE PRESENT GREEK GOVERNMENT

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 17, 1970

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, John Anastaplo, of radio station WJOB, Hammond, Ind., and one of the Midwest's outstanding news commentators, submitted the following factual information regarding some of the dictatorial operations of the military government which now controls the destiny of the great nation of Greece. This broadcast was excerpts from George Anastaplo, professor of international affairs of Chicago University. George Anastaplo is a recognized authority and a longtime advocate for free and democratic government in Greece.

The following excerpts from a radio broadcast by Prof. George Anastaplo reveals some of his personal experiences with the tyrannical military leaders of Greece, and I include it with my remarks: AMERICAN AID AND GREEK TYRANNY: A MEMORANDUM¹

(By George Anastaplo²)

The announcement a fortnight ago of the resumption of American military aid to Greece is the painful culmination of our sadly inept policy toward Greece since a handful of colonels betrayed their oaths, King and comrades by seizing power three years ago.

American policy has been characterized the past three years by our inability to appreciate the extent (and hence the responsibility) of American influence in Greece, thereby leading us to let down old friends in that country, to permit tyranny there, and to damage seriously our longterm strategic interests in the Mediterranean.

Illustrative of how the United States misuses its influence in Greece is how the American Embassy in Athens responded to the order denying me admission to Greece which awaited my arrival September 15 at Athens airport. (This happened, it might be of interest to note, ten years after I was expelled from the Soviet Union for alleged "subversion of public order." I have been visiting Greece annually since 1962.) There was among Embassy personnel considerable sympathetic talk about my predicament, but talk which was immediately rendered ineffectual by their

sincere belief that "nothing can be done." The serious, and ultimately successful, efforts to secure my admission to that country were made by English and Canadian newspapermen (whom I had come to know over the years in my capacity there as a foreign correspondent) who intervened with the Deputy Prime Minister—with the results that I received in Rome, after my exclusion from Greece, an apologetic invitation from the Office of the Prime Minister to return immediately to Athens.

Thus, misunderstanding of the situation led American officials in Athens to do far less than they should have done on behalf of someone whom they had come to know both there and in Washington as a recognized student of Greek affairs. In fact, they considered my matter so "hopeless" that they would not even send someone from our Embassy to Athens airport during the ten hours I was detained there (despite requests by me and others that they do so) to help me delay my departure while my colleagues of the press tried to reach the highest levels of the Greek government. (The most effective argument used by my colleagues evidently relied upon the recent efforts of the Greek military dictatorship to persuade American public opinion that genuine liberalization is really taking place in Greece these days. Thus, the Greek government appreciates better than does ours the significance for Greece of American influence and power.)

It is somewhat encouraging to me personally to learn that my exclusion was based on the anger of Greek foreign press officials and security police at the articles I have published in the United States, particularly those which have been reprinted in our *Congressional Record* and which have dared advise our government to withhold its support from the present Greek government and to do what it can to help the oppressed Greek people secure a government of its choice.¹

It is a dangerous state of affairs for everyone when the American government consistently miscalculates the extent of American power. Such miscalculations have led us to try to do far more than we can do in Vietnam and to put up with far more than we need have in Greece. It is ominous to hear even Greek conservatives bitterly condemn the United States as primarily responsible for the survival in Athens of the self-righteous tyranny which our NATO ally now seems destined to have to endure for a decade (behind a facade of "liberalization") while we Americans continue to proclaim our dedication to the defense of "the free world."

FOOTNOTES

¹ This memorandum originated as a Letter to the Editor, written from Sparta, Greece, September 24, 1970. It has been published in that form (edited in various ways) in *The International Herald-Tribune*, September 30, 1970, *The Guardian* (London), October 7, 1970, *The Chicago Daily News*, October 6, 1970, *Manchester Guardian Weekly*, Oct. 17, 1970.

² George Anastaplo (who was born in St. Louis and now lives in Chicago) is Lecturer in the Liberal Arts, The University of Chicago, and Professor of Political Science and of Philosophy, Rosary College.

³ The Russians never have invited me back: their regime is much more repressive than even that of the Greek colonels, partly because they are less dependent than the colonels on American public opinion. See, on my expulsion from the Soviet Union, *London Observer*, August 14, 1960. See, also, the appendix to my doctoral dissertation, *Notes on the First Amendment* (University of Chicago, 1964).

⁴ My articles on Greek affairs have been reprinted in Volume 115 of the *Congressional Record* at pages E1875 (March 11, 1969), E2631 (April 2, 1969), E2632 (April 2, 1969), E5156 (June 23, 1969), E5978 (July 15, 1969), E6294

(July 28, 1969), and E10873 (December 20, 1969), and in Volume 116 at pages E935 (February 16, 1970), E1818 (March 10, 1970) and S7585 (May 20, 1970).

THE PIKE COUNTY NEWS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 17, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, great concern about whether people in Missouri know how to celebrate properly was recently expressed by a local paper which I understand is printed on a daily basis enjoying a national rating exceeded only by two other Washington institutions—the Senators and the Redskins.

In the course of their comments they remarked that:

Missouri's observance of its 150th birthday is striking no sparks. The celebration is supposed to last a year, ending next August 10, and to include a dedication of the restored First State Capitol in St. Charles, along with the issuance of commemorative items. Of course 150 is not the same as 200, but it is a good long time and it is a bit surprising that the state has not made more of it. Perhaps it is not too soon for Missourians to start planning a celebration for 2021.

For their information, most Missourians and all Pike Countians would prefer the Pike County News to the Washington Post as the following lines will indicate:

THE PIKE COUNTY NEWS

(From *Poems All The Way From Pike* by a Subscriber in New York City)

You-All can read your Trybune, your Herald and your Sun,

Chuck full of furrin nonsense, and talk that's never done,

And what goes on in Congress, at Washington, D.C.,

Where we pay politicianers to jine that jabbaree.

You can read your high-tone' papers, with tariff rates and rot,

And political palaver; but for me—I'd ruther not.

When I'm a-wantin' readin' I'm as like as not to choose

A little old Mizzoury sheet—the Pike County News.

It hain't no glarin' headlines a-scarin' you to death,

Nor pictures of disasters that makes you hold your breath,

Nor any ornery poetry by some jimcrack galoot

The editor was sorry for and didn't like to shoot;

Nor it hain't no blamed opinions on things you don't know what

And no man livin' onderstands—like all these sheets has got.

It's jst the plain old homespun fac's a feller can peruse

When readin' in a paper like the Pike County News.

I like to see the mail man a-comin' Friday night;

It makes me peart and chipper-like and tones me up a sight.

All week I be'n perusin' of these picture sheets they sell

Here in Noo York, but mostly gits their contents out o' hell

Or some'eres in that latitood, and serves it up red-hot

To sear the souls of youngsters, and spil 'em like as not.

I tell you, when the mail man comes a-Fridays I enthuse,

For I know he's got the sheet I want—the Pike County News.

I grab them papers eager, and I hustle for my room,

And when I yank the wrapper off there's always a perfume

Of good old Country Campbell press and honest printers' ink,

Purt'-nigh intoxicatin' as a raal old-fashion' drink.

Jist does me good to snuff it up and sniff the aromer in—

It beats your French sham-pag-ne and it lays all over gin!

No use to drown myself in drink to chase away the blues;

Jist gimme this old sofy, and the Pike County News.

W'y, here's the "Personal" column that tells how Homer Smith

Has gone to take his bridal tower—and who he tuck it with;

And how MaxMichael's in Noo York a-layin' in his stock

(I'll hunt him up and chin him, if it takes till twelve o'clock!);

And how Ras Pearson, that I knowed when he was 'bout fourteen,

Is State's Attorney now and fights "the ring" at Bowlin' Green.

These things is all important, and ever' one I'd lose

If I didn't pay my dollar for the Pike County News.

And here's a piece about Will Gray, that used to run "The Press"

When I done local on it and made a holy mess.

He's got to be the Probate Jedge and passes on estates—

A lucky journalist, for now he gits the legal rates.

He used to offer me advice 'bout what he called "career,"

And when I mentioned lit'ratoor he said: "Now, look-ee here,

You'll only starve to death at that; think well before you choose."

But still I live on lit'ratoor—the Pike County News.

W'y here's a picture of Dave Ball, a feller that was ralsed

'Longside o' punkins in the fields; I'm not a-tall amazed

To read that he's a candidate for gov'nor of the state,

For that's the kind o'cornstalks that has the runnin' gait;

And when he gits elected—as you better bet he'll git—

I'm headin' for Mizzoury, to strike him for a sit;

I hanker for a sinecure, a job where I can snooze

And git my breath, and sal'ry, and the Pike County News.

This page is where the marriages and births and deaths is found;

There ain't a name that I don't know from all the country round.

Here's 'bout Frank Chapman's weddin'—he runs a grocery store;

And here I see the Walker folks has got a Walker more.

'Twas on this page a year ago with reverent eyes I read

A boy I went a-fishin' with was numbered with the dead;

And one whose name I name not—no need to ask me whose—

I read about her fun'ral in the Pike County News.

—New York, 1897, by Robertus Love.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
CONDEMNNS EXTRADITION OF
LITHUANIAN DEFECTOR

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 17, 1970

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Ukrainian Quarterly in New York City has forwarded to me a copy of a press release issued by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and a copy of a telegram by that organization sent to President Nixon on the matter of the Lithuanian sailor who sought political asylum in this country. On Monday, December 14, 1970, I made an address in the House on this subject and my remarks appear in the RECORD beginning on page 41421.

As part of my remarks today, I include a letter of transmittal from the editor of the Ukrainian Quarterly, Mr. Walter Dushnyck, as well as copies of the aforementioned press release and telegram.

THE UKRAINIAN QUARTERLY,
New York, N.Y., December 12, 1970.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
The Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Enclosed please find a copy of our press release and telegram sent to President Nixon in connection with the extradition of the Lithuanian defector, Simas Kuderka. We would appreciate your kindness in inserting it in your proposed address in the House of Representatives and sending a copy of it to us. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,
WALTER DUSHNYCK,
Editor.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE CONDEMNNS
EXTRADITION OF LITHUANIAN DEFECTOR

NEW YORK, N.Y.—The Executive Board of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America (UCCA), a nationwide organization of some 2 million Americans of Ukrainian origin, strongly condemned U.S. Coast Guard officials who handed over the Lithuanian defector, Simas Gruze, (later identified as Simas Kuderka) to his Soviet captors. Terming the act a "most disgraceful violation of our traditional policy of political sanctuary," the UCCA expressed its full support of an immediate investigation and bringing those responsible for this crime to account.

In a telegram sent to President Nixon, Secretary of State William P. Rogers and Sec-

retary of Transportation John A. Volpe, the Ukrainian Congress Committee said that "to surrender a political defector to the claws of the KGB at a time when the U.S. Government is pleading with the world for its intervention for humane treatment of our POW's in North Vietnam, is the acme of inhumanity, folly and responsibility."

[Telegram]

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States of America,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, speaking for over 2 million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry, we lodge the sternest protest against the illegal, immoral and inhuman handing over of the Lithuanian defector, Simas Gruze, by U.S. Coast Guard authorities to the Soviet guards.

This act, in total defiance of the U.N. Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, occurred in American waters and constitutes a most disgraceful violation of our traditional policy of political sanctuary for those fleeing oppression and tyranny.

To surrender a political defector to the claws of the KGB at a time, when the U.S. Government is pleading with the world for its intervention for human treatment of our POW's in North Vietnam is the acme of inhumanity, folly and irresponsibility. Therefore, we fully support your order for an immediate investigation to bring those responsible for this tragic and shameless crime against human rights to account.

This event undoubtedly has marred the American image abroad and makes a mockery of our professed dedication to human freedom at home and abroad. Only immediate rectification of the perpetrated violation, by bringing those culpable to account, can restore in the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain and the free world at large faith in our democracy and respect for our principles of personal freedom and human rights and justice.

EXECUTIVE BOARD,
UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA,
DECEMBER 2, 1970.

PRESIDENT MASTER OF THE PRESS
CONFERENCE

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 17, 1970

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, once again, last week President Nixon came off as the master of the press conference. He

proved, as he must do at each one, that he can handle with equal facility the tough questions, the loaded questions, and the rude questions.

He proved that the press conference can be a worthy vehicle for transmitting news to the American people.

The press also proved something. It proved it can ask searching, meaningful in-depth questions. And it proved that it can ask questions that are self-serving, impudent, designed to embarrass and are utterly asinine.

The points the good questions made in favor of more frequent press conferences were offset by the other questions that proved that some members of the Washington press do not deserve the courtesy of any such conferences.

Mr. Speaker, it is true the President must meet his responsibilities to keep the people informed. But it is equally true that a free press has a duty to keep the people informed in a responsible manner.

MESSAGE TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 17, 1970

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, annually I send the citizens I am privileged to represent in the Congress a message advising them of some of the services of my office and how they can become available. Within the next few days I will mail this message which is entitled "A Message from Craig Hosmer 'Your Man in Washington'" and reads as follows: A MESSAGE FROM CRAIG HOSMER—"YOUR MAN IN WASHINGTON"

As your Representative in the United States Congress I respectfully invite your views on the issues facing this Nation which are of special concern to you.

In addition to legislative duties, much of my effort is devoted to assisting with the difficult problems of our area which must be solved at the Nation's Capitol.

It also is my pleasure to be of help to you when you encounter a personal problem with a Department or Agency of the Federal Government.

Your letters will reach me for prompt attention when addressed as follows: Congressman Craig Hosmer, Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

On the obverse of the foregoing message is a home or office calendar for 1971.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Saturday, December 19, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.—II Corinthians 4: 6.

Almighty God, who hast declared Thy love to men by the birth of the Holy Child at Bethlehem: Help us to welcome Him with gladness and to make room for Him in all our common days, so that we may live at peace with one another and in good will with all Thy family: In His holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4983. An act for the relief of James M. Buster;

H.R. 6049. An act to amend the definition of "metal bearing ores" in the Tariff Schedules of the United States;

H.R. 6854. An act to provide for the free entry of a peal of eight bells and fittings for use of Smith College, Northampton, Mass.;

H.R. 9183. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that imported articles which are exported and thereafter reimported to the United States for failure to meet sample or specifications shall, in certain instances, be entered free of duty upon such reimportation;

H.R. 10150. An act for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Air Force at Kelly Air Force Base, Tex.;

H.R. 10704. An act for the relief of Samuel R. Stephenson;

H.R. 12621. An act for the relief of Lt. Robert J. Scanlon;