

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NATIONAL VOLUNTEER BLOOD  
DONOR MONTH

## HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, we are living in an age of scientific wonders, not the least of which is the transplantation of human organs. Actually, however, the first successful human tissue transplant took place more than 150 years ago, in 1818, when James Blundell, the English physician, performed a blood transfusion to control hemorrhage in a woman following childbirth.

The miracle of that first transfusion has been repeated hundreds of millions of times. Although there have been many dramatic advances in the practice of medicine, there is still no substitute for the vital, living human tissue—blood. The person who gives blood to help another is performing a service as unique and as indispensable today as it was a century and a half ago.

To honor the millions of Americans who share "gifts of life" with the ill and injured, and to remind others of the need, the month of January has been observed for the past 2 years as National Blood Donor Month. In 1970 and 1971, the observance was established following a joint resolution of Congress asking the President to proclaim it. National Blood Donor Month was initiated by the American Association of Blood Banks and has the support of the American National Red Cross, the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, and other national organizations.

Once again, these organizations are urging the designation of January as National Volunteer Blood Donor Month.

There is a great need to encourage more eligible people to voluntarily donate blood. A recent National Academy of Science report indicated that blood obtained from paid donors generally carries a higher risk of transmitting hepatitis than does that from unpaid donors. Figures ranging from 1.4 to 13.7 cases per 1,000 units of "commercial" blood have been reported.

The need for transfusion blood has never been greater. Open heart surgery, for example, is totally dependent on the availability of fresh blood obtained from donors whose blood type is compatible with that of the patient. The transfusion of blood platelets, together with cancer chemotherapy, is prolonging for months, even years, the lives of many leukemia patients who formerly would have died in a few weeks. Massive transfusions of whole blood and blood components are saving the lives of countless accident victims, patients undergoing general surgery, and victims of a variety of blood disorders, such as hemophilia.

To meet the increasing need, the American Association of Blood Banks,

representing 1,500 community and hospital blood banks and 3,500 professional members in the 50 States, strives unceasingly to persuade adults in good health to become volunteer blood donors. The association, the world's largest devoted specifically to blood banking, transfusion services and related areas, carries on numerous other programs to improve the quality and safety of blood transfusions, further research, and conserve available blood supplies. One of its most valuable services is the national clearinghouse program. Through this program, a donor may give blood at his local AABB blood bank or Red Cross Blood Center and have the credit transferred to a patient almost anywhere in the United States. By enabling blood banks with surpluses to lend to those with shortages, the program aids significantly in the nationwide utilization of blood supplies.

Our Nation's blood banks are truly "Guardians of Life" whose service protects all of us. They need the support of all our citizens in their vital work. I urge you to take favorable action on asking the President to proclaim January 1972, National Volunteer Blood Donor Month.

INDUSTRIALIST GEORGE STINSON  
PROVES HIS LEADERSHIP IN RE-  
CYCLING EFFORT—EDITORIALS  
INDICATE ATTENTION TO CON-  
STRUCTIVE PROGRAMS

## HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it has now become widely accepted that the development and use of methods to recycle our precious natural resources is essential to our efforts to provide a clean, healthful environment. It is gratifying to me to regularly observe the efforts of individuals and industries as they work to bring this goal to fruition.

One of the leaders in the effort to develop practical recycling technologies is George A. Stinson, president of National Steel Corp. Under his leadership, National Steel continues to point the way in this important field.

Mr. Stinson spoke last week in Follansbee, W. Va., at a banquet marking the beginning of Steelmark Month. At that time he reviewed the progress National Steel continues to point the way in this products.

National Steel's plant at Weirton, W. Va., has for some time been engaged in important research on the recycling of steel containers. Other industrial installations, notably Continental Can facilities in Florida, have done equally important work in this field.

Mr. Stinson's address and the work of his company were noted in an editorial in the Weirton Daily Times edited by Paul

Glover. The accomplishments in Florida were discussed in an editorial in the Orlando Sentinel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two editorials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Weirton (W. Va.) Daily Times, May 19, 1971]

## MAN OF CONFIDENCE

George A. Stinson, president of National Steel Corp., of which Weirton Steel is a division, was the speaker at the Steelmark Month kickoff banquet in Follansbee Monday night and reiterated the commitment he made before a U.S. Senate committee that the steel industry is "hard at work and will continue at that work" until the recycling of all steel containers can be carried out as a "regular routine matter with benefit to all of us who value the preservation of our raw materials and our environment."

He called for cooperation by the government, the public and producers of all container materials.

National Steel, like all other steel companies, is deeply involved in environmental problems, including air pollution and stream pollution, and millions of dollars have been spent and will continue to be spent to correct these problems.

Much of Weirton steel's production goes into the canning industry. The Tin Mill here is one of the largest and most up to date in the world.

Mr. Stinson, who has had a close attachment to the Weirton Steel and the Weirton community, has spoken often in the Weirton area and he always tells the story as it is. Despite the continually multiplying problems confronting the steel industry generally including the import threats, Mr. Stinson has always spoken very optimistically and inspiringly of the steel industry generally and Weirton Steel in particular.

In Monday's address he described how Weirton Steel was one of the first steel companies in the nation to experiment with recycling of tin cans and steel cans and he gave assurances that "the future for steel in the container market is bright." Its competition—aluminum, paper, glass and others—is tough, but Mr. Stinson assures that the future of the tin can is secure because it is inexpensive, it is totally reliable because of its greater strength, it is convenient to use and it can be disposed of, collected, separated and recycled with greater facility than any of its competition.

Mr. Stinson said he was impressed with the friendly spirit and cooperative nature of the local communities.

He paid tribute to the sponsors of Steelmark Month and underscored the fact that the observance originated in the Ohio Valley.

The Steelmark observance not only pays tribute to the men and women who make steel, but encourages people to buy products made of American steel.

With the American economy confronted with critical problems, it is reassuring to have people like Mr. Stinson come to Weirton and express their hopes with such supreme confidence and in the tradition of the past administrators of the Weirton industry.

[From the Orlando Sentinel, May 14, 1971]

## RECYCLING METAL CANS

One of the great fears of ecologists—that the nation will be interred under a mam-

moth pile of beer cans—will be unfounded if a pilot program started this week is successful.

With the endorsement of Gov. Reubin Askew and Apollo 7 Astronaut Walter Cunningham, an ecology advocate, five Florida metal can recycling plants will be buying cans at salvage prices for recycling.

Two of these centers are in Central Florida—the Continental Can plants in Auburndale and Winter Garden—and will be receiving scrap cans at \$10 a ton for those made of steel and aluminum, \$20 a ton for all-steel and \$200 a ton for all-aluminum cans.

Continental isn't trying to make money from the project; the company just wants to break even and keep the cans from being a blight.

This seems to us an excellent opportunity for civic and fraternal groups to make money and help clean up the environment at the same time.

#### ENDORSEMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT

### HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, recently the Governor of Pennsylvania, Milton J. Shapp, submitted to my subcommittee a statement endorsing H.R. 3613 to provide emergency employment in times of high unemployment. As Governor Shapp points out, public service employment would help alleviate two serious national problems—rising unemployment and deteriorating public services. Based on the most recently released statistics from the Department of Labor, Pennsylvania has 12 major areas of persistent and substantial unemployment, constituting an unemployment rate of over 5 percent. As the chief executive of a State in which 258,000 are unemployed and another 801,500 are on public assistance, Governor Shapp fully realizes the inability of the States to financially meet such great civic responsibilities without the immediate assistance of the Federal Government.

I would like to draw special attention to the projected institution of a public service program in the State of Pennsylvania resulting in virtually no major adjustments in existing State employment procedures. H.R. 3613 is designed to promote public service employment which can be coordinated to prevailing State requirements and to promote public service jobs which can be expanded occupationally once high unemployment recedes. Therefore, I would encourage my colleagues to carefully read the following testimony from Governor Shapp and consider the merits of a public service employment program in each of their States:

#### TESTIMONY BY GOV. MILTON J. SHAPP

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania strongly supports the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 (HR 3613) which could pump \$4 billion into public service jobs for the unemployed and underemployed over the next five years. Estimates are that it would mean half a million useful new jobs—some 150,000 of them immediately . . .

A very similar bill was vetoed by the President last year on the grounds that it would lock people into dead-end, make-work jobs. We believe that this bill overcomes such objections. It requires that special consideration be given to jobs with advancement prospects, with built-in training, and in occupational fields most likely to expand in the public and private sector as unemployment recedes. It demands assurance that the employing agency tie in with upgrading and other manpower programs to meaningful careers.

There can hardly be much danger that such jobs would be "make-work." There is more real work urgently needed now than we could hope to get done with a dozen times the money provided by this bill. State and local governments are driven closer to the wall of fiscal disaster daily by their public service needs and costs. Our most essential services are shockingly, dangerously understaffed. Streets are not repaired; transportation grows more sporadic; houses are collapsing; neighborhoods rot; schools abandon essential services; crime and delinquency mount; health and welfare services are tragically inadequate. It has been estimated that there is a need for 5.3 million public service jobs suitable not only for the marginally skilled but for out-of-work technicians and laid-off production workers and that 140,000 jobs in 130 of our largest cities can be filled immediately by untrained workers and another 140,000 by skilled or paraprofessional workers. Community service needs in the fields of public health, welfare, safety, child care, neighborhood preservation and so on are almost limitless. In Pennsylvania, our Department of Public Welfare alone could place 5,000 more people today in its mental health and mental retardation, geriatric, public assistance, child welfare and general health facilities, and has already submitted estimates to that effect to the Regional Manpower Administrator and the State CAMPS Committee . . .

The bill singles out employable public assistance recipients as particularly appropriate for this program. It specifies that work and training programs related to physical improvements give special consideration to deteriorating, low-income areas. It could make a significant dent in the public assistance rolls, which are substantially affected by job availability. And even more discouraging to a recipient, many of the best training programs running at present lead only to more disillusionment because the expected jobs never materialized and the training proved only another revolving door back out into more unemployment. This bill does guarantee immediate jobs—useful work at decent wages in which the recipient can take pride . . .

Pennsylvania has long expressed its commitment by actual outlays of substantial State monies for training and employment. We had a State manpower training program before the Federal Manpower Development and Training Act. Based on our past experience in Pennsylvania, this State could implement a large public employment program with little or no major disruption in the State's operation. The Department of Welfare alone could immediately produce 5,000 new jobs. The Commonwealth has already developed a system which could accommodate itself to a public service employment program in the following ways:

1. The Non-Civil Service classification of State Work Program Trainee presently used by the State's New Careers Programs, is suited to a wide range of other public service jobs. This position carries all benefits of regular State employes except for permanent status and participation in the State Retirement Plan.

2. The position carries an hourly wage of \$1.82 which could be adjusted according to the requirements of the bill. Civil Service and personnel procedural requirements have been

revised to allow flexibility for entry into the system and protection within it.

3. All enrollees would have an equal opportunity to compete for available permanent Civil Service jobs in their areas of training.

4. A delivery system for supportive services directly and/or by contract is established and functioning now providing health services, transportation, child care, counseling, adult education, etc., to enrollees of the presently operating programs described above.

5. Entry level Civil Service positions, particularly in the health and public assistance fields, have been revised to allow hiring of the hard-core disadvantaged after an individualized minimum of training. Career mobility is a built-in feature of the Civil Service system . . .

Pennsylvania State Government is not only a large potential public service career employer but a considerable Pennsylvania permanent employer as well, as there are currently 130,000 employees on the State payroll. The ability of the State, however, to increase the number of State employes is limited without Federal assistance, especially in light of the rapidly rising unemployment rate and its resultant rise in public assistance caseloads . . .

A public employment program which is properly identified as such, will lessen the human and fiscal waste inevitable to the job-oriented programs that promise permanent employment but live up to only a fraction of their expectations in a period of large-scale unemployment . . .

Pennsylvania endorses a program of public service employment because our people (in all categories of the work force) need jobs now, and because much public work needs doing now. We view it as an emergency measure, rather than a total expression of what national manpower should be. We hope that its passage will be followed up by a comprehensive revamp of the total manpower picture to realign fiscal and programmatic priorities into a well-articulated and coordinated national work planning, work training and work providing system . . .

The Emergency Employment Act of 1971 by matching people who badly need work to new jobs of increasingly urgent national civic need, can be an important milestone in our national drive toward full and meaningful employment.

POOR RONALD REAGAN

### HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, since welfare reform will soon be before the Congress, I thought this recent article of Art Buchwald may be of some help:

POOR RONALD REAGAN

(By Art Buchwald)

No matter how I try, I can't stop worrying about Gov. Ronald Reagan's personal financial situation. As everyone knows by now, Gov. Reagan had such bad financial reverses last year that he didn't have to pay state income taxes.

Instead of Californians sympathizing with him over these financial reverses, they became upset and felt there was something wrong because they had to pay taxes and Reagan didn't.

Very few people in the state said, "If the governor makes \$44,000 a year as salary and has assets of around \$1 million and still can't pay his state income taxes, then he must be hurting very badly, and needs pity rather than censure."

My first thought was that the governor

should seek legal aid from the local Office of Economic Opportunity. Although Reagan is trying to abolish legal aid for the poor in California, I'm sure the poverty lawyers would take his case anyway, just to prove that they will take anybody in dire financial straits, regardless of race, creed, or elective office.

To make sure, I telephoned a CRLA (California Rural Legal Assistance) lawyer in California and asked him if he would take Reagan as a client.

"Yes," he said, "he would qualify for free legal aid. Our charter specifically says that any governor of a state whose finances are in such poor shape that he doesn't have to pay personal state income taxes is in no position to pay a lawyer, and is therefore eligible for free legal advice. It would be our pleasure to help Gov. Reagan in any way we could."

"How would you go about it?"

"From a legal standpoint it would probably be the most interesting case we've ever handled. Most of our cases have had to do with people who didn't pay any state income taxes because they didn't make any money. This would be the first time we represented someone who made money but didn't pay income taxes.

"Surely there is something wrong with the system if the governor of the largest state in the Union has been hurt so badly financially that he can't pay any taxes."

"But what legal defense would you have for him?" I asked.

"First we would have to find out what financial reverses Reagan had, whether they came from cattle, oil, real estate, or the stock market. Then we would prove that it wasn't his fault that his investments went sour. It was probably due to the general economy."

"But the Republicans are in charge of the economy right now. Wouldn't it look bad if Reagan blamed his own party for the fact he had such a bad income situation?"

"I guess you're right. We'll have to think of something else. Perhaps we could persuade the courts to allow the governor to make one motion picture a year.

"Or a new 'Death Valley Days' series," I suggested.

"I was thinking of a remake of the 'Grapes of Wrath,'" the lawyer said. "They could shoot most of it around Sacramento, so the governor wouldn't have to be on location too long. But the important thing is to get him healthy financially so he doesn't have to eat from the public trough.

"This thing has far more ramifications than anyone wants to admit," he said. "We're trying to pull the poor up by their bootstraps so they become honest, hard-working citizens. But if they see somebody like Gov. Reagan, who has worked all his life and still has nothing left over for income taxes, they're going to say to themselves 'The hell with it. Let's stay on welfare.'"

THE POST OFFICE ROBBERY

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, there is an old expression in my home State of Kansas that when a farmer is faced with an unpleasant decision he is caught between a rock and a hard place. That is precisely the position I think we faced during the last session of Congress regarding postal reform legislation.

Faced with wildcat strikes that threatened our Nation's postal service and faced with deteriorating service through-

out the postal system, it was obvious overhaul and reform was urgently needed. It should also be recalled that during consideration of the postal reform bill Congress amended the bill to protect the right of postal employees to join or not join a union. Under the circumstances, there was no choice but to support postal reform legislation.

Mr. Speaker, since that time I have been most concerned over recent developments within our postal system.

First, I know the well-advertised decision to take politics out of the Post Office was long overdue and correct. Nevertheless, I am concerned over a system that in reality made sure the political patronage system of the past would remain intact and a system that in many cases will not even allow a competitive examination to determine personnel placement.

Second, in voting for postal reform legislation, I expressed concern that this reorganization would simply mean higher postal rates, a further decrease in service in our rural areas, and finally the closing down of many of our rural and smalltown postal offices. Since last session of Congress we have had a postal increase, the service has not improved, we have lost many regional offices, and we are waiting for the other shoe to drop regarding our local post offices.

What has happened to the concept that our national mail service was established as an economical way for our citizens to transmit messages rather than being run as a profitmaking corporation?

Recently, the editor of the Salina Journal, Mr. Whit Austin, summed up this situation very well in an editorial called "The Post Office Robbery." Mr. Austin clearly makes a case for the problems newspaper publishers face regarding postal rate increases, but perhaps even more to the point, he states correctly that the burden will fall upon the farmer, the senior citizen, and the residents of rural and small-town America. I should like to pose the question many of my constituents are asking: If postal reorganization means higher postal rates, a further decline in rural service, loss of our regional post offices, the closing down of many of our rural post offices, and a locked-in noncompetitive patronage system of the past, who needs it?

I commend the following article from the Salina Journal to the attention of my colleagues, all of whom were between a rock and a hard place regarding postal reform legislation last session of Congress:

THE POSTOFFICE ROBBERY

Newspaper publishers rightly are concerned about the increases in mailing costs. And so should be the subscribers!

Maynard Watkins, The Journal's circulation manager, estimates that the postal hike on second class mail to go into effect Sunday will increase mailing costs about 28 percent. This jump The Journal is prepared to absorb for the time being.

But if all the projected increases in newspaper rates eventually are put into effect, mailing costs will increase three times. If this were to happen, Watkins estimates The Journal's annual postage bill would jump from \$60,000 to \$180,000—or about a nickel per copy.

Nearly a third of The Journal's circula-

tion is now carried by mail. We are seeking to find other methods of delivery and undoubtedly will be able to divert some circulation from the postoffice. But for those who must receive their newspapers and magazines by mail, a surcharge probably will be necessary if all the increases are put into effect. This hasn't happened yet, however.

If it does, the burden will fall upon the farmer and the residents of small towns—those already getting the short end of the stick. City prices will not be affected where carrier delivery is possible.

Everyone, of course, will pay more for magazines taken through the mails. And businesses with heavy mailings will suffer as well. No one will escape entirely the new lug.

Out at Hays, Lloyd Ballhagen comments in his News on the sad situation as follows:

"Got any 6-cent stamps laying around the house?"

"Better use them. This week. Or else you'll have to add a two-cent stamp to them.

"As of Sunday, the U.S. Postal Service will raise regular postage on a letter to eight cents. Air mail will go up to 11 cents. Penny postcards go to six cents. All second and third-class rates, plus some fourth-class rates will increase by from 10 to more than 20 percent.

"What has happened? Congress has turned over the rate-making powers to the board of governors. No longer do our lawmakers set the rates. They've apparently decided others are more capable of determining how much it should cost us to mail a letter.

"The mail was established as an economical way for the public to transmit messages. It never was supposed to support itself. Suddenly the bright idea occurs, somewhere along the line, that the Post Office Department should be self-sustaining. That it shouldn't be subsidized as much by tax money. That the users of the mail should try to pay their own way. Wow!

"Applied to other areas of government, this means only those who use the public schools should pay for the schools, only those who use the police or fire departments should pay for them, only those who use the streets should pay for them. A radical departure from our system.

"The Post Office Department is in trouble, they say. It needs more money, they say.

"It's not in trouble for the lack of funds but for the overabundance of bureaucracy. It, like the railroads, is so bogged down in civil service bureaucrats that no Postmaster General, no matter how dynamic and efficient, can streamline the department.

"As a result, we'll all pay through the nose after Sunday—for our right to use the mails—a public service institution."

LATEST SEGMENT OF "THE FBI STORY"

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, while we have found the Federal Bureau of Investigation under heavy attack by some Members of Congress and some of our mass news media people, out in countryside America, where I come from, the people seem to believe that the FBI and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, are doing a commendable job.

As a further example of this attitude, I insert in the RECORD an editorial by Father Roger Vossberg of the St. Cloud

Visitor, a Catholic weekly, in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District:

Now THE FBI

"The case against the FBI is very weak, indeed . . . If anybody wants to make a more convincing case against the FBI, surely it should take the form of saying that it is underachieving rather than overzealous." This is the view of columnist William F. Buckley of the Washington Star Syndicate.

In his defense of the FBI, Buckley points out the spectacular rise of major crimes such as car theft, mugging, rape and murder over the past ten years. "That requires intensified police activity, refined methods of crime detection and improvement in the judicial and penological systems."

Buckley points out the great job the FBI has done in counteracting subversion, a far more subtle brand of crime. "During the '30s, '40s and '50s, subversion was mostly the organized job of the Communist Party, as agents for the Soviet Union. The FBI brilliantly penetrated the CP, and the tightly-disciplined Communists were neutralized."

Buckley is right when he points out: "After all, when one gets mugged, raped, murdered or blown up these days, it is not done by the FBI, but by those the FBI failed to lay its hands on".

(Personally, I would feel much more comfortable living in a city or the country if I knew the FBI were on the job there. I have no fear whatsoever of the FBI, the state highway patrol, the sheriff, the local police. I try to respect them and when tagged or warned for traffic violations, I have always found they were right and they were kind.

On the other hand, I fear to live in cities or other areas where crime is rampant and where it is not safe for anybody to be out after dark. I am always happy to see the police around and have the assurance that the FBI is trying to do its job of spotting and identifying dangerous characters and possible plots against life and property).

#### FIGHT DELINQUENCY

### HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker. Andrew McCause, editor of the Greater Kansas City Medical Bulletin, speaks for many in a recent editorial about delinquent medicare payments. As Mr. McCause states, the Kansas City Medicare Office is 34,000 claims behind.

It is most unfortunate that physicians who diligently and methodically care for their patients, then fill out the reams of forms, must then be compelled to wait months and months for payment of accounts receivable, while all the time seeing themselves castigated daily in the news media as the culprits who are responsible for the high cost of health care.

For the enlightenment of all, I offer the editorial by Editor McCause:

#### FIGHT DELINQUENCY

Around the first of March one of our local society members called to say that he was not receiving Medicare payments. He called the appropriate number and was told that the Kansas City Medicare office was about 34,000 claims behind in processing, dating back to October, 1970.

At the annual session of the House of Delegates of the MSMA in St. Louis two weeks ago, one of the delegates pointed out that

Medicare in his area of southern Missouri was behind in processing claims for his multi-specialty group to the tune of \$150,000 since January.

The Bulletin called the local Medicare office to inquire about the situation. After several calls to a busy number, contact was established and we were told that the Medicare people were working very hard. Furthermore, they did not wish to discuss the matter of being behind in processing claims since they did not feel this would be good publicity.

The intent of these comments is not to castigate a system of health care payment or to reflect on individuals who run the system. More accurately our intent is to draw public attention to the matter of delinquency in paying for a contracted service and to ask what can be done to control this backward slide before the system becomes as far behind as our court system is in trying cases.

Our federal government has felt the pinch of inflation in other ways besides failing to hire enough people to administer Medicare claims. Look at the new enlarged one page narcotics form recently received which now has a four page set of instructions, a new prescribing number which has doubled or tripled in size and requires five times as much tax as the previous form (\$5.00). The penalties for incorrectly filing the form also have increased considerably.

Perhaps we should hire some of the public relations people from the Pentagon to sell us on the idea of accepting with pleasure late payments from Medicare and the change from simplicity to extreme complexity in prescribing certain medications.

Some might think it wiser to use reason in solving these problems with haste, and let the quality of the result do the selling for itself.

#### RAILROAD LEGISLATION

### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the railroads are rolling again as a result of emergency legislation swiftly enacted by the Congress last week and signed into law within hours by the Chief Executive.

In a nutshell: This is no way in which to run the railroads—or the country.

I opposed the emergency legislation just as I have opposed each similar bill in the past.

It was less than 6 months ago that Congress last was required to enact similar stopgap legislation. And that was the third "emergency" congressional action of 1970 to avert a rail tieup.

Between January 1953 and December 1970, the respective Presidents appointed 75 emergency boards under authority of the Railway Labor Act, with 53 relating to rail disputes and the others to airline disputes.

#### SEVEN TIMES UP THE HILL

The Congress has been called upon seven times since 1953 to enact emergency legislation to deal with a major railroad strike. The first was in 1963, with three more coming in 1967. In 1970 there again were three instances, and the latest incident was the action last week.

The need is obvious. We need to establish a regular procedure for dealing

with these national emergencies when the railroads face shutdown.

I don't have the solution. At the same time, there is no shortage of recommendations before the congressional committees and they offer many variations.

What I do feel—and very strongly—is that the Congress needs to act to find a permanent solution. Let the legislative committees work out their best judgments and then let us have up-or-down votes in the House and the Senate. Only in this way can we move toward putting a solution into law.

#### CANNOT JUSTIFY INACTION

We in Congress cannot justify inaction on a permanent system, thus forcing now-repetitious emergency action whenever a railroad impasse arises.

Mr. Speaker, the two daily newspapers in my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., have editorialized on the subject and it is interesting to note their differing approaches. One criticizes my vote of last week which is its prerogative. I will let my record and position stand for themselves.

As part of my remarks I include the two editorials.

[From the Buffalo Evening News, May 19, 1971]

#### WRITE A NEW RAIL LABOR ACT

One wonders how many more disruptive railroad labor disputes the nation must endure before Congress ceases to legislate only crisis-to-crisis stopgaps and begins to legislate broad, long-range reforms to cope with fundamental causes of these periodic disputes.

With the strike precipitated by 13,000 signalmen already on, Congress had no better immediate choice, given its past defaults, than it had in the one-day strike last December when it ordered the strikers back to work, extended a cooling off period in which to negotiate a settlement—and prayed.

Even the granting of an interim pay raise to sweeten the bitter no-strike ban for the workers echoes last December's stopgap technique.

It's all as predictable as tomorrow's sunrise, or as the next rail crisis. But what if no settlement is reached voluntarily when this new cooling-off period expires? Congress and the President will be no more ready to tolerate a prolonged strike than now.

Nor should they. While the dwindling passenger service has dulled the public's immediate personal awareness of the damage a nationwide rail strike can do, trains still haul more intercity freight than all trucks, barges and airplanes combined. Thus a rail strike can quickly rot tons of perishables headed for the supermarkets and close down or severely curtail industrial operations, such as the steel and auto plants in Buffalo.

President Nixon has twice urged Congress to remodel existing laws so that labor disputes in the sensitive transportation industry—airlines, trucking and maritime as well as rails—can be more skillfully handled.

By discouraging premature federal intervention into the bargaining process, his plan would encourage more serious bargaining in the early stages of negotiation. Once faced with a national strike threat, however, the President would have wider options for promoting a settlement. This would give him an element of surprise, and one option would involve appointing an impartial body to choose between the final union or employer offer, totally imposing that choice on all parties. This would, contrary to the customary practice of splitting the difference, prod each party to be more flexible and reasonable in an effort to get its own plan accepted.

Congress has wholly ignored these recommendations, and has come up with nothing else in their place. Opponents claim the last-best-offer approach is really compulsory arbitration. But how free and how fair is the existing condition where a national rail strike is demonstrably intolerable, where workers go nearly two years without a raise, where the Washington scenario is so predictable as to become a part of the tactics of one side or the other, and where—in the crunch—Congress would surely impose a settlement, with all the political implications that holds? The time for something superior to interminable irresolution is long overdue.

[From the Buffalo Courier Express, May 20, 1971]

**NO OTHER CHOICE BUT TO VOTE  
RAIL-STRIKE HALT**

Congressional action in voting an emergency law to end the nationwide railway strike was, of course, a stopgap measure. It did not resolve the basic problem of averting these crippling tieups. Only some form of permanent adjudication machinery can, hopefully, do that.

But under the circumstances, this was the only thing that could be done as Congress—and the Nation—stood on the edge of the cliff being pushed. Along with the majority of the Western New York congressional delegation, we suppose the public too is fed up with having these periodic blackjack strikes wind up before Congress for resolution when they should be resolved before a nonpolitical, expert panel.

However, first things come first. The strike had to be ended. So we wonder what on earth Rep. Thaddeus J. Dulski, Buffalo Democrat, was thinking about when he voted against ending it. Of course no one really likes compulsion; no one likes the compulsion, or the blackjack, this kind of strike either.

The fact that these rail strikes have kept coming up with such regularity is largely due to the failure of Congress in the past to update the basic railway law, to put arbitration machinery into it because all else obviously has failed. Compulsory arbitration is the next logical step. This should be given top priority for it is in the public's interest, the interest of the larger majority.

**RESOLUTION TO CONSTRUCT HOSPITAL AT MOUNTAIN VILLAGE, ALASKA**

**HON. NICK BEGICH**

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems facing Alaska today is the inadequate medical and health care available to the residents of the State. In many villages, there are neither hospitals nor trained personnel to administer to the health needs of the villagers. In Mountain Village, Alaska, the situation is particularly critical.

When a villager in Mountain Village, Alaska, requires hospital attention, he is flown to Bethel for this medical care. Many times, bad weather prohibits flights between these two places and radio communication is very unreliable. This situation, needless to say, endangers the life and health of the people of Mountain Village as well as villages in similar situations throughout Alaska.

For this reason, the Alaska State Legislature has asked the Alaska Native Health Service of the U.S. Public Health Service to construct and operate a hospital at Mountain Village. The medical crisis in Alaska demands that we direct more attention to the health needs of our people. I heartily concur with the legislature's request and I include a copy of the resolution for inclusion into the RECORD:

**HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 71, ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE**

Relating to the construction and operation of a hospital at Mountain Village, Alaska

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas the people in the area of Mountain Village have no hospital and are required to fly to Bethel for medical care;

Whereas bad weather often prohibits flights between these places; and

Whereas radio communication is very unreliable; and

Whereas this situation endangers the life and health of the people of Mountain Village, Yukon Delta and the whole coastal area within that terrain;

Be it resolved that the Alaska Native Health Service of the U.S. Public Health Service is requested to construct and operate a hospital at Mountain Village, Alaska.

**KANSAS BEEF MONTH**

**HON. WILLIAM R. ROY**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, the month of May has been officially proclaimed by Kansas Gov. Robert Docking as "Kansas Beef Month." In light of this special observance, I would like to take this opportunity to point out to my colleagues the importance of the beef industry to my State and the Nation.

Kansas ranks third among the 50 States in total number of cattle and calves, with 6,618,000 head as of January 1 of this year. Even more significantly, this figure represents a 10-percent increase over the previous year—the largest increase of any State in the Nation.

The beef business, cattle production and feeding, is the No. 1 industry in the State of Kansas in terms of dollar sales. The No. 2 industry is meatpacking, a business which is closely aligned to the overall beef industry.

In 1965, the latest year for which comprehensive figures are available, cattle production and feeding accounted for \$597 million in sales. Meatpacking accounted for \$591 million. In 1969, based on unofficial records, the cattle industry became Kansas' first billion dollar business. With the multiplier effect, the cattle industry generates several billions of dollars into the Kansas economy each year.

Beef cattle are the No. 1 source of income on Kansas farms, having surpassed wheat several years ago.

Total red meat production on Kansas farms in 1970, including lamb and swine as well as beef, was 1.6 billion pounds.

This represents a 23-percent increase from 1969.

These figures tell a clear story—that the beef industry is, more than ever, vitally important to the State of Kansas. Dollars do not tell the whole story, however. The average per capita consumption of beef in the United States is now 113 pounds per year. Americans consume far more beef than any other meat product.

Kansans have taken the lead through the years to insure a smoothly functioning beef industry to meet the heavy demands of the American public.

In 1919, at its State convention in Hutchinson, Kans., the Kansas Livestock Association founded the National Livestock and Meat Board. This organization has become the promotion, research, and education arm of the cattle industry, seeking to provide a better product for the consumer. It is financed solely by producers and feeders.

Another national honor recently came to Kansas when Mr. Frank Smith, manager of the Pratt Feedlot in Pratt, Kans., was named National Commercial Feeder of the Year for 1971. Mr. Smith is one of the leaders in the greatly expanded cattle feedlot industry in Kansas, where the numbers of cattle on feedlots has increased 168 percent in the last 5 years.

The cattle industry has faced some difficult economic conditions in past years, but it has solved many of its problems without having to resort to Federal price support programs. It has concentrated on more efficient production and marketing procedures. The cattle facts program, for example, provides producers and feeders with better market intelligence.

On a national basis, the production and feeding of beef cattle represents 20 percent of all agricultural income. In Kansas, the beef industry is one of the bulwarks of the economy. Beef products are important weapons in the fight for a nutritionally rich diet for all Americans.

I congratulate members of the Kansas beef industry and the Kansas Livestock Association for their hard work and accomplishments through the years, and I offer my support to them in the future.

**A BILL TO ESTABLISH METHODS OF PAYMENT FOR NATIONAL FOREST TIMBER**

**HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 4 years Members of Congress and representatives of the forest service and the forest products industry have been discussing payment practices in the sales of national forest timber. As a participant in those discussions and the Representative of a district in which several billion board feet of national forest timber were sold during this period, I have become thoroughly familiar with the issue. It is my belief

that legislation should be considered to establish policy in this matter: The following bill is offered for that purpose:

H.R. 8738

A bill to establish methods of payment for National Forest timber, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That payment for National Forest timber shall be made before removal unless the purchaser provides an acceptable surety bond guaranteeing payment within thirty days of removal. In lieu of a surety bond, a purchaser may deposit negotiable securities of the United States accompanied by power of attorney and agreement authorizing sale of such securities if payment is not made as above provided.

If purchaser stores logs off the sale area before scaling and has provided an acceptable payment guarantee, payment must be made within thirty days of such storage unless the purchaser executes an instrument consenting to seizure and sale of such stored logs by the United States with guarantee of free access to the United States or its assigns to permit effective possession and removal of such logs from the storage site in event of failure of sureties to meet payment demands within thirty days after notification of default in payment by purchaser. Such instrument consenting to seizure and sale shall provide that such action shall be stayed if there is a bonafide dispute over the volume or value of the timber involved and the timber purchaser is pursuing administrative or judicial means to resolve the dispute. Payment for all logs which are in storage off the sale area on December 31, must be made by not later than June 30 of the following year.

The effect of the bill would be to continue the Forest Service's present practice of accepting negotiable securities of the United States or surety bonds as guarantees of payment for logs stored prior to the measurement used to determine the volume subject to payment. This practice has been in use for a dozen years without one instance of government loss due to failure to pay for stored logs. More than two-thirds of the national forest timber sold in California currently involves this practice. It should be continued for these reasons:

First. Its history of successful use.

Second. Because of the seasonal nature of logging activities in most of California, logs must be stored to provide full-year mill production and related employment.

Third. The most accurate log "scaling" (measurement) is possible in the mill after multi-segment logs are cut to standard lengths, because such cutting reveals the extent of defects in the interior of the logs and this information is needed to obtain the net volume.

Fourth. The Forest Service's timber appraisal premise assumes year-around processing of logs and does not treat interest charges as a cost of operation. The Forest Service data, basic to appraisals, comes from studies which have individual-log-segment scaling as an integral practice. Increase costs, due to delay of trucks for scaling, are not recognized in Forest Service timber appraisals, at least in California.

Fifth. A change from the present practice would require the replacement of payment guarantees with borrowed capi-

tal to cover the value of stored logs. Such capital would be difficult for some long-term operators to obtain and would unnecessarily increase costs without recognition in Forest Service appraisals. Some operators may have to reduce the length of their work year because of the inability to raise cash for logs stored for year-around operation.

Sixth. Through the competitive bidding procedure used in Forest Service timber sales, the government receives more than the appraised value for timber in most sales. The modification of the use of payment guarantees would tend to reduce the extent of overbidding.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, the present method of guaranteeing payment for national forest timber has been working well. A change is not warranted until substitute measures are available which give equal assurance of payment and fair treatment to timber purchasers. This bill will authorize continuance of present practice and assurance that the government could recover stored logs in the unlikely circumstances that payment was not made. There never has been need for such action.

#### WILDERNESS ACT SLOWDOWN

HON. DAVID W. DENNIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, we are moving much too slowly to implement the purposes of the Wilderness Act by adding to areas to be classified as wilderness, as provided in that law.

The President has proposed the inclusion of additional wilderness areas.

Our colleague, JOHN SAYLOR, and other Members have introduced legislation providing, as I understand it, interim and de facto wilderness classifications in order to protect major areas of our national forests until their status is finally determined.

I urge my colleagues, and the appropriate committees, to give early and favorable consideration to these legislative and executive proposals, so that our irreplaceable and dwindling wilderness areas may be preserved for future generations.

I include a copy of a recent and worthwhile editorial from the New York Times on this important subject:

#### FOREVER SLOW

In an increasingly crowded and polluted nation, it is imperative to set aside lands which are still virtually untouched by man. Such lands are essential to preserve an ecological balance for nature and to provide an opportunity for solitude for human beings. Recognizing this need, Congress in 1964 passed the Wilderness Act which established procedures by which lands could be declared "Forever Wild."

Approximately nine million acres were defined as wilderness in the original law. In the more than six years since its enactment, only another million acres have been added. Review of possible wilderness lands has proceeded with discreditable slowness.

In accordance with the law, the President is required to submit an annual report to

Congress on the wilderness program with his recommendations for the inclusion of additional areas. This week Mr. Nixon proposed adding fourteen areas. He also resubmitted proposals on which Congress failed to act last year.

Despite the fanfare of a White House presentation to launch this message, the President's recommendations are relatively modest. Six of the fourteen new proposals are for areas of less than 5,000 acres each. The old and new recommendations total only three million acres.

Secretary of the Interior Morton cites several sources of opposition to the designation of wilderness areas including local governments fearful of losing part of their tax base, hunters who are barred from such areas, and mining and timber companies. This list omits perhaps the most powerful opponents—the higher-level Federal bureaucrats. Once a stretch of land is classified as wilderness, these officials lose their administrative power to decide its fate.

Acknowledging that the evaluation process is seriously behind schedule, Secretary Morton declares that he has Presidential backing for a speed-up. If past performance is any guide, the wilderness program will need all the White House support it can get. Indeed, President Nixon is likely to find that additional executive action is necessary if his Administration is to lead the way toward the comprehensive wilderness system envisaged in the 1964 law.

Meanwhile, Representative John Saylor of Pennsylvania, the ranking minority member of the House Interior Committee, has introduced a bill to classify several major areas in the national forests as de facto wilderness to protect them from logging and development until the Forest Service reaches a judgment on their status. Significantly, President Nixon's fourteen proposed wilderness areas are in national parks, monuments and wildlife refuges but none is in a national forest. Yet the forests contain some of the purest and most beautiful wilderness and are subjected to probably the greatest economic pressure. If they are not to fall victim to logging, road-building and other development while bureaucratic torpor prevails, Congress must give them interim protection by passing the Saylor bill. In fact, the economic pressures on all the public lands are so powerful that other initiatives are needed from the President as well as Congress to save the vanishing wilderness.

#### KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS—THEIR WORTHWHILE ENDEAVORS

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, we have many fine organizations in New York State which concern themselves with projects deserving of public recognition. Among these is Knights of Columbus, which is presently committed to the fight against drug abuse, a problem which is endangering communities across the Nation.

In cooperation with the State narcotics addiction control commission, Knights of Columbus is sponsoring an educational program called SPAN, aimed at heightening the awareness of both parents and students to this menace.

Governor Rockefeller, recognizing the tremendous value of this commitment, paid tribute to Knights of Columbus in

proclaiming the month of May 1971, as Drug Abuse Prevention Month in New York State. I think it is fitting that his proclamation be included in the RECORD at this time:

**PROCLAMATION**

The abuse of drugs today threatens to destroy the very fiber of American character and, along with it, the American future.

While people of all ages are affected by this menace, drug abuse among the young is especially tragic.

Drug abuse is a complex problem which requires vigorous action by public and private agencies alike. The State of New York has been a pioneer in coming to grips with this problem through programs of prevention, law enforcement, and addict treatment.

Many citizen groups are also deeply committed to help.

Among these is the Knights of Columbus, which is cooperating with the State Narcotics Addiction Control Commission in sponsoring an education program called "SPAN," or Students and Parents Against Narcotics. The Knights of Columbus hopes to bring this program to communities throughout our state and to enlist the aid of other fraternal and civic organizations in the promotion of this most worthwhile program.

It is fitting that recognition be given to the Knights of Columbus and to all other public-spirited citizens and organizations engaged in the battle against drug abuse.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the month of May, 1971, as Drug Abuse Prevention Month in New York State.

**TELL IT AS IT IS**

**HON. JOHN E. HUNT**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 26, 1971*

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, on May 20, 1971, Congressman Koch extended his remarks to again call attention to a proposed bill (H.R. 854) which he also has introduced under about 10 other numbers in this Congress. The gentleman from New York fears the Government is building a mountain of dosiers filled with erroneous, misleading, and false information, and he suggests every person mentioned in Government files should have a chance to review the records and make corrections he feels necessary.

After reading the gentleman's comments I began to realize what he might mean when he refers to erroneous information being made a matter of record. Our colleague stated, in placing an article from New York Times of May 19, 1971, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that "It reports the alleged use of the Boy Scouts of America by the FBI as informers." The article he placed in the RECORD does no such thing, but this is a typical example of the type of erroneous and misleading statements about the FBI we are hearing all too often on the floor of this House.

Apparently, neither the Congressman nor the New York Times is troubled by any moral issue in using or publicizing documents stolen from the FBI. And if that were not bad enough, each distorts the contents to suit his own purpose. I doubt if our colleague would knowingly

ride in a stolen automobile, but he is apparently willing, for the sake of publicizing his proposed legislation, to use any vehicle, even the pages of documents obtained through burglary of U.S. Government space.

But most significant is the fact that our colleague has done exactly what he claims so many others are doing. He has set forth and made a matter of permanent record a completely erroneous statement.

As I said, the New York Times article does not state the FBI is using Boy Scouts as informers. It reports in some detail the fact that a stolen FBI document had commented favorably about a Rochester, N.Y., program—not an FBI program—to enlist Boy Scouts to report to the proper authorities matters which might help reduce the crime problem or which might affect public safety. The article indicates that at a 1969 Scout rally the Boy Scouts received a pamphlet suggesting 60 signs of trouble that they should report. These included such things as faulty traffic signs, blown-out street lights, fires, youngsters playing with matches, trees blown down, flooded viaducts, suspicious strangers in neighbors' homes and suspicious stranger loitering about schools.

It seems to me that this is the sort of information any citizen should report to the police. If we have reached the stage that telling the proper authorities of such matters makes one an informant then I suggest our Nation is indeed in serious trouble. To report such information is purely and simply a matter of good citizenship and, after all, teaching citizenship is a very important part of the Scouting program.

In spite of much that has been said, in our free and open society law enforcement agencies can do an effective job only with citizen cooperation. It is impossible for the police to be everywhere and know personally of every law violation. As a former member of the New Jersey State Police I know that in this country we are most fortunate that the vast majority of our citizens are law-abiding people who respect law enforcement and call upon them for assistance or to report dangerous situations when the facts require it. This surely does not make the average citizen an informer and the implication in the statement from the gentleman from New York is grossly unfair to the FBI, to the police, to the Boy Scouts, and to everyone who believes in fulfilling what is generally recognized as a very basic and fundamental civic responsibility.

Indeed, numerous organizations, both within and outside of our Government, have recognized and urged citizen cooperation and involvement in the law enforcement process. It would seem that this involvement, whether by adults or by young people of Boy Scout age, is both desirable and to be encouraged rather than ridiculed. As an example of what other organizations have done, I would like to place in the RECORD at this point the canons of American citizenship adopted and disseminated widely by the American Bar Association:

**CANONS OF AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP**

Every American citizen should recognize the duty to:

1. Uphold the laws of the United States, and the states and communities.
2. Defend our country from invasion and our government from overthrow by force, violence, or subversion.
3. Encourage respect for law and order and insist upon solutions of differences and grievances by processes of law and never by resort to violence or other unlawful means.
4. Support those charged with the enforcement and administration of our laws; voluntarily act as a witness and serve as a juror.
5. Harbor no prejudice against anyone because of race, religion or national origin.
6. Maintain pride in family, heritage and church as well as in community, state and nation.
7. Keep informed on issues and candidates, and vote in every election.
8. Respect the rights and opinions of others.
9. Participate in religious, charitable, civic, educational or other activities to promote the welfare of the community.
10. Acknowledge that 'responsibilities' are as important as 'rights' in the preservation of freedom and justice.

**OUTSTANDING ROTC PROGRAM AT TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY, LUBBOCK, TEX.**

**HON. GEORGE H. MAHON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 26, 1971*

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, as one who has given solid support through the years to the Reserve Officer Training Corps programs in the colleges of the country, I am especially proud of Texas Tech University in Lubbock, Tex., my hometown, for the outstanding job it is doing to maintain a strong ROTC program on its campus.

I would like to take special note of the fact that the 820th Air Force ROTC detachment at Tech was selected to receive the Outstanding Unit Award for exceptionally meritorious service. Out of 170 Air Force ROTC units in the Nation, Tech's program was one of only five selected to receive the outstanding unit awards this year.

The following citation accompanied the presentation of the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award to Texas Tech's ROTC Detachment 820:

**CITATION TO ACCOMPANY THE AWARD OF THE AIR FORCE OUTSTANDING UNIT AWARD TO AIR FORCE ROTC DETACHMENT 820, TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY**

Air Force ROTC Detachment 820 distinguished itself by exceptionally meritorious service of University, regional national and international significance during the period 30 September 1968 to 30 September 1970. Throughout this period Air Force ROTC Detachment 820 managed all available resources and accomplished outstanding pursuits of the Air Force ROTC mission—to select, motivate, educate and commission career oriented Second Lieutenants in response to Air Force requirements. Success of these enthusiastic and untiring efforts was achieved through a comprehensive University, community, national and international relations program, expanded and personal-

ized recruiting and retention program, an integrated education and Corps Training plan, extremely ambitious extracurricular and motivational activities, and a vastly improved academic stature and faculty integration within Texas Tech University. This combination produced Second Lieutenants of the highest quality with versatile backgrounds and strong dedication toward an Air Force Career. The outstanding initiative, resourcefulness and distinctive accomplishments of Air Force ROTC Detachment 820 reflect great credit on the detachment, Air University and the United States Air Force.

MEETING OF BOARD OF VISITORS  
TO THE U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY  
1971

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the annual meeting of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy was held at the Academy, April 30 and May 1, 1971. The Board is generally briefed by the Superintendent as the first order of business. I include the presentation made by Maj. Gen. William Knowlton, Superintendent of the Academy:

SUPERINTENDENT'S REMARKS, BOARD OF  
VISITORS BRIEFING

During the next day and a half, we shall endeavor to focus in on the current operations of the Military Academy, stressing those items which are of most concern to us and to the Department of the Army.

I am sure that you noticed while looking over the itinerary that you will receive a number of other briefings today. Therefore, I shall cover only the highlights of our programs, the details of which you will receive at subsequent briefings.

I think it important that you keep in mind the mission of the Military Academy as it will help you in your final assessment of our operation.

SLIDE 1

Simply stated our mission is to *train and educate* cadets to become career officers. It means that we must prepare them to become second lieutenants with the knowledge and capacity to progress upwards through positions of greater responsibility.

SLIDE 2

Inherent in this mission are several objectives—the military, mental, moral, and physical development of each cadet—and each receives emphasis.

Each cadet is required to meet the same standards of conduct, of discipline and of academic performance. They are required to participate and be proficient in basic physical training and in either intramural athletics or the intercollegiate program. Last but not least, each cadet accepts as his own, the same high standards of integrity and honesty.

With our ultimate goals in mind, let us first look at the instruction portion of the mission.

In the academic area, the past year has been largely one of consolidation. During the decade of the sixties, we made great strides in our academic program, which have resulted in a more flexible curriculum, a growing faculty, the advent of a modest research program, and several organizational shifts. The majority of these shifts are near completion, and thus this year has afforded us our first chance to view the combined effect of these measures. As we have watched

them through this year, their success has been apparent. I must point out, however, that even though it has been a year of relative stability, it has not been without a continuing self-review. Several curricular studies have been completed or are underway at this time, and we have continued with our plan of gradually implementing the approved recommendations of the Faculty Review Board.

That Board, appointed by the former Chief of Staff of the Army, General Johnson, sought to review our faculty composition and structure with a view toward recommending any changes it felt necessary or desirable. It found that we must constantly seek to adhere to the highest standards of the educational community; that some departures from normal personnel administrative procedures may be desirable to meet those standards; that the tenure component of the faculty should be increased; and that every effort should be made to assure that outstanding officers continue to be assigned to the Academy. With regard to these recommendations—with which we fully concur—we have moved forward in a phased implementation. The number of our appointed tenure associate professors has now risen to thirty-three. A committee is now meeting to select one, or possibly two, more. These especially selected officers provide us with greater continuity as they are assigned permanently to the Academy until their retirement with thirty years of service. When appointed, they generally have had fifteen years of service in the line, in graduate school, and as instructors, and so bring a wealth of valuable experience to the faculty. We encourage these officers to remain abreast of developments in the Army, and through visits to the field and Army schools they have continued to remain extremely aware of current theoretical and practical changes. In this vein, the fellowship program with the Army War College for the tenure faculty, now in its first year, is proving eminently successful. In addition, our modest Faculty Research Program—which now includes some nine participants—is proving to be most stimulating to the cadets and to the faculty, and beneficial in our relations with other educational institutions.

In the area of curricular studies, one committee was appointed to review the role of foreign language study at the Military Academy. After an extensive analysis, the committee concluded that the foreign language courses as offered at present are both fundamental to the future Army officers' educational requirements and responsible to foreseeable needs. We now permit qualified cadets to validate a foreign language. Two committee studies are presently underway: one is directed at an analysis of the load carried by cadets—in all aspects of their education and training at the Academy—and will offer its conclusions later this year. The second committee is conducting a study complementing the first: the sequencing of academic courses in the four year program, with the aim of seeking any changes which may prove to be desirable. This report is also expected this summer.

As a result of a study of the management science/operations research discipline completed last year, a new elective field in Management was created. It comprises courses encompassing both the engineering and socio-economic approaches to this area, and is interdisciplinary in nature. Some 5% of the First and Second Classes have enrolled in this field this year.

The Academy is now in the second academic year in which cadets have been permitted to concentrate their eight elective course choices in an area of their particular interest or aptitude. The results of the program are extremely gratifying, allowing the cadet an experience in making course selections, as well as affording him the opportunity to gain some degree of specialization in

an area of his particular interest. It is a modest program, and sufficiently flexible that no restrictions are placed on cadet choice. We have sought to keep our curriculum broadly-based, feeling that the future Army officer must have an equally firm grasp of the social sciences and humanities as he must of the sciences. Based on our successful experience in this program, thirteen new selective courses were developed and approved for implementation during the next academic year. These courses will bring the total number of electives to 150, and thus further insure that a reasonable breadth of course choices will be available for cadet selection.

General Jannarone will cover all of these areas, and more, in greater detail during his talk with you.

In the critical areas of leadership development, military training, physical training and motivation, the Department of Tactics continues to review its programs in light of the ever changing social environment from which we receive our cadets. While our values remain constant and the goals of these programs are unchanged, the methods of achieving and inculcating these values must change to remain effective and to prepare our graduates properly to face conditions in our Army today. The new Fourth Class System and the Yearling Sponsor Program continue to spark progress in the motivational area; and we have confidence that revisions to the Military Training Program, especially the introduction of duty-time airborne training for cadets, will be important additions. Airborne training for cadets has been conducted in former years but always on a leave-time basis. The Class of '73 has been offered a duty-time program this coming summer and has responded enthusiastically. More than 94 percent of the Class volunteered for airborne training. Eleven of the non-volunteers are already airborne qualified, and some of the rest are physically disqualified.

In addition to the Yearling Sponsor and Duty-Time Airborne Programs, the Recent Graduate Returnee Program and the Senior Officer Visit Program are specifically aimed at career motivation. In the Recent Graduate Returnee program, young officers, who have graduated in the last 2-3 years, return to discuss with cadets the problems and challenges facing the junior leader in our Army today; in the Senior Officer Visit program our senior Generals discuss frankly the most controversial and sensitive issues facing our Army and the Nation. From the quality and quantity of questions asked of our recent graduates and senior officers, both programs appear to be successful.

In an effort to keep abreast of contemporary problems within the Corps and to give the cadets a further voice in the formulation of major policy decisions, the Commandant has formed two councils to advise him in the area of drug abuse education and in human relations. The Alcohol and Drug Dependency Intervention Council or ADDIC and the Human Relations Council are advisory bodies composed of both cadets and officers designed to review and recommend certain curriculum input in each area and to present a forum where all aspects of contemporary problems can be aired. The fact that we have encountered no major problems in either of these sensitive areas is indicative of the success of the councils to date. You will be briefed further on both these areas by the Commandant.

The 1971-1972 academic year will see the first twelve tactical officers who were selected to attend Graduate School for their masters degrees in conjunction with the assignment as Company Tactical Officers. As a direct result of a great deal of effort and support at all levels, we now have a total of 24 officer spaces validated for graduate school for these critical positions. The provision of officers educated in counseling, psychology and the management of personnel cannot help but



benefit the cadets, who are influenced greatly by their continuous contact with their Company Tactical Officers.

I have thus far touched on recent changes in our military training program and some of our attempts at increasing cadet motivation. I would now like to discuss our Physical Education facilities. In our Physical Education Program we seek to develop physical skills, mental health, and efficiency, and desirable character traits—as well as to provide indoctrination in recreational sports to insure a physically active career. The proposed alterations to the gymnasium and the construction of the Cadet Athletic Center are sorely needed. The scope of the athletic program and the number of cadets engaged in this program have increased greatly during the past few years, while facilities to accommodate these activities have not kept pace. Colonel Anhart and Cadet McDonald will outline in detail the breadth of our athletic program during your visit to the Commandant's office. I am sure their comments will be borne out by your own observations of the physical activity of cadets.

I want to address you briefly on the Cadet Honor Code and System. Each cadet accepts as his own the Honor System, which embodies the highest standards of honesty and integrity. As you well know, this topic is one that has received considerable adverse and, I should add, distorted publicity from our news media. The Honor System is the wellspring of all that we strive for at the Academy and our cadets fully understand the importance of holding firmly to a system that will never be compromised or diluted in order to appease the whims of those who do not—and perhaps will never—fully comprehend its meaning or purpose. You will be briefed in greater detail on this subject by Cadet Pat Finnegan, Chairman of the Cadet Honor Committee, when you visit with the Commandant of Cadets.

I would like to digress from my script for a moment to discuss the Honor Code and the Honor System, by mentioning a specific case. My reason for talking about this case is that Congressman Anderson became involved in it. In a form letter to many who wrote him, he stated that he intended to ask the Board of Visitors to re-examine the Honor Code at West Point which he found archaic. The best description of Mr. Anderson's views were contained in last Sunday's New York Times, in an article about him in the Magazine Section. One word in the article underlies the difference between our views. The article said:

"Anderson recalled a young man he had appointed to the Military Academy who was expelled after turning himself in for having *inadvertently* told an upperclassman that he had shined his shoes the previous evening rather than several days earlier. The honor code had been violated."

In actuality, the young man lied *deliberately* in order to avoid the minor punishment for not shining his shoes and in full knowledge that the act was dishonest. He was offered legal counsel and the option of a Board of Officers once the Honor Committee had unanimously found him guilty. He refused the lawyer and the Board of Officers, stating that he wished to resign. His resignation was accepted. The two key points are that the offense was not inadvertent, but deliberate; the young man was not expelled, but resigned.

The other night I talked to the Second Class for an hour and a half. The last half hour I leaned heavily on the subjects of honor, integrity and morality. They are going to be next year's First Class, and the response was terrific. In the course of that talk I put on a slide with a quote from Newton D. Baker that is half a century old:

"Men may be inexact or even untruthful in ordinary matters and suffer as a consequence

only the disesteem of their associates or the inconvenience of unfavorable litigation; but the inexact or untruthful soldier trifles with the lives of fellow men and with the honor of his government. It is therefore no matter of pride but rather a stern disciplinary necessity that makes West Point require of her students a character of trustworthiness that knows no evasions."

The quote may be fifty years old, but I do not think we can improve upon it. Here is a quote from last month which is a modern version of the importance of this subject. General Westmoreland said:

"I am convinced that the Army can survive almost anything except a lack of personal integrity among its leaders. I have made it a personal goal of mine to press home to every leader in the Army—from senior general down to the newest corporal—the need for absolute honesty and morality in everything they do."

At the same time we must acknowledge that today's cadets come from a society in which many of the important terms are believed to be "quaint." These words are not as often used in the home, in the schools, and in the church (if they go to church). For that reason, the Cadet Honor Committee has a much tougher educational job than in our day. A member of this year's First Class Honor Committee said to me, "We did a good job of enforcement this year, but we should have spent more time on education." I want to tell you that next year's Honor Committee has already been working very diligently under its chairman, who has spent several hours with me at his request. That Committee intends to do a better job on education. They are now producing six television films for our internal television system here; so that the instruction given next year's Plebes will be of uniform quality and so that there will be no question as to what the instruction said.

In summary, the Cadet Honor Committee faces problems in education and understanding which were unknown to us. The cadets in general support the Code very strongly. The attacks of the last year have served to unify the Corps behind the Honor Code, rather than to dilute its importance.

Two significant events relating to the expansion program have occurred since the Board last met. First, a contract for construction of the Cadet Activities Center was awarded on 18 December 1970. Because the low bid received last May exceeded the appropriated funds by a considerable sum, an additional \$10.7 million had to be authorized by Congress prior to award of this contract. Construction began in January and is scheduled for completion in March 1974.

Secondly, the USMA Planning Advisory Board was established in December to provide advice and recommendations to Department of the Army concerning the Academy's construction program. The general attitude of the Board has been a desire to help USMA obtain facilities which the Board determines to be valid requirements, and to reestablish rapport between the agencies responsible for West Point construction and the Congress. The Board has recommended hiring a prominent architectural firm to conduct a comprehensive review of the West Point Master Plan and all outstanding expansion related requirements. Plans for this study are now being formulated.

Colonel Broshous, Director of the Expansion Planning and Control Office, will give you a detailed status report and discussion of the expansion program in his briefing this afternoon.

Remaining in the facilities area for a moment—the Department of the Army has been most generous in providing manpower and funds to support the increasing operational requirements as new facilities are completed and we request your support in recommend-

ing to the Department of the Army that this policy be continued. However, one area that has lagged in recent years is the maintenance and repair of many of the older buildings on the post. A lack of funds has resulted in a backlog in this area of essential maintenance approaching 5 million dollars. Your assistance is requested in assuring that funds are made available on an annual basis to reduce this sizeable maintenance backlog.

Concerning the Academy's Admissions Programs, I would like to touch briefly upon each of the three recommendations made by the Board of Visitors last year. The first was "That the current intensification of the admissions effort be continued." We were not able to maintain the momentum of the previous year because of unexpected losses in the professional forces working on our behalf in admissions. However, we have made substantial gains in the computer assisted admissions area and in our publications. Resources for use next year in the admissions area will be at the highest level and we do expect commensurate improvements in our ability to bring the name of West Point before the parents and candidates and to handle the increased level of interest expected next year.

The second recommendation of the Board was "That the Academy continue its efforts to assist Members of Congress in quality-ranking applicants for admission"; this has been acted upon with excellent results. The interest generated by this attempt on our part to communicate useful data to each Congressional Office has also resulted in increased participation by Congressional staff assistants in our Educator Visit Program which we feel goes a long way toward achieving the best possible working relationship with each Congressional Office.

The third recommendation read "That the Academy continue to work towards beneficial standardization of Congressional applicant procedures." We again have published an update of the Congressional Guide for USMA Admissions and will be discussing this publication with every Congressional Office during the coming few weeks. This publication, as you know, gives to the Congressional Office our recommendations which, if followed, will do much toward standardizing procedures throughout the country.

Just a brief word on the admissions status, more of which you will get during the admissions briefing. Last year, as perhaps you recall, West Point had 6003 candidates which was the largest number in the history of the Academy. Although this year our candidate population is down slightly, the total of 5500 plus will be the second largest number of candidates in our history. From this number of candidates, we have already selected a class of unusual strength and, for this, much of the credit must go to the efforts of the Congress.

The time has come when we must give serious consideration to a reevaluation of the present five-year service obligation for our graduates. The Commandant of Cadets raised this subject before this board last year citing that the five-year obligation was "a factor which operated to reduce motivation towards completion of the Academy Program and as a deterrent to the acceptance of an appointment" to the Academy.

There are many factors which cause us to recommend a reduction of this obligation. Return to peacetime environment, the anti-military atmosphere which prevails and the changing image of the Army are some of the most salient factors.

At this point we are unable to evaluate accurately the impact of all of these factors on our admission program, cadet motivation efforts and officer retention. However, the five-year obligation appears to be one of the influencing factors and one on which we can take positive action. The others are less tan-

gible. For example, the psychological impact on some cadets and junior officers of the five year obligation is that it is of such duration that it presents a ring of unreasonableness or a feeling of indentured federal service. Actually none of these factors have been quantified by cold-hard statistics.

Another factor is that the nation-wide demand for quality students is thinning the ranks of qualified candidates from which we can choose. The competition is offering some attractive incentives.

For example, the four-year ROTC Scholarship Program at a college of their choice provides a healthy monthly stipend, a free education and only a four-year obligation. Pending legislative proposals, if enacted, will make the ROTC Program even more attractive and competitive. Further, the ever expanding state university system and the student grant-in-aid program which have increased since 1964 when the five year obligation was enacted, provide opportunities for an excellent education with little or no obligation or commitment on the part of the recipient. Hence, in this era of change and the increasing competition for high caliber young men we believe that we must once again propose a four-year service obligation to maintain our competitive program.

We believe that one year of obligated service for each year of schooling is logical and equitable for both the individual and the Army alike. If the Army cannot motivate a youngster during his four years at West Point and during the early years of his service, then it seems to me that the fifth year is of little value to either the man or the Army.

We would like your support for this change, or your comments on it.

Last fall, the House Appropriations Committee requested the Secretary of Defense to make a comprehensive evaluation of the staffing requirements of the three service academies. We were advised recently that the Committee had concluded that our December 1970 staffing level is adequate for our mission of instructing and training the Corps of Cadets through expansion. If the restrictions on our manpower requirements which these conclusions imply are accepted formally, the Academy will be sorely pressed to fulfill its vital roles as an academic institution, a military installation, an Army community, and a national historic landmark. In this regard, I would like to advise the Board of the following conditions and seek your advice and assistance.

The staffing data submitted to the Committee did not specify any future needs. Further, and even more meaningful, the Department of the Army on-site evaluation of our manpower requirements conducted in January/February of this year recognized our then current need as being 285 spaces (55 officer, 108 EM, and 122 civilians) greater than what appears to be the OASD Committee recommendation. It should be noted that even this assessment did not provide for further expansion requirements. Acceptance of the staffing levels recommended by the OASD Committee will lock in the Academy with little room to maneuver. With incremental build-ups of the Corps strength still pending, and with acceptance of new and expanded physical facilities just on the horizon, the Academy must be afforded the opportunity to update its manpower requirements.

A precise staffing ratio such as the 1:1 (staff/cadet) implied by the House Committee cannot be applied at West Point. Consideration must be given to changes in staffing requirements which result from the assumption of greater responsibility for area support (commissary, hospital, etc.) stemming from base closures and an expanding military community.

A summary sheet is available for you should you desire it. This sheet illustrates our original manpower requirements for the Expansion Program; our current strength; our re-

quirements as evaluated by the Department of the Army; and what we project as additional needs through FY 1973. I feel that the basic Expansion Plan projections were well conceived; and am proud that the current projections for FY 1973 include fewer manpower resources than had been anticipated at the outset of our expansion effort. We are satisfied that Department of the Army recognized the validity of our needs, but concerned that the OASD Committee's recommended staffing could restrict our mission capability. Certainly, the shortfall of 76 officer, 110 enlisted and 199 civilian spaces depicted on our summary sheet poses a serious problem for the Academy. Above all we must have sufficient instructors. The requirement is directly proportioned to the strength of the Corps and is based on an accepted instructor to cadet ratio and the demands of the curriculum.

If I may digress again, I might explain our view of the OSD study. If I draw comparisons with the other service academies, the purpose is not to denigrate them, but to explain our problem comparatively. While Annapolis has been at a strength of 4417 for some years, and the Air Force Academy has essentially completed its expansion, we have not yet completed the process. Our requirements are becoming greater, not lesser. We also have a more favorable student-teacher ratio in the classroom than the other two academies. For budgetary reasons, both the other two major service academies have expanded the number of cadets assigned to each teacher. We have not. In a day when many students complain about the impersonal nature of education in America, we feel that the close association between the teacher and the student made possible at West Point has both inspirational and motivational value. I have taught in the classrooms at West Point and know how well I got to know each of my cadet students. I like to think I had an influence on their development by virtue of this close contact.

When Dr. Benson, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Education visited West Point for less than a day, it appeared as though he had made up his mind before his visit that our classes should be larger. Yet, at the same time that he told me our classes were too small, he asked why we were more effective than the other two academies in the retention of cadets. I believe there is a very definite link between the close contact which our small classes provide and the retention rate of cadets at West Point. Our small classes have been traditional since the days of Sylvanus Thayer. They are a hallmark of West Point. We ask your support for a continuation of this important policy.

The operation of West Point as a military installation, educational institution and national showplace is an expensive venture. We realize this and do our best to exact the greatest value from every dollar spent. The Department of the Army has in turn, provided support for our highly essential resource requirements. In this regard and in view of the increasingly stringent constrictions being imposed on funding programs, request this Board recommend that the Department of the Army continue to provide for the increasing operational and maintenance costs of the Academy and support its manpower requirements.

And now I would like to depart from my script to mention a facet of today's America which bothers me very much, and which I presume bothers you. This is the appearance on nationwide television, or before the Committee of Congressman Dellums, of graduates and former cadets who traffic in the name of West Point and use it to denigrate the Nation and the Army. There are about 20 of these who had connection with West Point, but every service academy has a similar group. Since we have over 20,000 living graduates, this small group of less than 20 makes

up less than one-tenth of one percent. I suppose we could say that a 99.9 percent record of success is good, and that we should not worry about the one-tenth of one percent. However, with the access of modern television, this small group wields an influence in America far beyond its numbers.

There are three kinds of people in this group. The first are those who attended West Point very briefly and who left. Such a man is Jan Barry Crum, who has written letters and articles in the New York Times and who appeared on the six hour TV spectacular on war crimes. He alleges to have seen crimes and atrocities when he served in Vietnam.

The fact is that he served in Vietnam in about 1963 as a radio repairman on an airfield. This was in the days before U.S. troop involvement, before airfields came under any sort of attack, and when military dependents lived with their families in Vietnam. While he won a Commendation Medal for his radio repair work, he just was not in a position or a time frame to see the sort of thing which he alleges.

His appearance at West Point was very brief. He entered in July 1964 and started his resignation from West Point in late September 1964, after one month of Plebe academics. Although his letters to The New York Times say that he left West Point because of the immorality of Vietnam, there is no indication of that view in his resignation. Instead, it stated that he believed his career lay in the writing of creative fiction rather than the military. I might suggest that perhaps he has already entered on this career. This one month exposure to Plebe academics is the background from which he testifies as to the content or lack thereof in the West Point curriculum.

The Freedom of Information Act has led us to a decision not to release the factual information on Crum and others in this first group. We have few enough personal records exempt from public attack so that we need to preserve the protection of medical records and efficiency-report type of files. Hence, despite the attractiveness of lashing back at those like Crum who misrepresent their background, the Army has decided that the risks of engaging in counterattack outweigh the advantages.

The second type of man who traffics in the name of West Point is exemplified by Louis Font. During war, not all young men who come to West Point do so from a desire to serve. In any large group there are a few who enter in the hopes of an uninterrupted education and of a war that will be over when they graduate. Louis Font entered in 1964 in the same class as Jan Crum. When he graduated in 1968, the war was still going on. He applied, as a member of the top five percent of his class, for immediate graduate schooling. (The top five percent of a given class is eligible to go directly to graduate school. We discourage this, considering that a few years of troop duty make them better soldiers and better scholars. Four or five still go each year.) At the end of the first of his two years of graduate school, Louis Font contacted the ACLU and began organizing his departure from the Army as a conscientious objector. In February of 1970 he filed application, a few months before graduation from his advanced schooling at Harvard. He first claimed conscientious objection to only the Vietnam War. When this was ruled as insufficient grounds, he shifted his stance to being against all wars. Recently, he has become even more irrational in some of the charges which he has filed and press conferences which he has held.

We can do and have done something with this kind of individual. Louis Font's file contained clear indications from his peers that they thought he would "ride the education gravy train" and then try not to repay in service. Accordingly, in arriving here last spring, I set up a committee—including a

member of the Commandant's staff—to interview all those who wished to go directly to graduate school. Each is interrogated at length on his motivation, and the results of the file are known to the board. Each is asked if he has any hesitation at all about a normal career in a combat arm in the Army. Each is also told that if such hesitations come to him later, he should withdraw from the education immediately. The results of this program have been very good, and we should not have the case of another Font appearing at graduate school.

Within West Point we have changed our philosophy somewhat. Formerly, we did our best to encourage cadets who were wavering to remain at West Point. Now, when a young man seems to have serious doubts about the military as a career and does not seem to have the type of character we desire in the Army, we encourage his departure. Two or three have left this year under those circumstances.

As a final step, we have screened the incoming candidates for signs of disaffection. We may need your support in this. Recently, the Academic Board turned down a young man with excellent academic and athletic qualifications. However, the file indicated that he refused to stand for the National Anthem. It was the opinion of the Academic Board that we did not need this kind of young man at West Point. While we might convert him to a more patriotic stance, there

are enough good young men in America who are already patriotic that we do not need to take this risk.

The third kind of young man trafficking in the West Point name make up a more difficult category. There are only one or two of them. They were good cadets and started off as good officers in combat with decorations for bravery. In each case there seems to have occurred some searing experience which resulted in alienation. Such a case is Laughlin in the Class of 1965. He has recently appeared before Representative Dellum to denounce one or two of his commanders in Vietnam. At West Point, we just do not have the information to assess the reasons for this sort of a case. One hunch is that the cause is peer pressure in the intellectual community. In one or two other cases we have found the female of the species more deadly than the male, and have found young men who fell under the influence of young ladies of liberal persuasion. I am sure that the Department of the Army is analyzing these cases.

As I said at the beginning, we should not lose our perspective on this small group. They do make up less than one-tenth of one percent. However, the damage they do is extensive. We all hope that the actions we all hope that the actions we are taking will reduce this contingent to zero.

Thank you again for taking the time to come to West Point for this important mission.

U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS—FULL EXPANSION—FISCAL YEAR 1973

	Officer	Enlisted men	Civilian	Total
USMA plan for expansion "Gray Book" (developed to implement Public Law 88-276 which increased Corps strength from 2,529 to 4,417)	850	1,050	2,892	4,792
Current DA authorization fiscal year 1971 (as of June 30, 1971)	817	967	2,541	4,325
Fiscal year 1971 requirement as recognized by D/Army MPR utilization survey, February 1971	862	1,056	2,662	4,580
USMA fiscal year 1972 requirements	15	2	74	89
USMA fiscal year 1973 requirements	6	2	3	11
Full expansion, fiscal year 1973	883	1,058	2,739	4,680
Optimum USMA staffing as assumed from advance advice on OSD Drake committee report on service academy manning comparisons	807	948	2,540	4,295
Shortfall	76	110	199	385

<sup>1</sup> Does not include resources for support of Stewart Field.

REMARKS OF HON. GEORGE I. BLOOM DELIVERED TO THE 38TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE SOUTHEASTERN ELECTRIC EXCHANGE

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the timely remarks delivered to the 38th Annual Conference of the Southeastern Electric Exchange meeting on March 31, 1971, by the Honorable George I. Bloom, chairman of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission and president of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners.

Mr. Bloom, a long-time friend, is an outstanding public servant in a position of authority and responsibility. In addition, as evidenced by his remarks, he is an American deeply concerned about the protection of our environment. His suggestions regarding more unified, in-depth environmental studies prior to construction of new power facilities are sincere and poignant.

He is optimistic about the progress of technology in his field, but his comments are aptly laced with caution in regard to the unrestricted use of resources.

I believe my distinguished colleagues will find Mr. Bloom's address of considerable interest and outstanding merit:

STATEMENT BY HON. GEORGE I. BLOOM

Mr. President, members of the Exchange, and guests, as we meet here today, in beautiful Boca Raton, in this peaceful setting, I am sure that we are all concerned and mindful of the fact, that we are living in a troubled United States, in a troubled world. We are living in a country that hardly resembles the one that our forefathers bequeathed to us.

America! It was once fired by hope, but now so many are permeated with despair. It was once guided by confidence, but now so many are filled with doubt.

And, indeed, the people are increasingly questioning the government's compassion; its concern and ability to cope with our national and local problems—to carry out the great mission, that we have felt that America was destined to achieve. I do not have to enumerate all of the symptoms and syndromes—indicating a loss of patriotism and love of country; a loss of faith in our religious principles; a loss of faith in the church; a deterioration in the moral fabric of the people—not only in our country, but throughout the world.

While all of us have these complex con-

cerns to face, those of you in the electric utility business, rendering great service to the people of America, have your own very special and specific problems.

We, as regulators, also have our problems. And, some of the difficulties you are experiencing, run parallel with the problems of the regulators. So, the regulators and the electric utility interests have some common concerns, and I am sure we will continue to work together, to find a solution to these problems in the public interest. When your program chairman, Mr. Harris, invited me to appear before you today, he suggested that I deal with this question: "In the light of clamor for more government voice in energy policy, where should such new powers reside, and how far should they reach?"

At the outset, I express the conviction, that the extent to which government has a voice in energy policy, should not be determined upon the basis of clamor for it.

Clamor—the amount of noise generated for a proposal—is hardly an accurate measure of the proposal's wisdom. In fact, clamor is a capricious and inconsistent thing, for example, ever since the Con Edison blackout of 1965, there has been much clamor for insurance against a recurrence; and there has been just as much clamor against the construction of the generating stations needed to provide that insurance.

One of the great difficulties of our time, is that in many instances government pays too much attention to the clamor, and becomes addicted to what I shall call the quote "instant cure" unquote. The instant cure approach sees only the immediate problem, and acts to solve it, without recognizing that the solution immediately or eventually, creates other problems of equal or even greater magnitude.

One of the areas in which the instant cure approach is being applied today, and which particularly concerns the electric industry, is environmental control.

Pollution of the environment—the creation of waste materials that cannot be recycled into something useful—has been with us always, and is an unavoidable incident of human existence.

But within the last five years or so, the term "environmental pollution" has become a cause celebre, and millions of words have been spoken and written about it; political careers are being built upon it; and innumerable bills against it, have been introduced in our Federal and State legislatures. From the noise being made about it, one would think that environmental pollution is a brand new threat, in the same way that sputnik loomed suddenly and without prior warning upon our horizon.

The nature of the noise being made over environmental pollution, is a demand for instant cure. If an automobile cannot be operated without creating exhaust gases, stop making automobiles. If electric energy cannot be generated without fossil fuel, without throwing sulphur dioxide into the atmosphere, then stop the use of fossil fuel. But under present day technology, that is possible only by the use of atomic reactors, and they in turn produce radioactive waste materials, that must be disposed of in some fashion. Very well, stop the use of such reactors. In my own state of Pennsylvania, there is a legislative proposal that would place a five-year moratorium on construction of atomic reactors.

The instant cure approach to environmental pollution, is so popular today, that if anyone dares to suggest a more careful diagnosis than the instant cure permits, he is placed in the same category as those—who oppose motherhood, the flag and the deity.

The sorriest defect of the instant cure approach, in environmental pollution as in everything else, is that it promises so much more than it produces. It has been made

into a kind of current fad, and when the instant cure fails to really cure, the public's attention will wane and turn away to something else. Thus, the very worthwhile cause of cleaning up the world in which we live, will falter because of public disillusionment with quack cures.

Our job—yours as electric company people and ours as regulators—is to do the sane and sensible things that can be done to clean up the environment and make it livable, and to keep on doing those things after the clamor has subsided, and the public has lost interest in the present crusade.

Let us lay down some standards—of what constitutes a sane and sensible approach, and apply them.

First, the extent to which government should have a voice in any matter—including the field of environmental control in the production of electric energy—depends upon whether that matter involves an important public interest, and whether that interest can be safeguarded or promoted only by governmental intervention.

I accept, as I am sure you do, the concept that cleanliness of the environment is a very important public interest. There are some who say that it is not a vital public interest—vital in the strict sense that our very lives depend on it—for there is considerable disagreement, in the scientific world, as to whether we are approaching the viable limits. But even if we were nowhere near those limits, we would still want a world of cleanliness and beauty, and to leave such a world to our children.

Can this important public interest be safeguarded or promoted by governmental intervention? I believe that the answer is yes, from many standpoints.

First, although you are here today as representatives of utility managements, the managements are responsible to boards of directors, and the boards of directors are very keenly interested as they should be, in the net per share. I am sure that as individuals, the board members are just as concerned as we are about the environment; but as board members, either they will produce the best possible net per share, or they will find themselves ex-board members. In short, they are not pollution-control-minded as board members, and cannot reasonably be expected to spend the stockholders' money for that purpose unless government intervenes to say "you must".

Second, improvement of the environment is going to cost a very large amount of money. Superficially, this money will be forthcoming from the corporations, which install the devices or pollution control, or from government. But ultimately—and this point the instant cure experts completely ignore—the only possible source of this money is the public, either as taxpayers, or as consumers of the goods produced by the corporations.

In your industry, there is no source of money for pollution control other than the ratepayers.

Certainly, you will obtain the capital funds for pollution control devices from investors; but the ratepayers must provide the return required to attract those investors, and pay off the capital obligations through depreciation charges.

There is no point in going into a long dissertation of why utility rates must be regulated. The significant aspect here is that they are regulated; and that governmental intervention is necessary, to assure that the rates do contain an ingredient for pollution control which is neither more nor less than is necessary, to provide proper return and amortization of capital. Regulation must recognize the monies expended and invested, by the electric industry in dealing with pollution, as well as other costs.

I now lay down another standard, that if governmental intervention is necessary, to the protection or promotion of some important

public interest, the power of government should be exercised, only after the problem affecting it has been clearly defined, and only after all of its possible solutions have been explored, not only from the standpoint of how well they solve the problem, but also from the standpoint of whether they create new ones.

Unless we use this approach—careful definition, and careful consideration of the consequences of various solutions—we are apt to get instant cure results, with their attendant problems of even greater magnitude.

The shortest clear definition of the problem confronting the electric industry and its regulators, is to find a sensible balance between two public needs. One of those needs is a clean environment. The other is electric energy.

In the present state of technology, at least, these needs are in conflict. The more we produce electric energy, the more we must also produce ashes, or sulphur dioxide, or atomic waste; and the more we must occupy the landscape, with generating stations and transmission lines. It is principally upon the construction of new generating stations and transmission lines, that the environmentalists have centered their attack.

We can, of course, moderate the impact of energy on the environment, by air pollution control devices, by cooling towers, by giving our generating stations, and transmission lines, the maximum possible sightliness. But the fact remains that there is an inverse relationship, between the quantity of electric energy produced and the quality of the environment.

Many people—including most of the instant cure experts—seem to be unaware of this relationship, for they assume that growing demands for electricity, can be provided despite the proposals for a halt in the construction of new facilities.

Other people—some of whom are responsible persons—are aware that reduction of pollution, necessarily entails reduction or elimination of growth of electric output, and are at least willing to consider paying that price. I shall comment later on this, but at this point, I would focus your attention upon the governmental mechanism employed, to maintain the reasonable balance between clean environment and energy supply.

I think it safe to say, that in most jurisdictions, that mechanism is nonexistent.

For example, in my native Pennsylvania, there are at least ten state agencies, each with jurisdiction over some aspect of environmental control; and in addition, local political subdivisions exercise environmental controls, through zoning restrictions, smoke control ordinances and the like.

Before ground may be broken for a new generating station, consents must be obtained from many—and sometimes all—of these agencies.

When it is considered that each such agency, has the single minded purpose of administering its own particular phase of environmental control, and when it is further considered, that a generating station cannot be built if any one of the agencies, whose consent is required, refuses that consent, it will be obvious that, at best, the construction of the station is subject to appreciable delay and at worst, it may be prevented altogether.

One of the best examples of this is the Branchburg-Whitpain line in the eastern part of my state—one of the most important power transmission links in America. Work on that line has been seriously delayed by area environmentalists, and an historical society.

They induced the former U.S. Interior Secretary to intervene in their behalf before our commission, and the council for preservation of historical sites, has been responsible for delaying completion of the line and withholding approval for the right to cross the Delaware River into New Jersey. An

alternate route has just been approved after two years delay.

The nature of the matter was well stated, in the report entitled "electric power and environment", issued last August by the energy policy staff, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President. It says:

"It is necessary, however, that a single agency empowered to carry out these functions, be established in each State or region of the Nation. The agency should assure that all legitimate environmental concerns, are satisfactorily resolved, and it must also assure, that once it grants such a certificate, construction can in fact proceed".

It is for the reason expressed in that quotation, that I commend to your attention, and urge your support, for the Model State Utility Environmental Protection Act which has been evolved by the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners.

The substance of that model act is, that a utility proposing to erect a generating station or transmission line, would have to apply to the regulatory commission for consent, and justify the facility in terms of its purpose, location and design; that all environmental agencies, State and local, would have notice and opportunity, to present their positions, and their recommendations for environmental protection; and that after all the evidence is in, the regulatory commission would issue an order subject to court review, granting, conditioning, or refusing its consent to the utility's proposal. No other State or local approvals would be required.

In short, the fragmented environmental jurisdictions would be eliminated; there would be developed a record, upon which the commission would take into consideration, all of the interests of the public—in clean air and water in the appearance of the landscape, in maintaining tax values, and in assuring an adequate supply of electric energy; and the commission would resolve all of these interests in a single decision.

Earlier I noted that some responsible persons, have recognized that reduction of pollution, entails reduction or elimination of the growth of electric output, and are willing to consider paying that price.

Up to the present time, the entire philosophy of the electric industry has been that the public's demand for power, should not only go unchecked but in fact should be stimulated as far as possible; and that the sole objective, is to keep abreast of that demand.

We as regulators have generally accepted this philosophy, and all of our endeavors, particularly in the last five years or so, have been in the direction of pushing, and helping the industry, to catch up with soaring demand for service.

I realize that any other philosophy is repugnant to you, partly because it would be novel and unfamiliar, and partly because the entire American business community, of which your industry is a part, is committed to the axiom that growth is essential to prosperity, and perhaps to survival.

Repugnant as the idea may be, I offer the possibility that continued growth, instead of being essential to survival, may destroy it.

As to what underlies that statement, I would like to identify some of the responsible persons, who have given thought to the idea.

The report on "Electric Power and the Environment," to which I referred earlier, represents the combined efforts of Chairman Nassikas of the FPC, Commissioner Ramey of the AEC, and equally distinguished representatives of other Federal agencies. Against that background, I now quote another significant passage from the report:

"But the basic question of whether electricity use is growing too rapidly, cannot be answered on an individual plant basis—an answer requires a broad examination, of the

significance of all forms of energy to the economy and the public welfare, including analysis of the form and amount of energy, that would be used if the projected increases in electricity consumption were materially curtailed . . .

It may well be timely, to re-examine all of the basic factors, that shape the present rapid rate of energy growth, in the light of our resource base, and the impact of growth on the environment. . . . The authors of the report, in questioning the propriety of allowing uncontrolled growth of electrical use, were well aware that control would have economic consequences; and although the report does not specify what those consequences might be, it is obvious that the authors were thinking, not only of the electric industry, but also of the impact that reduced energy supply would have upon the industrial, commercial and residential users. Nevertheless, the authors do question whether our resource base warrants uncontrolled energy growth.

Ages ago, the earth stored up deposits of coal, oil, gas and uranium, and nature has not added an ounce of these substances since. This is our capital, and once consumed, cannot be replaced. Until the industrial revolution of the 1800's the draw on our fuel resources was infinitesimal. The checks we wrote against our fuel account through time really became significant in the middle third of this century. Those checks are now enormous and with no halt in the upward curve of fuel use in sight, we are treating our capital as if it were inexhaustible.

No doubt it is inexhaustible, in the sense that the day will never come when we will have consumed the last pound of coal or uranium or the last gallon of oil or the last cubic foot of gas in the earth.

But if you will keep in mind that our present rate of energy use is only a fraction of what is projected for the year 2000 and thereafter, and if you will consider that we are now consuming the most easily reached fuel deposits so that future sources will become less and less accessible, it will be obvious that the future cost of fuel can easily become so prohibitive as to make it exhausted from the economic standpoint.

Some of you are probably saying to yourselves, that as recently as thirty years ago, no one dreamed that energy could be obtained from splitting atoms, and that somehow or other, science will pull us through again, with an energy source both plentiful and inexpensive.

Maybe so, maybe the physicists will find a way to create nuclear fusion, without the intervention of fission, and to sustain and control the fusion, so that it can be converted into useful energy. If they do this, we would in fact have a virtually inexhaustible energy source, for the deuterium needed for atomic fusion abounds in the oceans; and since fusion is far cleaner than fission, many of our environmental problems would disappear. I fervently hope so. I believe, however, that we must face the facts as we now know them and act accordingly.

If we don't, and if we lose our gamble that science will just somehow find an answer, the world is going to be a bleak one—perhaps an impossible one—for the generations that follow us.

Please do not misunderstand me, for I am not advocating that government immediately clamp down on the growth of electrical use. Earlier, in discussing the environment, I said that the power of government should be exercised, only after the problem, before it has been clearly defined, and only after all possible solutions have been explored, not only from the standpoint of how well they solve the problem, but also from the standpoint of whether they create new ones.

In noting that regulators are pushing the electric industry to catch up with soaring

demand, at a time when sentiment in some quarters strongly suggests curtailment, I may have created a contradictory impression in your minds. If so, I want to dispel it—and with all the emphasis at my command.

By no stretch of the imagination, do I think you are going to rush out and adopt instant cure proposals, or any others related to them, in giving you these thoughts. *Nor, do I necessarily think that you should do it, or have to do it.*

But, the point I want to make is that it does require *thought*, deep thought, because it is such a serious matter for the future.

It requires—and you must give—hard and cogent thinking, as an industry, in terms of how these problems can be licked. It is possible to meet energy demand and conserve our natural resources, in the same manner as America has always been able to meet, and overcome, one crisis after another. Just as we excelled Russia and its Sputnik in landing the first man on the moon so, too, can your industry overcome the grave problems confronting it.

I firmly believe that you must start to center your attention and effort, in concert with government, on a *concentrated crash program* of research for the break-through to tomorrow's bright horizon.

The most promising possibility is atomic fusion, but research should explore other areas as well. It is elementary—but vital—to caution you not to wait until the essential resources are exhausted and then start to worry.

Regulators too must play their part—a very responsible one—in allowing every electric utility to set up a reasonable amount for research and development—to go into a common effort to maintain and improve present and future service.

Working together, the nation's energy suppliers, the regulators, and the champions of environment, can solve this pressing problem.

It will take good minds, high dedication, and perseverance. There is no doubt, as to our ability to achieve the eventual triumph—the great reconciliation between mighty competing forces—which will provide for ourselves and our descendants a better America.

WASHINGTON REPORT

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL  
OF OHIO  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert at this point in the RECORD my May Washington Report.

WASHINGTON REPORT  
(By Congressman WILLIAM E. MINSHALL)

MAY, 1971.  
Opinion poll results, below, represent the views of more than 20,000 who returned completed questionnaires. Vietnam, law and order, and the national economy continue to be of prime concern to a majority of those polled. Future "Washington Reports" will deal with what we in Congress are trying to do about these critical problems. Thanks to all of you who once again have made the Minshall Poll a great success. Results will be sent to the President, Cabinet Members and agency heads, leaders of both parties in House and Senate and to the news media.

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Should the United States give diplomatic recognition to Red China?	65.8	29.5	4.7
2. Do you think the United States should begin trade relations in nonstrategic materials with Red China?	64.5	31.8	3.7
3. Should we recognize and resume trade with Cuba?	26.7	64.4	8.9
4. Do you support the President's Vietnam policies?	55.9	42.1	2.0
5. To curb inflation and unemployment, what actions should the Federal Government take?			
(a) Wage-price controls for all	44.0	41.8	14.2
(b) Wage-price controls for certain industries only	37.4	48.0	14.6
(c) Reduced government spending	73.4	15.3	11.3
(d) Work programs for the jobless	77.8	10.6	11.6
6. Should the Federal Government subsidize a guaranteed annual income for the poor?	23.1	69.4	7.5
7. Would you be willing to pay higher taxes for completely nationalized health care?	32.3	62.9	4.8
8. Do you favor my bill to raise personal income tax exemptions to \$1,200?	89.6	6.0	4.4
9. Are you in favor of federally subsidized public housing for your community for low-income and welfare families?	32.3	62.9	4.8
10. Do you favor my revenue-sharing bill to return part of all Federal taxes to State and local governments for their use?	81.8	12.0	6.2
11. Do you feel that fair, unbiased news coverage is being presented by:			
(a) Newspapers	26.3	64.3	9.4
(b) Television	30.4	59.7	9.9
(c) Radio	35.9	49.2	14.9
(d) News magazines	31.7	48.0	20.3
12. What is the most critical issue facing the Nation today?			
(1) Vietnam—29.0 percent; (2) Law and order (Crime: 4.7 percent; Courts: 1.9 percent; Civil disorders: 20.0 percent)—26.6 percent; (3) National economy (Inflation: 13.8 percent; Unemployment: 6.1 percent; Taxes: 2.2 percent)—22.1 percent—22.1 percent; (4) Environmental pollution—7.1 percent; (5) Welfare costs—4.5 percent; (6) Miscellaneous—5.9 percent; No opinion—4.8 percent.			

MINSHALL BILLS

Since my March newsletter I have introduced or co-sponsored the following legislation: H.R. 6713, to create a Great Lakes Basin Conservation Program to curb soil and water resource losses and enhance fish, wildlife and recreation resources . . . H.R. 6935, Truth in News Broadcasting, to require that all TV-radio broadcasters clearly identify for audiences news sequences that have been staged, altered or edited. . . . H.R. 6955, to strengthen Federal inspection of imported meat and meat products. . . . H.R. 7732, to limit U.S. Supreme Court Justices and Federal judges to earning outside income only when work is in the public interest and require them to file annual financial disclosures

similar to those now required for Members of Congress. . . . H.R. 7837, \$750 tax deduction for home repairs. . . . H.R. 7673, establish Cuyahoga Valley National Historical Park. . . . H.R. 8054, amend the Clayton Act to prevent below-cost sales aimed at destroying competition. . . . H.J. Res. 646, Constitutional Amendment to reverse recent U.S. Supreme Court ruling on mandatory school busing. Copies of these bills may be obtained by writing to my Washington office.

COUNTRY LIVING IN OHIO

"Country Living in Ohio" is the theme of this year's fifth annual Smithsonian Institution Festival of American Folklore. If you plan to be in Washington July 1-5, make it a Buckeye reunion on the Great Mall between

the Capitol Building and Washington Monument. Ohio music, cooking and crafts will be featured.

#### NEW PARENTS?

Proud new parents should telephone my Cleveland office for a copy of the very informative government publication, "Infant Care," mailed to you without charge.

### YOUTH APPRECIATION WEEK

#### HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 24, we passed House Joint Resolution 556, providing for the observance of Youth Appreciation Week for a 7-day period beginning the second Monday in November.

It was my privilege to support this resolution. Of course, it passed unanimously without any need or reason for a rollcall vote. But I know there are a lot of Members of the House who would have welcomed a call of the roll so that they could be recorded in black and white as having been in favor of it.

As a member of Optimist International, I am privileged to report that we have received letters from Optimist Club members from all over our congressional district suggesting the timely enactment of a resolution on "Youth Appreciation Week." As my colleagues in the House may know, the Optimist Clubs have for many years had a slogan "Friend of the Boy." That has recently been amended to include all youth of both sexes.

As a matter of history, the initial motto was "Friend of the Delinquent Boy." Realizing that there are millions of non-delinquent boys, that motto was later amended to "Friend of the Boy." Later on there was a realization that it is almost impossible to be a "Friend of the Boy" without also being a "Friend of the Girl" and that is how more and more Optimist Clubs activities became involved with youth of both sexes.

Recognition for the prompt enactment of the resolution for Youth Appreciation Week should go to the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS), who is chairman of the subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee. He took the floor last Monday to ask unanimous consent to call up the resolution for the observance of Youth Appreciation Week.

I thought it was noteworthy that the preliminary recitation of this resolution pointed out that a vast majority of our youth are constructive citizens and serious about the present and the future and are willing to work on special projects for the benefit of their fellowmen.

The resolution went on to emphasize that the achievements of youth are often overlooked by the majority of the adult community and that there should be a special acknowledgment of the constructive activities and responsible characteristics of our young people.

I am convinced that the great majority of the youth of our congressional district stand out in sharp contrast to

those young people who visited the Nation's Capital this year during the period from May 1 through May 5. Those who came to Washington only to create disturbances, in my opinion, are a small minority. The freaks, the weirdoes, and the crazies are only a small fraction of the total of American youth. I am proud that the Optimist Clubs of America recognized that the majority of young Americans are concerned with the betterment of America and the world. The Optimist International was determined that there be an appreciation for our youth who have rejected passivity on the one hand and violence on the other hand and who stand for reform on the middle ground in accordance with the law.

Mr. Speaker, I could recite so many instances of worthwhile youth activities in our country. There are the millions of members of the 4-H Clubs of America. They actually total 3.5 million. There are 4½ million Boy Scouts and 3¼ million Girl Scouts.

The observance of Youth Appreciation Week is not new. Last year more than 1,800 civic organizations participated. As a member of Optimist International, I am proud to say that the first Youth Appreciation Week was sponsored by the Optimist Club 16 years ago. In the February issue of the Optimist, the magazine of Optimist International, there is an article which clearly depicts the immense benefits and values derived from the increase in participation of our young people in nationwide projects. There is no geographical region in either of the two nations of the United States and Canada that does not observe Youth Appreciation Week during November of each year.

It is my hope that the calendar week in November set aside to honor the youth of America will continue to motivate them to be concerned about their country. I hope they will continue to cling to the truths and ideals that America symbolizes, as well as continue unending their efforts for the betterment of their country.

### STATEMENT ON MEMORIAL DAY

#### HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I include the following statement:

#### STATEMENT ON MEMORIAL DAY

My good friends, I am honored by your hospitable invitation to be with you on this occasion. For while Memorial Day is perhaps, in essence, the saddest day of our year, it is at the same time one of the most important of days.

It provides a quiet and reverent moment during which we can pause to reflect on some of the great and awesome responsibilities of life, and requires us—as does no similar event—to look reality squarely in the eyes. While we may find this uncomfortable, we can nonetheless be thankful for the opportunity, for it is often rewarding.

Memorial Day, originally conceived in honor of the dead Union heroes of our tragic Civil War, has by force of circumstances tak-

en on a new significance over the years and now stands as a tribute to those Americans who gave their lives in all our wars. Unfortunately, these wars have been numerous and our list of fallen heroes has grown to shocking proportions. No matter what we say here in their honor, it is understatement, for their sacrifice was unbounded and knows no parallel in our National history. It therefore behooves us to speak in more than words of reverence. We owe our war dead a debt of gratitude which cannot be repaid through words alone.

Our duty is twofold: to work for peace in the hope of establishing a world of reason—for which our heroes fought and died; yet also to insure, through vigilance, the National security. If there seems a conflict here, it is only verbal, for surely there is no conflict between strength, on the one hand, and a genuine, abiding desire for peace and harmony, on the other.

On many occasions past we have expressed the hope that world peace—that seeming will-o'-the-wisp of destiny, would settle down upon us in the manner of the all-embracing night; that we might then turn our energies to other more productive work than war. The time for turning these hopes to reality is now at hand. For as Woodrow Wilson once observed, "... the real fruition of life is to do the thing we have said we wished to do. There are times when words seem empty and only action seems great. Such a time has come, and in the providence of God, America will once more have an opportunity to show the world that she was born to serve mankind."

These words of Wilson, representing the hope for peace in a world that was once again already on the road to war, cannot be dismissed on these grounds alone. Indeed, the thought conveyed is too powerful to so dismiss. It is the thought upon which all united efforts are in effect today, with the object of peace in mind. God willing, it is this thought that shall, in fact, provide the salvation of the world, in the physical sense; that the work of God may continue among a world of peaceful souls, dedicated to the labors of productivity and love, as opposed to killing and hatred.

This hope is now a firmly established part of the American dream.

### THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY

#### HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, under a mandate from Congress, the Department of Transportation was due to present a national transportation policy statement by May 21.

They never made it.

For more than a year, DOT has been working on formulation of a policy which will give direction not only nationally, but also to our State and local governments. This direction is desperately needed.

In the 91st Congress, we forged out massive transportation legislation: The Airport-Airways Development and Revenue Act, Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act, Rail Passenger Service Act, and the Federal-Aid Highway Act.

But there is no one in the driver's seat.

What we have instead, is the Congress trying to collectively hold the reins. What

we need in reality is the DOT setting up clear-cut direction.

I cannot, in fairness, lay the fault alone at the feet of Hon. John Volpe, Secretary of Transportation. I know him to be a man dedicated to his job.

I can, however, fault the administration and/or the O.M.B. Unfortunately, the long-awaited national transportation policy is held captive by the administration's dream of revenue sharing and reorganization. This is faulty thinking at its best. Already, revenue sharing is being remolded into action programs by the House committees.

Reorganization may have a somewhat better chance.

But, Mr. Speaker, if we wait for either reorganization or for revenue sharing, we may never get a national transportation policy. At the very best, it would delay such a policy for at least one year, possibly two. The delay is unnecessary and unrealistic. I call on DOT to release a national transportation policy now.

#### RESOLUTION, NATION VILLAGE OF GAMBELL

### HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly concerned about the deplorable housing conditions in the Native villages in Alaska, particularly the Native village of Gambell. The northwest region of Alaska is exposed to severe weather conditions and the present housing facilities lack adequate heat and insulation. The fuel rates in that part of the State are the highest in the Nation and the large quantities consumed each winter make living in these areas an extra financial burden.

Besides the inadequate health conditions in the bush area, the most important problem to Alaskans is the inadequate housing conditions. I have toured the northwest area many times, and I am constantly amazed at the severe lack of adequate housing in this cold-weather area of Alaska.

The IRA Council of the Native village of Gambell has passed a resolution that merits the consideration of the entire Congress. I have, therefore, included it in the RECORD:

#### NATIVE VILLAGE OF GAMBELL—JOINT RESOLUTION No. 71-1

Whereas, we, the duly elected committee, consisting of four members from the City and four members from the I.R.A. Council has full power and authority to request Housing from the State under the provisions of the Constitution and By-Laws of each Council, and

Whereas, the Native Village of Gambell, being in dire need of adequate housing, and Whereas, the Village, with a population of about 400, has been neglected from any Housing Programs in the past, and

Whereas, most houses are inadequate and poorly built from scrap lumber, and

Whereas, the village is located in an area where high winds and cold climates are prevalent the year round, and

Whereas, the price of fuel rates about the

highest in the nation, and about five barrels of fuel are consumed by most at twenty seven dollars per barrel per month, and

Whereas, the present location of housing is in danger of high seas and shore waves as witnessed in the past, and reconstruction and relocation would be costly and impractical the houses would be built at a safer site, and

Whereas, the village now has electrical power from AVEC;

Therefore be it resolved, that Gambell be considered for housing and a representative be sent to Gambell at the earliest time possible.

#### RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE ON GERMANY

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I recently reported to my people on the defeat of the proposal to reduce or withdraw U.S. troops from West Germany.

I insert my report in the RECORD at this point:

#### RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE ON GERMANY

Today in my report I thought we'd talk about Germany. U.S.-German relations have been in the news lately, both in connection with U.S. dollars and proposals to withdraw troops stationed there.

Earlier this year in explaining my serious conscientious reservations on casting our vote to extend the draft, when it expires on June 30 of this year, I pointed out that I could find no moral, ethical, or legal justification for drafting American men for military service in an army of occupation in Germany 27 years after World War II is over. In such prolonged service our men are reduced to the role of mercenaries performing at best the mission of serving as political pawns, or honorary hostages, to pacify foreign diplomacy and enhancing U.S. prestige.

A good example to illustrate the misuse of American servicemen as political pawns almost three decades after the end of World War II is West Germany, where approximately 215,000 American troops are stationed today—almost as many as the 259,300 now in Vietnam and supposedly being phased out.

A few days ago on May 19, the United States Senate defeated a move to bring home American troops from West Germany and other NATO countries of Europe.

Lending their verbal support to President Nixon in opposition to any U.S. troop withdrawals from NATO countries were ex-Presidents Truman and Johnson as well as 21 identified CFR members—this withdrawal dealt primarily with bringing Americans home from Germany.

It is strange that many of the same legislators who voted for stopping the draft voted against any U.S. troop withdrawal from Germany. It also is most unusual that some of those same Senators who are considered doves on Vietnam and who backed the Cooper-Church Amendment for pulling all troops out of Vietnam voted against reducing U.S. troop strength in Germany.

One of the arguments offered against withdrawal from NATO countries, of which the U.S. occupation troops in the Federal Republic of Germany makes up the greatest number, is that it would make Germany vulnerable to Russian intimidation if not invasion—we might lose Germany. Is our occupation force there to police Germany or to protect her with our men as mercenary soldiers? To bolster such thinking, Chairman Kosygin of the Soviet Union conveniently in-

fluenced public hysteria by his timely calling for U.S. troop reduction in Europe at a Moscow luncheon honoring Canadian Prime Minister Trudeau. The timing was perfect—as if Trudeau carried the message and had acted as an "honest broker" between the great powers. The inference in Washington was made to appear that support of troop withdrawal from Germany would be opposing the President and supporting the Soviets. No one even suggested that it might be vice versa.

The double standard of the position on withdrawal of troops from Germany when considered with a vote such as the Cooper-Church Amendment on Vietnam withdrawal is clear when one understands that it is the Russians our men and allies are fighting in Vietnam—the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese but supply the real estate and cannon fodder. Conservatively speaking, 80% of the military arms and equipment used by the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong are estimated to be supplied by Russia. Yet the American people are supposed to believe that it is morally right to disengage our troops from combat with Russia's allies in Vietnam but morally wrong not to maintain our occupation forces in West Germany to prevent further Russian aggression from her Warsaw Pact allies.

If our fighting men in Vietnam are denied victory, does it not make sense that the deterrent value of U.S. occupation troops in Germany will be ineffective? It is reasonable to assume that in Germany under Russian attack, U.S. fighting men would also be denied the offensive authority to win. Germany would become Vietnam all over again. East Germany would serve as the sanctuary and the West German Communists by guerrilla action would take the place of the Viet Cong and National Liberation Front.

Germany would become but another Vietnam.

It is reasonable and proper for American parents as well as other taxpayers to ask just why we are forced to continue drafting American men to be stationed in Germany. Is Germany still a hostile nation? A threat to international peace? Balance of payments? Or are there other reasons? Few are buying the Russian threat or the German bodyguard theories.

Most Americans are sick and tired of serving as world policemen and would like to see American soldiers come home from wherever they are stationed in foreign countries. It is only human that Americans are becoming more and more critical about U.S. troops being assigned to Germany years after a war under the farce of serving as an occupation force. Many Americans are asking, "Are we going to keep Germany occupied forever? Why do we have to protect the Germans now? Why don't they do it themselves? Why not a Germanization program for Germany to protect itself, similar to the Vietnamization plan?"

Neither the government nor the news media ever explain to the ordinary citizen why we must not force the Germans to defend themselves; why we must keep U.S. troops there, not only to protect what's left of Germany, but what's left of Free Europe.

At most, the U.S. Occupation Force in Germany offers a false sense of security to the German people and our NATO allies. Other than the economic benefits provided the German economy by American military pay checks and spending and the show of force which American men provide, the U.S. military presence is but a political pawn to German politicians. The Germans would be much better off without the false protection furnished by U.S. military forces. Denied U.S. manpower, the Germans would be forced to recruit their own men and defend their own country against Soviet threats.

Whoever heard of a national policy of defending a conquered enemy against threats

of aggression from an ally with whom we trade, negotiate and entertain diplomatic relations here in Washington, D.C.?

With leaders of the U.S. and Kosygin of the USSR now announcing talks over negotiating troop strength in Europe, it should be obvious to the West German leaders that the underlying significance of the Senate vote on the Mansfield Amendment was not concern by the Administration for German freedom and independence but rather because of German's proximity to the Middle East. U.S. troops are retained in Germany as a staging area for the Arab-Israeli war. The doves' reaction to troop reduction in Germany was not over fear of Soviet threats to the Germans but rather over threats to some mystical balance of power in the Middle East.

During the waning days of the last Congress, the Senate added language to an appropriations bill forbidding use of U.S. ground combat forces in Laos, Thailand, and Cambodia but by a 60 to 20 vote refused to bar U.S. troops from involvement in defense of Israel. This vote defeating an amendment to ban the sending of American ground troops to Israel must be regarded as expressing a positive intent to authorize American ground combat forces in the Middle East.

No reasonable conclusion can be reached but that the Washington doves who are against supporting Vietnamese anti-Communists are superhawks when it comes to defending Israel against the same Red armament and aggression. Such thinking and threat to our people are borne out by this double standard in the use of our troops and can be the only explanation why the same doves do not want any U.S. troop withdrawal from Germany.

After all, U.S. troops in Germany are readily available to the Middle East. They can hold maneuvers and train openly. Their continued presence does not incite any new fears or tensions that might be aroused by a U.S. troop buildup in the Middle East or in another country. And most Germans do not object. After 27 years they've accepted occupation. It reaps financial benefits—avoids drafting German men, and the Germans have been conditioned to believe we'll protect them from Soviet aggression.

As the U.S. and the Soviets prepare to negotiate away the Germans' "security" provided by occupation troops, the German leaders would seem to be in a better position to demand reunification of their country rather than make additional compromises to try to retain the false security of U.S. forces.

If the prevailing reason for continuing to quarter U.S. troops in Germany is to stop Soviet advancement, then why should not the Germans be free to reunify their nation, develop their own nuclear deterrent, and raise and support their own standing army? The free world needs a free Germany much more than they need us.

Maintaining a security force of occupation by continuing to draft American youth 27 years after the end of World War II is unrealistic. We cannot justify either occupying or defending Germany forever.

Considering the conventional military power of the Warsaw Pact nations, it is highly questionable whether the NATO power constitutes an effective deterrent without the advantage of nuclear weapons.

Nowhere in the world do the German people constitute any threat to free people. Therefore, if Germany is not a power and does not constitute a threat, continued U.S. occupation can only be for reasons other than preventing Germany threatening world peace.

Historians and geopolitical strategists have often said what the Huns and Turks have experienced, that Germany is the defense of Europe against Asia. Likewise, a strong and free Germany is the surest bulwark to the expansion of Communism. That

is why German reunification is important and in the interest not only of the United States but of the remaining free world.

A look at the map of Central Europe will show why Germany should be reunified and why Germany must be freed to become a nation on her own.

We no longer have any business defending or promising to bodyguard any part of Europe against anyone. Defending Berlin is a job for Germans and Europeans—not Americans. We can supply the tools and expertise but not the manpower. Germans are an able, industrious people—more soundly prosperous and progressive in many ways than we are. The German National Bank alone possesses sufficient U.S. paper dollars to demand all remaining U.S. gold reserves.

With or without the consent of any of our World War II allies, we should negotiate a peace treaty with the government of West Germany, recognizing it as the lawful government of all Germany and freeing any restrictions on German sovereignty—leaving those people unhindered to organize and defend themselves.

We should repudiate the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, give the Germans a reasonable time to prepare their own defenses and then withdraw our military aid and presence from all of Germany, exerting whatever diplomatic pressures available to persuade France, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union to do likewise.

Our own diplomatic and military resources which include our young men should be devoted to the defense of our own country.

#### BIG BUS BILL

### HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post featured an article on bus safety in its January 14, 1971, issue. The article reports on a speech delivered by Dr. William Haddon, Jr., on the subject of bus safety. Dr. Haddon is the former Director of the National Highway Safety Bureau.

The article follows:

#### SAFETY EXPERT BLAMES BUS DESIGN FOR SEVERE INJURIES IN CRASHES

An automotive safety specialist yesterday blamed inadequacies in the design of school and other buses for "most, if not virtually all injuries of any severity" to their occupants in crashes.

Dr. William Haddon, Jr., president of the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety here, made the charge in Detroit in a speech prepared for the Automotive Engineering Congress of the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety.

He said existing technology and hardware make it "straightforwardly possible" to "package" bus occupants with great safety, especially with changes in fore-and-aft bus dimensions and in maximum permissible speeds.

Haddon protested that this is but one of a large number of issues that affect the life and health of millions, but that "are not usually talked about except within groups with special interest."

The engineer-physician, who was the first director of the National Highway Safety Bureau, said there is no "adequate federal standard" for truck braking rates, even though heavy trucks commonly can't be braked to a stop in distances less than two to three times those required by passenger cars.

"In many emergencies, regardless of the skill of their drivers, this guarantees" that trucks will collide with other vehicles, Haddon said.

As an example, he cited a "multi-vehicular holocaust" on the New Jersey Turnpike on Nov. 29, 1969, in which one of several causal factors was the inability of a huge truck to stop in a short space. The truck "plowed into the vehicles and people ahead," Haddon said. He said that even though hundreds of thousands of trucks a year crash, there is an absence of truck design to prevent spillage of hazardous cargoes.

#### SCIENCE AND GOVERNMENT REPORT NOTES ADMINISTRATION'S HEAVYHAND

### HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, a very disturbing account of political interference in the filling of the Federal Government's high-level scientific and technical posts appears in the authoritative Washington publication, Science & Government Report, of April 1, 1971. This journal, which is a valuable source of news and analysis on the crucial subject of science and government relations, points out that the present administration has frequently put politics before professional ability in making its selections for what have traditionally been apolitical appointments. The effects of this shift in policy can only be to the detriment of the Federal service and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of this article in the RECORD at this point:

#### SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Nixon Administration is compiling an impressive record of silencing, intimidating, or rejecting for employment scientific and technical specialists whose opinions or professional findings on public policy matters differ from its own. The record ranges from the cancellation of high-level appointments at the National Science Foundation and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the screening off from the press of civil service statisticians whose findings do not support the Administration's optimistic prophecies on the nation's economy. The most defensible thing to be said in behalf of the Administration in regard to these matters is that it is the instinct of any government to seek loyalty and harmonious performance from its officials. But, on the basis of the visible record—and it is reasonable to assume that that is only part of the whole story—it is clear that the Administration has passed from mere orchestration into the selective intimidation of disinterested judgment and even the suppression or distortion of technical information when such suits its purposes.

The process began early in the Administration when the appointment of Franklin Long, of Cornell University, to the directorship of the National Science Foundation was aborted at the last minute for no apparent reason other than his public record of opposition to the Administration's strategic weapons policies. Following grumbles of indignation from elder statesmen of science who reminded the President that theretofore the NSF directorship had been considered a-political, Nixon humbly apologized and promised it wouldn't happen again. Subsequently, however, the intended appointment of John H. Knowles, of



Harvard Medical School, to the top scientific post in HEW was dropped as an offer of conciliation to the Neanderthals of the American Medical Association. Then last spring, the all-but-announced appointment of George S. Hammond, of Caltech, to the No. 2 post at NSF was suddenly called off after he spoke out publicly against the U.S. invasion of Cambodia.

#### LATEST ACTION

A more recent episode concerns the directorship of an Environmental Institute that President Nixon has proposed be created with joint government and private financing. According to the *New York Times*, the name of Alain C. Enthoven, who was Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Analysis under Robert S. McNamara, was about to emerge from the White House clearance procedure when he was vetoed by H.R. Haldeman, the President's Chief of Staff. Enthoven, who left the Pentagon when the Nixon Administration took office, is a Democrat. The *Times* quotes him as speculating that he was turned down because in his Pentagon days, he sought to reduce military spending.

Then there is the case of the career civil servants at the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) who prepare the official figures on what have become major political embarrassments to the Nixon Administration—unemployment and the consumer price index. For the past 20 years, these specialists have met monthly with the press to release their figures and answer questions concerning the intricacies of statistical fluctuations in the American economy. According to the business and economics affairs reporters who regularly met with the BLS statisticians, no question ever arose as to their ability, dedication to informing the public, or professional integrity.

A few weeks ago, the Labor Department announced that the briefings would be terminated, the monthly information would be confined to press releases, and that if amplification were desired, it would be provided by high-level appointees of the Department. This change, according to an announcement, would "avoid the awkwardness of subjecting the professional staff of the Bureau of Labor Statistics to questions with policy implications"—which, in translation from Obfuscation, the official tongue in such matters, means questions that arise from puzzlement over the irreconcilability of Mr. Nixon's cheery economic views and his statisticians' cold and gloomy numbers.

#### GAG RULE

The carnage wrought on free expression of expert opinion in the SST fight will never be known, since neither the silencers nor the silenced are proud of their performance. In the course of the struggle, it became known that one NIH staffer suddenly and inexplicably begged off from testifying before a Congressional committee. It was expected that his testimony would be in line with warnings that a fleet of SST's might produce atmospheric effects that would contribute to an increase in skin cancer cases. By and large, pro-SST expert testimony came from scientists and engineers in government employ, or with close financial ties to the government. The opposition tended to be located some distance from federal funds.

Considering the depressed financial state of scientific and technical institutions throughout this country, it is interesting to speculate on the possible effects of the telephonic effort in behalf of the SST that was conducted by Edward E. David Jr., the President's science adviser. Confronted by petitions of scientists and engineers opposed to the SST, the Administration naturally desired to line up scientists and engineers who favored it. The route that brought David into the fray is not clear, but whether a conscript or a volunteer in this quest, he personally favored construction of two proto-

types for experimental purposes, and supporting the SST did no violence to his own judgment. In view, however, of this Administration's amply evidenced willingness to exact political loyalty in return for its favor, it is, at the least, not impossible that some anti-SST preferences were discreetly hushed in preference to making a costly wrath on the part of the political types immediately around Nixon. After all, a call from President Nixon's science adviser is not an everyday occurrence in the life of a financially pressed laboratory director.

Any attempt to saddle the Nixon Administration with a charge of deliberate intimidation of independent policy-affairs judgment among scientists and other specialists immediately runs into the fact that this country's professional communities resound with a variety of publicly stated opinion, with most of it, by rough measure, anti-Administration. Furthermore, the Nixon Administration must be credited with various acts in behalf of scientific freedom, among them the elimination of the antiquated blacklist for HEW advisory groups and an encouragement of scientific and technical exchanges with Communist bloc nations.

Nevertheless, there should be no illusions about the instincts of Nixon and his inner political circle. He and his bunch got to the White House through a savage political struggle in which they were counted out several times, and they are not naturally disposed to indulge the notion that scientists and other specialists should be given free rein to voice their professional opinions, regardless of the political implications. In this regard, the scientific community and its institutions will have to look after themselves. As political issues increasingly come to contain complex scientific and technical components, the value as well as the irritation of free voices increases commensurately.

#### THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY CRISIS

### HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the current international monetary crisis is multifaceted and, to economists—to say nothing of the layman—very confusing. Since some West German banks refused to exchange marks for dollars, and the West German Government in effect revalued its currency by allowing the value of the mark to float, and people in Europe began to change dollars into gold, there has been much talk of the adverse roles played by special drawing rights, Eurodollars, the International Monetary Fund, and international banking speculators. There has also been much criticism of the German Government for its action.

At the outset it must be clear that the German Government did not really initiate any policy on its own. It merely recognized the situation that had developed. It revised its policy to bring it into accord with the laws of economics which, like the natural law, men defy only at their peril.

The United States these days seems to be the last to recognize these immutable laws, and here is where the problem largely lies.

The archcriminal is inflation. U.S. in-

flation is comparatively greater than German and other foreign inflation, and this drives down the purchasing power of the dollar abroad. Americans, with one exception, are usually slow to realize this. Wages go up, profits go up, and costs go up—almost everyone tries to keep up with the inflation. However, people on fixed incomes in an inflationary economy are the ones hardest hit by the inflation. Although the dollar amount of pensions or fixed payments stays the same, the dollar value—because of inflation—goes down. It is the same with foreign currencies. Though most Americans in America do not immediately feel the acute pressures of inflation—salaries and wages go up—foreign currencies—with a fixed ratio to the dollar—register the decline in the value of the dollar quickly. Thus, they must revise the exchange rate or lose money. This is what Germany has done.

Another consequence of the inflation—decline in the value of the dollar—is that people abroad begin cashing in their dollars for gold, since gold is more stable than the dollar. Sources at the Federal Reserve estimate—conservatively—that there are four to six American dollars in Europe for every \$1 the United States holds in gold. There are—again conservatively—\$60 to \$70 billion in American currency in Europe. The latest reports show the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit to be approximately \$20 billion annually. All this means that if people and governments abroad today demanded—as they can—gold in exchange for dollars, we could not pay. We are broke many times over.

Fortunately, Europeans look not just to gold as a backing for U.S. currency, but to our productive capacity as a nation. Gold, however, is the ultimate standard, and if U.S. policy continues the way it is now, inflation may destroy all confidence in the dollar.

The solution is to beat inflation. Inflation is fueled by excessive union wage demands and by corresponding corporate price increases which spiral upward in a vicious cycle. But the real fault lies not with the unions, nor with business, but rather with Government.

The cause of inflation is the money supply. If the U.S. Government abided by economic law instead of financial fiat, the money supply would increase only to match production. At worse, says Economist Milton Friedman, the U.S. could tolerate a 1- or 2-percent inflation, but not the present 5 or 6 percent.

Many people blame debt financing—the practice of borrowing from future generations for present needs. Actually, debt financing is not itself inflationary. The way the U.S. Government operates debt financing, however, it is. Because the Government is the only entity in our country able to spend money it does not have; and because debts are incurred by Government on paper only—by merely juggling the books—irresponsible spending and monstrous inflation are the result. Needless to say, if you and I conducted our financial affairs like that, we would be in "debtor's prison" before we could say "International Bank for Reconstruction and Development."

One way to curb the Government's irresponsible money appetite would be to reduce the debt limit—the maximum debt the Government is allowed to accumulate. But when the question of raising the U.S. debt limit came up for its final vote in the House of Representatives recently, I was one of only three Members of Congress voting against it.

If Congress and the President do not face up squarely to the problem of inflationary spending—vote buying—inflation will keep growing, the balance-of-payments deficit will continue to worsen, the United States will price itself out of world markets and Uncle Sam will go deeper and deeper into bankruptcy.

#### TENNESSEE CELEBRATES ITS 175TH YEAR AS A STATE

### HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, the Volunteer State of Tennessee will observe its 175th anniversary as a State of the United States of America.

As we mark this occasion, a review of the State's historical highlights is in order.

Tennessee entered the Union in 1796 as our 16th State. Previously, it had been part of the Carolina grant of Charles II of England and home of the Cherokee Indian tribes. During 1784-88, settlers from North Carolina formed the "state of Franklin" in the area now encompassed by Tennessee, and from 1788-96, Tennessee was part of the territory south of the River Ohio.

Rich in heritage, Tennessee has been known as the Volunteer State since the "glorious era" of Andrew Jackson, "Old Hickory," who led his army of "Tennessee Volunteers" to victory in the Battle of New Orleans at the close of the War of 1812.

Andrew Jackson, by the way, was one of three Presidents of the U.S., who hailed from Tennessee—the others being James K. Polk, and Andrew Johnson. Tennessee has also produced some of America's most outstanding citizens and most courageous heroes, including John Sevier, the first governor, Sam Houston, Sam Davis, Nathan Bedford Forrest, Sgt. Alvin York, and Cordell Hull.

In 1848, when Governor N. S. Brown called for 2,800 volunteers to fight in the Mexican War, Tennessee sent 30,000 troops—thus confirming its reputation as the Volunteer State.

At the onset of the Civil War, Tennessee joined the Confederacy; yet its volunteers were clad in both gray and blue. Many decisive, bloody battles, such as Shiloh and Chattanooga, were waged on Tennessee soil during the War Between the States.

The Volunteer State rejoined the Union in 1866. Since then Tennessee has enjoyed a progressive century of growth through its industrious people, its natural resources, its manufacturing, agriculture, tourism, and, of course, the TVA.

Tennessee had grown in population from 105,000 in 1800 to 1,002,717 in 1850, and by 1900 boasted a population of more than 2 million. The recent 1970 census shows that almost 4 million people live in Tennessee, with the four major metropolitan areas—Memphis, Nashville, Knoxville, and Chattanooga—containing almost half the population.

Memphis, with 620,000, is the largest city in the Southeast, having surpassed New Orleans and Atlanta in population.

Manufacturing, which produces goods valued at more than \$4.6 billion annually, has taken top place in the State's diversified economy. The chief industrial center, Chattanooga, makes more than 1,500 different products, and in 1967 its value added by manufacture was \$617,000,000. Textiles, chemicals, apparel, electrical equipment, machinery, and furniture are among the main products manufactured in the State.

Agriculture has always played an important role in the State's vibrant economy, with farm receipts totaling \$677,637,000 in 1969. Lumbering, which provides jobs for 40,000 Tennesseans, is also significant, as the State's wood products are valued at more than \$500 million annually.

Producing a wide variety of minerals, Tennessee leads the other 49 States in zinc and pyrites. Other mineral products include silver, copper, coal, and phosphate rock. In 1969 the State's mineral production was valued at \$213,017,000.

Tourism is of increasing significance as more visitors are attracted each year to the scenic beauty of the Great Smoky Mountains, Lookout Mountain, and the Cumberland Plateau; to the 25 major lakes with more than 10,000 miles of shoreline; to the rolling hills and green farmland of middle Tennessee and the deltas along the Mississippi River. In 1969 tourists spent more than \$640,000,000 while enjoying "the beautiful world of Tennessee."

Gov. Winfield Dunn, who was recently elected the first Republican Governor of Tennessee in 50 years, has done much to promote tourism throughout the State. He said:

We think this great State of ours is so rich in beauty, so steeped in history, so abundantly blessed with natural resources, that we shall refer to it as "the Beautiful World of Tennessee."

Previously, it had been referred to as "the three States of Tennessee," east Tennessee, middle Tennessee, and west Tennessee, but now the Governor has consolidated them into one "big, beautiful world."

Tennessee's new commissioner of conservation, William L. Jenkins, recently said:

Tennessee is as representative of America at its best as any of the states of the Union. Rich in historical significance, abundant in folklore, Tennessee offers an opportunity for all citizens to recapture the spirit of America.

Tennessee's birthday will be observed next Tuesday, June 1, with the type of homespun commemoration which will be appropriate and appealing to the people of the Volunteer State. There will be an old-fashioned watermelon cutting on the

grounds of the State capitol. An historical skit and a fireworks display will highlight the celebration, which Gov. Winfield Dunn plans to make a great day in the colorful history of Tennessee.

#### WELFARE REFORM

### HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, more than 70 percent of black families in the United States have income below the \$6,500 level which Bureau of Labor Statistics survey show to be the minimum needed for health and decency. Yet, the Nixon administration has directly rejected one of the congressional black caucus' most crucial recommendations—a \$6,500 guaranteed adequate family income for four.

The administration continues to advocate its racist and repressive family assistance plan—FAP—against which we have declared our opposition. In addition, the administration has given its support to an even more repressive version of FAP which was approved by the Ways and Means Committee on May 13. This bill (H.R. 1) contains provisions which comprise a vicious attack on five million black women and children who make up almost half the aid to families with dependent children—AFDC—population.

The congressional black caucus must and will fight these racist provisions with every weapon at our disposal.

The Family Assistance Act sets a minimum and a maximum Federal payment of \$2,400 a year for a family of four. There is no requirement that States maintain present payment levels in the 45 States where they now exceed \$2,400 in cash plus food stamps. In fact, nine of our 10 welfare families are likely to be worse off, since \$2,400 a year is above present payments levels for only 10 percent of them.

The \$2,400 amount proposed by the Ways and Means Committee is actually less than the \$1,600 proposed earlier by the administration. The earlier bill provided \$1,600 in cash plus \$864 in food stamps. The committee's proposal would make recipients ineligible for food stamps.

States would be encouraged to reduce payments. If States increased payments above the amount recipients received in cash and food stamps combined as of January 1, 1971, the States will have to pay the entire cost of these increases.

Some States have been providing increased payments under the present welfare system in accordance with the rising cost of living. There is no provision, in FAP, for cost-of-living increases of the Federal payment of \$2,400. Thus, cost of living increases, essential in our unstable economy, will be denied for the poor.

We feel that the burden is on the administration to prove that there will be a \$75 billion cost to the Government as a result of establishing a \$6,500 payment

level. Since the black caucus has not suggested, moreover, that these funds be raised through a 58-percent surtax on income, we believe the administration has raised a false issue which will have the effect of stymieing serious discussion.

In light of an unemployment crisis of massive proportions, including a 33-percent unemployment rate among welfare mothers who are actually looking for work, the forced work requirement of the family assistance plan can only be seen as punitive and unnecessary. In addition, the plan will only help the lowest wage earners and will deny them the protection of the Federal minimum wage. As presently written, the bill does not guarantee that recipients will be assigned to suitable employment. In addition, 200,000 public service jobs in face of 10-percent unemployment rate in the black community is ludicrous.

I note with interest that the administration stated its willingness to back provisions for suitable work opportunities and requirements, and the caucus anticipates their efforts to change H.R. 1 to reflect these views.

The overall support given the present FAP by the administration would indicate, however, a failure of commitment to principles the caucus set forth.

For example:

First. Families will still be required to register for work even though the lack of adequate training, child care services, and employment opportunities will result in more harassment than help for the poor.

Second. We find it difficult to comprehend why the already obnoxious provisions of the original FAP, requiring mothers of children over 6 to register for work, would have been changed to include mothers of children over 3, forcing them to turn their preschoolers over to a third party rather than to perform the essential work of caring for their own.

Recipients will have fewer rights under the FAP than they now have. People who lost their jobs can be denied assistance. Welfare recipients are assumed to be guilty before trial. The right to appeal unfavorable decisions is curtailed. Illegal residency requirements may be imposed. In short, in countless ways, the administration's enforcement of such provisions violate the letter and spirit of our recommendation.

The President's report indicates that over 10 million persons are now assisted by the food stamp program and this is triple the number aided just 16 months ago. It is further stated that new and more liberal regulations on food stamps have been published in the Federal Register and will be implemented during the summer. What the administration fails to mention, however, is that under the new regulations over 2 million present participants in the program will be seriously hurt by the new schedules; 350,000 eliminated and 1.7 million receiving substantially reduced benefits.

In addition, testimony before the Senate has disclosed that an additional 2 million persons will be excluded because of the new restrictive definition of what constitutes a household in the regula-

tions. The blind, aged and disabled in 10 States will be rendered ineligible for the program in the one and two person category. It is estimated that hundreds of thousands will also be eliminated because of the new regulations regarding proposed maximum allowable resources.

The administration is recommending to Congress that the food stamp program be eliminated when the welfare reform bill is passed. The new Department of Agriculture regulations might accomplish that task prematurely.

Although the Department of Agriculture supports a "standstill" budget for child nutrition programs based on an estimated 6.6 million eligible children, testimony before the House Education and Labor Subcommittee on April 26, 1971, placed the figure at 10 million eligible children. I remind the administration of its pledge and our recommendation that no children in America go hungry.

The black caucus recommends a fully operational cash assistance program whereby welfare families will receive additional cash in lieu of food stamps. Yet, the administration's proposal of a maximum benefit of \$2,400 includes the cash value of the stamps and is actually less than the cash-food stamp package originally proposed.

My views presented here echo in large part the overall philosophy developed by the National Welfare Rights Organization. I strongly endorse the efforts made by NWRO and I urge my colleagues to carefully analyze the following studies prepared by the organization dealing with upcoming welfare reform legislation:

THE WAYS & MEANS WELFARE BILL, H.R. 1:  
THE GAPS IN F.A.P.

NATIONAL WELFARE RIGHTS  
ORGANIZATION,  
Washington, D.C.

The Family Assistance Plan (Title IV of H.R. 1) will soon be released by the House Ways and Means Committee chaired by Wilbur Mills. The House of Representatives is expected to vote on the bill during June.

The bill has been sold to Congress and the American people by the Nixon Administration as a reform of the welfare system. The bill does make several positive changes in the welfare system. It provides cash assistance to families with an employed father in the home for the first time. It raises the payment level for recipients in states which now pay the least. It provides substantial benefits to the aged, disabled and blind. Yet, even in these programs a number of provisions restrict certain benefits and require poor families and aged, disabled and blind individuals to pay too heavily for the benefits they do receive.

Based on our careful study of how the bill's provisions affect poor people's income, legal rights, ability to find meaningful employment and medical care, the National Welfare Rights Organization stands firmly opposed to the bill.

The Family Assistance Plan (F.A.P.) is not welfare reform. It is not a step toward welfare reform. It is a giant step backward. It is worse than the present, inadequate welfare system. F.A.P. must be opposed and defeated by those who believe in improving the conditions and opportunities of poor people.

Meet with your Congressman now. Explain to him how the provisions of this bill really affect poor people. Urge him to vote against the Family Assistance Plan. Attached to FAP are Social Security benefit increases and in-

creases for the aged, disabled and blind. But if the bill were defeated Congress will enact these measures on their own merits. If liberal members of Congress join the vote against F.A.P. it can be defeated. Only if liberals defeat the bill will Congress want to consider a better welfare bill, one that will increase and protect the rights of poor and low-income Americans.

CASH BENEFIT PROVISIONS

1. *Payment level inadequate.* F.A.P. sets a minimum and maximum payment of \$2400 a year for a family of four. Payments would never go above \$2400; there is no commitment to adequate income or to maintaining present payment levels in the 45 states where payments are now above \$2400. The payment level is \$1600 below the official poverty level and \$4100 below \$6500 the minimum amount of family needs to subsist at a decent level which is NWRO's position based on Department of Labor Surveys. NWRO's \$6500 has been introduced by 21 members of Congress including the entire Black Caucus, H.R. 7257.

2. *\$2400 is less than \$1600.* The \$2400 amount proposed by the Ways and Means Committee is actually less than the \$1600 proposed earlier by President Nixon. The earlier bill provided \$1600 in cash plus \$864 in food stamps for a total of \$2464. Ways and Means has made recipients ineligible for food stamps.

3. *Nine out of ten welfare families could be worse off.* \$2400 a year, \$200 a month is above present payment levels for only 10% of the welfare families, those in Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi and South Carolina. In addition, poor families in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and Guam will receive less than \$2400—\$1330 in Puerto Rico even though the cost-of-living on that island is 20% higher than in Washington, D.C. Recipients in the Virgin Islands and Guam along with those in the other 45 states 90% of the families, could receive less than the meager payments they receive under the current welfare system. While payments go up in five southern states and Puerto Rico, Mississippi and Puerto Rico will be the only places where the increases will be substantial.

4. *States would be encouraged to reduce payments.* State governments will not have to spend more than they spend during calendar year 1971 no matter how many more people get on welfare. The federal government will pay for the costs due to more people getting on welfare. However, if states increase payments above the amount recipients received in cash and food stamps combined as of January 1, 1971 the states will have to pay the entire cost of these increases. While the \$2400 payment means most states will save money in the first years of the plan, they are not likely to pass this money along to poor people. Most states will keep the savings because they now spend more than they want to on welfare.

In fact, states may cut the amount they spend on welfare. No state is required to maintain present payment levels. They can cut back to the federal \$2400 and not spend anything on welfare. By reducing payments, states can save even more than they would by maintaining benefits. It will be much easier for states to cut benefits under F.A.P. than under the present system which requires that a state percentage reduction plan be approved by H.E.W.

5. *Present cost-of-living increases will be denied.* In addition to the possible cuts in the amount recipients receive, poor people will be denied the cost-of-living increases states have been providing under the present welfare system. Between 1969 and 1970, 25 states increased the payment levels of AFDC families, raising grants for over one million recipients. In the same period only ten states cut grants, reducing payments to 250,000 recipients. There are no provisions

in F.A.P. allowing increases in the federal payment of \$2400. States will have no incentive to provide increases since they must pay for them entirely with state and local money. Poor people will become poorer as the cost-of-living rises.

#### 6. Family Maximum Imposed.

A family of two people receives, \$1,600; three people receive, \$2,000; four, \$2,400; five, \$2,800; six, \$3,100; seven, \$3,400; and eight (or more), \$3,600.

Families' payments vary with the number of people in the family. The more people, the more money it can receive. However, families of more than eight members will be able to get no more than \$3,600, the amount a family of eight receives. FAP discriminates against large families.

7. *Discrimination against single individuals, childless couples, families and against blacks.* F.A.P. provides benefits only for families with children. Single individuals and couples without children receive no benefits whatsoever, unless they are aged, disabled or blind. They must rely on almost nonexistent state and local relief programs.

Families with children would receive only half as much as the aged, disabled and blind. While a family of four receives \$200 a month, by July, 1973 an aged couple will receive the same amount.

Half of the families on welfare are black. Only one-fifth of the aged, disabled and blind recipients are black. The program that is largely black will pay half as much as the program that is largely white.

#### FORCED WORK PROVISIONS

1. *The forced work requirement is more repressive and punitive than present law.* In the light of growing unemployment these provisions will only serve to deny benefits to needy people, harass innocent citizens, destroy family life and deny real opportunities for advancement. Families with members considered employable will be referred to O.F.F., "Opportunities For Families," a separate program run by the Labor Department. Recipients who refuse to participate will be thrown off welfare. However, the lack of adequate training, child care and employment provisions means no real opportunities, only harassment for poor people.

2. *Mothers with children over 3 years old will be forced to work.* All family members will be required to register and accept a job offer unless they are specifically exempted. Under present law only those specifically referred to work are forced to register. Mothers of children over three and children over sixteen and not in school are among those not exempted and forced to work. Mothers with a father in the home who registers need not register. But if there is no father in the home the mother will be forced out of the home into a job.

3. *Stable family life is threatened.* If a family member refuses to register or refuses a job that member is cut off welfare. This includes a mother in cases where there is no male parent in the home. Payments for other members of the family will not be sent to that member. Instead the children's welfare is required to be paid to a third party. The government can pay the children's benefits to someone outside the home whom the government believes will be more interested in the well-being of the children than the mother who prefers to work raising her family rather than work outside the home at a menial, low-paying job. A recipient who refuses a job will not be entitled to a hearing before the third party payments begin. Third party payments were not required by earlier versions of F.A.P., and should be restricted to cases where the mother is proved to be unable to manage funds.

4. *The plan will help only the very lowest paid workers.* Recipients will be allowed to keep only the first \$720 a year they earn one third of their earnings above \$720 and still receive assistance. Unless family mem-

bers receive training allowances or have school children who work, the most a family of four can receive in welfare and wages combined is \$4140 a year. This provision will not allow a family to work its way out of poverty since the poverty level will be above \$4140 by the time the bill goes into effect.

5. *The incentive to work will be less than under present law.* Under current law, recipients retain the first thirty dollars they make each month plus the entire amount of their work related expenses and a third of the remaining income. Under the O.F.F. provisions of H.R. 1, recipients will retain \$60 instead of \$30 plus a third of their remaining income. However they will not retain any of their income to cover work related expenses except for some portion of their child care costs. Recipients will be forced to take money for transportation, lunch, union dues, uniforms, tools and income and Social Security taxes out of their earnings. This usually amounts to far more than the \$30 additional amount recipients are allowed under the bill.

6. *The incentive to work is completely destroyed if you get sick.* F.A.P. recipients must spend a third of their earnings on medical bills before they become eligible for Medicaid coverage. Since F.A.P. recipients are allowed to keep only a third of their earnings in the first place, this means a family will be reduced to the basic welfare level of \$2400 before they get Medicaid.

7. *Recipients are not protected by the federal minimum wage.* It is unlikely that recipients will be referred to jobs paying the minimum wage since the jobs available to the poorest workers are not covered by the minimum. The bill forces recipients to take whatever work is available unless the job pays less than three-fourths of the federal minimum. The present federal minimum wage is \$1.60 an hour so recipients must accept \$1.20 an hour, or \$2400 a year.

8. *Recipients may be referred to any type of job.* The only language in the bill on the suitability of the job prevents recipients from being forced to strike break. Provisions insuring that no one would have to take a job that endangers health and safety or that is too far from home have been removed. The clause allowing a person to refuse a job for "good cause" means little without some definition written in the bill.

9. *Opportunities for training are restricted.* The bill makes it very clear that the purpose of F.A.P. is to subsidize low wage paying employers rather than enable poor people to become self-supporting. Families headed by a college or university student will not be eligible for benefits. Under current law welfare mothers are regularly attending college in the WIN Program. Under F.A.P. family heads will be denied the opportunity to receive the training necessary to enable them to advance to the limit of their capabilities.

10. *Child care opportunities are almost non-existent.* Mothers with children will be required to accept whatever child care facilities are offered by the Labor Department or be cut off welfare. Under present law a mother has the right to be consulted about the adequacy of the child care arrangement. No standards that child care arrangements must meet are written in the bill. Authorization of funds for child care in this bill are totally inadequate. Families may be asked to pay all or part of the child care costs although some of these costs may be credited to the family's income. Child care authorities estimate the actual cost at over \$2100 a year for the care of just one pre-school child, but the bill allows a total cost of \$2000 for a family of four for all child care plus earnings of school children. The bill also limits the amount of child care costs that may be deducted from income under the income tax law to \$750.

11. *The federal government will not provide jobs.* Public service employment authorized by F.A.P. would receive federal funds for only three years: 100% in the first year, 75% in the second and 50% in the third, nothing thereafter unless states fund the entire cost. More extensive legislation has been passed by Congress but vetoed by President Nixon.

12. *Jobs for welfare recipients are not available.* The punitive nature of the forced work requirement assumes that jobs are available for welfare mothers and that the rolls are filled with employable people who simply refuse to work. Neither assumption is correct. The 1969 H.E.W. Study of Aid to Families with Dependent Children reports that 20.1% of welfare mothers are in the labor market. Of these, 66.5% are working. 33.5% are unemployed—looking for work but unable to find it. This is over five times the national unemployment rate.

Governor Reagan of California wrote to 309,485 employers in the state asking each to hire one welfare recipient. Only 13,000 employers responded. A total of 337 jobs were reported but only 26 actual jobs resulted from the effort. The average salary was \$71.00 a week.

#### LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

1. Recipients would have fewer legal rights under F.A.P. than they have now. The few legal rights to welfare poor people enjoy under current law are seriously undermined or outright denied by H.R. 1. Several provisions fly in the face of constitutionally protected rights to equal protection and due process of law. Many provisions further demean poor people and destroy their family life, dignity and pride and make them less able to stand on their own.

2. Needy people who lose their jobs can be denied assistance. The present law says that payments are based on current needs, no matter what the family's past earnings were. Under H.R. 1, this concept is rejected. Income received in the previous three calendar quarters is to be deducted from benefits due the family in the current quarter even if in reality all the income has been spent. A family could be denied assistance for six to nine months under this provision.

3. Families are denied the right to prompt assistance. Aged, blind and disabled recipients may receive assistance simply by filling out a form and stating that they are eligible. On the other hand, families may be put through a long and complicated investigation of eligibility before they can receive assistance. There is no language in the bill stating that families must receive aid promptly. This is a clear act of discrimination. Experiments with the declaration form under present law show no evidence of cheating.

4. *Recipients will be cut off assistance and fined for failure to report their income every three months.* Recipients who fail—for whatever reason—to report accurately all earnings plus other income from Social Security and other sources will be cut off and fined \$25 for the first offense, \$50 for the second and \$100 for later times. If found guilty of fraud, recipients would be fined \$1000 or be imprisoned for one year or both. Under the Medicaid provisions of H.R. 1, hospitals and nursing homes must be reviewed by "program review teams" before those hospitals and nursing homes which abuse the program can be cut off. People under the F.A.P. provisions of H.R. 1 are not given this review opportunity.

5. *Recipients must reapply every two years.* Since the provision noted above requires recipients to report accurately their income every three months, there is no need for this provision which forces a family to reapply as if it had never been receiving assistance. It is a means of harassing recipients and encouraging those eligible for aid to go without it.

6. *Recipients and applicants can be de-*

nied adequate representation. The Secretary of H.E.W. is given broad authority to ban certain people from entering Family Assistance offices to help recipients obtain their legal rights. Furthermore, the bill contains language which could be used to interfere with organizations like N.W.R.O. which are attempting to organize recipients.

7. Families can be cut off assistance if they fail to apply for other benefits. If a family is informed that it may be eligible for Social Security, Unemployment Insurance and similar benefits and fails to apply for them within 90 days it will no longer receive Family Assistance benefits.

8. The right to appeal decisions is curtailed. Recipients and applicants may apply for a hearing if they feel they have been unjustly treated. However, hearing procedures need not conform to present regulations nor to the requirement set forth by the Supreme Court in *Goldberg v. Kelly*, 397 U.S. 254 (1970), that benefits be continued pending a hearing decision. Therefore the rights to present evidence, cross-examine witnesses, and be heard by an impartial hearing examiner are not guaranteed, although they are granted to citizens and corporations in their dealings with other federal agencies and to welfare recipients under the current law. In addition, factual rulings made by hearing examiners are not permitted to be appealed to the courts.

9. Illegal residency requirements may be imposed. States which choose to supplement above the federal \$200 a month payment may also choose to impose a one year residency requirement as a condition of eligibility for supplementary payments. F.A.P. would obligate the Federal Government to follow the state's decision in administering the supplementation. This entire provision violates the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court in *Shapiro v. Thompson*, 394 U.S. 618, April 21, 1969.

10. Step parents of F.A.P. children are held liable for support payments. Under present federal welfare law, a step parent must support the children of his or her spouse only if there is a general state law requiring all step parents to support their step children. Only a few states have such general laws. This provision of F.A.P. would require step parent support and thereby provision of F.A.P. would require step parent support and thereby discriminate against the poorest families by imposing an unnecessary financial hardship. Rather than reducing the amount of government funds necessary for the support of step children, it will increase the need for welfare payments. A mother with children will be deterred from remarrying because her new husband would be forced to support the entire family. Step fathers would be encouraged to leave home so that the mother and children could receive higher payments. The Supreme Court has ruled that such provisions are illegal under the present law in *King v. Smith*, 392 U.S. 309, June 17, 1968.

11. There is no limit on parents' support obligations. Even if a mother or father cannot afford to support the children, a parent who leaves home would be obligated to the United States government for every cent the family receives from F.A.P. unless the amount of support payments were fixed by a court order. If no court order has been issued, the ability of the parent to pay is not permitted to be a factor in limiting his or her liability. Many fathers do in fact leave their wives and children because they cannot afford to support them. Parents who travel in interstate commerce to avoid supporting their children are subject to a fine of \$1000, a year in prison, or both.

12. Advisory committees may exclude recipients. Advisory committees to evaluate the program would be composed of representatives of labor, business, the public and the

government. Representatives of recipients and recipient organizations are not specified.

MEDICARE AND MEDICAID PROVISIONS

1. Basic principles of the present Medicaid Program are undermined in a separate part of H.R. 1, Title II. Recipients would have to pay for services now completely paid by the government and the quality of the services which is already horrible in many communities would be cut back further. The requirement that a state provide a comprehensive Medicaid program by 1977 is eliminated. States will be able to cut back on services already provided.

2. Medicare Recipients would have to pay part of their hospital bills. After the 30th day of hospitalization a recipient would have to pay \$7.50 a day. After the 60th day a recipient would have to pay \$15.00 a day. The longer a person is ill the lower his ability to pay becomes. But the federal government reduces its contribution and forces the recipient to increase his as time goes by.

3. Recipients would have to pay part of their nursing home bills. After the first 60 days of nursing home care, the Federal Government reduces its contribution by one-third. For mental hospital care a one-third reduction is made after the first 90 days and after one year there is no Federal contribution.

4. Services covered by Medicaid may be cut back and people eligible for assistance for the first time under F.A.P. are not necessarily eligible for Medicaid. States are not required to spend more on Medicaid than they now spend. Rather than paying for the additional cost of the program, the Federal Government will allow states to reduce the medical services provided under Medicaid and to decide whether or not newly eligible families with a father employed full-time will be eligible for Medicaid at all.

5. Profiteering by nursing homes in rural areas will be encouraged. Requirements that nursing homes in rural areas have at least one full-time registered nurse on staff would be dropped.

II. RECIPIENTS BELOW VARIOUS FEDERAL FLOORS, JULY 1970  
(Cash and food stamp bonus combined)

State	Grant level	Number of recipients
<b>\$1,600 per year, \$133 per month:</b>		
249,000 or 2.7 percent:		
1. Puerto Rico	\$53	249,000
<b>\$2,200 per year, \$183 per month:</b>		
572,700 or 6.6 percent:		
2. Mississippi	160	124,000
3. Alabama	168	146,000
4. Arkansas	181	53,700
<b>\$2,400 per year, \$200 per month:</b>		
872,500 or 10.2 percent:		
5. South Carolina	184	63,800
6. Louisiana	190	236,000
<b>\$2,800 per year, \$233 per month:</b>		
2,123,700 or 24.4 percent:		
7. Missouri	202	162,000
8. Tennessee	204	157,000
9. Georgia	205	237,000
10. Florida	206	242,000
11. West Virginia	210	104,000
12. Nevada	212	14,800
13. Indiana	214	93,000
14. North Carolina	222	137,000
15. Arizona	231	58,700
16. Maine	232	45,700
<b>\$3,000 per year, \$250 per month:</b>		
2,871,500 or 32.9 percent:		
17. Texas	237	284,000
18. New Mexico	240	56,900
19. Oklahoma	243	99,900
20. Delaware	245	23,000
21. Kentucky	245	135,000
22. Maryland	248	149,000
<b>\$3,300 per year, \$275 per month:</b>		
4,900,900 or 57.4 percent:		
23. Nebraska	252	34,000
24. Ohio	252	306,000
25. Utah	258	39,500
26. Wisconsin	263	85,600
27. California	267	1,378,000
28. Oregon	271	83,000
29. Wyoming	273	6,000
30. Montana	274	16,400
31. Colorado	275	80,900

State	Grant level	Number of recipients
<b>\$3,600 per year, \$300 per month:</b>		
5,601,900 or 64.3 percent:		
32. District of Columbia	278	51,200
33. Idaho	282	18,400
34. Iowa	283	71,100
35. Kansas	284	61,400
36. North Dakota	295	11,500
37. Virginia	295	105,000
38. Hawaii	297	28,300
39. Michigan	297	312,000
40. Rhode Island	297	42,100
<b>\$4,000 per year, \$333 per month:</b>		
6,282,100 or 72.1 percent:		
41. Illinois	316	427,000
42. New Hampshire	324	11,200
43. Minnesota	329	91,000
44. South Dakota	330	18,000
45. Washington	333	133,000
<b>\$4,200 per year \$350 per month:</b>		
6,952,200 or 79.7 percent:		
46. Vermont	334	13,100
47. Pennsylvania	339	508,000
48. Massachusetts	340	149,000
<b>\$4,500 per year, \$375 per month:</b>		
8,563,200 or 90 percent:		
49. Connecticut	356	91,000
50. New York	362	1,140,000
51. New Jersey	371	380,000
<b>\$4,800 per year, \$400 per month:</b>		
8,709,200 or 100 percent:		
52. Alaska	399	146,000

III. SHOULD A MOTHER WORK FOR \$1.20/HR.?  
(Weekly)

A mother of 3 working 40 hours a week at \$1.20 per hour earns	\$48.00
Social Security tax (5.2%)	2.50
Other deductions (union dues, hospitalization, etc.)	2.50
<b>Net pay</b>	<b>43.00</b>

<b>(Her costs)</b>	
Bus fare at \$1.00 per day	5.00
Lunch away from home (\$1.50 is reasonable; allow \$1.00/day)	5.00
Extra personal expenses; clothing, tools, cleaning and laundry, etc. (\$10.00 is reasonable, allow \$5.00/wk.)	5.00
Bus fare to get 3 children to babysitter or child care center (\$3.00 is reasonable; allow \$2.00)	10.00
Child care for 3 children: HEW estimates \$2,100/yr/child, or \$40.00 per week per child. We estimate \$25.00 per week per child for babysitter. Allow \$20.00/wk/child	60.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>85.00</b>

Net loss from working full time at \$1.20 per hour -42.00  
Work without pay is slavery! work for minus pay is tyranny!  
FAP-OFF grant is \$2,400 per year for a mother with 3 children each week that comes to \$46.15

As a reward for working, a mother with three children ends up with 4.15

A family of four needs \$6,500 a year or \$125 a week net for minimum health and decency in 1971.

WHAT IS A REAL WORK INCENTIVE?  
(Weekly)

Mother of three working 40 hours at \$2 per hour	\$80.00
Social security tax (5.2%)	4.16
Other deductions (union dues, hospitalization)	2.84
<b>Net pay</b>	<b>73.00</b>

<b>(Her costs)</b>	
Bus fare	5.00
Lunches	5.00

(Her costs)—Continued

Laundry, etc.....	\$5.00
Children's transportation and child-care provided in her neighborhood, free.	
Total .....	-15.00
Net real income.....	58.00

Adequate income grant, \$6,500/year.	125.00
One-third of her real income is exempt in computing her grant ( $\frac{1}{3} \times \$5 = \$20$ ) .....	20.00

The family ends up with \$145 and actually improves their standard of living by working.

The mother has a choice of whether she wants the additional money or the additional time with her children.

**PROPELLER CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES SUPPORT COMPLETION OF CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL**

**HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the Cross-Florida Barge Canal, authorized and funded by the Congress, is a national project which will benefit all Americans. The canal has wide support, not only in Florida, but across the country.

An indication of this support is the resolution recently adopted by the Propeller Club of the United States. Mr. William M. White, president of the Port of Jacksonville, Fla., chapter of the Propeller Club has called to my attention a recent resolution adopted by the Southeast Regional Convention of the Propeller Club. It is similar to the action taken earlier this year at the national convention of the organization.

I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of Mr. White's letter to me and the resolution of the national organization backing the Cross-Florida Barge Canal, which is economically justified, will help the environmental control in central Florida, and is needed for national defense, especially in light of increasing Soviet Navy activity in Caribbean.

The material follows:

PROPELLER CLUB  
OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Jacksonville, Fla., May 12, 1971.

Representative CHARLES E. BENNETT,  
House of Representatives, House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BENNETT: Delegates attending the Southeast Regional Convention of the Propeller Club of the United States held recently in San Juan, Puerto Rico unanimously adopted a resolution calling for completion of the Cross Florida Barge Canal. A copy of this resolution is enclosed for your information.

This action re-emphasizes the favorable position taken at the National Convention and the importance of this project to the local sixty (60) clubs and thirteen thousand (13,000) members of the Propeller Club across the nation.

Your restudy of this project and support for its completion without further delay will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. WHITE,  
President.

**THE PROPELLER CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES, POSITION NO. 10-1971, THE CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL**

**BACKGROUND**

The Cross-Florida Barge Canal project, linking the Gulf intracoastal waterway and the Atlantic intracoastal waterway, was authorized by Congress in 1942 to promote the National defense and facilitate the transportation of material and supplies under both wartime and peacetime conditions.

In addition to providing flood control, water supply hydrology and navigation, the Army Corps of Engineers' project plans approved by Congress were designed to prevent or eliminate danger to the environment.

The Corps' action in considering the need for protecting the environment and maintaining ecological balance was in keeping with its long-standing practice in construction of other water resource projects.

Each year since 1962 Congress has appropriated funds for the design and construction of the Cross-Florida Barge project. In its fiscal year 1971 appropriations, Congress specifically directed that the project not be delayed for any additional environmental impact studies, feeling that sufficient studies already had been made to prove that the environmental quality would not be disturbed but would, in fact, be enhanced over the years.

On January 19, 1971, President Nixon ordered a halt to further construction work on the Cross-Florida Barge Canal. He indicated he was taking such action on recommendation of the Council on Environmental Quality. The Council had pointed out to him "that the project could endanger the unique wildlife of the area and destroy this region of unusual and unique natural beauty." Subsequently, the Army Corps of Engineers ordered all work on the project stopped. At that time the project was one-third complete and the United States had expended more than \$50 million on design and construction. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida has disbursed an additional \$12 million since 1964 when actual construction on the project got under way.

Water transportation interests, water resource development interests, and the Congress of the United States are united in the belief that continued development of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal is essential to the nation's defense posture, and transportation needs of the country as a whole. They believe this can be accomplished in harmony with ecological considerations.

**POSITION**

The Propeller Club of the United States appeals to the President of the United States to re-consider his action on the Cross-Florida Barge Canal and to allow construction on this essential project to proceed without further delay in accordance with authority already granted by the Congress.

**MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—  
HOW LONG?**

**HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

**PUERTO RICO AND THE MINIMUM WAGE**

**HON. HERMAN BADILLO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, one of the major pieces of legislation currently before the Congress is that which seeks to raise the Federal minimum wage. A particularly controversial issue—and one which the House General Labor Subcommittee carefully examined in recent hearings in San Juan—is the proposal that the minimum wage be fully applicable to Puerto Rico, on the same basis as it would apply to the 50 States.

Although much has been written about the effects of the minimum wage in Puerto Rico, I do not feel that labor's side of the issue has been adequately presented or fully considered. Furthermore, opponents of the proposal seem to want separate treatment for Puerto Rican workers, even though they are American citizens entitled to the same benefits and protections as other American citizens.

I have recently received a letter from Sr. Nicolas Noguerras Rivera, president of the Puerto Rico Free Federation of Labor. In urging that the minimum wage be fully applied to Puerto Rico, Sr. Noguerras presents a forceful and perceptive argument. As he aptly notes, Puerto Ricans are American citizens and deserve equal treatment.

Commenting on the position of certain industrial groups and special business interests, Sr. Noguerras comments that—

Sometimes they have expressed the idea of leaving out Puerto Rico from the benefits of the National Labor Standards Act. In other occasions, they talk about flexibility, meaning that the law should continue with the so-called Special or Industrial Committees, where employers have practically the dominant privileged position. In some occasions, they maintain the position that some industries in Puerto Rico may afford to pay the statutory increases, but not all the industries or employers.

This Puerto Rican labor leader continues his letter by noting that Puerto Rican workers are entitled to equal protection and the opportunity to achieve a standard of living at the same level as their fellow Americans on the mainland:

We are just simply and plain and loyal American citizens entitled to the equal protection of the law. The American citizenship of which we are really proud should not be understood only to receive grants-in-aid; to enjoy subsidies and protection for agricultural, commerce and industries and help to carry on the economic burden of the local government of the Commonwealth. The American citizenship contemplates also the fulfillments of individual and social duties. They, the conservative and ultra-reactionary employers, do not believe in economic and social justice; do not believe Puerto Ricans are entitled to the high standards of living of the continental fellow Americans; they do not believe in the constitutional precepts of the equal protection of the law.

The Puerto Rico Free Federation of Labor ("Federación Libre de los Trabajadores de Puerto Rico") founded 1899 by the late Santiago Iglesias Pantin, and the membership and leaders are hopeful that the people will be protected in their rights to live a

decent life and to receive the economic justice of the federal law to face, to some extent, the inflationary spiral so as to afford our people the opportunity to pay goods, commodities in general and services so badly needed in the homes of the Puerto Rican families, integrated by loyal American citizens.

Attached to Sr. Nogueras letter was a copy of a statement which the Puerto Rico Free Federation of Labor submitted to the General Labor Subcommittee last fall. Although this statement does not specifically pertain to minimum wage legislation, it eloquently expresses the status and plight of the Puerto Rican labor movement and petitions the Congress for equal treatment under the laws we enact. As I mentioned in my speech on Puerto Rico earlier this month, wages on the island are only a fraction of those on the mainland, although the cost of living in Puerto Rico is much higher than in many U.S. locales. If we are going to effectively grapple with the urban crisis and the impending influx of Puerto Rican migrants, we must make certain that Puerto Rico receives its full and fair share.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Federation's statement to the attention of our colleagues and am pleased to present it herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF MR. NICOLAS NOGUERAS RIVERA, PRESIDENT OF THE PUERTO RICO FREE FEDERATION OF LABOR TO THE HOUSE GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR ON PROPOSED BILLS AMENDING THE NATIONAL LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Distinguished members of the Subcommittee: We have the privilege to appear before the general Subcommittee of Labor on behalf of the Puerto Rico Free Federation of Labor founded in 1899 under the leadership of the late Santiago Iglesias Pantin and voicing the sentiments of the toiling masses of Puerto Rico integrated by loyal Americans. We are urging, as we have done before, that in considering any amendment or amendments to the National Labor Standards Act, Puerto Rico be treated as if it were a state of the Union and that no discrimination be made affecting the Puerto Rican working people, your fellow citizens. We base our petition on the following points:

1. By the Treaty of Paris signed with Spain, the United States assumed the responsibility of the political destiny of Puerto Rico. This island was occupied by the American troops in 1898. In 1900 the U.S. Congress adopted the Bill Foraker and a civil government was established in our beloved island. In 1917 the U.S. Congress approved the Jones Act and a new Organic Law was extended to Puerto Rico and American citizenship was bestowed to the people of this Island. Thus, we are, by the will of Congress and the people of the United States, American citizens. And we are proud of being Americans. And we have shown and demonstrated once and again that we have been loyal and fullfledged Americans. And there are no two different classes or categories of American citizenship.

2. In 1938 the U.S. Congress considered it proper and justified in adopting the Fair Labor Standards Act making it applicable to Puerto Rico in equal footing with continental United States. The late Santiago Iglesias Pantin, who by that time was Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Washington approved the congressional action together with our Free Federation of Labor and our working people in general. There seems to be no valid reason to continue since 1940 discriminating against Puerto Rican labor in

the application of the Federal Labor Standards Act. In 1940 the law was amended with the excuse of protecting the needlework industry. All other industries were covered by the protection. As we have said in previous statements "this long break has produced anxiety, social and economic frustrations, hopelessness in the hearts and homes of the working people and have developed malnutrition and diseases and has hampered the normal development in the social and educational fields in a great segment of underpaid labor";

3. The discrimination of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Law against the working people of Puerto Rico who are also American citizens doesn't assure the people of Puerto Rico the equal protection of the law. The Constitution of the United States was adopted and amended to guarantee the equal protection of the law to every citizen of our Nation. A minimum wage rate for agricultural workers and other for industrial employees have been established to workers on the mainland nationwide and uniformly. But when coming to Puerto Rico and other territories integrated by American citizens, by loyal Americans, wage rates are lower and the procedure to fix them are let to special industry committees where labor has a minority vote;

4. Sometimes you have to hear and endure the argument that we do not pay direct federal taxes; that we do not economically cooperate to keep the public structure of the administration. This is one of the fallacies that have been used once and again by some enemies of the United States in Puerto Rico; by secessionists. The people of Puerto Rico are one of the best buyers of the American production both on the mainland and of this island. In all that we buy we pay all the costs of production; all the taxes; all the wage increases; all the interests; all the expenses from the area of production to the market in Puerto Rico. And we have to buy and pay the high prices of commodities with the low wages received by the toiling masses, who, naturally have a very low buying power;

5. In 1938 when Congress adopted the National Labor Standards Act and extended it to Puerto Rico fixing a minimum wage of 25 cents an hour, the employers in Puerto Rico vigorously opposed the Act and used almost the same arguments they are using nowadays. But they are not opposing federal subsidies; grants-in-aid; and other federal programs to protect agriculture, commerce, business, etc.

6. Inflation is constantly deducing the buying power of the dollar and the discrimination in wages make it impossible for the American workers in this American territory to keep pace with the high standards of living and inflation in the mainland. And we buy with low wages the high priced commodities.

7. We suggest that the definition of "State" should include Puerto Rico and that this island be treated in the law and in its amendments just as any of the states of the Union are treated or will be treated. We in Puerto Rico are American citizens as are the citizens of New York, California, Louisiana or Michigan. We have fought side by side with our fellow Americans from the mainland during the First and Second World War; during the Korean War and recently in Vietnam.

We are confident that the distinguished members of the Honorable Subcommittee on Labor will understand the position of organized labor and the toiling masses of Puerto Rico who have to face the constant resistance of employers who have in their hands means and ways to fight against any measure of the U.S. Congress destined to afford to our people in this island economic and social justice and the American way of life to which we are entitled.

PUBLIC SAFETY AND POLICE POWERS

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in including in the RECORD an excellent statement from America magazine, the National Catholic Weekly, edited by the Jesuits of the United States. This statement, entitled "Public Safety and Police Powers," appeared in the May 22, 1971, issue of America and states that the thousands of arrests made by the police of demonstrators in early May in Washington would be legal only "by changing the Constitution to permit 24- or 48-hour detention by the police of any citizen for reasons of public safety." America magazine goes on to state, however, that—

As a nation . . . we have wisely declined to give the police this authority. It is too easily abused. These days, the government can find a need for public safety anytime it wants to.

The article from America magazine follows:

PUBLIC SAFETY AND POLICE POWERS

Through the technique of mass arrests, the Washington, D.C., police force efficiently thwarted the efforts of the "Mayday Tribe" to disrupt the government during the opening days of May. But the mass arrests themselves demonstrated that, where public safety is the issue, constitutional principles will be disregarded until order has been restored. The ancient Romans immortalized this principle in the words *Salus populi, suprema lex*; we might render it in modern English as "no government, no rights."

The principle is sound enough, but its application must be carefully restricted to situations of the utmost urgency. When police cleared the parks, the bridges and the traffic circles in Washington, they were confronted with mobs openly dedicated to public disruption. In the process of suppressing those mobs, the police also swept up large numbers of peaceful sympathizers and a small number of curious onlookers and completely innocent bystanders. The arresting officers did not have time to distinguish between the zealots, the eggheads, the sympathizers, the fire-watchers and the casual passers-by. Anyone caught within the limits arbitrarily declared off-bounds was rounded up and hauled away, without any of the usual niceties of constitutional procedure.

It would be possible to legalize everything the police did during the recent demonstrations by changing the Constitution to permit 24- or 48-hour detention by the police of any citizen for reasons of public safety. As a nation, however, we have wisely declined to give the police this authority. It is too easily abused. These days, the government can find a need for public safety anytime it wants to. It is better to bend the Constitution now and then rather than declare open season on our individual freedoms.

For the same reason, when the Attorney General of the United States claims the authority to wiretap, without court approval, any group suspected of domestic subversion, as Mr. Mitchell did in an appeal filed with the U.S. Supreme Court on May 8, that authority must be emphatically denied him. We should take it as a simple fact of life that government authorities will use wiretaps whenever they think it indispensable to do so. But if we are to preserve any pri-

vacy, we must maintain the basic principle that government surveillance of individuals and organizations, by wiretap or otherwise, is the exception and not the rule.

Where foreign espionage is concerned, delicate problems of international diplomacy justify maximum swiftness and secrecy in our government's counter-operations. But where domestic subversion is the issue, it will be the rare case in which the F.B.I. or the police do not have time to secure a court order permitting wiretapping. The necessity of securing the order, under penalty of not being able to use the information acquired in a criminal prosecution, will effectively deter the government from conducting drag-net wiretaps. It will also be a constant reminder, to both the government and to all of us, that freedom and privacy, however much restricted in times of great peril, are primary constitutional values and therefore not subject to routine suspension.

#### A NEW STAGE OF CIVILIZATION

### HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, a very discerning constituent of mine sent me a copy of a short article she has written which I found to be most profound and impressive. I would like to share it with my colleagues and include it herewith:

#### A NEW STAGE OF CIVILIZATION

(By Mrs. Zell Gaston Pope, Georgiana, Ala.)

About twenty years ago a Maxwell Field Chaplain spoke to our county teachers' organization on the development of our civilization in regard to social acceptance of murder. He said we had finally come to reject any form of civilian murder except for self-defense, but we still accepted mass murder in the form of war as right and honorable as long as we could consider the victims as a part of an enemy nation. He predicted that some day we would reach a stage of civilization when we would realize that war murder is as wrong as civilian murder. I am hoping and praying that the present anti-war sentiment will bring us to that stage.

According to the news media, however, we are still lagging in some relative priorities. The Calley incident of civilian murders made top news while the list of our fighting men killed, wounded, and missing can hardly be found on some obscure page in small print, and with no TV mention at all. Are not our military sons also innocent victims of a war they did not make or ask to fight? Are we so steeped in the customs and traditions of war that we cannot honorably admit that we love and cherish the lives of our sons as much as our daughters and children? There is public concern about the right and wrong of the death penalty for criminals and their unsanitary prison conditions. But what about the present count of our 262 thousand men in the death row horrors of Vietnam? We criticize the irresponsible attitude of today's youth and continue with a draft law that is so disrupting to their careers that they do not know how to plan their lives.

As an ordinary American citizen, I may not always be able to see the difference between political honesty and personal ambition among the antiwar candidates, but I am with the young people who plan to take their anti-war campaign to the polls. As a former student and teacher of history, I know there have been economic causes of all

wars and I know that ending this one now will create an economic problem. But just as we would not legally allow the murder of a son in a civilian home for the sake of family economy, I do not think we should continue battlefield murder for the sake of national economy. I believe we should have strong military defense at home and lock our doors to outside intruders, but to continue sending our troops to foreign nations because we are afraid they might intrude on us is too much like going over and murdering my personal enemy because I'm afraid he might come over and murder me.

I believe that an international extension of our personal morality based on Christ's teaching of peace through love is our only hope for the survival of our present civilization and that if we continue our "might makes right" policy with Russia, we will end up like the proverbial gingham dog and calico cat.

#### REPORT TO THE THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, I sent to my constituents in the Third Congressional District of New York a report on Federal activities of interest to them. Included in the report were my thoughts on the economic situation in this country, revenue sharing, and the lack of progress in the Paris peace talks. I would like to include a copy of my report at this point in the RECORD:

A REPORT FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN, LESTER L. WOLFF, THIRD DISTRICT, N.Y.

MAY 1971.

DEAR FRIEND: The past several months have been unusually busy for the beginning of a new Congress and there is much to report. First, for those of you who want to visit or correspond with me in Washington, note my new office address: 403 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515. For my Queens constituents, I have a new direct New York City line to my District office (212) 423-1050. The Nassau number remains unchanged (516) 767-4343.

#### NEW COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT

Last month I was elected sole downstate Member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. In addition to continuing service on the Foreign Affairs Committee, I sought the added assignment because I believe Congress must devote greater effort to meeting the needs of former servicemen. It is my intention to use this new Committee assignment to push for a shake-up of Veterans' Hospital care, a new VA Hospital for Long Island and needed benefits for those who have served our country.

I shall be making a special effort in the area of veteran re-employment and job training. Unlike the programs which existed after World War II and the Korean War, the Federal Government has not given the needed attention to helping discharged servicemen secure jobs. This is especially important because the generally poor employment picture complicates this problem. I will try to find a solution to the growing Vietnam Veterans narcotics addition problem. I am hopeful that in my new position on the Veterans' Affairs Committee I can be of direct assistance to Long Island veterans.

This is an appropriate place to note that with my reappointment to the Foreign Affairs Committee, I am continuing, as a ranking

Member, to serve on three Sub-Committees: (1) Asian and Pacific Affairs; (2) Near East; and (3) Foreign Economic Policy.

#### FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT

During my April visit to Paris, Ambassador Bruce, our chief negotiator to the Paris Peace talks, reported a complete stalemate.

Congressman Rosenthal and I arranged an informal meeting with the North Vietnamese chief negotiator, Nygen Vy, the first informal conference in 1½ years, since Senator Vance Hartke of Indiana saw them. I cannot report great progress in any area. However, as "small steps for man" have been taken before, this could prove to be one of them leading to discussions on the fate and release of our POW's—a cease fire and peace.

Their response was that if a reasonable termination date were set for our presence in Vietnam, they would arrange for the release of "all captured Americans" in their custody and would guarantee the safety of all of our withdrawing forces.

I do not fully trust the words of Hanoi, but since we are engaged in a "phased Vietnamization and withdrawal", as articulated by President Nixon, we could gain lives and safety for our forces and those who are rotting in prison camps by testing this proposal.

If we set a date and Hanoi fails to release our POW's according to plan, we have the option to rescind our withdrawal date. By failing to respond to this proposal, we are failing our men who pay with their lives in Vietnam and those at home who pay with their dollars to support the war while conditions at home continue to erode.

Recently, as a Member of the Middle East subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I visited Israel to assess the U.S. interest in this troubled land. The Soviet design for a take-over of the entire Middle East has been a long standing policy. Our nation, concerned with our own basic Middle East interests, cannot permit this "take-over" to occur. It would be an invitation for further penetration into Africa, India and Pakistan and control of the Mediterranean; it is in our interest to continue supporting the independence of the State of Israel.

In Israel, I found a strength of purpose and dedication seemingly unparalleled. This type of support was unfortunately not evidenced by the South Vietnamese.

Israel has built strong defenses and has put those items that they have been permitted "to purchase" from us to good use. To request the Israelis to cede defensive capabilities by giving up strategic areas would be an open invitation to rekindle the war which could involve the entire world. In my talks with leaders, Israel requested not one American soldier to do battle for them. They need and should have U.S. materiel to meet the combined Soviet-Arab challenge. Gerald Ford, Republican Leader of the House of Representatives said: "U.S. security is tied to Israel's". Since the program of materiel support closely follows the Nixon Doctrine, to do less than fill Israel's materiel needs would be in conflict with our basic interests.

#### INDOCHINA

The war in Indochina continues to be on center stage in Washington. I have been active on several different projects to end the conflict.

More than 40 colleagues from both parties have co-sponsored my legislation to send a high level U.S. study team to the October South Vietnamese presidential elections to determine whether these elections are fair and free. Senator Adlai Stevenson of Illinois sponsored similar legislation in the Senate. Protecting the South Vietnamese right of self-determination has been the avowed purpose of our involvement. We have the right and the responsibility to determine if this purpose has been fulfilled.

A large bi-partisan group of my colleagues



and I have sponsored the Vietnam Disengagement Act providing for the orderly and total withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Vietnam by a fixed date. This measure assures maximum protection for our troops during the withdrawal period, provides for the safe return of all American POW's and gives the South Vietnamese fair notice they will be responsible for their own defense. This is the only responsible path to pursue. We should not get out in the same haphazard way that we got into this war.

I have sponsored and endorsed several resolutions and statements in Congress making certain that the total withdrawal of U.S. forces includes the return of all our prisoners of war. The POW situation concerns me greatly and I think it imperative that we maintain our interest in these brave men until they are finally back on American soil.

**ECONOMIC ILLS CONTINUE**

The rate of inflation has slowed just slightly and the level of unemployment remains excessively high—obviously the lack of coherent, responsible national economic policies has taken its toll on Long Island. I am continuing to work with industrial and labor leaders on Long Island to increase employment opportunities and bring new business to our area.

The President, responding to repeated requests to give special attention to our particularly severe unemployment problem, has designated Nassau and Suffolk among the 14 regions in the country selected for special relief.

The Congress has also acted to help fight our economic problems. I was proud to be counted on the "Low interest honor roll" compiled by Banking and Currency Committee Chairman Wright Patman to fight high interest rates and am even more pleased that our effort has seen a reduction in interest rates.

Extension by Congress of unemployment compensation as a means of immediate relief and to secure the release of blocked federal funds as a long-term solution to our economic weakness is under consideration. I am a sponsor of both efforts.

I have written to you many times about the short-sighted fiscal and monetary policies pursued by 2 consecutive Administrations. I reiterate my fundamental commitment to a reordering of national priorities which can effect a net reduction in federal spending and, at the same time, provide constructive employment for all Americans. Nurturing of special interests through costly and unproductive programs must stop.

**LONG ISLAND SOUND AND ITS SHORELINE**

After years of working on this problem, it has been highly gratifying to have secured substantive Federal action on the conservation of the Sound and its shoreline.

I had two staff members at the New England River Basins Commission meeting in March. The Commission announced a preliminary timetable for their comprehensive three year study of the Sound.

The Environmental Protection Agency held an enforcement conference designed to secure industrial, municipal and private adherence to existing water quality laws for the Sound. Hundreds of polluters—most of them on the Connecticut side of the Sound—are violating existing laws which, if enforced could effectively clean up the Sound. I pledge to use all the power I can command to improve the water quality of the Sound.

Closer to home, the Interior Department completed a study I requested of Udall's Cove, at the tip of Little Neck Bay, and reported that portions of the Cove have ecological value worth protecting. The Department's Bureau of Sports, Fisheries and Wildlife said it favored conservation of the land for open spaces recreation and offered to

work with local authorities to achieve this goal.

In Hempstead Harbor, the Town of North Hempstead applied to the Army Corps of Engineers for permission to fill 26 acres of marshlands preparatory to enlarging the Town incinerator. At a public hearing called at my request by the Corps, I opposed this request and suggested the Town use the Port Washington sand pits as a short-term location for dumping incinerator residue. I urged the Town to show some initiative by moving toward modern means of refuse disposal including recycling and residue treatment. Creative and imaginative solutions to the solid waste problem are the only alternative to being buried in our own garbage.

Further east is the Bayville-Oyster Bay area where the State would like to locate a bridgehead for a Long Island Sound crossing. I am continuing to oppose this project with the goal of protecting the 5,000 acre federal wildlife refuge created by the Town at my suggestion three years ago. The bridge battle has been long and difficult, but I am convinced that the public can win if we sustain our interest and continue to cooperate.

**ASK CONGRESS**

It has been my privilege to serve as moderator of the new nationally broadcast television show "Ask Congress." Now seen in approximately 20 major cities across the country, "Ask Congress" is a non-profit, bipartisan public affairs show which presents leading members of Congress, answering viewer questions. You may watch "Ask Congress" in New York at 11:30 p.m. every Sunday on WPIX, Channel 11.

**SOCIAL SECURITY BOOST**

The newly convened 92nd. Congress took quick action to pass legislation which I sponsored to raise Social Security benefits by 10 percent. This was the minimum increase required to enable those on Social Security to keep pace with sharply rising inflation and unless the cost-of-living spiral is checked, another increase will be required.

To solve this constant emergency action on Social Security benefits, I am an author of legislation, the concept of which was endorsed by the President, to provide automatic cost-of-living increments in Social Security payments. Senior citizens and others receiving Social Security would not have to wait for the legislative and bureaucratic machinery to provide needed and justified increases. There is reason to believe that such a change in the Social Security law might be enacted this year thereby resolving the inflationary bite on Social Security pensions.

**SAVING THE MUSTANGS**

A justifiable public outcry gained momentum in recent months against the continual destruction of the remaining wild horses on our Western plains. The mustang population has been reduced since the start of the century from an estimated two million to fewer than 17 thousand today.

Long Island has become a center of national interest in saving the mustangs from extinction. A number of constituents called this subject to my attention early in the current Congressional Session. I promptly authored a strong measure to protect the mustangs and hearings have already been held in the House and Senate on legislation which I proposed along with Congressman Baring and Gude and Senators Jackson, Nelson and Mansfield.

There is an excellent prospect of prompt legislative action on this measure which would instruct the Secretary of the Interior to take steps to protect the remaining wild horse herds from destruction for commercial or other purposes.

**AID FOR THE CITIES AND STATES**

The financial plight of state and local governments will not be solved by the President's

revenue sharing proposals. New York State would pay more than 12 percent of all taxes and receive only 10.68 percent of "shared revenue" under the President's proposal, obviously not a Fair Share.

I think the Federal Government should assume the burden of welfare, the largest expenditure of city, county and state governments. Since much of the problem has been created by the in-migration, especially to New York, from all over the United States, this would save New York State and the local governments in the State approximately \$1.7 billion a year compared to the 1/2 billion to be returned via revenue sharing.

Such financial relief should enable New York State to assume the full cost of public education and eliminate unfair and regressive local property taxes as the base for education. The net effect of such a program would be fair taxation, better public services and more responsible administration.

I am pleased that House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur Mills is giving high priority to welfare reform. Inequities and waste in the present system must be eliminated. Public assistance is essential but wasting the public's money is wrong.

I welcome your comments and suggestions on the wide range of issues pending before Congress.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER L. WOLFF,  
Member of Congress.

**THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER: KNOWN BUT TO GOD**

**HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to place in the RECORD a composition that ties in with the day we observe with reverence and dedication—Memorial Day.

Written by Mr. Gene Rickett of Knoxville, Tenn., the work is called "The Unknown Soldier." It follows:

**THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER: KNOWN BUT TO GOD**

(By Gene Rickett)

Known but to God, is the unknown soldier. Laying in his tomb, he represents the war dead.

Known but to God, is the fate of our country, protected by those, who lie in our stead.

Known but to God, he represents a great army, of loved ones to us, who will never more roam.

Known but to God, are the souls of the last ones.

May they rest in peace, til God calls them home.

Known but to God, is the strength of our nation.

United by him, we know we will stand. Divided among us, are the strangers of Satan.

Known but to God, our life's in his hand.

Known but to God, are the hearts of all people.

Known but to him, we must do what we can, if we should lose, our life to gain freedom.

Known but to God, is the freedom of man. Known but to God, is the fate of our country. Divided by fear and troubles within.

Known but to God, we must seek the right answer.

Down on my knees, is the place where I've been.

**"YOU ARE THE FLAG" GRAND PRIZE  
WINNERS—PITTSBURGH**

**HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, patriotism might be said to be love of country, pride in it, desire to serve it.

On April 7 it was my pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues in the RECORD the unique "You Are the Flag" essay contest, sponsored by the Duquesne Light Co., Pittsburgh, in cooperation with the Allegheny Trails Council, Boy Scouts of America, which had the twofold aim of encouraging a meaningful vision of America in our young people, and honoring our bicentennial.

The 15 grand prize winners have now been chosen by a panel of local educators, business and civic leaders from among more than 25,000 seventh and eighth grade entrants in Allegheny and Beaver Counties. Their prize will be a 3-day all expense paid "Cradle of Democracy" Historic Flag Expedition to Boston.

Mr. Speaker, I feel quite honored to have been asked to present the certificates of award to the grand prize winners on June 14 in Flag Plaza, Pittsburgh, and would like at this time to announce them to you, and share some of their inspiring essays with you, as well as some of the remarks of the judges.

In these days of questioning and dissent, it is refreshing to know that patriotism is not dead in our youth. Congratulations to the winners, sponsors, judges, and all involved in this contest.

**GRAND PRIZE AWARD WINNERS—DUQUESNE  
LIGHT CO. "YOU ARE THE FLAG" ESSAY CONTEST**

1. Suzanne Ague, 8th Grade, 926 Mina St., Pgh. 15212 (231-8291), Latimer Junior High School, Pgh. (321-0312), Principal: A. Bellini, Teacher: Frank M. Craig.

2. Bob Beggs, 8th Grade, 200 Belladonna Dr., Glenshaw 15116 (486-4046), Shaler Junior High School (486-1900), Principal: Edward A. Winkler, Teacher: Mrs. Lois Kazenski.

3. Michelle Brewer, 8th Grade, 1002 Deerfield Dr., Elizabeth 15037 (384-7714), Elizabeth Forward Junior High School (751-5903), Principal: A. Raymond Kochis, Teacher: Ronald F. Corbin.

4. Joye Kosis, 8th Grade, 506 Ehman Ave., Baden 15005 (869-9443), Baden-Economy Junior High School, Beaver (869-2146), Principal: Fred Milanovich, Teacher: Virginia Woodling.

5. Donna Marie Little, 8th Grade, 158 Holiday Park Dr. (Plum Borough), Pgh. 15239 (793-9196), St. John Baptist School (793-0555), Principal: Sister Mary Mark Lowry, Teacher: Sister St. Helen Sullivan.

6. Melanie Matich, 8th Grade, 5308 Adobe Dr., Pgh. 15236 (653-3492) Whitehall Junior High School (881-8848), Principal: William John, Teacher: Vance R. Bunardzysa.

7. Mark Reilly, 7th Grade, 347 Fingal Street, Pgh. 15211 (431-9007), St. Mary of the Mount Elementary School (431-4645), Principal: Sister Clare Roche, I.H.M., Teacher: Sister deRicci Baker, I.H.M.

8. Jill Scheide, 8th Grade, 3218 Mt. Troy Rd., Pgh. 15212 (321-3315), St. Aloysius School, Reserve Township (821-1454), Principal: Sister Barabar Mary, Teacher: Mrs. Ann Stockhausen.

9. Allen Schriver, 7th Grade, M.R. #2, Baden 15005 (869-7203), Principal: Fred Milanovich, Teacher: Virginia Woodling Baden-Economy Junior High School, Beaver County (869-2146).

10. Matthew Schroeder, 8th Grade, 106 Link Ave. Pgh 15237 (366-0319), St. Teresa School, North Hills (364-4216), Principal Sister Marcia, O.S.B., Teacher: Mrs. Mae Crenner.

11. Mary Beth Styslinger, 7th Grade, 292 Hansell Ave., Verona 15235, Seneca Junior High School, Penn Hills, Principal: J. D. Snyder, Teacher: Miss A. L. Jerema.

12. Anna Tepsic, 8th Grade, R.D. 1, Industry, 15052 (643-8214), Western Beaver Junior-Senior High School (643-8500), Principal: Carlisle McPherson, Teacher: Mrs. Sabina Walsh.

13. Joseph Tierney, 7th Grade, 1330 Sheridan Ave. Pgh. 15206 (326-8518), Sacred Heart School, Pittsburgh (441-1582), Principal: Sister Irene Mary, Teacher: Sister Mary Clark.

14. Arnd Von Waldow, 8th Grade, 2629 Middle Road, Glenshaw 15116 (486-0518), Hampton Middle School, Hampton Township (486-6000), Principal: Raymond Snyder, Teacher: Mrs. Katherine McCormick.

15. Joan M. Zolkoski, 7th Grade, 1071 Woodlow St. 15205 (922-1309), St. James School (921-6059), Principal: Sister Lucia Marie, S.C., Teacher: Russell Steiner.

**YOU ARE THE FLAG**

(By Suzanne Ague)

You are the flag. Not just ordinary colors, white, blue, and red made from bits and pieces of cloth, but a symbol for our great nation and for what this nation and its citizens stand. So what do the letters spell? To many they just spell flag; but to an American, they stand for:

**F:** Freedom stands for the European immigrants who came to the shores of the United States. For Negro slaves in slavery until brave men under the stars and stripes fought for and won their freedom in 1865. This is the flag that stands for freedom for everyone.

**L:** Love. The love Nathan Hale showed for his country when he regretted "that he had but one life to give for his country." Love that America gave to "the sick, the homeless, the afflicted." No child will die of starvation in the United States when we have the ability to keep it from happening. The love shown to defeated enemies that we have aided after our victories.

**A:** Achievement which America made in putting the first flag on the North Pole. Achievement to keep it waving in the war of 1812, when our National Anthem was written. Achievement to be the first flag on the moon. Achievement in discovering cures for Polio, Yellow Fever, Smallpox, and measles.

**G:** Greatness for its outstanding power that it held with humility for many years. The greatness that all religions may worship freely. Every boy and girl no matter who they are can have free education. Greatness for what the flag means.

The flag isn't an ordinary piece of cloth with colors on it. Freedom, Love, Achievement, and Greatness, "You are the flag."

**WHY AM I HERE?**

(By Bob Beggs)

How stark my shadow looks against this gray, desolate surface. Why am I here? I have asked this question before in years past. In the peacefulness and loneliness here on the moon, I can review my life.

My origin dates back to 1777. I did not look the same as I look now. Originally, my stars numbered thirteen, but presently fifty stars adorn my field of blue. The nation which gave birth to me, the United States of America, preserved the traditions and ideals of its original thirteen states, which is represented by my thirteen red and white

stripes. My future at that time was uncertain.

The year 1814 found me waving over Fort McHenry while the British were bombarding it. "Why am I here, I asked. I was not harmed, and when morning dawned, a young man was inspired to write the "Star Spangled Banner."

I recall that tragic time when my nation was divided. I witnessed much bloodshed as I was carried into battle. That question again: Why am I here? I could not have realized that this was a great turning point in the history of my young nation.

In the years to follow, two more wars affected my motherland: World Wars I and II. I was the symbol of a democratic nation which fought to make the world safe for democracy. We were victorious. However, the struggles continue. Mine is not a country at rest. It is continuously growing and searching.

I've looked back long enough. It is time to look forward. There beyond this dismal horizon, shining like a jewel against the black sky, is earth. How precious a gem it is. My nation, under God, must preserve it.

**THE FLAG'S MEANING TO ME THROUGH THE  
YEARS ONE TO THIRTEEN**

(By Michelle Brewer)

It is hard to put into words my feelings about the flag. I will start from the beginning of my knowledge of the flag and recall the special meanings it has for me. I remember as a pre-school child watching a television program, where one of the main attractions was to teach the children to stand with the hand over the heart and recite the pledge of allegiance to the flag. I recall how pleased I was when I could recite the pledge, and was praised by my parents for learning so quickly. At this time I had no idea what it was all about.

When I became of school age, once again, every day the class would stand and recite the pledge to the flag. It still had little meaning to me. When I was in fourth grade we learned about the flag's history. I was anxious to tell my parents what I had learned, not realizing they already knew all of this information.

When I attended football games with my family, I remember how my parents looked so proud as they stood up looking at the flag.

When I became a Girl Scout and participated in the Flag Ceremony, it had a special meaning to me. I carried out my procedure with honor.

I remember my father assigning me the job of erecting the flag and taking it down on all special occasions at our home. I was proud to have this job and handled the flag with tender, loving care.

As I became older and interested in the news of the day, I recall all of the trouble about people misusing the flag and being disrespectful to it. This bothered me because I was always taught to respect and honor it. Through all of these encounters with the flag, my feeling for it was still not quite established in my mind, other than its red, white and blue standing for my country.

The true meaning came to me after all of these years as I stood and touched the flag that draped over the casket bearing the body of my brother. He loved the flag enough to fight to protect it and died that it may ever fly in freedom. This flag to me means the love of my country. Love strong enough to die for, as my brother did, for a land I call home, my country, the United States of America.

**YOU ARE THE FLAG**

(By Joye Kosis)

You, the flag of the United States of America, symbolize the brave pioneers who first settled in our country and endured the

hardships of the wilderness building a country where freedom of religion, speech, and press could long endure. You represent the colonists who bravely defended America in the Revolutionary War to keep these important freedoms and make our land independent and free from foreign rule. You stand for the laws of the nation which give the people the opportunity to elect their own officials to represent and speak for them. You are courts where justice reigns, with trial by jury and protection of life, liberty, and property. You fly over a nation where a firm stand was taken against slavery in a four year struggle between brothers in the Civil War. You are a banner of people of all races, all colors, and all religions proudly working side by side to make our nation a leader of nations. You signify open arms welcoming refugees and the homeless who are seeking shelter. You are the great defenders who fought oppression in the two World Wars. You are charity that provides for the underprivileged in our nation and abroad. You are opportunity of education for all. You are happiness, under God, which gives us values that are permanent and enduring rather than those that fade and die. So I will respect you, honor you, and fly you and be proud I am an American.

**YOU ARE THE FLAG**  
(By Donna Marie Little)

What is the flag? What is the symbol for which it stands? It is the land, and the people on the land. It is the bright new sun, peeking its head over the horizon; the morning dew, sparkling on the new grass. It is a child, building a snowman in mid-winter. It is rain, announcing a new spring, and the rays of the sun, painting bodies stretched on the beach. It is the brightly colored leaves of autumn in mid-September. It is the soft, stirring breeze, and the familiar smell of salt water; it is the "little bit of everything" smell in big cities.

It is people: the farmer who tills the soil; the factory worker, the refuse collector, the plumber, the electrician, the construction worker, the man who forges steel. It is the doctor; the teacher, leading a child to discover new things; the dentist, and, in a special way, it is the family, gathered around the table, giving thanks to God for another Thanksgiving Day.

It is a lot of happy memories: the house you grew up in; the town and the people you loved; that favorite teacher who made learning such fun; that one special friend. It is your very own dream, never to be revealed.

It is the Pilgrim, dying as he faces the hardship of a new land. It is the minuteman at Concord; the battle of Lexington; the freezing cold that made men die at Valley Forge. It is "Old Glory" at Appomattox; it is a surrender, in 1865, that established America a free nation, indivisible. It is George Washington, accepting the Grand Union flag of the new American Nation. It is the North, fighting the South, in a Civil War where men died, that their brothers might be free. It is the raising of the 48-star flag over Mount Suribachi, in Iwo Jima. It is our beloved Tom Dooley and Alan Shepard; it is James Meredith at the doors of Mississippi State University. It is Medgar Evers, bathed in his own blood. It is men like John and Robert Kennedy, and Martin Luther King.

See that flag!

Young Americans, stand tall! That flag is yours! You are the flag!

**YOU ARE THE FLAG**  
(By Melaine Matich)

When I recite the Pledge of Allegiance, I am doing more than just talking to a piece of cloth. I am saying that I believe in the aspirations we are trying to achieve and in the way of life represented by the flag.

The flag stands for the basic rights of man. What other flag stands for so many free-

doms? The right of free enterprise has played a big part in the dynamic growth of our country. The right to vote gives each of us a voice in our way of life. This right is now being extended to eighteen year olds. This, and other constructive changes, are possible under this flag.

It is true that all men have not always been given their guaranteed rights. However, this same flag will help them in their struggle to attain their rights. Much needs to be done to see that all who live under this flag are treated equally. The fact that we are talking and thinking about our shortcomings shows we care. You and I are the flag! We must care!

The flag has been with us through good times and bad. It took part in the expansion of our country. It was tested to the utmost during the Civil War, but weathered the storm.

Today, once more, it is being tested by some who have chosen to desecrate and burn our symbol. Because of its foundation, the flag will withstand this test, too. No other flag would allow dissent of this nature. It is willing to undergo changes to make what it stands for a reality for all and not just a dream of a few.

Today, this symbol of our way of life flies proudly on another heavenly body, the moon. The flag represents hope for the future.

You are the flag! Are you satisfied with yourself?

**YOU ARE THE FLAG**  
(By Mark Reilly)

Lady Liberty, a nation, a seamstress of renown, threads her shining needle with white and black . . . and plunges it into the fabric of royal blue. She has been sewing for quite some time—almost two-hundred years now—on a banner made of people.

(Who are the people?)

A few of her stars have fallen, Abraham, John, Martin and Bob, but she patiently picks them up, one at a time, and repairs the breach with new material.

(Who are the new?)

Of course, breaches are made to be filled and tears to be mended. Diplomacy, industry and commerce are a tough fabric to sew, and medicine and science are no small thing; yet each great star depends on the small, the neat little stitches that hold it in place.

(Who are the small?)

Valley Forge and Bunker Hill needed many stitches; and in 1861, the lady wept when her banner of freedom was torn in half . . . and brother fought brother in the Civil War. She needed much thread, then. Much strong thread.

(Who are the strong?)

However, her restless peoples are her strength. She is a young nation, working with a raw and tough fabric; a fabric never seen before in the halls of history; a fabric woven from the fleece of freedom. Freedom, threaded on the needle of good will, and thrust into the very moon above, a standard for all peoples to rally to, the banner of a new thing in this old world.

Stand tall, every American, so that all the nations will see the needlework of the Lady called Liberty! Line up and make a thread . . . for it is your day to enter the eye of the needle. You are the flag.

**THE MANY FACES OF THE FLAG**  
(By Jill Scheide)

From the tattered remnant of the Red, White, and Blue waving proudly over Fort McHenry to the flag hanging motionless in the atmosphere of the moon, our flag stands for America. It reflects our past, present and our future. America was built on ideals . . . ideals that could not be relinquished as long as man dreams of freedom and a better life for himself and his family. The flag is the symbol of the American dream. Dreams that a man could do better than his father

and his children, better than himself. America may not be perfect, but it has the strength, the ability to see it to a day when every man can call each other brother. America's strength lies not in its government or in a handful of men in Washington, but in its people. Its citizens are America's greatest resource. When Americans start believing that they don't count, that's when we lose everything, our strength, respect and courage. So when we are pledging our allegiance to our flag we are really expressing loyalty to ourselves.

The flag is a multitude of faces, backgrounds, races and religions. It is the President in the White House, the colored kid in the slums. It is the demonstrators, militants, the radicals and conservatives. Some people say, eliminate those who protest, but if we do we are taking away people's rights to be themselves, even though they are different than yourself. But weren't all our great men militant or radical? They wanted a country where you could walk free and fear nothing from anybody. Wasn't that revolutionary then? Are you not condemning the younger generation for wanting just that? We are a part of the flag, a vital part, for we represent America's future, someday we hope to be as glorious as our past.

**YOU ARE THE FLAG**  
(By Allen Schriver)

You are the flag! You symbolize a country that will be 200 years old in 1976. You represent the dreams of those who explored this land, and the bitter struggle of the pioneers who carved a new land from a wilderness. Many men have risked their lives and fortunes in your honor.

You are more than just a brightly-colored piece of cloth. Each stripe, star and color has a special meaning. Your thirteen stripes, alternating red and white, stand for the thirteen original colonies. Each star, one for each state now totaling fifty, symbolizes dominion and sovereignty, as well as high hopes.

The flagmakers of 1777 left no records to tell why they chose the colors, red, white and blue as your colors. But in 1782, the Department of State said your colors have these meanings:

Red stands for hardiness and courage.

White is the symbol of hope, purity, and innocence.

Blue, the color of heaven, stands for loyalty, friendship, justice, truth and reverence to God.

Even your letters have special meaning:

F stands for *faith* in our country;

L stands for *loyalty* to our country;

A is *Amo*—the latin word for *love* for our country; and

G stands for *glory* of our country.

Just a short time ago, you traveled with two of our astronauts on a historic journey to the Moon. You now stand on soil 238,548 miles from Planet Earth. You carried with you American ideas, American history and American feelings.

We salute you, "Old Glory"! You are the symbol of the mighty, yet humble Nation that we have become.

**MY FLAG**  
(By Matthew Schroeder)

The flag is a symbol of liberty and justice for one and all,

Wherever it's displayed today  
In stores and on classroom walls.

The flag to me is wonderful  
In every perfect way  
Since Betsy Ross first stitched the stars and stripes of yesterday.

It makes me think of battlefields,  
Of boys in grey and blue,  
It makes me wonder of the men who gave  
their lives for you—

They also gave their lives for me;  
For strangers of all races,  
Who came across the ocean blue  
To settle in new places.

But most of all it makes me think of America our nation.  
Of all our presidents, old and new,  
Who've won through their frustration.  
I am so very proud to be raising a loyal hand,  
To this great flag that flies above our great  
United land.

#### YOU ARE THE FLAG

(By Mary Beth Stylsinger)

I am the flag of the United States of America. I am the symbol of liberty and justice to the American people. I am the symbol for the independence of this country. That is all I am, for I am just a symbol. It is the people who are the flag. They are the ones who make it stand. My colors would have no meaning if it had not been for the people. Because of our leaders and the fathers of our country, I do have meaning. My thirteen stripes stand for the original colonies and the stars for the states we have now. In the words of George Washington . . . "We take the stars and blue from heaven, the red from our Mother country, separating it by white stripes, thus showing we have separated from her, and the white shall go down to posterity, representing liberty." I have stood through many a war, gaining more meaning every time. I have been respected, sometimes revered, and sometimes mistreated. Lately it seems I am more mistreated by those who protest what our leaders are doing. In their own way, these protesters only serve to make me have more meaning. If I didn't stand for justice, the protesters could not protest. If I didn't stand for liberty, they would not be free to use me to demonstrate against injustice. And so as my country learns to walk and grows in knowledge, I become prouder and more meaningful as a symbol of truth, justice, liberty, and the dreams of men before I was born and men who are yet to be born. I am the American flag. I am the American people. I stand proudly as their symbol for:

F—reedom  
L—liberty and  
A—allegiance with  
G—od.

#### YOU ARE THE FLAG

(By Anna Tepsic)

To my grandparents, who came from Europe, our Flag meant a great deal. To them our Flag represented a refuge where they could live, work and raise children in peace. In America they found that peace and an abundance of pride in living like free human beings. They came here looking for domestic tranquility and they found it. My grandparents, mere peasants, had a feeling that America was too far from their grasp and too great a dream to ever really be here, but Kahlil Gibran said, "In the magnifying glass of man's eye the world looks greater than it is."

Love, freedom, tranquility, justice . . . are just a few of the things which the Flag means to me. When I see the Flag and hear the National Anthem, many thoughts race through my mind. I think of all the men who have died at Valley Forge, Gettysburg, in Korea, Germany, and Guadalcanal, and those dying in Vietnam. And I think of all the great inventors who assisted in making our country great. While these thoughts race through my mind, tears course down my face, and I think how proud I am to be an American. I get an indescribable sensation when I read these words, "With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessings and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must be our own." These are the words of J. F. Kennedy.

"The world's richest person is the one who can say . . . I am an American!"

This statement by Paul Powell, Secretary of State, rings true in the hearts of Americans today, but for it to live on in the future, we must continue to stand for Truth, Justice, and Freedom.

#### YOU ARE THE FLAG

(By Joseph Tierney)

Although the flag of the United States represents a glorious heritage and a great nation, it also has to stand for the dark side of our country. In this essay I want to say that the flag must also bear the ugly half of the United States.

Too many people are under the impression that the flag represents only something beautiful or wonderful. The United States is far from a perfect nation and there are a great many problems left unsolved. These problems include the war in Asia, pollution in the water and air, poverty, prejudice, drugs, runaway inflation, rioting, campus unrest, a high crime rate, and many more.

Sometimes when I see the flag I think of something dark or evil.

Besides, the flag's colors seem to have lost their meaning. The red represents the blood of the men that have fought and died for our country . . . now many men refuse to be drafted. White stands for purity . . . now there is so much obscenity that there are demonstrations against it. Blue is supposed to mean justice . . . but there are still many prejudices against many people.

Despite all of this, the flag in itself is not something bad or evil. It merely represents something which may have both good and bad. And the United States does have many admirable qualities, all of which we should be proud of.

A flag, of course, is no better than what it represents. If what the flag symbolizes is honorable, then the flag is honorable. If what the flag stands for is evil, then the flag is evil. Therefore, in order to improve the image of the flag we must improve what it represents, the United States.

#### YOU ARE THE FLAG

(By Arnd Von Waldow)

I was born under the flag of Germany, a country which was destroyed by a dictatorship, injustice and war. I lived seven years under the flag of Brazil. My friends were very poor, many of them were colored and suffering from malnutrition. Now I am in the United States of America. I urged my parents to apply for citizenship. I want to live here for the rest of my life because I like you (the flag) and the ideals for which you stand.

The first English words which I learned in school was the Pledge of Allegiance. I understand that these words if taken seriously can protect this country from the way Germany went and can create conditions which are better than those from which my Brazilian friends are suffering today. When I say together with my parents for the first time as an American citizen the Pledge of Allegiance to you I feel that I am taking over a responsibility. This nation is indivisible so I have to make my contribution to bring together young and old, rich and poor, black and white. You stand for liberty and justice for all. This means that I must help to protect this and make my contribution that it really becomes true. My greatest wish is that your colors are respected as a symbol of peace by all nations. I understand that without peace in our nation and in the world nobody can enjoy liberty and justice.

#### YOU ARE THE FLAG

(By Joan M. Zolkoski)

Whenever I watch the American flag as it dances with the wind in the schoolyard or salute it every day in the classroom, or

while singing the National Anthem at the beginning of a baseball game, a warm image comes over me. I can picture the millions of men and women fighting to preserve our flag. I do not mean the cloth of the flag, but the nation it stands for.

The flag most certainly should and does mean more to me than a vision of Betsy Ross sewing by the fireside. To me it stands for the two-hundred trying years the many people have courageously tried to preserve and make our nation what it is today. It stands for the thousands upon thousands of young men giving their lives because they believe our nation is worth fighting for. Also it represents to me, all the great women and men who have striven excessively to keep our United States going. By this, I mean not only political leaders but those who work through fields of science and art. These are people such as Albert Einstein, Robert Kennedy, Clara Barton, Jonas Salk and Neil Armstrong.

Most important, however, I feel the flag represents us, the people of America who may not have gotten our name in history books but are playing our role as American citizens. If it weren't for us there would be no reason for our nation to stand, no reason to have a government, no reason to fly a flag. Yes, we, the common people of America make the nation. We are the country, we are the flag.

In that "we", I include not only myself and others but you too. Yes, you also make the country, you also make the flag!

#### COMMENTS OF JUDGES: "YOU ARE THE FLAG" ESSAY CONTEST

Judge William S. Rahauer, Allegheny County Orphans Court: Industry is to be congratulated and I hope the essay contest will be continued.

The essay contest was an impressive exhibition of our young people. It was proof that a lofty stimulus will produce a spiritual reaction of depth and feeling.

The contest and the content of what these young people had to say was an encouraging proof that our oncoming generation has both the patriotism and the ability to carry our nation forward in the years to come.

William R. Jackson, Sr., Chairman of the Board, Pittsburgh DesMoines County: It is very encouraging to see the thoughtfulness and perception with which the boys and girls view the problems in our country today.

Their expressions of faith, that the principles of freedom and liberty will survive and will help solve the unrest is also encouraging.

It is reassuring to see these expressions of faith and belief in the younger generation and they suggest that the generation gap is not as wide as some people think.

William J. Stephens, Chairman of the Board, Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., President, Flag Plaza Foundation: Four hours of a thrilling experience! The response to the essay contest, "You Are The Flag," clearly demonstrated the deep and real feeling of the boys and girls of school age as they address themselves to writing about their flag. Make no mistake—they care! They do not understand disrespect to the flag shown by the few. They are proud of their flag and see it in their hopes for the future and the future of the world.

Duquesne Light and Flag Plaza Foundation have blazed new trails, through this magnificent effort, to record the thoughts of the students 12 to 14 years of age. Their love of their flag comes through in many expressions. Would that all the essays could be printed and read by those who believe that devotion to the flag is waning in the hearts and minds of the young.

Judge Maurice B. Cahill, Allegheny County Common Pleas Court: Congratulations to

the Allegheny Trails Council, Boy Scouts of America and to Duquesne Light Company. It was inspiring to participate in the judging of this contest. If all of our young people could concentrate on projects such as these, I'm sure we could operate Juvenile Court on a part-time basis.

E. H. Eaton, Treasurer, PPG Industries, Inc., Treasurer, Flag Plaza Foundation: The "You Are The Flag" Essay Contest has stimulated students to think about the development of their country and the responsibilities each citizen has to this country. The sponsor of the contest is to be congratulated for backing a contest with such meaningful results.

Alfred W. Wishart, Jr., Director and Secretary, Pittsburgh Foundation: In addition to being a bit weary after reading these essays, my mood is one of surprise at the depth and grasp of these young people and hope in the insights and spirit which they all evidenced. These young Americans are all worthy of commendation. I hope my judgments have been adequate and fair. It has been a pleasure to participate in this contest.

Robert L. Richmond, Senior Vice-President, Ketchum, Inc.: Duquesne Light is to be congratulated and lauded for sponsoring this essay contest in Allegheny and Beaver County Schools. While such a program is always meaningful, it has provided a much more vital focus at this point in time.

For me, it has underscored that our greatest American resource is our young. But only if they are properly lead and educated! The Flag Foundation's program properly accentuates the positive and by so doing helps to beget that sort of a response from young Americans.

This nation, or no nation, can constantly withstand constant abuse and derision about its every institution. Each and every firm and company in our free enterprise nation has the obligation to help teach the fundamentals of freedom and responsibility upon which all else depends. Hurrah for Duquesne Light for helping to light the way here in Pittsburgh as we move into our third century in 1976!

James R. McIlroy, President, Anvil Products Co.: I am impressed by the undoubted sincerity of these young people in writing on a "square" subject. Their essays reflect the feelings of an age group which has begun to appreciate, but has not yet begun to doubt, its heritage. May these feelings and this strength and faith carry them through those turbulent late teens!

James H. Blier, President, Pittsburgh Corning Corp.: Judging 55 essays on "You Are The Flag" has been a rewarding experience—it proves once again that the majority of American boys and girls stand for the things that have always made this country strong.

Duquesne Light Company has performed a great service in promoting the contest. Winners and losers alike just have to be better citizens because of their participation.

W. McCook Miller, Esquire, Senior Partner, Kirkpatrick Lockhart, Johnson & Hutchinson, Secretary, Flag Plaza Foundation: I see now one of the whys of the generation gap—these girls and boys are far ahead of what I was in their day. When I was their age, I couldn't possibly have written with the imagination and clarity they uniformly show.

Leonard Swanson, Vice-President and General Manager, WIICTV: The reflection of confidence in our nation evolving from the efforts and expressions of the young people in this "You Are The Flag" contest were most heartening—and encouraging. As a judge, I wanted to generalize that these youngsters are indeed representative of the vast majority of our nation's young people—and that our future will be in responsible, sane hands, in spite of our worst fears exaggerated today as a result of excessive, instant communication

reflecting all of our world's ills. The meaning of our American Flag has not changed, and the participants in this outstanding contest support this opinion.

Richard L. Thornburg, U.S. Attorney: The Flag Plaza Foundation and Duquesne Light Company deserve the highest commendation for affording youngsters the opportunity to express themselves regarding their flag. I found the essays to be well prepared and thoughtful and—as we might expect in a free society—reflecting a variety of viewpoints. All who assisted in this project and put in the long hours necessary to bring it to fruition are owed a debt by us all.

Reverend Dr. Robert J. Lamont, First Presbyterian Church: I was impressed by the clarity of thought and sincerity of spirit expressed in many of the essays as they related to American history and most especially to the deep-seated hopes of the 7th and 8th graders. I was pleased to be asked to serve as a judge and I was encouraged by the attitude of these young people who seem to be determined to be part of the solution, rather than part of the problem of our day.

Paul E. London, Executive Vice President, Beaver County Times: I hope 7th and 8th grades across the country feel as the writers of these essays do about our flag and country—for if they do, we as older citizens need not be so terribly concerned about the future of "Old Glory." I hope that in the near future our government can spend millions advertising projects "like this" instead of advertising military recruiting.

Mrs. Carmen R. Capone, First Vice President, Allegheny County League of Women Voters: I was extremely happy to serve as a judge for Duquesne Light's "You Are The Flag" essay contest. I hope the contest will be continued because it makes the youngsters think about patriotism and what the flag really stands for, and helps to counteract publicity about those who desecrate our flag.

Dr. Edwin C. Clarke, President, Geneva College: Duquesne Light Company should be congratulated for inaugurating this imaginative educational program which helps to focus the attention of the young people on our country's history, and, hopefully, stimulates them to have an appreciation of the things that are good and which should be nurtured and continued.

I appreciate the time and effort given by the teachers and thousands of students who responded in such a capable manner.

It was encouraging in reading the essays to learn of the breadth of the knowledge of these young people and their appreciation of those things which make our country great.

#### IN FAVOR OF THE SST

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, while the American SST appears dead as a result of the onslaught against it in this session of Congress, I do not believe that we have heard the last of this subject.

Now that the dust has settled a bit, I trust it is possible for one to comment on the subject without the furor that has existed.

WBBM-TV, Chicago CBS station, editorially opposed the SST but, in keeping with their policy, presented the opportunity for a proponent of the plane to state the positive point of view. On Tuesday, May 18, Peter Reich, aerospace edi-

tor of Chicago Today, expressing his own views and not those of that publication, presented a very effective argument in favor of an American SST.

The editorial follows:

#### IN FAVOR OF THE SST

There are honest differences of opinion concerning the wisdom of building an SST—an aircraft that will fly 300 passengers from Chicago to Europe in less time than it now takes to drive to Springfield.

My own newspaper, *Chicago Today*, believes other projects should take precedence—and has said so editorially.

Yet nearly 20 years of aerospace reporting have convinced me that President Nixon is right: The supersonic jetliner will be a good thing for the United States and for the world.

As one of the first newsmen actually permitted to fly through the sound barrier in a jet interceptor, I am satisfied that a faster-than-sound jetliner will not change our weather, will not cause skin cancer, and will not irradiate its passengers.

Moreover, tests indicate that one American SST, flying at 1,800 miles an hour—that's three times as fast as jetliners now fly and faster than a pistol bullet—will not pollute our air any more than three compact cars going along at 60 miles an hour.

As for the thunderclap-like sonic boom—people on the ground won't even hear it. That's because our SST's will not be permitted to fly beyond the speed of sound while over land, only while over the oceans.

What an American SST will do is this: It will assure our nation's continued leadership in commercial aviation.

We took that lead shortly after World War II. We kept it through the Jet Age, and today most of the world's flying public flies in American jet transports. Our Boeing 747's are the undisputed queens of the skies.

But if we don't build the SST, we will be throwing it all away—and suffer serious economic consequences as a result.

Regardless of what Congress does tomorrow, a fleet of SST's will be built.

The only question is: Will it be built in the United States?

#### LEST WE FORGET

### HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in a land of progress and prosperity, it is often easy to assume an "out of sight, out of mind" attitude about matters which are not consistently brought to our attention. The fact exists that today more than 1,550 American servicemen are listed as prisoners or missing in Southeast Asia. The wives, children, and parents of these men have not forgotten, and I would hope that my colleagues in Congress and our countrymen across America will not neglect the fact that all men are not free for as long as one of our number is enslaved. I insert the name of one of the missing:

Sgt. Robert L. Luster, U.S. Army, **XXXXXXXXXX** Upper Sandusky, Ohio. Married. The son of Mr. and Mrs. Fred Luster, Upper Sandusky, Ohio. Graduate of Columbia High School. Officially listed as missing January 23, 1969. As of today, Sergeant Luster has been missing in action in Southeast Asia for 853 days.

SOVIET UNION SEEKING CREDIT  
FROM THE UNITED STATES

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, at the present time the Soviet Union is seeking credit for the purchase of \$15 million to \$100 million of purebred livestock from the United States.

Two Russian missions have called on Agriculture Secretary Clifford M. Hardin and his staff to inquire about extensive cattle purchases. Unlike the wheat purchases made here and in Canada several years ago, the Russians are no longer willing to pay in gold for their purchases.

The Department of Agriculture has stated:

It is now only a question of whether the Russians are willing to go ahead at our prices. If they want to buy, we are ready to cooperate.

Before any such agreement is made, it is important that the Department of Agriculture understand the misgivings of many Americans about such extension of credit to the Government of the Soviet Union.

The Committee on Soviet Jewry, for example, wrote to Agriculture Secretary Clifford Hardin, stating:

We oppose this sale for many reasons. But primarily, our opposition stems from the bankrupt moral philosophy of the Russian government by not allowing their Jewish citizens cultural and religious freedom, or the right to emigrate.

Shall the U.S. Government help to subsidize a government which has deprived its own citizens of all basic and elementary freedoms? More and more Americans are concerned about the fact that such subsidization encourages the Soviet Government in its policy of tyrannizing all Soviet citizens who seek to retain their own religious and cultural identities.

Before we entertain the possibility of such a deal with the Soviet Union, let us look briefly at only one single area of life under communism, that of the treatment of religion.

In recent days there has been a great deal of discussion about the alleged "liberalization" of life in the Soviet Union. Many clergymen have expressed the view that communism and Christianity are, in fact, compatible and that past misunderstandings may have been based upon ignorance rather than truth. Carrying this new philosophy into action we find a new Christian activism, one which holds that capitalism and not communism may be the enemy.

Yet a recently published volume, "Aspects of Religion In The Soviet Union, 1917-1967," reminds us of the fact that ever since the Russian Revolution of 1917, religion has been held in disrepute in the Soviet Union and from that time forward the most strenuous efforts have been made by the Soviet Government to eliminate it.

In 1925, for example, the League of

Militant Atheists was formed in the Soviet Union to publish and spread anti-religious material and, like the government's economic plan, an atheistic 5-year plan was launched in 1927 and again in 1932. The program aimed at the complete disappearance of God's name from the U.S.S.R. by 1937. In the late 1930's the league was reported to have 3.5 million members.

The much heralded decree on the separation of church and state and of school and church of January 23, 1918 was not aimed at religious freedom or tolerance but at the undermining of the very existence of religion. The clergymen of all faiths were deprived of voting rights and were considered obscurers and enemies of the people, not engaged in work. By order of Lenin, the All Russian Extraordinary Committee for the Suppression of Counterrevolution was established in 1918 and during the first 3 years of Communist rule thousands of clergy were victims of Soviet terror.

According to official Soviet data, for example, 423 churches were closed and 322 destroyed in the first half of 1929, and 1,440 churches were closed by the year's end. Synagogues were converted into clubs, Buddhist monasteries were closed, mosques were converted into atheist museums, and the printing of the Koran was prohibited.

No one who reads this volume, edited by Richard J. Marshall, Jr., and published by the University of Chicago Press, will suffer under any further illusions.

In the essay, "The Communist Party and Soviet Jewry," Zvi Gitelman, professor of political science at the University of Michigan, discusses one of the more bizarre aspects of the campaign against the Jewish religion: the trials. On Rosh Hashanah, 1921, the Evseksiia—the Jewish section of the Communist Party—in Kiev "tried" the Jewish religion in the same auditorium, ironically, where the Beilis trial had been held. According to a non-Communist source, a weird cast of characters appeared before the "Judges:" a lady dressed in old-fashioned clothes explained that she sent her children to kheder—religious school—because, she proclaimed haughtily, she was no "low class tailor or cobbler" but of a "distinguished religious family."

This was submitted as evidence that the Jewish religion was a creature of the bourgeoisie. A "rabbi" testified that he taught religion in order to keep the masses ignorant and servile. When someone in the audience accused him of being a "lying ignoramus," stormy applause broke out, according to a stenographic report. The culprit in the audience was immediately arrested. After further testimony by a corpulent woman bedecked with glittering gold and diamond rings, the Evseksiia "prosecutor" summarized "the case against the Jewish religion" and asked for a "sentence of death for the Jewish religion."

The "judges" retired to their chambers and returned with a verdict of death to the Jewish religion. Professor Gitelman reports that a similar trial—this time of the kheder—took place in Vitebsk. The yeshiva was tried in Rostov, and circum-

cision was "put on trial" in Kharkov in 1928.

In 1924 a "Red Haggadah" was read which substituted the deliverance from czarist rule for deliverance from the pharaoh's oppression. Following the example of the living church—the Communist dominated effort at using religion to serve political purposes—the Evseksiia tried to set up a "living synagogue" in 1924. "Communism is the Mosaic Torah translated by Lenin into the Bolshevik tongue," one of its founders declared. The "living synagogue," however, died a quick death and Professor Gitelman estimates that of the one thousand rabbis in the U.S.S.R. only six are known to have had pro-Communist sympathies. In 1922-23 alone over 1,000 kheders were closed. In Vitebsk 39 kheders with 1,358 students and 49 teachers were shut down.

In his foreword to the volume, Richard Marshall, Jr., criticizes those who have tended to overlook and minimize Soviet religious persecution:

Exponents of the . . . "soft" view would appear to be unaware of the harsh repressive measures taken against various religious groups and individuals throughout the last half-century (and as recently as the early sixties) for no other reason than the fact of their religious beliefs. They also do not face up to the contradiction between the guarantee of freedom of confession, on the one hand and, on the other, the strictures placed upon religious instruction by a continuing and extensive campaign of anti-religious propaganda . . . Furthermore, they do not seem to be aware of either the tenacity of traditional religion or of the increased interest in religion in the USSR, especially among the intelligentsia, which has been manifested in a variety of ways since Stalin's death.

Despite a 50-year campaign calling for its eradication, religion remains a force in modern Russia. Many in the West believed that the death of Stalin would usher a more liberal period into the life of Soviet citizens. In an essay concerning "Khrushchev's Religious Policy, 1959-1964," Donald A. Lowrie and William C. Fletcher tell a far different story. Fletcher is director of the Centre de Recherches et d'Etude in Geneva and Lowrie is past director of the YMCA press.

They point out that at the 22d Congress of the Communist Party in 1961 Khrushchev openly gave his support to the antireligious campaign which by then was well under way:

The battle with survivals of capitalism in the consciousness of the people, the changing by our revolution of the habits and customs of millions of people built up over centuries, is a prolonged and not a simple matter. Survivals of the past are a dreadful power, which like a nightmare, prevail over the minds of living creatures. They are rooted in the modes of life and in the consciousness of millions of people long after the economic conditions which gave them birth have vanished.

Khrushchev declared that:

. . . Communist education presupposes emancipation from religious prejudices and superstitions which hinder individual Soviet people from fully developing their creative powers. A well thought out and well proportioned system of scientific atheist propaganda is necessary, which would embrace all strata and groups of society to prevent the spread of religious attitudes, espe-

cially among children and juveniles . . . the interests of building communism require that questions of communist education stand at the center of attention and activity of each party organization . . .

Discussing the Stalin period as a "liberal" one with regard to religion, the Soviet atheist journal *Nauka i Religiya* stated in its April 1962 issue that:

During the period of the personality cult, all churches, and the Orthodox Church in particular, received a number of privileges which contradicted Lenin's decree on the separation of church and state.

Reference here is being made to the temporary suspension during World War II of blatant religious persecution in an effort to unite the country against the German invader.

Beginning in late 1961, children under 18 years of age were forbidden to attend Baptist worship services and by the fall of 1963 this restriction was being applied in Orthodox churches as well. In 1963 the Central Committee of the Komsomol urged that services not be allowed to begin if children were present in church.

These measures are without parallel in Soviet history, for the most that was ever done in the thirties was to claim that it was illegal for parents to force children to go to churches against their will. Similarly, priests were categorically denied the right to give religious instruction to children. These restrictions were far more severe than the regulations introduced in the Stalin era when priests had not been allowed to teach religion to children in groups larger than three. Denial of parental rights was given ideological justification in 1962 at a Komsomol congress, when it was explained that freedom of conscience does not apply to children and no parent should be allowed to cripple a child spiritually.

Judaism in the U.S.S.R. is subject to unique discrimination. Jewish congregations are not permitted to organize a nationwide federation or any other central organization. Judaism is permitted no publication facilities, and no Hebrew Bible has been published for Jews since 1917, nor is a Russian translation of the Jewish version of the Old Testament allowed. The study of Hebrew, even for religious purposes, has been outlawed and the production of religious objects, such as prayer shawls, is prohibited.

The numbers of Jews in the Soviet Union is over 3 million, of whom more than 1 million have been estimated to be believers. For these there are approximately 60 synagogues and rabbis, or one synagogue and rabbi for each 16,000 believers. No new rabbis are being trained and the average age of rabbis is over 70. Little hope remains for a continuation of Jewish religious life in the Soviet Union.

The campaign against religion has mounted in recent years. Mr. Oliver Clement, an orthodox professor, declared that from 1959 to 1962, the number of churches open decreased from 22,000 to 11,500 and the number of priests carrying on their functions from 30,000 to 14,000. More than half of the monasteries have been closed, from 69 in 1958 to 31 in 1962. Of eight seminaries reopened in 1945, two have been closed and two have been almost stripped of students.

Religion, we must remember, has been the enemy of all modern tyrannies. Mussolini stated, "Religion is a species of mental disease." Karl Marx called it the "opium of the people" and Hitler denounced Christianity not only because Jesus was a Jew, but because it was cowardly to speak of giving love for hate.

Tyranny is also the enemy of religion. The Soviet Union, in its more than 50 years of Communist rule, has wasted no effort in teaching us this lesson.

Given the fact that this tyranny is not loosening up, but, in fact, tightening up as a period of re-Stalinization appears to be upon us, it makes little sense to extend credits and to propose business deals with those who are enslaving millions of men, women, and children. For the Department of Agriculture to approve such an agreement would be a cynical act, especially for an administration which declares that human freedom and human dignity is its goal. Strengthening tyrants has never been the path to either peace or freedom. It is not the path to peace and freedom today.

#### QUESTIONS PRESIDENT'S STAND ON POW ISSUE

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, many responsible Members of Congress and other citizens of this country have recently questioned the wisdom of the President's insistence that all American troops will not leave South Vietnam until our prisoners of war have been released. All of us are deeply concerned over the safety of our POW's and those missing in action, of course. But after talking last month with Senator Nguyen Ninh Vy, Deputy Head of the North Vietnamese delegation to the Paris peace talks, I can only conclude that the President's intransigence on this point is not only prolonging our involvement in the war, but is also postponing the release of our prisoners. In my judgment, if the administration set a date for withdrawal of all our troops, the North Vietnamese would promptly enter into discussion for fixing a date for release of all our POW's being held in North Vietnam. I will therefore continue to urge that the administration set such a date and force the North Vietnamese to fish or cut bait.

The New York Times of May 25, included two perceptive columns on our involvement in Vietnam. I would like to include at this point in the RECORD Tom Wicker's provocative analysis of President Nixon's stand on the POW issue, and Dean Acheson's thoughts on winding down the war:

#### ILLOGIC IN VIETNAM

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, May 4.—An interview with Xuan Thuy, North Vietnam's chief negotiator in Paris, by Anthony Lewis of The New York Times, has made plain the essential illogic of President Nixon's stand on the so-called "P.O.W. issue."

In fact, as Eugene McCarthy pointed out in a weekend speech at a peace rally in Minneapolis, the policy of "Vietnamization" itself appears illogical if it is really Mr. Nixon's aim to insure South Vietnam "a chance" for self-determination.

The President has insisted that he will not set a date for the complete withdrawal of American forces from Indochina until Hanoi promises more than a mere discussion of the prisoner issue. "We need action on their part and a commitment on their part with regard to the prisoners," he said on April 28.

But what is the threat, if any, which makes this stand credible? Mr. Nixon also has said that all American troops will not leave South Vietnam—a "residual force" of unspecified size will remain—until the prisoners are released. But a residual force certainly cannot effect the release of the prisoners if the larger force of this year or last year could not do so.

Thus, Mr. Nixon's stand not only can do nothing to effect the release of the prisoners; it is also an explicit admission that the policy of unilateral withdrawal cannot be a policy of total withdrawal but one of withdrawal to some point to be determined by Mr. Nixon. On that basis, if we are to keep some troops in South Vietnam until the prisoners are released, we may keep both troops and prisoners there forever.

All of that, Mr. Thuy told Mr. Lewis, merely confirms the suspicion of Hanoi that Mr. Nixon does not intend a total withdrawal, but plans to keep enough American force in Indochina to guarantee the survival of a non-Communist South Vietnamese regime—a so-called "Korean solution."

It may well be that Mr. Nixon is correct that "a promise to discuss means nothing from the North Vietnamese." Even so, if he is determined to stick with his withdrawal policy, it is difficult to see what could be lost by extensive secret discussions, in Paris and elsewhere, to see if there could not be developed an understanding, tacit or explicit, that Washington and Hanoi would announce simultaneously (a) a date for the completion of the American withdrawal, and (b) that on the same date or sooner the P.O.W.'s would be released, probably in several installments.

This would not only remove the necessity for the residual force, which would be a certain point of political controversy in this country and elsewhere; it would also at a stroke deprive all the potential Democratic Presidential nominees (save Senator Henry Jackson) of their chosen position on Vietnam.

Mr. McCarthy is another matter. He hinted strongly that he is thinking more nearly in terms of a third-party candidacy than of another run within the Democratic party. And in addition, he set himself apart from the Democratic aspirants by advocating a negotiated settlement rather than a unilateral American withdrawal by a certain date.

Mr. McCarthy pointed to the inescapable but often obscured fact that there is little chance the United States can have more influence than it now has on the future of Indochina after it has pulled out all its forces (either at Mr. Nixon's order or under Congressional mandate). But to negotiate now, while there is some rough equilibrium of forces and with the lure of cutting short a war costly to all sides, might produce more acceptable arrangements than withdrawal or the "Korean solution." It might even get the prisoners home more swiftly.

Mr. Thuy lent credence to this view when he expressed to Mr. Lewis that because of the failure of Mr. Nixon's efforts to win a "military victory" through escalation in Cambodia and Laos, the North Vietnamese now have only to wait for the fruits of an inevitable victory of their own.

If that represents Hanoi's attitude, it will not be possible to negotiate any kind of an

Indochinese settlement without substantial concessions from Washington and Saigon—presumably the acceptance of an interim arrangement for sharing political power in South Vietnam among all contending elements until a longer-term arrangement can be reached by the parties themselves.

It is true that that might open the door to a Communist take-over at some point in the future. But withdrawing all American troops will far more surely open that door, and prolong a sad, destructive, pointless war by how many years no one can say.

DEAN ACHESON: ON WINDING DOWN  
(By Dean Acheson)

The present debate about the President's intentions regarding troop withdrawals from Vietnam arises from what he has said rather than from what he has done. The logic of the facts is plain. When Mr. Nixon announced the beginning of troop withdrawals the authorized troop strength in Vietnam was 549,000; actual troop strength probably a few thousand less. Withdrawals actually made since that time, plus the 100,000 announced by the President to be made by December 31, 1971, will amount to 365,000, leaving a remainder from authorized strength of about 185,000 in Vietnam. The average withdrawal rate over the thirty months of the operation has been 12,000 per month.

What are the prospects for withdrawals in 1972, a Presidential election year? One would hardly expect a reduction of the monthly rate. A continuation of the rate would leave about 40,000 men in Vietnam at the end of the year, rather fewer than remain in Korea. If the process of strengthening the organization, training, and armament of the Vietnamese Government forces is to be successful in 1972, this would seem to require an end to such sorties as that into Cambodia in 1970 and into Laos in 1971. A sensible way of preparing the South Vietnamese military establishment to assume full defense of Vietnam would not be to enlarge its theater of operations to include over three times the area of Vietnam. Furthermore, the way to remove the Vietnam issue from the 1972 political campaign in the United States would not seem to be to enlarge the war. Whatever their critics may say of the President's political advisers, it can hardly be believed that they are that obtuse.

Should we, however, assume that the logic of events would point to leaving 40,000 American troops in Vietnam at the end of 1972? If the Vietnamization program has been successful, these troops will not be needed to effect a final withdrawal or to prevent a sudden takeover of South Vietnam by the North. If it has not been successful, they will be too few. In any event, this country will have done all that one country can do for another to give it the opportunity to preserve itself from such dangers as faced Vietnam.

It has been said that the United States should not withdraw all its forces from Vietnam until satisfactory arrangements have been made for the return of our prisoners. With that few will disagree. To say this, however, is not to argue for maintaining in a dangerous position an aggregate of troops wholly insufficient to enforce the return of the prisoners.

Years ago Justice Brandeis told me of once having been pressed, while at the bar, to do something he was unwilling to do. He replied, "I must inform you that I cannot do what you ask. So that you may know that my refusal is final, I give no reasons." Bad reasons for a refusal carry no conviction. Soon the end of our effective military presence in Vietnam will be plain enough to be no military secret. Before that time arrangements for the return of prisoners can be made and sufficient trust established to insure what Hanoi would have no reason for refusing.

Once this has been done, the logic of the facts would make clear a complete withdrawal from Vietnam by the end of 1972.

### HEARINGS ON CORRECTIONS PRACTICES UNDERWAY

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary has embarked on a series of hearings explorative of corrections practices in the United States. The next hearing date is June 2, at 10 a.m., in room 2226, Rayburn House Office Building, where the first witness will be the Honorable Ramsey Clark, former Attorney General of the United States.

In opening this new series of hearings, Subcommittee Chairman KASTENMEIER made the following remarks:

With this morning's hearing, the Subcommittee embarks on a probe of corrections practices in the United States, their faults and shortcomings. We shall be concerned both with Federal corrections on the one hand and state and local corrections on the other. We shall seek to determine and report what Federal action, if any, will appropriately stimulate improvements at the state and local levels. Where legislation seems needed, we shall propose its enactment.

If there is any single proposition as to which there is virtually no disagreement, it is that corrections reform presents a major—if not *the* major—domestic challenge of our time. It has been charged, for example, that many, if not most, of the nation's corrections institutions are correctional in name only; that state after state reports that most of its prisons and jails have no program to rehabilitate the offender, or indeed that conditions prevail which can make a criminal where none existed before. The clear implication is that prisoners are often subjected to a kind of "warehousing" under conditions that virtually assure their further deterioration.

These charges were not made by some dissident or radical, but by the Attorney General of the United States as recently as last February. Mr. Mitchell went on to point out that one state had reported that half of the inmates in one of its jails had not been convicted, but were being detained for lack of bail; that in many localities no effort is made to separate first offenders from hardened criminals or juveniles from adults. The facilities themselves, he said, were often antiquated and overcrowded.

This was the context in which President Nixon had instructed the Task Force on Prisoner Rehabilitation to recommend what could be done in this area to enable determination of how the ex-offender "could best achieve a lastingly productive and rewarding return to society." In its report of April 1970, the Task Force recommended development of a program of jobs and job-training for ex-offenders as well as a program for improvement of correctional institutions, stressing the need for so-called "community-based" corrections.

It must, of course, be borne in mind that national concern about the American correctional system did not begin with the present Administration. In 1967 President Johnson's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice issued its general report, "The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society," including findings and rec-

ommendations relating to the problems facing the nation's correctional system. These findings and recommendations were in turn based on a Task Force Report on Corrections, published under the chairmanship of former Attorney General Katzenbach. That, also, included recommendations for achieving community-based corrections and for improving correctional institutions.

In the hearing starting today, the Subcommittee will seek to ascertain, among other things, the extent to which the recommendations of the various task force reports on corrections have been implemented or remain to be carried out. At the outset, however, we shall hear a number of witnesses who have basic criticisms to make of the corrections system in one or more of its aspects. Very probably, also, the Subcommittee will wish to make some visits to correctional institutions. The ultimate direction of our probe remains to be determined as the hearings progress.

### CENTERS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in this era of increasingly diverse and difficult pressures on our colleges and universities, ranging from severe financial strains to campus unrest, and the need for greater institutional relevance, a widespread search is underway for men and women with the dedication, the administrative skills, the creative energy and courage, and the strong leadership capabilities necessary to insure the continued effectiveness and, in some cases, the very survival of our centers of higher education.

As an alumnus of Boston University I was, indeed, gratified to read that such a man has been found to head that institution. According to the description provided by Emanuel Goldberg in the Jewish Times, Dr. John R. Silber is ready, willing, and exceedingly able to take on the prodigious tasks at hand. I am, indeed, pleased to share this outstanding profile with my colleagues in the House, and know they join with me in wishing him every success in his position as president of Boston University and meaningful progress in the realization of the objectives he has espoused.

The article follows:

DR. SILBER: AWAKENING B.U.'S SLEEPING GIANT

Ever since the late Daniel L. Marsh centralized and built Boston University into mammoth size and consideration at the higher education counter, the tug on the Commonwealth Avenue campus has been to combine quantitative considerations with across-the-board quality. There has continued, however, the traditional pattern of seeing the well-heeled among B.U.'s 100,000 or so alumni either ignore completely development appeals from their needy alma mater or give liberally to the prestigious colleges of their children.

In fact, when one evaluates how much a B.U. education meant to so many graduates, particularly those who were the children of the Depression, the situation in some cases was scandalous.

Now along comes a 44 year old Texan, Dr. John R. Silber, who is a philosopher and



Kant authority, as well as a first rate academic administrator as witness his celebrated and innovative tenure as Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Texas, who has already managed to electrify—for the first time—the 100 year old, Methodist-founded institution in Boston.

I haven't met him yet but must confess that I quivered when his appointment was first announced and he promptly sounded off in the press, even before taking over the job, about the need for financial aid to B.U. from the city and state. After his arrival, some feedback indicated that Silber was not a hall-fellow-well-met and, in fact, was quite a solitary figure and provocative in utterances at various meetings. What gives, one thought?

But now we know.

The other day, speaking to alumni, B.U.'s new President announced a series of distinguished new faculty appointments, including the creation of "University Professorships" and the advent of a cadre of outstanding scholars from abroad. More of the same has been promised in the near future.

B.U., despite overwhelming financial obligations and puny endowment, Silber opined, was going to the top—or, by implication, if financial failure ensued, would have to throw in the sponge entirely.

There couldn't have been a better time for B.U. to take this position for nearly all private institutions in America, which conduct business as usual, face the possibility of either extinction or plummeting to mediocrity. Silber also recently announced an excellent administrative appointment in making Daniel J. Flinn, a B.U. trustee and former Administrator of the Boston Housing Authority and one of the city's finest public servants, Director of Community Relations.

As one probed deeper, I learned from one of the leading education writers in the country that she considered John Silber to be "one of if not the" most exciting college President in the United States. In this day and age, Prexy, even a young and dynamic one, can't serve too long—so Silber may have a half dozen years to complete the prodigious task of lifting middle-brow B.U. into the elite sphere of American higher education and of energizing the fund-raising potential of alumni and friends.

He has an excellent board chairman, Hans Estlin, to pull with, as well as really interested and dedicated trustees (in stark contrast to the window-dressing of yesteryear). He must also overcome the historic fact that B.U. has occasionally had narrow, conventional approaches and uninspiring objectives.

Silber's record as the person who first brought Operation Headstart to the attention of the Johnson administration (comments of Senator Ralph Yarborough of Texas in the December 31, 1971, Appendix of the Congressional Record) attest that he will not let the pursuit of excellence become the Holy Grail—rather that he will press for the right mix of the underprivileged, the ghetto, the need for "relevance" and community-orientation in today's university while not compromising the essential academic posture. He seems stern, too, and unlikely to tolerate excess permissiveness with students or the antics of the "crazies."

Silber's maturity and sensitivity should also assist him in explaining to irate alumni why a Howard Zinn cannot be fired merely because he fans tempestuous disagreement (here I heartily commend a dip into B.U. history, during the infamous Joe McCarthy era, when the institution courageously refused to bend to pressure in the Professor Halpern case).

One hopes that President Silber can fully document and communicate effectively the story of B.U.'s long, many and continuing contributions to our community (whether tax money will roll in as a result is another question).

But one thing is sure: if Dr. Silber keeps pressing his thesis, "A B.U. Second to None," he'll galvanize at long last the 100,000 sleeping giant alumni, along with a torrent of foundations, corporations and individuals—and then even Harvard had better look out!

#### COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT DE-PAUW UNIVERSITY, MAY 23, 1971

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following commencement address which I gave at DePauw University on May 23, 1971:

#### COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS

I was thinking about the problems of DePauw students when my wife, Nancy, and I were here as students years ago. At that time we were concerned about the hours for women, visitation rights, the administration's intransigent attitude toward alcohol on campus, intown housing, and frequent run-ins with the campus security police.

It is heartening to learn that some twenty years later all these matters have been resolved and the great work of the university can go forward unimpeded.

Let me assure you that you have made progress. I am almost embarrassed to admit to you that we had to have our dates in by 10 p.m. on week nights. I can recall delivering my future wife to the front door of the Tri Delt house at the ghastly hour of 10 minutes after 10 in the evening, and being threatened with banishment from the Tri Delt house by the House mother; expulsion from the University by the administration and incarceration by the campus police.

Not even the most revolutionary campus radical among us ever dreamed that we could achieve no hours for women.

In this instance, if not in others, the system has been responsive.

When you entered DePauw three years and 9 months ago, the Vietnam war was at the peak of its intensity. Today, although things are better, men still die there, and you will live your entire life profoundly affected by Vietnam and its aftermath.

When you entered DePauw a lightning-quick war had just been fought in the Middle East, and as you leave a peace is still to be won.

When you entered only the science majors among us could define the word ecology. As you leave, the threat to man's environment is a paramount concern for all.

You came to DePauw after the summer of the race riots and during your years here the nation became acutely disturbed by acts of violence and demonstrations of non-violence.

Your college years have introduced the phenomenon of student unrest, and the tragedies of Kent State and Jackson State have been seared into our minds.

During your college years: man set foot on the moon;—a United States Senator and a civil rights leader were brutally assassinated; a Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court resigned under fire, and two Presidential nominees were rejected by the Senate as unfit for the Court.

A bomb exploded in the United States Capitol, a President resigned, there was the McCarthy campaign from the left, the Wallace campaign from the right, and a new form of political protest: the mass demonstration.

During your DePauw years, There were:

heart transplants; hijackings; the Pueblo incident;—Hurricane Camille and an earthquake in California;—and getting down to really important things:

The New York Mets won a World Series; mini skirts gave us all an uplift; Jackie Kennedy married Aristotle Onassis; and Kate Millet and Germaine Greer dealt a devastating blow to the hapless American male.

Whatever happened to the four placid and peaceful years of study and reflection in the sequestered halls of academia which were once the birthright of every college student? Apparently they have vanished, and perhaps forever, because one of the distinguished characteristics of the United States in the 1970s is that virtually every major institution is under fire and in a state of crisis:

From the military to the university; from Lockheed Aircraft to the Methodist Church; from the courts of justice to the county hospital; from the U.S. Congress to the Ford Foundation.

Indeed, for an institution not to be in a state of crisis is almost a badge of dishonor and ill repute.

Take a look about you:

The people, the President says, are simply fed up with government at all levels. Any politician can tell you that people are beginning to doubt whether their government is responsive; whether they can make a difference in the decision making process; whether government can meet its problems before they occur or only fight off disaster after they occur.

The welfare system is a colossal failure.

It is costly; almost impossible to administer; degrading to the recipient.

No one is satisfied with it.

Our most responsible health officials say we are faced with a breakdown in the delivery of health care unless immediate and drastic action is taken. Health costs are rising rapidly, while access to health care is inequitable, and the quality of care is not as good as it ought to be.

In education, teachers strike, students riot, whites and blacks clash, taxpayers revolt, and we have a crisis in the classroom.

The cities are described by the poet: "Why are the mayors all quitting? Why are the cities all broke? Why are the people all angry?"

Why are we dying of smoke? Why are the streets unprotected? Why are the schools in distress? Why is the trash uncollected? How did we make such a mess? The battle against crime falters?

Our law enforcement agencies are undermanned and undertrained.

The courts are clogged, and prisons become universities of crime.

Not even the church stands serene, its growth has leveled off, new construction has slackened, circulation of religious publications is down, and there is an alarming lack of interest in the organized church among large segments of the population.

And, as one constituent reminded me the other day, we don't even know how to keep the same time in Indiana.

And so it goes. Before the Congress it is hard to find a witness who does not speak in apocalyptic terms about his concern, whatever it is.

We live, of course, in a maze of paradoxes. The GNP doubles in a decade, as cities and states teeter on the edge of bankruptcy.

We have built a nation of incredible wealth, and yet never have the problems of the poor so beset us.

We have passed civil rights laws of sweeping dimensions, yet discrimination still denies jobs and housing to millions, and many young still grow up stunted, inarticulate, and angry.

We are progressing, but our expectations soar, and the gap widens between where we are and where we would like to be.

So you graduate at a time when the mood of the nation is troubled and our problems seem more stubborn and incurable than they once did.

I mention these crises—not to depress or to discourage—but because I believe that our best hope for resolving them is men and women who possess the finest qualities of a liberal arts education.

What disciplines, if not the liberal arts, will better cultivate the imagination, lengthen the perspective, sober the judgment, refine the taste, broaden the sympathies, encompass the relatedness of things in balance and proportion, and give direction and purpose?

In the tradition of the liberal arts, we have been taught the importance of knowledge, not for the sake of knowledge, or to give immediate results. Measurable in dollars, but as a means to enhance the quality of life. People sensitive to the impact of these crises on other people are in short supply.

This nation needs people who see that too many for too long have been in a headlong rush toward progress and power measured in terms of dollars, miles of concrete laid, miles per hour achieved, kilowatts generated, nuclear missiles stockpiled, who recognize that this nation is rich enough to provide for all Americans health care, education, and the basic necessities—if we have the will to redirect our resources to the goal of improving the quality of life.

In the liberal arts tradition, we can break free from the limitations of ignorance and prejudice, from the prisons of class, race, time, undue self-interest, and the servitude of the crowd. The man or woman unencumbered by these limitations brings to the challenge of these crises a freshness of perspective and a quality of judgment that is rare and essential.

In this tradition of the liberal arts we know that we cannot hide from these crises in our tidy suburbs and green country clubs. They come crashing down upon us in the form of tax dollars demanded, congested traffic, an assault on the streets, an impoverished family, or an unresponsive elected officials.

These things happen because the institutions that have served many of us well, serve others very inadequately, or not at all, and we know our duty is to deal with them.

In this tradition we have been educated to a point beyond which we can educate ourselves. And there is hope to be found in people: who can push beyond traditional approaches, who can reject the cascade of platitudes and clichés that inundate most of our problems, who can push aside the deception which accompanies the soaring rhetoric, who can analyze and articulate with precision and clarity, who can adapt to new disciplines, ideas, methods, and integrate them to solve problems.

I do not deceive myself about the contributions those of us educated in this tradition can make to solving these challenges.

Some of us are apathetic.

Others become quickly discouraged, and lose hope.

Some figure that if they take care of themselves and their own, everything will work out all right.

Some respond with passion, thrashing away with great fervor and little skill.

Some become cynical and blame someone or something for everything that goes wrong.

All of us show some of these attitudes some of the time. A liberal arts education is not a panacea for the crises which surround us or the attitudes that deter us.

But, a fine liberal arts education has produced, and will continue to produce, more than its share of people who can make a constructive contribution to solving these challenges. I hope you shall be among them.

All of us congratulate you and hail your entry to the ranks of college graduates. A new college graduate, like a newly minted

coin, shines with a luster that the more tarnished graduates among us admire and even envy. We include in our congratulations parents and relatives for whom this is a very special day, and who deserve some credit, too, for your achievement—although you might, at the moment, be reluctant to admit it. And all of us who are visitors join you who graduate in expressing our deep sense of gratitude to President Kerstetter, the faculty, and the trustees, and the DePauw family, for making DePauw the kind of institution it is.

From this memorable afternoon you travel diverse paths—to graduate schools, marriage, military service and, if I read the employment figures correctly, a few of the more fortunate among you, after four years of college study, may even find a job.

We wish you Godspeed.

But none of you will be left untouched by the crises that confront us. You have been equipped, as few in this day have been, to deal with them constructively. Not all of you will. But the hope is that enough of you will to move this Nation, in your generation, a step or two closer to a more perfect union.

### CONGRESS FUMBLING CRISIS STRIKE ISSUE

## HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the action taken by Congress on May 18 in ending a 2-day nationwide railway strike is but the most recent reminder of the urgent need to find a better way of settling disputes which threaten the broad national interest and potentially even the security of the country. Unfortunately, the stopgap agreement passed by Congress offers no hope of avoiding such crises in the future. This problem has been near the top of the list of President Nixon's priority requests both to the 91st and 92d Congresses. Other proposals have been introduced as well but still we have had no effective action by the Congress. In an editorial on Wednesday, May 19, 1971, the Jackson Citizen Patriot made clear what it thinks about this failure of the Congress in a persuasive argument entitled "Congress Fumbling Crisis Strike Issue." I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and to the House leadership:

### CONGRESS FUMBLING CRISIS STRIKE ISSUE

National welfare strikes, such as the one in which 13,000 signalmen briefly tied up the rail system with an immediate, potentially dangerous effect on the economy, have got to go.

Which is something that has been said a thousand different ways over the past half century.

There is utter frustration even in saying it because society, through its government, never has made the difficult decision to end such walkouts through the only device which protects the rights of both employer and employee—compulsory arbitration.

Until that decision is made, the strikes will continue to occur, as they have despite the elaborate laws made available by the government.

Compulsory arbitration and legal machinery which will make it possible to bar walkouts in industries and services vital to the public interest, is resisted on both sides of the bargaining table.

Both labor and management, generally speaking, would rather operate in the traditional atmosphere of free bargaining. Each fears that it will lose something through compulsion as each has done when the federal government actively intervenes in labor disputes. Even though arbitration procedures are freely used in labor-management relations, particularly in the field of handling grievances, the final step to compulsory arbitration as a substitute for collective bargaining appears to be frightening in both the corporate board rooms and the union offices.

But is there any other permanent answer to the strike against the public interest and one which has ramifications far beyond the workers and the industry involved?

If there is another solution, it has failed to appear over decades of debate and legislating on labor-management relations.

The right to strike seemingly is so deeply ingrained into the American consciousness—and its political system—that even anti-strike legislation in fields of public service, such as education and health and safety services, often is rendered ineffective.

Administrators, management, enforcement agencies, and even the courts resist every possible way that hard decision that puts the final barrier to the right to strike and imposes penalties for those who disobey the law.

This hesitancy is more evident in Congress where one crisis strike after another is dealt with through emergency legislation without coming to grips with the nub of the matter, which is a permanent decision to provide for compulsory arbitration or its equivalent.

That is exactly what happened in the present dispute. It was ended by an "emergency" resolution designed to make the walkout illegal, while offering the signalmen an interim wage increase.

Thus does Congress once more go through the charade of putting off a strike and delaying a crisis without really offering anything which will keep these public interest strikes from happening. It may only have achieved a delay in the real crisis for a few months.

Because organized labor is powerful in the political field and stoutly resists any incursion into the right to strike, no matter how disastrous a given walk-out may be, positive improvement in the field of labor legislation is almost impossible to come by.

And so, ten years from now, we expect to be saying about the current crisis strike, whether it be on the rails or elsewhere, that something needs to be done.

If Congress makes that unnecessary we shall be surprised—pleased, to be sure, but certainly surprised.

### JIM HUNTLEY, COLLEGE ATHLETE OF THE MONTH

## HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I have heard some commentary to the effect that competitive athletics are coming under increased attack by those who believe that competition precludes cooperation. I disagree, Mr. Speaker, and as a prime example I can point with pride to Brooks Robinson of the Baltimore Orioles. He has been helping the youth of America find the best answers to life with his cooperative desire to give young people super leadership. Brooks feels this is necessary if we are to help our youth

bring peace and love and renewal to our country and the world.

Brooks Robinson is a member of the Fellowship of Christian Athletes as am I. The FCA is not an assembly of saints, but a group of strugglers, such as Sport magazine's college athlete of the month—Jim Huntley, in the good fight of faith propagating a he-man brand of Christianity that is Christ-centered.

Mr. Speaker, each month, Sport magazine runs a feature titled "college athlete of the month." The award goes to a student who has lettered in one or more intercollegiate sports. But more important, he is a young man who has made an outstanding contribution to his college through his involvement in meaningful community activities.

It will be my pleasure to be on hand when Sport magazine honors all 12 athletes of the month for the 1970-71 school year on June 8 at the Madison here in Washington, D.C. It will be particularly gratifying to see Jim Huntley get his award, not only because he is a member of the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, but also for the fact that he is from Hamburg, N.Y., which is in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include an article from Sport magazine concerning Jim Huntley:

JIM HUNTLEY, ITHACA COLLEGE  
(By Gene Sunshine)

(NOTE.—Beginning with this issue, SPORT introduces a new monthly feature, College Athlete of the Month, which will honor college athletes who are making significant contributions to their campuses, communities and society. Candidates are nominated by their respective schools, and all winners receive engraved awards at special presentation ceremonies.)

Jim Huntley has a gift for understatement. A 22-year-old senior physical education major at Ithaca (New York) College, Huntley modestly describes himself as "sort of an active person." He spends his time participating in three varsity sports, working for the service-oriented Ithaca Fellowship of Athletes he organized last fall and hitting the books hard enough to make Dean's List three times in a row. That's Huntley's version of "sort of" active.

Jim was a defensive guard on the football team, a parallel bar specialist on the gymnastics team and the fifth man on Ithaca's crew last year. Surprisingly, he seems to prefer to talk about his work for the non-sectarian Ithaca Fellowship of Athletes, which was inspired by a Fellowship of Christian Athletes' conference he attended in Missouri.

Huntley, a native of Hamburg, New York, started his organization by gathering together about 30 male and female students, most of them varsity athletes. They elected him president, and he immediately began preparing for the group's first project, a weekly learn-to-swim course for the physically handicapped and mentally retarded children of Ithaca.

Using the college's pool, the group held swim sessions every Saturday, beginning in November and running through April. Ten children were involved in the program, which enjoyed remarkable success. "One boy didn't even want to put his face in the water," Jim recalls. "His parents had spent summers with him at the lake but they could never get him to put his head under water. But we got him to swim 15 to 20 yards. We did it with a snorkel that he liked. We put it underwater, and one time he just didn't think anything about it and he just went in and got it."

Huntley said that the college students involved in the program couldn't help being impressed with the enthusiasm of the youngsters. "It was just amazing to watch how eager they were to learn how to swim," he said. "They never gave up." None of the college students had any special training in teaching swimming, but some had taken a course, "Physical Education for Atypical Children," which was helpful. Now the Fellowship is planning on extending its program during the upcoming academic year. "We hope to work right around the area," Jim says. "There are some schools that need people to officiate, and there is a reform school for boys that needs people to help set up physical education facilities." The organization also hopes to bring some speakers to campus and take children to some of the college's sporting events.

No matter what time of the year it is, the kids will be able to watch Huntley perform. He's a fine athlete, as evidenced by the fact that he made the gymnastics and rowing teams even though he had never participated in either before transferring to Ithaca from Lehigh as a sophomore. "I got interested in gymnastics while I was taking a parallel bar course," Jim said, "and I wanted to stay active." He was introduced to crew by a football teammate (Ithaca's team won the Metropolitan New York Championship). "Right from the start I liked it," he said. "It's a fantastic sport because you are busy all the time."

So is Jim Huntley. Sort of.

WARNING TO THE UNITED STATES

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point an excellent editorial from the Waterloo, Iowa, Daily Courier on the dollar crisis in Europe.

With billions of American dollars floating around the world, and especially in Europe, foreign financial experts have repeatedly warned the United States that it must correct the staggering deficit in its international balance of payments. All too little heed has been paid to these warnings and recently a dollar crisis was precipitated when Europeans rallied around the German mark, thus giving clear notice that the American dollar is no longer regarded as the world's soundest currency.

If those who manage the financial affairs of the United States wish to avoid an international financial debacle, they will do well to heed this and other warnings.

The editorial follows:

DOLLAR CRISIS IN EUROPE GIVES WARNING TO THE UNITED STATES

An uneasy truce seems to exist in Europe so far as attacks upon the dollar are concerned but it would be a mistake to dismiss the seriousness of the current threat to international financial stability.

The subject is complex and controversial. However, it is plain that Europeans, particularly the West Germans, are rushing to their banks to get rid of their dollars for the simplest of all reasons. Their faith in the ability of the United States of America to resolve its domestic financial problems is wavering.

Thus the Europeans are rallying around the Deutsche Mark, the most stable and valuable currency on the continent.

Admittedly there is a basis for European fears. For more than half a decade, the United States has refused to come to grips with a raging inflation whose effects are felt keenly abroad because the dollar is the only international medium of exchange.

Aware of the adverse consequences to their own economies should the dollar lose its international eminence, our friends and trading partners in Europe have in the past protected it—as they put it in exchange for our physical protection of them with troops and arms.

The current crisis exhibits that Europeans see a limit to this reciprocal arrangement. So many dollars have flowed out of the United States in recent years that our financial allies are no longer willing to purchase all of the surplus dollars to get them out of circulation. At the same time speculators are abandoning their dollars, seeking the safer and more stable Deutsche Mark—adding to the surfeit.

None of the solutions is painless. Raising the value of the Deutsche Mark in relation to the dollar, or letting our currency find its own value in an open exchange, does not get at the roots of the present crisis.

The financial crisis is not a "German problem" as some suggest, but an American and Free World problem.

Nor does the offer of the United States to sell attractive securities to banks in Europe in order to blot up some of the surplus dollars do more than postpone a solution.

The dollar crisis in Europe is a warning to us that we must start putting our economic affairs in order if we want to be the world economic leader. Phrased another way, if we want to continue to enjoy the present standard of living and freedoms that we have, we had better start biting the economic bullet at home.

A catastrophe may be averted this time by the support that the dollar has received. There is little doubt, however, that there are only so many shocks that the dollar can take before it succumbs.

SENATOR BUCKLEY SPEAKS ABOUT THE PROBLEMS OF POLICE IN OUR SOCIETY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, in recent years this Nation has experienced an unprecedented attack on its law enforcement system. Policemen have been subject to verbal abuse not only on the streets of our cities but also in the hallowed halls and grounds of this building. They have been the victims of sniper fire and wanton assaults in ever-increasing numbers. And now, in New York City especially, we are witnessing what appears to be an all-out war on the police.

This trend takes on the appearance of outright anarchy with every slaughter and it must stop. Cooler heads must prevail in order for our police system to survive and remain an effective and fair dispenser of justice for all. More sober minds must put the difficult task of the law enforcement officers of our Nation in perspective.

I am pleased to present, in this regard, the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from New York, Mr. JAMES L. BUCKLEY. His recently delivered address given before the Police Conference of New York State focuses on the fine efforts made by the Metropolitan Police Force in the District of Columbia during the potentially chaotic demonstrations of early May. I urge my colleagues to read his message printed at this point in the RECORD.

SPEECH BY SENATOR JAMES L. BUCKLEY AT THE POLICE CONFERENCE OF NEW YORK STATE, THE PINES HOTEL, SOUTH FALLSBURG, N.Y., MAY 17, 1971

I would like to discuss a new dimension of a problem which is not just a police problem, but a problem of our society as a whole. I speak of the problem which confronted the police of the District of Columbia and the citizens of the city of Washington during the Mayday protests of two weeks ago.

To place these in perspective, I think it is useful to go back a few years and to review the events which paved the way for this challenge to the Federal Government.

This country has had a long history of mass demonstrations; of demonstrations organized to express concern, to express dissent. But these other demonstrations, by and large, have observed the legitimate limits of dissent; and although some from time to time have gotten out of hand and have triggered rioting and destruction and injuries, they have represented lawful exercises of our great constitutional rights of petition and assembly—lawful because they never set out as a matter of deliberate purpose to trample on the rights and freedoms of others.

But in recent years, principally on our campuses, we have seen the growth of something dangerously different. We have seen a step-by-step testing of the limits of outrage; of the limits to which the lives and rights of others could be trespassed upon with impunity. Accidental aggressions became deliberate; and as campus and civil authorities backed down, excusing the militants with talk about the understandable frustrations of young idealists or the righteousness of their non-negotiable demands, the militants reacted with new demands and new reports to force. Thus we have seen an escalation in the tactics of confrontation politics from picketing and shoving to sit-ins and shut-outs, to kidnappings, to the destruction of files, to the fouling of offices, to arson, to orchestrated bombings, to the closing down of entire universities.

All this, of course, in the name of causes of such transcendent righteousness that those who advocated them assumed special immunity to flout the law and to throw the rights and lives of entire communities into jeopardy. These causes, let us recall, have not been exclusively or even principally concerned with the Vietnam War.

They have ranged the gamut from the right to shout obscenities at Berkeley, to the propriety of a proposed gymnasium at Columbia, to campus recruitment by the police, to abolition of ROTC. As Jerry Rubin once observed, if there had not been a Vietnam war, the New Left would have invented one.

And so a self-righteous corps of self-styled revolutionaries have been given their head and encouraged to seek out ever-grander targets for their increasingly refined guerrilla tactics; and in the process we have made celebrities of the Abbie Hoffmans and the Jerry Rubins who roam about the country's lecture circuits preaching their special brands of disruption and anarchy. "The system is cor-

rupt," they shout, "the system must be destroyed."

This is the background which is necessary to an understanding of what took place in Washington during the first week of May. The Mayday confrontations were different in quality and purpose from the earlier, often moving, mass protests against the war which had taken place in April. Those who wrote the Scenario for the week beginning May 2nd had far more in mind than the peaceful expression of dissent. There was a program which had as its explicit purpose the disruption of the city of Washington and the stoppage of the Federal Government. And their stated objectives went far beyond an immediate American withdrawal.

The Scenario was written by the "Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice" and its adjunct, the "Mayday Collective." They had their nonnegotiable demands and they distributed their literature in which they described their demands and their specific goals.

To give you the flavor of what they planned for the first week of May, let me quote from this literature—literature incidentally, which featured the Viet Cong flag and never the American flag, except as a symbol of death:

"The same military machine that is choking Vietnam is killing black people and young people in America. Angela Davis, dope-smokers, draft-resisters, poor people, the people who are trying to challenge the stronghold it now grips us with.

"We will go to Washington in May to focus in on the war, poverty, racism, sexism that (are) the natural outgrowths of maintaining American capitalism and imperialism.

"In May we will take to the streets in righteous anger and force the American Government to accept the wishes of the American people . . .

"Mayday begins the first national implementation of the peoples peace . . . we will ask Government workers to join us in implementing the treaty by striking against Nixon on May 3-7. We will jam into their hallways and offices . . .

"And on May 3 we will enter some 26 roads and bridges in the downtown Washington area, in rush-hour traffic, to stop the Government."

So we see the true dimensions of the Mayday confrontations. They were not so much anti-war as anti-America. They rallied behind the Viet Cong flag; and, if the Government of the United States refused their preposterous demand to ratify their "peoples peace treaty," which for all intents and purposes was drafted in Hanoi, they would—in their own words—"stop the Government."

This was the challenge which the Mayday tribe and their camp followers presented to the city of Washington and to the Government of the United States; and they boasted that they would bring into the city some 70,000 to 100,000 persons to make good their threat. It was a naked challenge to the authority of government, and to the rights of a city of 800,000 persons.

And it was a challenge that was met firmly, effectively and efficiently by what must be one of the great police forces of this or any nation. The innocents who had flocked to Washington to join in the fun of paralyzing a city were quickly put on notice that the authorities intended to do their duty, and tens of thousands of them quietly stole away. But the 20,000 or so who stayed on fully intended to carry out the planned disruptions, flooding the streets with their thousands, slashing tires, overturning trucks; and, when deflected by the police, they roamed through residential areas relieving their frustrations through random acts of vandalism.

Throughout this period, the police me-

thodically and tirelessly did their job, and did it in the only way it could be done. They countered mass invasions of buildings and key intersections with mass arrests after first using bullhorns to warn the crowds to disperse. As a result of their action and self-restraint, injuries were kept at an absolute minimum and the city of Washington was kept open and the Government of the United States allowed to function.

But now that the city has been saved, now that civil order has been maintained, now that the Government has demonstrated that it will not be intimidated, we are hearing the predictable cries about police state tactics and the denial of constitutional rights—all those charges which these days we have come to expect anytime anyone attempts to draw and enforce the clear distinction between the lawful exercise of the rights of free speech and assembly on the one hand, and the unlawful acts of coercion, disruption, destruction on the others.

Those who raise their voices in protest against the actions taken by the city of Washington seem so exclusively concerned with the rights of those who sought to close down the city, that they appear oblivious of the rights of the public at large. They are unconcerned, apparently, over the rights of the 800,000 persons who live and work in the District to go about their daily lives in peace, secure in their persons and property; unconcerned for these citizens' right to unobstructed streets for their own legitimate use and for all those public uses—fire engines, ambulances, and the lot—on which the safety of a great city and its people depends. True, some innocent passersby were undoubtedly swept into the vans used in the mass arrests. But what was the practical alternative? By-standers had been warned to stay away from the disruptions, and the police had to clear the streets and office buildings if the city and Government were to continue to function.

True, thousands of those arrested were kept in hastily mobilized compounds without adequate sanitary facilities, and often without food for long hours at a time. But does this mean that we must keep on hand 10,000 or 20,000 standby cells just in case we need to cope with future emergencies of the kind created by the May Day collective? And what about the long hours which the thousands of police were forced to go without food as they worked to keep the city functioning?

True also, some pre-arrest procedures were dispensed with, and long delays were experienced in the processing of individual cases. But again, what was the alternative if the essential, emergency job of protecting the rights of the public was to be accomplished?

The arrested demonstrators can well be asked, in the words of Eric Sevareid, "Why they are furious at delays in the legal processing of their cases when they had set out to put a full stop to all processes of government here. Or why they resent the unsanitary conditions in their detention centers when, had their own plans succeeded, there would be no sanitation anywhere in the city, including the hospitals."

I believe that we need to give careful study to what was done to cope with these demonstrations. As we have been spared this kind of confrontation through most of our history, we may still have much to learn about more effective countermeasures and about keeping these measures in the closest possible harmony with our proud traditions of individual justice. But to say that the emergency measures taken in Washington two weeks ago represented a suspension of the constitution is to distort what in fact took place, and to state that a free society cannot as a practical matter protect itself against

mass action. This is to enshrine legal abstractions at the cost of the common sense which is part and parcel of any system of constitutional rights. As former Justice Arthur Goldberg once wrote, "While the constitution protects against the invasion of individual rights, it is not a suicide pact."

And now we come to what ought to be the principal lesson to be drawn from our most recent experience with confrontation politics.

Freedom is a fragile thing. It is not the natural state of human society, but a state which is achieved through sacrifice, through self-discipline, through a common understanding of the need to substitute the mechanisms of representative government for force. Freedom thrives where civil order thrives and where there is the broadest willingness to abide by the rules. This is not to suggest that the rules may not be wrong or may not need changing; but it does suggest that the rules must be changed in accordance with the rule book if the conditions of a free society are to be preserved.

Any reading of history will indicate that when a people is required to choose between anarchy and civil disorder on the one hand, and a restriction of their freedoms on the other, a people will usually decide in favor of order even at the expense of some of their freedoms.

This is why we need to be so very concerned about this growing impulse to anarchy, this flowering of confrontation politics. This is why it has become so important that those who occupy positions of moral or civil responsibility begin making the necessary distinctions between lawful dissent and the unlawful disruption of the rights of others, why it is time that we stopped excusing and flattering our self-styled revolutionaries. This is why we must begin drawing the necessary lines.

Happily, in Washington this month, the city and federal authorities drew the line and let it be known that we as a society intend to survive with our freedoms intact, and that we will not be bullied by the new anarchists among us.

There is still another lesson to be learned from this month's experience, and that is the critical role which a skilled, courageous and professional police force is called upon to play in the protection of a free society. Although thousands of troops had been mobilized and deployed in case the demonstrations got out of hand, these were largely kept out of sight. It was the police of the city of Washington who had the prime responsibility for maintaining order in the city; and it was the police who during those three critical days waged a successful effort to keep the thousands of rioters from closing down the city. It was the police, not the military, who held the line between civil order and chaos.

In so doing they deprived the rioters of what they wanted most—the drama of confrontation between civilians and the military. What the citizens of this country saw instead was a demonstration of mob control which highlighted the full role of their police in the protection of their rights. They saw and understood that the police exist not only to protect them from the aggressions of the criminal, but from the disruptions and violence unleashed by the arrogant few who claim some superior monopoly on morality or high principle.

Attorney General John Mitchell summed up as follows the special accomplishments of the forces of law which the country witnessed two weeks ago:

"I am proud of the Washington City Police. I am proud that they stopped a repressive mob from robbing the rights of others.

I am proud that they did so in the best tradition of the peace officer—with firmness but restraint, exercising no more authority than necessary to accomplish their duty of protecting the Washington citizenry. I am proud that they gave their opponents no excuse to cry, 'police brutality!' I am proud that they have presented to the world a picture of police fairness and effectiveness—a picture that can go a long way to counter the unfavorable police image that extremists have tried to palm off on the American public."

I want to echo the attorney general's sentiments. I believe that the kind of professionalism exhibited in Washington two weeks ago, and the kind of professionalism which the police of New York State routinely display will build a new respect for our law enforcement officers, a better understanding for some of the problems which they face today, and a new appreciation of their critical role in preserving our freedoms.

I know that recent times have been hard ones for you who have chosen the honorable career of policeman. But I believe your steadfastness in your duty, your self-restraint, your courage and cool in the face of often outrageous abuse will achieve once again that broad-based respect which Americans have traditionally shown their police. And in the meantime, I want to express this citizen's gratitude for your fidelity.

#### TAX REFORM

### HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as part of a package of tax reform bills, I have today introduced legislation which provides for the income taxation of unrealized appreciation from a decedent. The gain, which is treated as having been realized by the decedent taxpayer in his final taxable period, is treated as long-term capital gain. Losses on depreciated property are also taken into account in determining the net gain or loss from property which is acquired from a decedent. There are two exemptions from the tax on gains at death. First, the tax will not apply to gain on household or personal effects if the fair market value of the household or personal item at the time of death is less than \$2,000. Second, property which passes to the surviving spouse—and is eligible for the estate tax marital deduction—will not be subject to the tax. So that decedents possessing a relatively small amount of appreciated property at death will not be subject to the tax, the bill also provides that each decedent is considered to have a minimum basis in property which passes as a result of his death of \$60,000—or the fair market value of the property, if lower.

Generally, the rule relating to the basis of property acquired from a decedent is not changed by this bill. The bill provides, however, that an interest in property which is received by a surviving spouse, and is not subject to the tax on gains at death, will have a basis in the hands of the surviving spouse

equal to the basis of the property to the decedent immediately before his death. The bill also contains a provision changing the time when a decedent's last income tax return must be filed and provisions permitting the Secretary or his delegate, in certain situations, to extend the time for paying the tax due on gains at death.

A detailed explanation of the bill follows:

This bill adds a new section, section 84, to the Code which provides for the inclusion in the decedent's final income tax return of the gains and losses which would have been taken into account if the taxpayer had sold all the property which is considered "to have been acquired from or to have passed from the decedent"—within the meaning of section 1014(b)—at a selling price equal to its fair market value at death. Property which is income in respect of a decedent is not subject to the tax on gains at death and is treated in the same manner as under present law. If the decedent's fiduciary elects the alternate valuation date for estate tax purposes, the property is considered to have been sold by the decedent at its value on the alternate valuation date. The gains and losses arising as a result of this section are considered to be amounts received from the sale or exchange of capital assets held for more than 6 months, that is, long-term capital gain or loss. For purposes of computing the losses under this section, the provisions in present law relating to the disallowance of losses from wash sales and the provision limiting the deductibility of capital losses by individuals will not apply.

Two types of property will not be subject to the tax on gains at death. A household or personal item which is acquired from a decedent will not be subject to the tax if the fair market value of the item at death—or the alternate valuation date—is less than \$2,000. If the value is in excess of that amount, the property is to be subject to the tax like any other property acquired from a decedent. Losses due to the depreciation in value of personal and household items will be disallowed, following the usual rules relating to losses of a personal nature. Also exempt from the tax on gains at death is property which passes, or has passed, from the decedent to his surviving spouse, but only to the extent that the property interest is deductible under the present estate tax marital deduction.

The new section also contains three basis rules to be used in computing the tax on gains at death. The first rule provides a minimum basis in property owned by the taxpayer at his death. According to this provision, property acquired from a decedent will be considered to have a minimum total adjusted basis to the decedent of \$60,000, or the fair market value of the property, if lower. If the actual basis exceeds \$60,000, then the gain or loss is computed from the actual basis. If the fair market value of the property is less than \$60,000, that value will be the basis for determining gain.

The second basis rule relates to property acquired before the date of enactment. So that only appreciation occurring after the date of enactment will be subject to the tax on gains at death, the bill provides that if the basis of the property—determined under the normal rules—is less than the fair market value of the property as of the date of enactment, the basis for determining gain shall be the fair market value on the date of enactment.

However, depreciation which occurred prior to the date of enactment may be taken into consideration in determining the net gain or loss from the provision imposing a tax on gains at death. The third basis rule provides for the allocation of basis between the marital share of the decedent's property—which is not subject to the tax on gains at death—and the nonmarital share of the property—which is subject to the tax. The basic objective of using allocated, rather than actual, basis is to eliminate any incentive for the decedent or his fiduciary to transfer any particular piece of property to the surviving spouse. For example, without a basis allocation rule, considerable incentive would exist to transfer low basis property to a surviving spouse so that the gain on that property would escape taxation at the decedent's death. To avoid this effect the bill provides a basis rule which requires allocation of the total basis among all property—other than cash—before computing the taxable gain, with a carryover of the allocated basis in the case of property on which the gain is not subject to taxation at death.

If the application of the provision providing for taxation of gains at death produces a net long-term capital loss the amount thereof may first be utilized against the net capital gain for the decedent's final taxable period. Any amount remaining may be carried back to each of the three taxable years preceding the decedent's final taxable year. The net loss eligible for carryback shall first be carried, as a net long-term capital loss, to the third preceding year and any amount remaining, after use as a net long-term capital loss in that year, may be carried back to the second and first preceding years in the same manner. If any loss remains after the application of the loss as a net long-term capital loss in each of the three preceding years, one-half of the amount of any remaining loss may be carried back, as an ordinary loss, to the three preceding years in the same manner. The carryback of a loss may not increase or produce a net operating loss for the year to which it is carried back.

The bill also provides that the executor may, in certain circumstances, collect a proportionate share of the tax on gains at death from a person to whom property was transferred by the decedent during the decedent's lifetime. In certain situations property which is transferred during the decedent's lifetime will, nonetheless, be subject to the tax on gains at death. This would occur, for example, if

the decedent transferred property during his lifetime reserving the right to revoke the transfer.

Although the estate is liable for the tax on gains at death with respect to the property transferred, it is appropriate to provide that the executor of the decedent's estate may collect a proportionate portion of the tax generated by the property transferred during the decedent's lifetime from the transferee.

While the normal basis rule relating to property acquired from a decedent is not changed, the bill provides that property acquired from a decedent by a surviving spouse—and not subject to the tax on gains at death—will have a carryover basis in the hands of the surviving spouse. This carryover basis is, however, determined by taking into consideration the basis allocated to the marital property for purposes of determining the tax on gains at death.

With respect to the decedent's final income tax return, on which the tax on gains at death will be reported, the bill provides that the return will in no case be due before 9 months after the date of decedent's death. Since the valuation for estate tax purposes will be utilized in computing the tax on gains at death, it is appropriate to provide that the decedent's final income tax return may be filed on or before April 15 following the close of the calendar year or within 9 months after the date of the decedent's death, whichever is later.

Provisions for obtaining an extension of time for the payment of the estate tax are made applicable to the income tax on gains at death. Thus, under the bill, the Secretary or his delegate may extend the time for payment of the income tax on gains at death for a reasonable period not to exceed 12 months from the date on which the tax is due. Also, if the Secretary or his delegate finds that the payment of the income tax on gains at death would result in undue hardship, he may extend the time for payment for a reasonable period not in excess of 10 years. Further, if a decedent's estate consists largely of an interest in a closely held business, the executor may elect to pay the income tax on gains at death which is attributable to the closely held business interest in two or more—but not exceeding 10—equal installments.

The bill provides that it shall apply to decedents dying on or after the first day of the first calendar year beginning after the date of enactment.

#### SURVIVAL OF JEWS IN RUSSIA

**HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1971

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, once again the survival of the Jewish people has been seriously threatened by the Government of the Soviet Union. It is no longer

sufficient for the people of the Jewish faith residing in Russia to endure every kind of political, social, and religious persecution. Now they must submit to harassment, arrest, and persecution for attempting to leave the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union, with its oppressive and discriminatory social structure, has proved to be uninhabitable for a people who merely desire to practice their religion and live in peace, without fear of reprisal. The kind of treachery which forces a people to want to flee from their homeland is indeed extreme. And not content with the day to day harassment of the Jewish citizenry and their subjugation through official sanction, the Soviet Union has initiated the most inhuman and calculating tactics aimed at vanquishing the Jewish people and destroying their culture. While this corruption of justice takes place, the free people of the world stand idly by and watch the travesty unfold. It is apparent that decisive and quick action is necessary to save the Jewish people from further persecution. The Soviet Union is a world power and as a world power should be made more responsive to the humanitarian concerns of the rest of the world. Such irresponsible action by a government of the world community of nations is inexcusable and reflects not only on the Soviet Union, but likewise on the United States.

Pressure must be brought to bear on a government which has hardened itself to the suffering and torment of a people whose history is one of continuous struggle against adversity and hostility. As a Nation of free people who value highly the right to live in peace and tranquility, and who also cherish and respect the right of other people to seek that same freedom, we must exert ourselves on the behalf of the enslaved Jews of the Soviet Union and secure for them the dignity and justice to which every human being is entitled.

I join my colleagues, friends and constituents of the New England Region of the Zionist Organization of America in calling upon the Soviet Government to permit Soviet Jews freely to practice their religion and maintain their culture.

The resolution follows:

#### RESOLUTION ON SOVIET JEWRY

At a meeting of the New England Region of the Zionist Organization of America, held on Sunday, May 16, 1971 at the Sidney Hill Country Club, Chestnut Hill, Mass., the following resolution on Soviet Jewry was passed:

This meeting strongly condemns the mock Leningrad trials, the religious, political and racist repression of the Jews in Soviet Russia. It deplores unequivocally persecutions and the refusal of the Soviet government to permit Jews to leave the Soviet Union, in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, subscribed to and ratified formally by the Supreme Soviet, which clearly obligates governments to recognize that "everyone has the right to leave any country including his own."

It called upon the Soviet government to permit Soviet Jews freely to practice their religion and maintain their culture.