

No. A-4993823, pursuant to section 244(a) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

941. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on better cost accounting needed for operation and maintenance of military family housing, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations

942. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on improvements needed in management of motor equipment activities, District of Columbia government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

943. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on opportunities for improving the southern Monterey rural health project, King City, Calif.; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and Office of Economic Opportunity; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. RYAN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, and Mr. KOCH):

H.R. 9596. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 9597. A bill to subject certain nationals or citizens of the United States to the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts for their crimes committed outside the United States and to provide for the apprehension, restraint, removal, and delivery of such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 9598. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code so as to provide for the awarding of a "Supreme Sacrifice Medal" to relatives of members of the Armed Forces killed in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.R. 9599. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to conduct an election for the purpose of a referendum on the question of statehood for the residents of the present District, election of delegates to a constitutional convention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 9600. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to include certain organizations providing laundry or linen services to hospitals among the cooperative hospital service organizations entitled to tax exemption thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN (for himself and Mr. POBELL):

H.R. 9601. A bill to authorize the Office of Management and Budget to establish a system governing the creation and operation of advisory committees throughout the Federal Government which are created to advise officers and agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BOW, Mr. BRAY, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. BOB WILSON, and Mr. WYDLER):

H.R. 9602. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 to enlarge the mission of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy and to assist in enlarging the mission of the State Maritime academies; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.J. Res. 767. Joint resolution: Stable Purchasing Power Resolution of 1971; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MAZZOLI:

H.J. Res. 768. A resolution: White House Conference on Environment and International Law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

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

233. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the creation of a Golden Gate National Recreation Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

234. Also, Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age and older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

235. Also, Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age and older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

236. Also, Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age and older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

237. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age and older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

238. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age and older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

239. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the protection of the beaches and shoreline of Ventura County; to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

96. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Alianza Federal de Pueblos Libres, Albuquerque, N. Mex., relative to the municipal status of certain community land grants; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

97. Also, petition of the Board of Commissioners, Ottawa County, Mich., relative to amending the Social Security Act to assist the aged in public facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

98. Also, petition of the Congress of Micronesia, Trust Territory of the Pacific, relative to amending the tariff laws to allow entry of Micronesian products into the United States on the same basis as provided for insular possessions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE—Tuesday, July 6, 1971

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, ruler of men and nations, as we return to this Hallowed Hall, we thank Thee for respite from daily duties, and for the annual rituals renewing our national heritage befitting "one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

In the days before us, guide, we pray Thee, all those to whom has been committed the government of this Nation, and grant them special gifts of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and strength: that upholding what is right, and following what is true, they may obey Thy holy will and fulfill Thy divine pur-

pose, to the honor and glory of Thy name. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 30, 1971, the Secretary of the Senate, on July 1, 1971, received the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2133) to extend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, for 3 months.

That the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 31) to provide during times of high unemployment for programs of public service employment for unemployed persons, to assist States and local communi-

ties in providing needed public services, and for other purposes.

That the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 31. An act to provide during times of high unemployment for programs of public service employment for unemployed persons, to assist States and local communities in providing needed public services, and for other purposes;

S. 2133. An act to extend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, for 3 months; and

H.R. 9271. An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 30, 1971, the President pro tempore signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 9271) on July 1, 1971.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

On June 30, 1971:

S. 645. An act to provide relief 'n patent and trademark cases affected by the emergency situation in the U.S. Postal Service which began on March 30, 1970;

S. 1538. An act to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, as amended;

S. 1732. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 118. Joint resolution to provide a temporary extension of the authority conferred by the Export Administration Act of 1969.

On July 2, 1971:

S. 1700. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today, are printed at the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to House Concurrent Resolution 354, commemorating July 4, 1971, as Honor America Day, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed H.R. 9382, making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development; for space, science, veterans, and certain other independent executive agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 9382) making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development; for space, science, veterans, and certain other independent executive agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 354) commemorating July 4, 1971, as Honor America Day, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 30, 1971, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, 25 years ago this month, on July 4, 1946, the United States withdrew its sovereignty from the Philippine Islands and a new nation was launched in Southeast Asia.

The new Republic of the Philippines that emerged that day has flourished and grown over the intervening quarter century. The process has of course not been without difficulties. On the whole, however, the Government in Manila has remained stable and the economy has expanded at a notable rate. In recent years, moreover, there have been significant social advances, notably in education.

A few statistics tell the story graphically. Gross national product has increased by 109 percent since 1947. Total foreign trade has increased by 177 percent and trade with countries other than the United States has increased by 659 percent. After decades of rice shortages, the Philippines is now an exporter of rice. In the past 5½ years alone, the number of school rooms has doubled and the children in attendance has increased by 7 million.

Nevertheless, the situation as regards the livelihood of the Filipino people leaves much to be desired, as the President of the Philippines and other political leaders have recognized. The growth and expansion have come in the face of a great carryover of social inequities, some of which go back decades and even centuries. One major consequence is a severe strain on the political and governmental structure that was patterned largely on that of the United States and which was promulgated in the preindependence period. There has been a long felt need for change in many of the basic institutions as not adequately responsive to the needs of the Filipino people at a time of mounting pressure for social reform. The President of the Philippines, Ferdinand Marcos, the only reelected President in Philippines history, has been one of the most eloquent articulators of this sentiment.

It is against this background that the Philippine Republic is now holding a national constitutional convention. The newly elected president of the convention is Diosdado Macapagal, who served as President of the Philippines from 1962 to 1966. He was elected to head the convention after the untimely death of Car-

los P. Garcia, another former President who had been elected to head the convention only last month.

Mr. President, the Journal of Commerce of New York issued on June 1, 1971, a very comprehensive special edition devoted to an economic review of the Philippines, especially keyed to the 25th anniversary of the Republic. I commend the issue to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that there be included therefrom an article by former President Diosdado Macapagal. In addition, I ask unanimous consent that an interview which was conducted last month by Kingsbury Smith, chief foreign editor of the Hearst newspapers, with Philippine President Ferdinand Marcos also be included in the Record. It details some of the exceptional achievements in the Philippines, many of which have been recorded in large part during the half decade of his incumbency.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CONSTITUTION REFORMS HELD DUE (By Diosdado Macapagal)

Within a month after I was elected to the Presidency in 1962, I urged Congress to convoke a Constitutional Convention to frame a new Constitution of the Philippines. Although it took Congress eight years to act, I am gratified that it has now done so.

In envisioning the promulgation of a new Constitution, I was mindful of the gross inadequacies of the present charter as a framework within which to mould the welfare and future of the Filipino people.

The Filipinos regained their sovereignty in 1946 after four and a half centuries of colonial life—400 years under Spain and 50 years under the United States. It is no indictment of the colonial powers but an avowal of historical fact that such a long period of imperialism is bound to leave a sedimentative influence that would be a repressive weight upon the former colony's salutary development. For all the colonizers' avowals of altruism, it cannot be gainsaid that the colonized country was administered primarily for the aggrandizement of the imperial power and only subsidiarily for the well-being of the subject people.

ESSENTIAL REEXAMINATION

The political system, administrative structure, economic order, social institutions and practices developed during the long colonialism need to be reexamined in the light of the indigenous qualities and traits of the people and of their desire to pursue their most cherished aspirations in their own way and with their own genius.

This explains the fact that today there exists dissatisfaction with the American two-party system which is entrenched in the present Philippine Constitution. There is dissent to the exaltation of capital which is almighty in the American system and is likewise enthroned in the Philippine charter. There is a clamor for social reform which is underplayed in the present organic law that was patterned after the American Constitution.

U.S. PARITY RIGHTS

The existing charter embodies American parity rights which have inflamed the stu-

tions precipitated the convening of the Convention. It is significant that among the Delegates who have spoken out, an overwhelming number are for the termination of parity rights; and relative to the rights already acquired, 62 per cent are for their lapsing, with compensation, while 17 per

cent believe that the "vested" rights subsist "under the rule of law."

The Filipino youth are in revolt against American military bases which were established under the Tydings-McDuffie Independence Law through which the present Constitution was contrived. It is noteworthy that 54 per cent of the Delegates are for the removal of the bases as against 40 per cent who are for their maintenance.

POPULAR SENTIMENT

In sum, abundant evidence is marshallable to establish that the aggravating popular unrest partakes of a revolution thus far pacific to demolish the vestiges of centuries of foreign domination which are regarded as distortive of the Filipino soul and, therefore, deleterious to Philippine development and national fulfillment. The Convention is thus looked upon as the vehicle that can pull off this "peaceful revolution"; that it constitutes in fact an "unfinished revolution" in the sense that it aims to initiate reforms and establish institutions which will enable the mass of the people to wrest economic, social and spiritual well-being by shattering the dominance of extant imperialistic interests and their native collaborators. It is generally believed that the failure of the Convention to measure up to this expectation may worsen popular unrest and detonate a violent revolution.

PRESIDENTIAL SYSTEM

In view of this widespread sentiment, the Convention may be expected to reexamine the American presidential system of government and consider the parliamentary system. Specifically, it may impugn the institution of a strong Presidency by limiting its tenure and reducing its powers. It will consider removing from the Executive the supervision of the courts and restricting its power of appointing judges. It will endeavor to rinse the political and administrative processes of their graft-reeding debilities.

The Convention will also likely jettison the two-party system and facilitate the rise of three or four political parties. Stung by the "imposition" of parity rights, it will be inclined to be nationalistic in the utilization of the nation's natural resources. It may hew a similar path on the principle of citizenship, as indicated by the trend that 64 per cent of the Delegates are for *jus sanguinis* and 23 per cent for *jus soli*. The Convention may also be disposed favorably to relations with communist countries and to economic planning as an implement of growth. Sixty-nine percent of the Delegates incline to the recognition of Red China; 25 per cent oppose it.

LOCAL AUTONOMY

American example is not in all ways disregarded. The American system of state rights has bolstered a demand for local autonomy. The Convention may establish stronger local governmental units with powers of taxation to remove their financial dependence on national government.

The fervor for change and national individuality will constrain the Convention to assess politico-economic systems other than republicanism. New ideologies likely to be examined are Christian socialism, the Welfare State, and "national democracy" which is midway between socialist and democratic states. Some Delegates would seek a consideration of communism.

Considering the genesis and motivations of the Convention, the most significant change looms to be a stress on social justice and welfare. Most Delegates regard the socio-economic issues as paramount over other problems. Several Delegates would invest property with a social function in equitable ways. There may thus emerge a Constitution that will be socially-minded in contrast with the property-orientation of the present charter.

A proper question is: will the Convention

be free enough to undertake desirable innovations? Senate President Gil Puyat has warned of possible "intervention not only from political but other groups that may want to dominate the Convention." The answer may have been given by Delegate Raymundo Baguilat of Ifugao who says: "Those who shout that the coming Convention will be an exercise in futility are belittling the ability and patriotism of the Delegates."

The Ifugao spokesman echoes a rising sentiment among the 320 Delegates—that they will act as free agents of a sovereign people, responsible to no politician, financier or manipulator and responsive only to their inviolate duty of writing a Constitution that will provide the Filipino people a new, tangible and credible hope for a better life in a society that is just and Filipino and thereby make the Republic endure.

INTERVIEW

(By Kingsbury Smith)

MANILA, June 10.—One of the most remarkable leaders in the world today is striving to save democracy in the Philippines by a peaceful revolution that aims at a major transformation of the social and economic order in this island republic of 38,000,000 people.

President Ferdinand Marcos, whose heroic deeds in World War II and miraculous survival from a dozen close calls with death—five times gravely wounded and repeatedly tortured by the Japanese—have already made him a legendary figure in his homeland, believes that democracy in the Philippines is being endangered by a combination of oligarchism and Communist subversion.

He is risking his political future, his honor and even his life, to carry out reforms he is convinced are necessary to preserve democracy in the Asian nation which, under American guidance, was the first to embrace it.

"If I fail," he told me in an exclusive interview, "either the Communists will take over in two or three years or there will be an extreme rightist or military dictatorship."

His plans for restructuring the social and economic order in the Philippines include distribution of land to the peasants, redistribution of wealth through increased inheritance and other taxes, local farm collectivization, family-level producers, improved housing and educational facilities for the poor, rural electrification and strict censorship of pornographic films and literature to protect the youth.

The record of what he has already achieved in five and a half years as president is an amazing one.

Government revenue up 60 per cent. A virtually bankrupt government when he took over now enjoys a balanced budget, a favorable foreign trade balance and a stabilized economy with a growth rate this year of 5.5 per cent. Unemployment down from 8.7 to 6 per cent. Seven million more children in school. The number of schoolrooms doubled. Six thousand miles of new roads. The country, long a big importer of rice, the basic diet, is now not only self-sufficient, but exporting the "miracle rice" his research projects developed.

To spend a few days as the guest of this youthful-looking, 53-year-old crusading leader and his beautiful and talented first lady, who is even more of a political asset to him than Jackie was to the late President Kennedy, is an inspiring experience.

I have seen, interviewed and corresponded with most of the world's leaders, over the past 30 years, including Churchill, Stalin, Khrushchev, Nehru, De Gaulle, Adenauer and every American President since Herbert Hoover. Seidom have I encountered a leader who impressed me as much as this dynamic man of Malay ancestry who combines a charismatic personality with a pragmatic, common sense approach to problems and

whose idealism is centered on the betterment of his people's welfare.

It seems fortunate for the Philippines, the United States and the neighboring Asian nations that this man is one of Asia's most outstanding leaders at this turbulent time.

Decorated 28 times for bravery in World War II, one of his heroic deeds was credited with delaying the Japanese capture of Bataan for three months. Although wounded, he survived the infamous death march to lead an underground guerrilla movement that continuously harassed the Japanese during their occupation of the Philippines and helped prepare the way for the return of General MacArthur's allied forces.

There is at times a pained expression on the President's face, especially around the eyes, that seems to reflect the suffering he has endured.

Convicted while a college student of a political murder and imprisoned, young Marcos was later offered a Presidential pardon but refused it and insisted on a Supreme Court review. He pleaded his own case and won a complete reversal of the conviction, absolving him of all guilt.

He has been accused by his political enemies of having become the richest man in Asia since he became President. Son of a wealthy land-owning family and one of the country's most successful trial lawyers before he became President, he ridicules the allegations as attempts by the oligarchists and Communists to try to destroy him politically. After his re-election to a second term in 1969, he announced he was disposing of his worldly possessions. He established trust funds for his wife and three children, and willed everything else to the nation.

"When I die," he remarked to me, "I will die a poor man."

A mass media, which he contends is almost entirely controlled by business interests who bitterly resent his efforts to curb corruption and the exploitation of the nation's resources for their own selfish purposes, has subjected him and his wife to scandalous abuse and slander, accusing them of practically everything from robbing the country to having separate lovers.

Both the President and the First Lady speak with frankness about these attempts not only to destroy them politically but to wreck their marital happiness. Both say it only has served to strengthen their love and devotion to one another.

Evidence of the faith the people have in them is clearly apparent in the fact that while the President won his first election to the nation's highest office in 1965 by a plurality of 600,000, he was re-elected in 1969 by two and a half million votes.

Following is the condensed text of the first of a series of interviews with President Marcos in Malacanang Palace:

Q—What do you consider to be the most important achievements of your presidency?

A—The changing of the mind and heart of our people, more than anything else. What I mean by this is the change from resignation, outright indolence and fatalism. All kinds of suffering and failure were ascribed to some divine judgment that was unchangeable. So much so that impoverishment, illness, and ignorance were considered a part of the dictate of God and therefore should not and cannot be changed.

This has reached such a point that unfinished bridges were allowed to rot, roads, although started, were not finished. It was wrecking the entire economy.

Two thousand of our industries were either closed or closing when I took over. Not a single person offered or worked out a solution.

When I took over as president, I asked our people to think. "Do not accept our misery and deprivation in resignation. Think and your thoughts will make you free. Be discontented." And I got what I asked for. The

change of heart and the change of mind of our people. This to me is the most important.

Q—How did you bring this change about?

A—By varied measures. One of the most important was to show them that something could be done. We did it in the most dramatic way possible.

For instance, in the question of rice. We set pilot farms in very municipality. I called in the professionals. I don't mean agriculturalists, but doctors, lawyers and men who understand scientific farming. I told them they could help their country in some other way than just practicing their profession. We showed the people we could harvest three times, four times and more than they were harvesting. Of course, when profit comes in everybody starts noticing.

Another dramatic way was in schools. When I assumed office there were 108,000 schoolrooms. Today there are 202,000. Seven million more children are attending school today than when I took over.

Q—Where did you find the funds to do that?

A—First I tapped our Japanese reparations payments, which used to go to a few privileged, private industries. Then in four years I increased the government's revenue by 60 per cent. I wonder whether any government anywhere in the world has been able to do this.

Q—How did you do it?

A—By sending the crooks to jail and appealing to our people to pay their taxes. I gave a one year tax amnesty to all those who had failed to pay their taxes—one year to pay up and they would not be prosecuted. We doubled the number of people who were paying their income taxes.

We also imposed higher duties on luxuries, and on consumer items, especially items that were being produced here. For example, we imposed a 200 per cent duty on big cars.

Q—How about roads?

A—As soon as I knew I was elected in December, 1965, I called in as many experts as I could from all over the world. I asked them to tell me what was the difference between a modern country, say Switzerland, or Germany or England, and the Philippines. Why do we not move?

The answers were quite obvious. They said we did not have any communications, no effective way of moving our products from production areas to markets. Then we had to build up skilled labor because our target was a balanced agro-industrial economy. Roads became a primary project. This was one of the dramatic things we did.

Here in Manila there wasn't a single modern through road. I built straightway thoroughfares. I called in the army engineers to do it, and we finished them in record time. Instead of teaching the soldiers merely how to shoot, to destroy, we taught them how to work on such projects as roads.

Another dramatic thing we did was to build schoolhouses quickly. I would bring pre-fabricated schoolhouses to the barrios (rural villages) and we would put them up in five hours. I designed the marcos pre-fabricated schoolhouse during the war. I just improved on it for our needs today. It is all steel and cement.

Q—What are your ultimate aims and objectives for the country?

A—Fundamentally this country is democratic and its beliefs are democratic. I would like to see this country not threatened by subversion. We have been threatened by subversion since the beginning of our independence, and this has blocked our economic development because the demands of national security always draw funds and resources from economic development.

I would like to eliminate this basic threat not only to our freedom and security, but to our economic, social and political development, and to do so before my term as president expires in 1973. I would like to restructure our society.

Q—How?

A—We want to give full implementation to the meaning of equality. Equality of opportunity. I want to see every child whatever his birth, enjoy the right to develop all his God-given talents. The Filipino is fundamentally an energetic, honest and decent man. He doesn't want to beg and yet many of the Filipinos now are actually beggars, and this I would like to wipe out.

Land reform is part of my program for restructuring the society, and increasing the share of labor without eliminating the incentives to capital and investment. This, I know, is a little difficult but we can just about make it because the cost of our labor is not yet too high. This country has one of the world's lowest costs of production. Some of the Japanese are coming here. So are some of the Hong Kong investors, putting up all kinds of factories in our free trade zone.

What I dream of is to see our country, free from the threat of both external and internal aggression of subversion, moving in such a direction and orientation and with such momentum that no matter what happens to the political leadership, the country will move on towards its goals.

Q—What do you foresee happening in the country if your social and economic reforms are not carried out?

A—I foresee the Communists taking over, perhaps within the next two, three years, or at least a revolution. Either the Communists or the rightists will take over. By rightists, I mean either the military or the economic imperialists.

Q—You once described the Philippines as a sick society. Is it now beginning to recover?

A—Yes, it started to recover sometime in 1968, but it is still sick in the sense that many of those in the upper strata still do not realize the pivotal nature of all the reforms we are trying to initiate. They still do not realize the need for this restructuring, the voluntary giving away of part of their gains in the economic world in order that the lower ranks of our people may realize that they have a stake in democracy.

Q—Do you feel that what you have described as the oligarchs are endangering democracy in the Philippines by providing political ammunition for the Communists and other extremist groups?

A—Yes, they are an opportunist group just like the Communists. Both are trying to utilize the other for their own private purposes. I will be frank with you. The oligarchs think they can handle the Communists and use them as tools. The Communists think they can do the same. I know both of them are planning to liquidate the other the moment there is trouble here in the Philippines.

Q—Why did the oligarchists turn against you?

A—They turned against me because I would not give way to their importunings about further economic opportunities and favors, like grants or licenses, permits for monopolies or exploitation of natural resources at the expense of public welfare.

Q—Are the oligarchists using their control of the mass media to try to destroy you politically because of your reform programs?

A—Yes, the oligarchs are bent on removing me from public office by any means fair or foul.

Q—Have you given any thought to seeking a special mandate from the people through a referendum for your reform programs?

A—I am going to seek a special mandate in the November elections (local and congressional) this year. In fact, I placed my reform programs at issue during the elections last November for delegates to the constitutional convention. Even those who don't like me politically or personally went for the program. Now they claim it as their own.

Q—I have been told that your opponents have sought to destroy your popularity with the people and your reputation abroad by spreading false and malicious rumors concerning you, especially that you greatly in-

creased your personal fortune since you became President.

A—Yes, that was one of their campaign lies. My wealth is a public record. When I leave this office, the Presidency of our country, they will realize that all my funds have been put in a foundation which shall be utilized for the welfare of our people. I will die an impoverished man, with the exception of funds set aside for my children's education.

Politics here is so free-wheeling that almost any charge is made. But our people are so sophisticated now about politics that they know what is happening. That is why, in the surveys we have found that even the publications that are utilized to attack me personally about my alleged involvement with women and increase in wealth are no longer believed by our people. So all I can say is that I look to history writing the truth about what is happening in the Philippines.

Q—Am I correct in the impression that by your reform programs you are striving to save democracy in the Philippines?

A—Yes, and to protect our people from immediate and future danger.

Q—You feel that you have to risk what in effect is almost character assassination in order to protect and promote the interests of the people?

A—Yes, this is precisely one of the things I have spoken about. I have said in war all you risk is your life. Here, in the new battles that we have to fight, you risk even your honor and this is something more valuable than even life itself. But I am willing to risk it. My wife and my children have agreed that even if it should mean losing our reputations, we must stand by the principles on which we stood when I ran for public office.

KINGSMITH—MARCOS

(By Kingsbury Smith)

MANILA.—If the United States will enable the Philippines to strengthen its trade with America and will support by training and equipment an increase in the country's defense forces, this strategically vital island republic can serve as a bastion of freedom in Asia.

A militarily and economically stronger Philippines could relieve substantially the defense burden America is carrying in this part of the world.

If, on the other hand, America pulls out prematurely or precipitates an economic collapse by curtailing the Philippines' access to the American sugar market, then this country could become through massive subversion another Vietnam.

These points were made by President Ferdinand Marcos in an exclusive interview with the writer in Malacanang Palace.

The almost legendary hero of Bataan and many other battles against the Japanese in World War II, and who has been a crusading progressive leader of his country for the past 5½ years, is deeply concerned about pending legislation in the American Congress that would reduce the Philippine sugar quota and cost his country, with its millions of impoverished people, \$40,000,000 annually.

Not only would this action hurt the Philippine economy, but the President pointed out it would provide propaganda ammunition for the Communists, radicals and other anti-American elements in the Philippines who already accuse him of being the "running dog" of the Americans.

"We are not asking for aid," the President said. "What we are asking for is trade. We are not asking for special favors. What we are asking for is that the relationships between our two countries, especially economic, be not so suddenly disrupted that we are hard put to adjust ourselves to them."

If the ten per cent cut in the Philippine sugar quota which has already been approved by the House of Representatives and is now before the Senate goes into effect, some Philippine sugar producers will be unable to meet payments on credits granted to them

by the Government to produce sugar for the American market. The American quota can be reduced at any time without any advance notice to the Philippines, since it is not protected by any specific time period.

With regard to American policy in Asia generally, the President expressed the hope the United States would let the Philippines know what are America's future intentions in Asia.

"We would like to see the United States come out frankly with a definite program on which we, the Asians, can act," he said.

President Marcos also revealed that the South Korean leaders informed him the United States would not have had to enter the Korean War and seek United Nations police action there if South Korea had been enabled to prepare itself for defense against North Korean aggression.

"They told me that a short period before the attack, the United States suddenly withdrew armor, heavy artillery and left nothing but guns for the internal police," he added.

"This seems to be one of the basic flaws in American policy. Look at China and Russia. They give equipment. Look how the Chinese and Russian equipment is wreaking havoc in Viet Nam, Laos and Cambodia."

The President said he foresaw the need for an American military and economic presence in Asia, "a high or low posture, for the next five or 10 years or perhaps even longer."

Following is the condensed text of the second in a series of interviews with President Marcos:

Q. What could the United States do to be helpful to the Philippines that it is not now doing?

A. There are two aspects. One is security. I have always felt that the United States' presence will be needed here for both security and economic development for the next five or 10 years, perhaps even longer.

I cannot foresee any country alone or jointly with others in Asia capable of balancing the power of Red China. And it is certainly the height of folly to think we can, by supplication, prevent the leaders of any predatory state or nation in our part of the world from any of the designs which have been articulated openly in the past of an Asian hegemony under the aegis, of course, of Mao Tse-tung.

Therefore, we would like to see the United States come out frankly with a definite program on which we, the Asians, can act.

While we do not ask for publication of such a program, we do hope the leaders of America will bring us into the secrets of your policy and tell us exactly when you do intend to pull out, if you do intend to do so, and to what extent.

If we need to prepare to stand by ourselves, then to what extent will you help us prepare? Look at Viet Nam. When your Government was under pressure from public opinion to pull out, you have been hard-put to train the South Vietnamese, so much so that it was even suggested some of them be trained in the Philippines.

Would it not be possible for the United States now to help us train our men to take over some of the burdens you now carry?

For instance—I think I can reveal this to you—the understanding between your country and mine is that you will prevent any external aggression, but at the moment the enemy comes within our territorial limits we would participate. That is the agreement.

Anything that has to do with internal disorder we will handle. But there may perhaps come a time when your government will not assume the responsibility of defending us against external aggression. When and if that happens, we would require better equipment and better trained troops than we now have. Would it not be better that we prepare for it now while we can instead of waiting for a Viet Nam war and the need that might bring for help of your troops?

Our preparedness would in itself be a

deterrent. As General MacArthur said, if we were properly prepared no rational man would think of attempting to conquer the Philippines.

That is one aspect. The other is economic development. You should remember that if we go under because our economy collapses, your military bases here will be useless.

We consider ourselves a somewhat different ally because we did not surrender to the Japanese but fought side by side with you and we suffered a million casualties both military and civilian.

Q. Do you feel the Philippines has not been supplied with the right kind of weapons to defend the nation now?

A. Yes and no. We have the right weapons for internal security, but for other things, no. Well, for instance, we don't have any all-weather interceptors. We are not prepared for anti-submarine warfare. Things like that.

Q. What is your conception of partnership with the United States on security matters?

A. A partnership between two independent countries that recognizes the national interests of both but at the same time is based on feeling, understanding and friendship.

When we say we want to be independent, we merely say it in a way of a son who tells his father: "I am 21 now and I would like to go out in the world and find out what it's all about. It doesn't mean I am going to be your enemy."

Q. What are some of the irritants in relations between the two countries?

A. Jurisdiction over military personnel and supposed unequal treatment with respect to American bases.

Q. Do these irritants serve as ammunition for the Communists, and for your political enemies?

A. Yes, very much so. The Communists call me "Tuta Ng Amerikano," meaning the running dog of the Americans. This is because I have said repeatedly, "we need the United States now and we will need them for the next several years." We cannot protect ourselves from external aggression. While there is no such threat now, there would soon be one if the United States was not here, and the time may come when there will be such a threat.

Q. If the Philippines lost the American sugar market could the nation survive economically, could it progress?

A. It would be touch and go as to survival. On progress, you can strike it off as impossible if we lose the American sugar market.

Q. I have been told there is a feeling here that the Philippines has to virtually beg for continuance of access to the American sugar market whereas the Philippines did not resort to any hard bargaining when the military bases were granted to America. Is that so?

A. Yes, that's true; there is such a feeling, and the Communists are making the most of it.

Q. What do you consider the most important thing now for the American people to bear in mind about the Philippines?

A. One thing is that the Philippines is your creation actually, because you gave us independence. In giving us independence, you established an example that could not be disregarded by the other nations of the world. That was the start of decolonization, of the colonial empires of the world—the French, British, Dutch. Therefore, if this experiment which you started should fail and we should go down before the Communist onslaught, your experiment will have proved a failure.

Q. How can that danger be averted?

A. With two basic policies—trade and security; training our people to be prepared.

Q. Why did you send Philippine forces to South Vietnam?

A. First of all, because the Vietnamese peo-

ple requested it. Secondly, because we felt it was in the national interest that the Communists be kept at that distance. If they had succeeded in Vietnam, they would have come down all the way to Malaysia and into the islands to our south, Borneo, Kalimantan, and Sabah.

Q. Will that danger exist if the Communists still succeed in conquering South Vietnam?

A. Yes, but now the countries of Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, and even Indonesia are better prepared. Remember that Indonesia was in the hands of a man who was riding the fence at the time and who had Communists in his cabinet and even in his armed forces.

Q. Are you concerned at the rate of American withdrawal from Vietnam?

A. Yes and no. I would take the word of such men as Admiral McCain, your Commander in Chief in the Pacific, and also General Abrams, who has briefed me, that the Vietnamization program is succeeding, but I have misgivings, and every leader in Asia has his misgivings, about the capability of the South Vietnamese armed forces to sustain themselves when you have completely withdrawn.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the standing order, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT) is recognized.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that, on June 30, 1971, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1700) to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, there are instances in one's public career which bear explanation. For me, the events of last Tuesday evening is such an instance. Often the circumstances surrounding such instances offer sufficient explanation. At times they do not.

Let me first say that it was in response to what I sincerely deemed as my duty as a U.S. Senator, and because I was not able to speak on the floor of the U.S. Senate, that I convened a hearing before the Subcommittee of Buildings and Grounds which I am proud to chair.

Each of us must act in accordance with the dictates of our conscience. Were it otherwise, we should not serve as Senators. It was within such a framework that last Tuesday evening I undertook to discharge my obligations. In doing so, perhaps, I did not approach the matter with the same degree of delicacy another would employ.

However, I can assure you that I would not place myself below any Member in the degree of respect and affection I hold for the Senate. What I did, I did sincerely and patriotically in the best interest of this Nation we all love. I did it as a Senator of my State of Alaska representing the people of Alaska, and as a Senator of the United States working for the interests of all Americans.

What I did, I felt and continue to feel, will bring credit to the U.S. Senate, not embarrassment. I would never be party to any act that would bring discredit to this august body.

In this connection, I have met with the distinguished majority leader. I did so seeking his advice and counsel on these matters. For his understanding, I am deeply grateful.

Mr. President, I have testimony to the statement that I made about what I felt and what I continue to feel. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD various letters and communications that I have received, being but a small, small portion of the letters and just a slight flavoring of their contents. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD with the deletion of the names of the individuals, showing only the body of the letter and the State from which they come, because I do not think it is my prerogative to violate a personal communication.

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

From Illinois:

DEAR SEN. GRAVEL: I would like to thank you for not keeping any secrets from the American people. You are the greatest senator, and we all love you. Thank you.

Sincerely,

DEAR SENATOR GRAVEL: I have just returned from hearing you tonight, and I apologize for everything that I have thought of you these past few days.

I have no more tears left: thank God there are men in this country who still do.

Sincerely,

From a doctor in New York State:

DEAR SENATOR GRAVEL: God bless you. For a new state Alaska is doing pretty well.

Respectfully,

From California:

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to thank you for giving me the first feeling of pride in being an American that I have experienced in some time.

I equate you with Patrick Henry and while I had thought Congress dead, I begin to wonder.

I do wish you well.

Sincerely,

From Pennsylvania:

DEAR SENATOR GRAVEL: I am enclosing a copy of a letter I wrote to the New York Times.

Since then, I have come to the conclusion that people like Dr. Ellsworth and yourself are the real heroes of this terrible mess we find ourselves in. The courage of men like you, putting not only your careers and reputations on the line, but your freedom, should be a lesson to the "silent majority".

I am the mother of a boy who will be 19 years old July 6. He is a perfect example of what this senseless war has done to our youth. He did his best to work against the war since he was 15—wrote for his school

paper, held meetings, etc., and finally gave up in frustration.

My beloved son, Barry, in a complete retreat from worldly problems, joined the International Society for Krishna Consciousness (the group that chants on the streets to spread their message of God) and is now a full time priest. I guess I am lucky—other mothers have had their sons killed in Viet Nam, or dead from overdoses of narcotics, etc.

As you spoke and cried last night, I sobbed along with you, as must have many other mothers. What you have done, in reading the forbidden Pentagon papers, will awaken all mothers, fathers, sons, and, hopefully, legislators who will finally end this dreadful war.

Blessed be the peacemaker . . .
Shalom,

(Peace).

[From the New York Times, June 20, 1971]
To the Editor:

Perhaps if the television networks would have done what you are now doing, in regard to your carrying the story of the Vietnam war and what went on behind the scenes, the Bill of Rights, especially the First Amendment, would be alive and well and undisputed in the United States.

The Times is pursuing its usual course in publishing, in full, important documents and speeches. This is surely the most important story you have done in my memory, and the most worthwhile. The people of this country owe you a debt of gratitude, which they will only realize in years to come.

Permit me to quote from the Russian poet, Yevtushenko:

"One day posterity will remember
This strange era, these strange times,
When honesty was called courage."

From California:

HONORABLE SIR: Since 1961, I have been active in the peace movement. I have lived through insults, alienation from my family, red baiting, etc., because of my political beliefs. During those years I have felt a sense of hopelessness and frustration that has at times led to terrible despair. I have become militant and increasingly alienated from the country of my birth—to the point of shame, pure shame, at being an American citizen. Many times I have wanted to leave, to seek an easier life in a land of peace, but I have found such a course of action untenable. For, as an American this is my war and my war to stop. If it is not stopped, and by the power of this people, there will soon be no land of peace anywhere—perhaps no world at all. And so I have remained, dedicated to the struggle, yet growing angrier as time goes on. There is not a "liberal" bone left in my body—I am a radical through and through, and I have found the gulf that separates me from the American system and its representatives to be a dark, gaping chasm, impossible to broach. Never once did I think, not even in my wildest hopes that I could or would ever want to reach across that gulf to shake the hand of a very brave and righteous and to say thank you thank you very much, Senator Gravel for what you have done.

Sincerely yours,

From New Mexico:

DEAR MIKE: This was to have been a telegram, but the strike prevented sending it.

"We are both extremely proud that the senator from Alaska had the fortitude to risk so much for mankind.

Your courage is rare and beautiful in this age of hypocrisy and accommodation."

Thank you,

From a doctor in Florida:

DEAR SENATOR GRAVEL: An excerpt of your press conference of last night, reading the

"Pentagon Papers" was on our local television station this morning.

I was very moved by your depth of feeling and concern on this vital matter.

I'm very pleased and thankful we have men of your calibre and dedication in the Senate.

My best wishes for your continued service to our country and to the principles upon which it was founded.

Sincerely,

From an actress:

DEAR SENATOR: It was with revolation and the great hope for our country to listen to a man like you speak.

If there were more people like you, we wouldn't be in the trouble we are now.

I would find it a great honor to meet with you one day.

Sincerely yours,

From Oregon:

SENATOR GRAVEL: We love you!

From New York State:

DEAR SENATOR GRAVEL: Permit me to take the first opportunity I have had, since I have heard of it, to congratulate you on your most unprecedented act of patriotism. As an American, your action fills me with pride and renews my hope in the future of our country.

Please accept my sincerest wishes for your future, along with my expression of admiration.

Sincerely,

From Virginia:

DEAR SENATOR: You have stirred the conscience, heart and soul of America. Our country needs more like you!

Respectfully yours,

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I did not come to the floor this morning for this purpose, but having heard the sincere remarks of our colleague from Alaska, I should like to take advantage of the opportunity in the morning hour to say a word concerning my personal feelings.

The issue which prompted the distinguished Senator from Alaska to take the steps he took the other evening has been sufficiently laid to rest by the Supreme Court. In the judgment of the Senator from Indiana, the Supreme Court acted wisely.

Since that issue has been decided by the highest court in the land, it seems to me little will be gained by thrashing it out; but I would like to say for one or two moments that in the 9 years it has been my good fortune to be in the Senate, one thing that has impressed me more than anything else about the relationships among Senators is that, although we may differ in philosophy and in politics, and we may vigorously oppose one another on the issues that come along from time to time, we may have grave concern at times over the strategy that some of our colleagues pursue in pressing their points, and even though I have found myself locked in near mortal combat with some of my colleagues over an issue, one thing that has impressed me about the U.S. Senate is that here are 100 Members from all across the country who look upon each other's activities as the activities of one representing one of the 50 States. There has been almost no effort made in the Senate to impugn the motives of any other Senator.

I, for one, think that the Senator from Alaska has gone through a very difficult time. I salute him for the courage he has

displayed. I hope that the precedent of the Senate under which we let each individual decide for himself what course he wants to follow, giving him full faith and credit that he indeed is following the course he believes to be right, will be followed in the case of the Senator from Alaska. If we are to erode that precedent, I think that the activities of the Senate will be seriously jeopardized in the future.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, July 6, 1971, he signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 31. An act to provide during times of high unemployment for programs of public service employment for unemployed persons, to assist States and local communities in providing needed public services, and for other purposes; and

S. 2133. An act to extend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, for 3 months.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEVENSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET FOR THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, 1972 (S. Doc. No. 92-29)

A communication from the President of the United States submitting amendments to the request for appropriations transmitted in the budget for the fiscal year 1972 for the legislative branch (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE PENN CENTRAL TRANSPORTATION CO.

A letter from the Secretary of Transportation transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the financial condition of the Penn Central Transportation Co. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

Three letters from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, three reports entitled "Improvements Needed in Management of Motor Equipment Activities"; "Better Cost Accounting Needed for Operation and Maintenance of Military Family Housing"; and "Need To Evaluate and Improve Postal Source Data System Before Further Expansion" (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO STIMULATE INDIAN EMPLOYMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting proposed legislation to establish

within the Department of the Interior the Indian business development program (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION REGARDING SURVEYS OF PUBLIC LANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior submitting proposed legislation to amend the act of March 3, 1909 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ORDERS SUSPENDING DEPORTATION

Two letters from the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service transmitting, pursuant to law, orders suspending deportation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF THE PACIFIC TROPICAL BOTANICAL GARDENS

A letter from the Counsel to the Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of audit for the Corporation for 1970 (with accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON RADIATION PROTECTION AND MEASUREMENTS

A letter from the General Counsel for the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of accounts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of General Services transmitting, pursuant to resolution of the Senate Public Works Committee, a report of a building project survey for Las Cruces, N. Mex. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"(Amended Senate Joint Resolution No. 16)

"Joint resolution providing for the ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older

"Whereas, both Houses of the ninety-first Congress of the United States of America, at the first session of such Congress, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds of the members of each house thereof, made a proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States in the following words, to wit:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens eighteen years of age or older.

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States, who are eighteen years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age.

"SEC. 2 The Congress shall have power to

enforce this article by appropriate legislation; therefore be it

"Resolved, By the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, that the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and the same is hereby ratified; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Ohio be, and he hereby is directed, to deliver to the Governor of this state a certified copy of this resolution, and such certified copy shall be forwarded at once by the Governor to the Administrator of General Services, United States Government, Washington, D.C., to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Secretary of State of the United States.

"Adopted June 30, 1971."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO NAME A NUCLEAR SUBMARINE IN MEMORY OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM H. BATES

Whereas, Congressman William H. Bates of Salem, Massachusetts, Representative in Congress, 81st to 91st, died June 22, 1969; and

Whereas, Congressman Bates was educated at Salem High School, Worcester Academy, Brown University and Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration; and

Whereas, He rose from rank of Apprentice Seaman to rank of Captain in the United States Navy; and

Whereas, At the time of his death, he was a ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee and the second ranking minority member of the Joint Commission on Atomic Energy; and

Whereas, He served his country with honor, distinction and dedication in World War II and while a member of Congress; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully urges the Secretary of the Navy to name a Nuclear Submarine in memory of Congressman William H. Bates; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"House of Representatives, adopted, June 22, 1971."

A resolution adopted by the FBI National Academy Associates, of New England, paying tribute to the President and to Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL

The following bill was introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2220. A bill for the relief of Biagio Caraballo. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF A JOINT RESOLUTION

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 102

At the request of Mr. GRIFFIN, for Mr. BROCK, the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 102, authorizing the President to designate the week of October 12 through 19 of each

year as National Patriotic Education Week.

THE HEALTH SECURITY ACT— AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 236

(Ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on Finance.)

Mr. GRAVEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to S. 3, a bill to create a national system of health security.

CONTINUATION OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE HEARINGS: SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations (Mr. MUSKIE), I am privileged to announce that the subcommittee has scheduled hearings on legislation with respect to advisory committees to Federal agencies—S. 1637; S. 1694; and S. 2064—for July 13, 16, 27, 28 and 29. These dates are subject to possible change depending on the availability of witnesses, but we intend to keep as close to this schedule as possible.

The legislation is directed to reducing the proliferation of Federal advisory committees and establishing certain standards and guidelines relating to membership, disclosure of information and conduct of such committees.

Any persons desiring to testify before the subcommittee on the subject legislation, or the general issue of Federal advisory committees, please contact the chief clerk of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Mrs. Lucinda Dennis, in room 357, Old Senate Office Building—phone number: 225-4718—Washington, D.C.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMARKS BY SENATOR WALLACE F. BENNETT AT SENATE PRAYER BREAKFAST MEETING, JUNE 30, 1971

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on June 30, the distinguished Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) spoke at the Senate Prayer Breakfast. His thoughtful and scholarly remarks were intellectually and spiritually stimulating, and much appreciated by all who were present.

Senator BENNETT took as his text a line from Goethe's Faust:

Before we can possess that which we have inherited from our fathers—we must first earn it for ourselves.

He pointed out that it is the responsibility of every individual, of every generation, to earn his share of his intellectual and spiritual inheritance from his ancestors. To do this, he must pursue the basic spiritual powers of self-control, sacrifice, and study.

The failure of an individual to accept this responsibility denies to his children a part of their heritage of great truths from the past. Should the members of a whole generation reject the past com-

pletely, which seems a present danger, because they focus their attention on its mistakes and failures, then the ability of past generations to help their heirs can become dormant and be lost, and can be recovered only by painful effort.

Senator BENNETT pointed out the dangers to our Nation of a large-scale rejection of the determination to earn an inheritance by exercising the same spiritual powers that created it. He called to our attention the great trust held by every custodian of that heritage—the church, the home, the schools, the Government, and the Members of this body. His remarks deserve to be read in full by all thinking Americans. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

SPEECH BY SENATOR WALLACE F. BENNETT

This morning I shall not take my text from the scriptures—but from one of the world's greatest literary treasures—Goethe's Faust. I can't remember when I first ran across this two-line quotation, but over the years it has continually cropped up, until I found I had fixed it firmly in my memory. As our way of life has come more directly under attack, its message has become more and more intriguing, to the point that when John asked me to take this assignment today, I decided to dig below its surface meaning to try to find the richer truths that I felt sure were there. First, let me develop the setting in which Goethe placed his brief, but very profound observation.

Apparently a man named Johann Faust actually lived in the 16th Century in Germany. In a letter written at the time, he was described as a man who had studied magic and to quote from this letter, he "practiced this beautiful art with unspeakable deceit and many lies." Out of this, came the legend that for the privilege of doing this, he had sold his soul to the Devil.

This Faust lived at the time of the beginning of the Renaissance in Europe—a movement whose explosion of secular learning led men to challenge the teachings and authority of the medieval church. The church's reply was that this rediscovered knowledge of the ancient Greeks and Romans came from the Devil and the legendary Faust, who became the symbol of the conflict, was changed from a charlatan and mountebank into a great secular scholar. The idea that he sold his soul to the Devil persisted, but now they said he did it not for magic powers, but for worldly knowledge and pleasure.

Books and plays on this theme began to appear as early as 1587, and new ones kept coming for two hundred years. Goethe's monumental two-volume poem came at the end of the series and was literally a life's work. There is a draft in existence that was written in his 20's (around 1775) and the second part was finished only shortly before his death in 1832.

Now I am ready for my text. It is taken from a rather free rendering of two lines in the opening scene. Faust, an aged scholar, is sitting in his study surrounded by his books and other tools of his scholarship. Realizing that he has come to the end of his life without having mastered all the knowledge or enjoyed all the experiences he wanted, he returns back to magic for help and is about to drink a magic potion which he hopes will extend his life and his study. Brooding on his frustration he says:

"Before we can possess that which we have inherited from our fathers—we must first earn it for ourselves."

This profound observation is my theme. First let me repeat it: (repeat) and then let me interpret one word—the word "possess."

By the dictionary definition, the word "possess" means static ownership, but in the context in which it is used in the poem, I am sure Goethe meant it to include also the right and power to use and enjoy that which is possessed, and that is the meaning I shall give to it.

It is obvious from the context too, that the old scholar Faust was not talking of money or material things. These we can receive and spend without the price of effort of our own. Rather he was thinking of the intellectual and spiritual resources accumulated by our ancestors, in search for which he had spent his life. If these are not "earned" by each succeeding generation through study and use, they can lie dormant and useless for ages, or can even disappear forever, as many did during the Dark Ages. And when this happens, the power and ability of members of past generations to help their heirs also lies dormant or is lost, and can only be recovered by painful and arduous effort. This is the lesson of the Renaissance and the Reformation: "Before we can possess that which we have inherited from our fathers, we must first earn it for ourselves."

We can understand this great and profound truth better if we realize that just beneath its surface there are three other inherent, unstated truths of equal worth.

The first is that this central truth applies to individuals as well as to whole generations. Today we are very proud of the total volume of human knowledge and the rate at which it is expanding. But we need to be reminded always that this accelerating accumulation is only possible because it is built on the work done by men of earlier generations, which we have used and adapted to our later needs. Albert Einstein is now dead—a member of a past generation—but today's space program would not have been possible unless members of our generation had known about his theories and had the capacity to apply them to problems of which Einstein never dreamed when he developed them. This is why, to me, there are none so blind as those who think the past is a burden and that in order to make a better world in the present, they must make a clean break with it—that in order to show their dissatisfaction of its mistakes or failures on which they focus their attention, they will reject all its greater treasures of accumulated positive values in the delusion that they can build a new world without using as an existing foundation the distilled wisdom of all past time.

And, as I said, this same thing is true for an individual as for a whole generation. Any increase in the world's total knowledge or spiritual capacity must be the total of the combined efforts of many individuals, each of whom adds his little bit by building on what he has earned by learning to command the resources of the past. Everyone who drops out—or cops out—diminishes both his own resources and those of all society.

The second implied truth is that there is much of the legendary Faust in each of us. As children, we loved to dream about what we could do if we possessed the magic powers that filled the fairy tales we loved, and as adults, we are still constantly tempted to look for magic in drugs, gimmicks, programs and laws which promise to get us more benefits for less effort—even something for nothing. Of course, when we make decisions on that basis, are we not bargaining, as Faust did, to sell our souls to the Devil. And aren't we chipping away bits of our potential and using them to try to buy partial freedom from our inescapable responsibility to earn our own share of the past?

A third supplementary concept is that we have an obligation to earn a share of that in-

heritance, not only that we may enjoy its benefits for ourselves, but also that we may keep those benefits alive and in full supply for the next generation. Has anyone the right to say, "all this was accumulated for me to spend, and the next generation will have to look out for itself?" Or to say that because I do not value my inheritance enough to earn it, I am entitled to make it harder for the next generation or even to destroy it for everyone?

To me, this selfish attitude is the ultimate in social and spiritual ingratitude—the essential tragedy of today's alienated youth. The only interest they seem to have in their heritage from the past is to get out of it what they can spend on themselves and they seem to be willing, yes, often determined, to destroy those values which they do not want or cannot readily use because they have not labored to understand them. Being unwilling to try to earn their inheritance, they make a virtue of rejecting it and having no other world with which to replace it. They are tempted to use drugs to try to create a synthetic one.

Let me repeat my theme again: "Before we can possess that which we have inherited from our fathers, we must first earn it for ourselves."

The Goethe who wrote these words for his dramatic character, Faust, was not only one of the world's greatest poets, but, for his time, a great scholar and philosopher. In his broad vision, he was concerned with the total inheritance of human wisdom—represented in his text as a thousand volumes on the shelves in Faust's study. But the truth of his observation, being profoundly fundamental, applies even more importantly to the simple experiences of everyday life, then, and now.

In our modern American society, we are proud of our great tradition of respect and concern for the individual and his rights. The youthful rebels are particularly sensitive to this, but they refuse to see that if any among us would enjoy that respect, he must first earn it for himself by his respect for others and their rights.

The economic values of our way of life have been built on the right to own property acquired either by our ancestors or ourselves through hard work and thrift. True, this is a material heritage, but the virtues that produced it represent the basic spiritual powers of self-control and sacrifices. And its material values will be dissipated or destroyed if we cease to pay this spiritual price or if our vision is distorted so that we see material progress only as the product of greed or exploitation. Our time-proven economic pattern can only be preserved and increased to keep pace with the growing population if the same principles of work and thrift are strengthened and preserved against the temptations to "reap where we have not sown". The truth of Goethe's maxim is inexorable, and we cannot escape by the magic of emotionalism which attempts to substitute the word "rights" for the word "earn". Nor can you command the intellectual heritage of the past with an education that promotes children without achievement and graduates those who have not learned. They may have the shadow of their paper credentials, but the possession of the substance of their heritage will have eluded them.

And, most important of all, there is the world's heritage of love. Of all spiritual resources, this is the most fragile. Its supply is neither indestructible nor inexhaustible. If it has been lost from the contact of two hearts, it cannot be preserved in the symbol of a painted daisy or by a chanted incantation. It grows naturally in every human heart and if it ever exists between parent and child, husband and wife, brother and sister, friend and friend, and has been killed by design or neglect, the spiritual cost of its resurrection is a heavy one. But because it was planted in our hearts before we were born—coming with us as part of

our divine inheritance—if properly earned, it can last our lifetimes or through eternity. Such love must be earned day by day by unselfish acts constantly repeated in the manner of the Spirit of God, who is love. Strip away love's divinity, and it has no roots in the past, no promise of permanence for the present or the future. It cannot be commanded by force, created by artifice, preserved by the will. Those who reject the heritage of love offered by their parents or their religion, will have great difficulty in establishing a viable love relationship with their children.

"Before we can possess that which we have inherited from our fathers, we must first earn it for ourselves."

Does this truth of Goethe's have any special meanings for today's American people, and for its Senators as part of their government? I'm sure you can think of many when the time comes for your comments and I would like to suggest a few for starters.

The most obvious, of course, is the rebellion of our thousands of alienated youth against what they call the Establishment, which includes us. In a way, they acknowledge the truth of Goethe's thesis, but say the inheritance of the past is not only not worth the effort to earn it, but that it should definitely and positively be rejected. This is a new nihilism, and if successful, could plunge the world into a 20th Century version of the Dark Ages. These youngsters demand the privilege of enjoying the material values accumulated by their ancestors, but refuse to pay their own way or provide for those who will follow. They have related counter-parts in those who say unearned welfare is a right. They have the same attitude toward the political values, including the basic concept of liberty and freedom. They are unable to distinguish liberty, which protects, from license, which destroys, because they refuse to make the effort to earn an understanding of the centuries of painful and tragic effort by which the common man won the right to make his own political, economic and religious choices, and thus be free. They refuse to give any value to the price that has been paid, in the past, to make it available to them as a heritage. In fact, they show both their ignorance of it and their contempt for it by claiming the right to destroy the institutions that preserve it, using any method they can find—deceit, legalistic gimmickry, subversion or force.

So, can we survive? Is our system so vulnerable that it is doomed? Of course not, but its defenses do have weak points which the new nihilists can exploit with those who want instant easy answers. Take the one instance of the concept in the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal. We have waited nearly three hundred years to vitalize that part of our political heritage. But we are moving, and destruction of the structure that is being slowly but surely put together would wipe out all our gains. Other examples might be quoted if there were time.

There is another question that may not have occurred to many of us. Have we time to protect this inheritance? I hope so, but we must hurry. There is a cycle in the lives of men and nations which runs like this: Starting with humility in poverty, they work up to affluence and ease which tends to degenerate into idleness and decadence, as a result of which they descend again into poverty, into which they either sink out of sight or begin to climb again by humility and hard work. If a nation is completely isolated, its people have a chance to repeat the cycle, but this has seldom happened. History reveals that there are usually other nations pressing closely behind the leader in the cycle, which have forced it into oblivion when it begins to enter the downward course. We may be either approaching or just over the peak, and face to face with this test of survival; in any event, we have no time to lose.

The basic question is: do we believe our system can be preserved, and if so, how? Goethe's maxim has the answer. I am completely convinced that the vast majority want it preserved, and if they do, they must be inspired to learn to understand its values, and to earn these values anew by using the same process and powers that created them—all of which to me are essentially spiritual.

Without trying to catalog them all, to me they include love, selflessness and sacrifice—expressed in study, work and self-control.

As I close, let me say even once more that I believe Goethe was stating a profound truth when he wrote, "before we can possess that which we have inherited from our fathers, we must first earn it for ourselves."

With this re-statement, let us turn again to the story of Faust. To Goethe's character, Faust, these words were an expression of despair over his failure. He had grown very old, was facing death, and he realized that he had earned so little of the Renaissance scholars' heritage of secular knowledge to which he had devoted a whole lifetime of study. In desperation, he deserted scholarship for magic, and Mephistopholes appeared who offered him a deal by which he could avoid all the pain and effort of earning knowledge through study. He would be given all this—and renewed youth too—in exchange for the surrender of his soul to the Devil after he had satisfied his desires. Faust agreed, but not honestly. He believed that if given a second chance, he could earn and possess enough of the accumulated intellectual inheritance of the race so that he could defy and escape the Devil—and in the story, he did.

And what about us? Will we need to resort to magic to buy time to solve our problem? Faust felt he had to because, being mortal and old, he could not get the full knowledge and experience he craved without it.

Nations and their governments are not so limited in time. The constant work to earn their heritage need never stop, but like an eternal flame, the determination to do so must be kept alive in every generation through the combined effort of every custodian of that heritage—the church—the home—the schools and the government. And we as Senators carry a large share of that responsibility.

SENATOR THOMAS DODD

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wish to join other Members of this body who have paid tribute to the memory of the late Senator Thomas Dodd, of Connecticut.

I doubt that I need to remind Senators of Senator Dodd's great devotion to his country and of his unswerving opposition to its Communist enemies. It is entirely possible that Senator Dodd contributed as much as, if not more than, most Members of Congress to the security of our Nation during the dangerous years of the cold war.

Mr. President, I do not feel that any remarks made to honor the memory of Senator Dodd would be complete without a reference to an unfortunate act once taken by the Senate to censure Senator Dodd on the basis of newspaper charges of a highly questionable character. It was my privilege at that time to oppose this unfortunate action taken against an honorable Member of this body who had served his State and Nation in exemplary fashion.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to say that in the passing of Connecticut's Tom Dodd this Nation lost a stalwart, steadfast, and fearless friend.

INCREASED OIL PRICES IMPAIR COMPETITION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a lot of attention has been focused upon the effects of increased crude oil prices.

Increased crude oil prices impair competition.

Because the major oil companies can make enormous tax-free profits from producing oil, they have little need to earn profits in refining and marketing. They can drive the independent refiners and marketers who do compete, who provide lower cost gasoline to the consumers, out of business.

Prof. Fred C. Allvine has detailed this phenomenon in a recent speech. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

TALK GIVEN TO SOCIETY OF INDEPENDENT GASOLINE MARKETERS AT MONTREAL, CANADA, MAY 17, 1971

(By Fred C. Allvine)

The Office of Emergency Preparedness invited responses to the price increases announced by the major oil companies last November. These price changes supposedly included:

1. A 25 cent per barrel increase in the price of crude oil
2. A 7/10 cent per gallon increase in the dealer tank wagon price
3. A one cent per gallon increase in the price of gasoline to the public.

Having studied the gasoline industry the past three years, I was concerned about the likely consequence of the announced price increases and decided to respond to the invitation of the Office of Emergency Preparedness to submit a statement. As a result of what has transpired the past six months, it seems germane to review certain of the points that were made in the statement. In addition, these points seem to be particularly relevant since there is widespread talk of further crude oil price increases.

The following comments are in general drawn from my statement to the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

The fixed and relatively high price of crude oil has played a major role in restructuring the oil industry over the past decade. The oil industry is becoming more vertically integrated and concentrated. A much higher degree of crude oil sufficiency is necessary to successfully compete in the industry than was the case 10 to 15 years ago. Crude oil problems have been a significant factor in the large number of major oil company mergers of the 1960's. In almost all of these mergers, crude poor companies sought unions with companies that held prospect for remedying their crude oil deficiencies. Standard Oil of Kentucky was merged into Standard of California, Pure Oil Company was dissolved into Union Oil Company, Richfield was enveloped by Atlantic, Sunray DX was taken over by Sun, the largest part of Sinclair went to Atlantic Richfield, Hess negotiated a much needed union with Amerada, and Sohio has good chance of reducing its acute problem as a result of the merger with B.P. Clearly, the high and fixed price of crude oil has made crude oil self-sufficiency the goal of most oil companies. This goal and the importance of crude oil is reflected in numerous statements of major oil company executives and reports on oil company operations.

Should the recent crude oil price increases be primarily an effort to shift more profits to the crude oil level, where prices are administered by the joint action of business and government, where profits benefit from

special tax treatment, the consequence will ultimately be further concentration of economic power in the industry and a reduction in the strength of certain types of competitors. Unless the crude oil price increases are required to earn a fair return on investment from production, the crude oil price increases will ultimately result in an economic squeeze on competitors buying a relatively high portion of their crude oil requirements from others. This would include integrated oil companies with low crude sufficiency ratios and independent refiners who purchase most of their crude oil from others. Frequently those companies having relatively low crude oil positions are major suppliers of unbranded gasoline to private branders—specialists in selling gasoline on a volume basis at lower prices. If the crude oil increases do result in an economic squeeze on those in a less favorable crude position, it will ultimately work its way forward in the form of unjustifiably higher costs to the price marketers.

There is reason to suspect that the most recent price increases of the major oil companies will be primarily realized in terms of the crude price and not in product prices. The price increases came at a time when many gasoline markets were the worst they had been since 1964. The unusually depressed prices in large numbers of competitive gasoline markets were routinely reported throughout the year in the *Platt's OILGRAM Price Service*, the *Oil Daily*, and the *National Petroleum News*. Even major oil company executives were vocal about the price wars, the record level gasoline price subsidies, and the "inadequate marketing profits." When already soft gasoline markets are restored to the old normal (which frequently has meant several cents per gallon price increase), and then increased one cent to a new normal, the likelihood of the price increases holding is not great.

With higher crude oil prices and soft market conditions, the consequences of the price increases by the major oil companies is likely to be low or negligible earnings from refining and marketing with big and disproportional profits being taken at the crude oil level. It is very likely that price wars will become more frequent as they were during the early 1960's when companies were making high profits from crude oil, particularly from the lucrative foreign production, and there was little pressure to make normal profits from refining and marketing. The integrated oil companies with low crude oil sufficiency and the independent refiners and marketers may find that their ability to compete has been greatly impaired as a result of the recent price increases. (End of comments drawn from statement to the Office of Emergency Preparedness). Unfortunately, the prediction of possibly worse gasoline markets following the November 1970 crude oil, tank wagon, and consumer price increases by the major oil companies has materialized. From the towering levels at which gasoline prices were established in November, they have fallen precipitously in many areas. Since the first of the year, the Mid-Continent has experienced the worst price conditions since the severe price war years of 1962-1964. Many markets have fallen 6 cents, 8 cents, 10 cents, or even more below the so called "normal price level." Other markets outside of the Mid-Continent have also fallen to the lowest price level in years.

Numerous explanations have been offered as reasons for the depressed gasoline markets. Supposedly some of the major oil companies have decided to attack the maverick major brand dealer problem. The result in certain markets has frequently been long drawn out price wars. However, the unanswered question is why at this time attack an old problem that major oil companies created themselves by giving special deals to certain dealers so that they couldn't afford

to do anything else but cut price. A second explanation advanced for the intensified price wars is that the price marketers have become too greedy and aggressive and the majors are simply responding to the challenge you present. While meekness is certainly not one of your virtues, I have seen little evidence that all of a sudden you have accelerated your discounts and have become more aggressive. A third frequently heard explanation for the price wars is a condition of over supply of gasoline. While over supply would certainly be related to gasoline price wars, it would appear to be more of a symptom than the basic problem itself. This would also be true of the "maverick" major brand dealer and "overly aggressive" price marketer explanations—these are fundamentally excuses but not the real cause of the price wars.

In my opinion one of the fundamental reasons for the widespread gasoline price wars is the artificially high price of crude oil. During the past two years crude oil prices have been increased 17 percent. Concurrent with higher crude oil prices has been an increasing intensity of gasoline price wars. Many of the major oil company executives on the surface express alarm over the terrible market conditions. From American Oil comes the advice that the "volume at any price" philosophy has to stop. An executive of Union Oil warns that the industry may be following the suicidal procedure of lemmings marching into the sea. Keith Fanshier in his editorials in the *Oil Daily* expresses with regularity seeming bewilderment over the high crude prices and weak market prices. However, what is happening should not surprise anyone that has a basic grasp of economics. When crude oil prices are pegged at artificially high levels, conditions are established for price war in the forward markets. It is logical for companies with strong crude positions to cut refined product prices in "certain areas" to move more of their highly profitable crude oil.

There appears to be a close parallel in what is currently happening in the gasoline industry and what occurred during the prolonged price war years of 1962-1964. During this three year price war period many of the independent refineries and marketers were forced to sell-out and others retrenched hoping to make it through to better times. The peculiar thing about this three year period of severe gasoline price wars is that in general the major oil company profits were unaffected—1962 was better than 1961, 1963 better than 1962, and 1964 better than 1963. This "profit-price war paradox" was in a large part associated with improvements in the crude oil production of the major oil companies. During this period of time the foreign crude oil liftings were particularly profitable.

While many gasoline markets were extremely depressed during the first quarter of 1971, the major oil companies reported much improved earnings over a year ago. In contrast, many of the price marketers had sharply reduced profits during the first quarter. The factor that particularly alarms me about the prospects for the future of the independents is the widespread talk of an additional 25¢-50¢ per barrel increase in the price of crude oil. If this happens, and other things remain basically the same, there will be little hope for improvements in gasoline markets and the price wars may well intensify. If there are further increases in the crude oil price, many of you are going to be compelled to pay more for the gasoline you purchase from independent refineries, or from majors with low crude oil positions like Ashland. Furthermore, the likelihood of your offsetting the cost increase if you operate in highly competitive markets is not good.

The gyrations of prices that many of you are experiencing in your principal markets, and near your volume stations, is financed by the "price protection" schemes of the

major oil companies. While almost everyone is familiar with the practice of price protection, relatively few people seem to appreciate clearly what is taking place. When the price protection schemes were perfected in the later 1950's and early 1960's, public statements by major oil companies such as Shell indicated that one of the principal targets of price protection was the price marketers. Throughout the 1960's price protection was, in my opinion, systematically used to control the volume, profit, and growth of price marketers and this is how it is being employed to the present.

Price protection is fundamentally a massive subsidization scheme by which especially low prices are programmed into certain markets or segments of markets. The practice is based upon high tank wagon and reference prices to the public. From the high tank wagon and consumer prices, price protection is programmed into areas where the majors face particularly tough competition from price marketers. For example, General Lincoln, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, found from a study of confidential data of a major oil company with a high degree of crude oil sufficiency that price protection had averaged, during the first 11 months of 1970, 1.3 cents per gallon of gasoline ("Price Supports Costly to Majors", *Oil Week*, May 10, 1971, p. 1). Lincoln went on to say that in some areas price protection had resulted in prices being dropped for a period of time 12 cents per gallon below "normal". Clearly the revenues derived from high price markets permit the subsidization of stations in low price markets where competition is keen. Furthermore, price protection frequently results in prices being decreased to levels far below reasonable cost of doing business. The consequence of price protection schemes over the years has been to weaken, control, and even destroy the independents. In addition, Tom Sigler, Vice President of Marketing of Continental Oil Company, has pointed out in several recent speeches that price protection perpetuates a costly and inefficient system for marketing of gasoline. Without the major oil company price protection programs, the price marketers would exert great pressure for gasoline marketing to become more efficient and large numbers of unneeded stations would be forced to close.

The purpose of this talk has not been to simply paint a potentially dismal picture for the future. It is intended to point out what seems to be two serious problems facing the independent segment of the industry. These problems are:

1. the likelihood of further increases in the price of crude oil, and
2. the price protection schemes of the major oil companies.

Progress can be made in both of these areas if the problems are recognized and forceful steps are taken in attempting to remedy them. There are many questions that should be raised about the latest crude oil price increase and the government should be encouraged to look further into the matter. It might be very interesting if the government were to study the return on investment of the major integrated oil companies crude oil operations based upon the tax reference price, and compare this with their return on investment from refining and marketing for 1970. In addition, any effort that would help to liberalize oil import restrictions would assist in counteracting the likelihood of further crude oil price increases. Finally it seems to me that the price protection schemes of the major oil companies can not withstand being put under a microscope and thoroughly investigated. Facts might be presented as to how the price protection mechanism works, to whom it has largely been directed, and its consequences. If this were done, and the anti-competitive use and characteristics of price protection became obvious, a ruling might be obtained outlawing the practice.

GENOCIDE CONVENTION POSES NO THREAT TO AMERICANS' CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I speak today to those groups who resist the passage of the Human Rights Conventions because they fear for the sovereignty of these United States.

I speak today to calm their fears and to make clear that passage of the Human Rights Convention is detrimental to our system of laws.

Mr. President, ratification of the International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide poses no threat to our judicial system. For any citizen to be so convicted of genocide, there would have to be in existence an international court to try him. There is no such court in existence at this time. Moreover, as James B. Webb, former Acting Secretary of State wrote in a letter to President Truman in 1949 regarding this exact same question:

Should such a tribunal be established, Senate advice and consent to United States ratification of any agreement establishing it would be necessary before such an agreement would be binding on the United States.

Since there is no international penal tribunal to try American citizens on charges of genocide, there is no possibility that Americans' rights would be violated by such a court. The World Court, the only such existing international tribunal, is given a purely interpretive function by the Genocide Convention. It will have no power to try persons accused of genocide.

Objections to the Human Rights Conventions on these grounds are without reasonable support of any kind; they should not be grounds for rejecting the conventions. Rather, as Chief Justice Earl Warren admonished us more than 3 years ago:

We as a nation should have been the first to ratify the Genocide Convention.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today July 6, 1971, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 31. An act to provide during times of high unemployment for programs of public service employment for unemployed persons, to assist States and local communities in providing needed public services, and for other purposes; and

S. 2133. An act to extend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, for 3 months.

CONQUEST OF CANCER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 239, S. 1828, and that it be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1828) to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to promote the public health by strengthening the national effort to conquer cancer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEES URGED TO ACT IN JULY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this is near the beginning of the last month before the statutory recess of Congress which will occur in early August. Therefore, I take this occasion, after consultation with the distinguished majority leader, to express the hope that our committees in the Senate—the chairmen, the ranking minority members, and members of the subcommittees—having legislation to consider would be good enough to bear in mind that July can be a very fruitful month for action in Washington and that everything we can accomplish in July will not have to be accomplished on Christmas Eve, as unfortunately occurred last year.

I like to think of Thanksgiving at home, when permitted, which is rarely; I like to think of Christmas as a family celebration; and I do not like to think of the Senate being in session any longer than it needs to be for the transaction of the Nation's business.

This is a great opportunity; this is a bargain offered to all committee chairmen and committees. We offer them the special July series of bargain days, and in those days they can bring in legislation which they are considering, they can bring in perhaps some of the less major items of business, and perhaps also the great issues which dominate debate.

But this is an opportunity and it should not be lost, because every day we do lose means that we work later in the year, which rather tries the patience of the public and certainly it is hard on Congress itself.

We know this is a lengthy job, we know it has to be done, but the less we do in July the more we have to do after the recess, and the longer we have to stay.

Therefore, again I make a periodic appeal, with which I am sure the majority leader agrees, that we must do everything possible legislatively in this wonderful and beckoning month of July.

I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am wholeheartedly in accord with what the distinguished minority leader just said. The committees have been working hard this year; and they have had permission to meet on practically every day that the Senate has been in session.

It is my understanding that because of the initiative shown by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations (Mr. ELLENDER), and supported by the chairmen and ranking members of the subcommittees, it is anticipated that all but possibly 3 appropriation bills will be before the Senate before August 6, the day that the recess under the law begins.

It is not anticipated that the military procurement bill will be ready at that time, nor the foreign aid bill. There is one other—perhaps the military procurement bill—but I wish to assure the distinguished minority leader in that respect that when the Armed Services Committee reports that bill to the Senate, giving us the necessary authorization, hearings will be held expeditiously and we will make every effort to get the appropriation bill to the floor before the sixth. But I do hope—and I join the distinguished minority leader in making this plea—that the committees will report legislation to the Senate, not hastily, not expeditiously, but in line with the hearings they have held and the results which they should be now on the verge of achieving.

It is to the interest of the Senate that this be done, because otherwise we will be in session late into this year, whereas, if we get down to bedrock and really put our shoulder to the wheel, we could get out by October 1.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the distinguished majority leader. If I could mix a few metaphors, I think we should keep our ear to the ground, our nose to the grindstone, and our shoulder to the wheel, and having gotten ourselves into that impossible anatomical position, I hope we will work out ways to get the legislation adopted.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to file reports from the close of business today until 5 p.m. this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEVENSON). Without objection it is so ordered.

THE ENEMY AMONG US

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, recently the Pueblo Star Journal & Chieftain published a series of 10 articles examining drug abuse in Pueblo County. The series, under the by-line of Mr. Bill Gagnon, is entitled "The Enemy Among Us."

Everyone is aware of the increasing drug problem in America. I believe that "The Enemy Among Us" indicates that we should direct concern to the local community.

The first article, "Drugs: A Deadly Game in Pueblo," is an overview of the

drug problem now existing in Pueblo County.

Next, "Variety of Sources Push Illicit Drugs Into Pueblo," reports that drugs are not coming from any one source but, instead, from various places.

The third article, "Drug Abuse Not Limited to Youth," examines the age brackets affected by drugs. According to one source, the junior high schools in Pueblo were free of drug abuse until a year ago. This is no longer true and the problem is not limited to youth.

The fourth and fifth articles examine the merits of methadone in combating drug addiction.

"Programs Help Curb Drug Abuse" is a discussion of several programs in Pueblo that are having some degree of success.

The seventh and eighth articles examine the effect of certain recently enacted State laws and the views of local officials on how juvenile offenders are handled.

The first two articles look at drug abuse from the enforcement side.

I commend the Pueblo papers for publishing this very informative series of articles. And the people of Pueblo owe Mr. Gagnon a special debt of gratitude for his very competent work in preparing the articles.

Mr. President, so that all Senators may have the chance to read "The Enemy Among Us," I ask unanimous consent that 10 articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I—DRUGS: A DEADLY GAME IN PUEBLO

(By Bill Gagnon)

Last December life as a young adult was just beginning for 18-year-old Stephen Ray Prince of Pueblo.

But then, suddenly—and unnecessarily—only a week before Christmas, the life of young Prince came to an abrupt end.

The cause? An overdose of self-administered illegal drugs.

However, the death of Prince, tragic though it may be, perhaps was not completely in vain.

His death lifted a curtain, giving the unsuspecting—and all-too-oftentimes indifferent—public a glimpse into the sordid and shocking twilight world of narcotic addiction and drug use in Pueblo County.

HERE ARE THE FACTS

And for those that would scoff at and deny that a critical narcotic and drug problem exists here right now, the undisputable and awesome facts speak for themselves:

Three persons, including Prince, died in Pueblo County last year from illegal narcotic overdose.

The number of 10-milligram methadone (a synthetic narcotic) tablets ordered by legal prescriptions from physicians and dispensed by local druggists rose from 4,600 in 1969 to a staggering 124,000 in 1970.

The trafficking of illegal narcotics such as heroin, morphine and other opiates, and dangerous drugs such as marijuana, hallucinogens (LSD), amphetamines, barbiturates and the like steadily is increasing here.

The age of drug "experimenters" and narcotics users is showing an alarming trend—in many cases—down to the tender age of 12.

- Ages 1 to 6: 15 cases.
- Ages 7 to 12: None.
- Ages 13 (2 cases) to 22: 53 cases total.
- Ages 23 to 30: 22 cases.
- Ages 30 to 50: 32 cases.
- Over 50: 6 cases.

Of the 46 patients total in this category who were admitted to Parkview during the year, nine were for LSD overdose; one for amphetamine; one for methadone (near death from a cardiac arrest when admitted) one narcotics mixed with alcohol; six barbiturates; three for "speed" or hypnotic drug overdose; eight analgesics and antipyretics; five for other drugs and 12 for unspecified-type drugs.

A hospital spokesman reported that, of these 46 cases, there were more between 15- to 23-year-olds than any other age group.

ST. MARY-CORWIN RECORDS

At St. Mary-Corwin Hospital, records for 1970 reflect that 69 patients in this category admitted for treatment included 24 who were 20 and under; 15 in the 21-to-30 age group; 13 in the 31-to-40 age group; 16 were 40 or older and the age of one was unknown.

Those treated in the St. Mary-Corwin emergency room facility last year totaled 82 and included overdoses of heroin, amphetamines, LSD-alcohol mixtures; marijuana and speed, meprobamate, desputal, dolophine (methadone) and the like.

Also recorded last year at St. Mary-Corwin was one of the more pitiful and tragic cases which vividly portrays the danger of spreading narcotic addiction to innocent persons.

It was the case of a young mother addicted to heroin who gave birth to a baby—a baby born a confirmed heroin addict!

II—VARIETY OF SOURCES PUSH ILLICIT DRUGS INTO PUEBLO

(By Bill Gagnon)

Illicit narcotics and drugs are flowing into Pueblo County from a variety of sources at an ever-increasing rate, according to local police.

And yet, in some instances, certain narcotics and drugs obtained here by various methods at minimal cost are being shipped elsewhere for sale on the black market at greatly inflated prices.

Police Cpl. John Koncilja believes that the greatest drug abuse problem in Pueblo at the present time is marijuana, closely followed by speed (amphetamines), by hallucinogens (LSD, Mescaline, Peyote, DMT, STP, etc.), barbiturates, alcohol and glue sniffing.

However, Koncilja also pointed out that the use of heroin, methadone (a synthetic narcotic), and other opiates is on the rise here at an alarming rate, especially among lower-age groups.

Koncilja and other law-enforcement authorities say that illegal drugs and narcotics are being smuggled into Pueblo County from large urban areas such as Denver, Boulder, Colorado Springs and Albuquerque, N.M.

MAIL FROM SOUTHEAST ASIA

Other sources of illicit drugs have been identified as arriving here in the U.S. mail shipped to ex-GIs from South Vietnam and other Southeast Asia points.

Some of the underground drug supply, said Koncilja, is reaching Pueblo via Ft. Carson as well as from West Coast points and Mexico.

But, surprisingly, perhaps the most frequent drug supply source, especially for the younger set, is the medicine cabinet in the home itself.

There, youngsters find the opportunity to gain free and easy access to various narcotics and drugs prescribed for their parents and other members of the family by reputable physicians, such as tranquilizers, sleeping pills (Seconal), barbiturates, and other amphetamines, so-called pep-pills and the like.

From such easy sources youngsters are given the opportunity to experiment with drugs. This in many cases, leads to more serious drug abuse and the use of "hard" narcotics, authorities report.

METHADONE BLACK MARKET

Last year a staggering increase in the number of methadone tablets dispensed by local druggists on physician-issued prescriptions paved the way for the trafficking of this narcotic on the black market elsewhere for huge profits.

It was estimated that bootlegging of this illegal drug was widespread and netted "pushers" upwards of \$600,000 a year by obtaining methadone from legitimate sources and selling it on underground markets at inflated prices.

The synthetic narcotic, in many instances, was obtained by youngsters who were taught to fake heroin addiction to obtain prescriptions from local doctors.

The 10-milligram methadone tablets are purchased from local druggists for \$3 per 120 tablets and some later are resold to addicts via the black market for from \$3 to \$5 per tablet.

SALES SKYROCKET

Local authorities estimate that the number of 20cc vials of methadone sales more than doubled here in 1970 over the previous year, and that while one package of 25 vials containing 20cc of methadone was sold in 1969 such sales leaped to 159 in 1970.

But most shocking of all was recent testimony at an inquest which revealed that the number of 10-milligram methadone tablets sold in 1969 was 4,600; this amount skyrocketed to a staggering 124,000 in 1970.

With the number of heroin addicts in Pueblo County (estimated by authorities at less than 100) who use methadone as a substitute to relieve withdrawal distress, little doubt remains that the bulk of methadone purchased legally during 1970 was bootlegged elsewhere by greedy pushers.

III—DRUG ABUSE NOT LIMITED TO YOUTH

(By Bill Gagnon)

"I think every public school in America today has a drug problem," Carl S. Wilkerson, principal of Heaton Junior High School, said recently.

Wilkerson, testifying at an inquest here, said:

"... The junior high schools in Pueblo, in my opinion, were relatively free of any drug abuse with exception of an occasional child who might sniff glue, an occasional child who might use some kind of home narcotic such as Niquil or something of that nature, until a year ago.

"In the last year, I think most of us who deal with adolescent-age youngsters have become very conscious of their identity with older youngsters.

"It's a natural thing for an adolescent to emulate the people older than himself. He also emulates high school or college kids ... We do have drug abuse problems. . ."

INVOLVEMENT WIDESPREAD

Wilkerson's words echoed those of Pueblo Police Cpl. Dan Studen who has charged that "a large percentage" of Pueblo high school seniors are on some kind of drugs.

"Children as young as the third grade are involved with drugs," Studen said, "and narcotics will be available in the future to kindergartners."

Studen said kids often protect the illicit drug pushers because "very often they are their best friends."

ABUSE TAKES MANY FORMS

However drug abuse is many things, runs the gamut from adolescent to senior citizen and knows no racial or socio-economic barriers.

It's the 12-year-old sniffing chloroform, model airplane glue, paint thinner or the like.

It's the young adult inhaling the euphoric smoke of a joint or stick (marijuana).

It's individuals of both sexes addicted to heroin or other opiates who say, "I will get

it in (their vein) if I have to use a claw hammer."

It's the pill popper and the "mainliner" shooting "mindbusting" drugs into his blood stream.

And, yes, it's the moms and dads who start the day off with amphetamines, belt the "booze" after work to "relax" and then hit the barbiturate route to get a "good night's sleep."

It's also the heavy drinker of alcohol who cannot let a day pass without a bout with a bottle.

ADULTS GUILTY, TOO

But for drug abuse there are no single conclusions, no simple answers, and while the drug abusers of tender age lean toward illegal drugs, their so-called "peers"—the adults—use legal drugs available to them.

And, of the two, it's the adult drug abuser who is more difficult to detect, experts report.

One expert recently told reporters that "middle-age persons who abuse drugs are not going to help anyone find them out."

During a recent speech here in Pueblo, Donald J. Farabaugh, a 10-year veteran of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, warned:

—All drugs effect the central nervous system.

—Heroin is the most sought and the most readily available of "hard" drugs.

—All narcotics have a depressing effect on the nervous system.

Nationally, the drug-abuse problem is at epidemic proportions.

—Drug experimenters are starting younger and younger.

—The drug problem is not limited to lower economic groups but involves kids from middle and upper income families as well.

"Drug abuse no longer is just a police problem as it was prior to the 1960s," said Farabaugh, "It's everybody's problem—parents, students, teachers and everyone else in the community."

IV—METHADONE: GOOD SUBSTITUTE?

(By Bill Gagnon)

"... He was getting real sick. He was begging me for them. How can you turn down a guy that's begging?"

These are the words of a 16-year-old Pueblo boy, a "junkie" addicted to heroin for more than two years, who gave 10 of his methadone tablets to 18-year-old Stephen Ray Prince last Dec. 16.

And because of the younger boy's "generosity" and "compassion," Stephen Ray Prince will never beg again. For he is dead; dead from a self-administered overdose of the synthetic narcotic given him by a "friend" because he was "begging."

Ironically, the younger boy obtained the methadone by proper and legal means. It was prescribed for him by a gullible and unsuspecting Pueblo physician as a substitute for the youth's more serious heroin habit, to give him relief from heroin withdrawal discomfort.

METHADONE CONTROVERSY

Because of the unknown long-range effects of the synthetic narcotic, its dangerous and often lethal effect in the hands of the novice and non-addicted user, and the fact that in itself it's an addicting narcotic drug, a controversy rages nationwide over the use of methadone.

On the plus side, methadone has been found to be an excellent substitute for heroin, without any of the harmful effects produced by heroin.

Also, an individual can function normally on methadone without suffering the frightening ordeal incurred in withdrawal from heroin.

Physicians and other medically trained personnel involved in rigidly controlled and monitored methadone maintenance pro-

grams for opiate addicts are enthusiastic about the results thus far achieved with the substitute drug.

While these experts agree that the use of methadone is, for the user, substituting a narcotic for a narcotic, they liken it to the diabetes patient who has to take shots of insulin daily to control his affliction.

DIFFERENCE IN COST IS VAST

They also point out that, whereas the inflated price of heroin forces most addicts into a life of crime to obtain funds necessary to sustain their habit, methadone costs only pennies a day and has none of the abnormal and harmful effects produced by heroin.

Methadone, experts explain, satisfies the addict's craving for heroin without giving him a "high" and allows him to function normally and become a useful member of society.

But methadone may be used only as a substitute for any of the opiate drugs such as heroin, morphine, codeine and the like, and cannot be used for any other type of drug addiction.

However, on the minus side, indiscriminate distribution of methadone by "legal" sources has placed the narcotic in the hands of non-addicts and the uniformed.

"MAINLINING" POSSIBLE

Unfortunately, like so many other useful drugs, ways have been devised to get a "high" from methadone by "mainlining" it directly into the bloodstream by hypodermic syringe or needle. And by this means the non-addict may get "hooked" on the synthetic drug and risk adverse effects which could cost him his life.

New federal laws governing the distribution and use of methadone for maintenance programs went into effect across the nation April 1 and have been instrumental in eliminating much of the abuse by private physicians and others.

Rigid requirements contained in the new federal laws cannot be met by most physicians, who normally do not have laboratory and other ancillary backup support to qualify for such a program, therefore restricting methadone maintenance programs to properly recognized and equipped hospitals and clinics operated by responsible persons.

V—METHADONE: SIGNIFICANT WEAPON IN THE DRUG WAR

(By Bill Gagnon)

One of the most significant and meaningful efforts to combat drug abuse in Pueblo County is the methadone maintenance program at Colorado State Hospital.

Recently implemented under rigid federal guidelines, the CSH methadone maintenance clinic is providing the way for some heroin addicts—once considered hopeless cases—to return to a normal way of life and as useful members of the community.

Under the careful supervision of a small but dedicated medical team of experts led by Dr. Franklin G. Osberg, more than 25 individuals addicted to heroin and other opiates are participating in the program daily.

Those involved in the program at CSH range in age between 18 and mid-50s and nearly all are from the Pueblo area.

BENEFITS RECOGNIZED

Methadone, a synthetic narcotic, is in itself addicting, but taken in the proper dosage by those addicted to other opiates such as heroin, morphine, codeine or demerol, it can be extremely beneficial.

Properly used, methadone satisfies the burning craving for other opiates without the user's getting a "high" or suffering the pangs of withdrawal or otherwise being physically influenced by the drug.

Methadone maintenance allows an individual to function normally without any visible or latent detrimental effects.

Costing only pennies a day to use, the syn-

thetic drug is a marked contrast to the staggering costs to the addict buying illegal opiates on the black market, forcing him into a life of crime to maintain this vicious habit.

CRITERIA FOR ADMISSION

Dr. Osberg said that the criteria for admission to the program includes a nonspecified length of time of addiction, but definite addiction to hard narcotic, opiate drugs.

"Once the applicant fills these criteria for admission," said Dr. Osberg, "we take a very careful history of his addiction to assure ourselves beyond doubt that, as near as humanly possible, he is addicted to an opiate drug; that has wrestled with it on his own or with the help of someone else."

He said symptoms also are sought which might show underlying reasons for an individual's addiction, and a close look is taken into his medical history for other clues to physical disabilities or mental illness.

Following a complete physical examination, the applicant is required to report to the CSH methadone clinic daily for a predetermined dose of methadone, the amount of which the patient is not told but is known only to Dr. Osberg and his staff.

Osberg and his staff, which includes three medical technicians and a registered nurse, also provide other therapy for patients in support of the methadone treatment.

CONTROLS ESTABLISHED

However, stringent rules and controls are used by the clinic to offset abuse of the program.

They include:

—Weekly urine samples taken at random to detect use of any opiates other than methadone by the patient.

—Inspection for fresh needle marks or "tracks" on the patient's body indicating illegal use of drugs.

—Requiring the patient to take his daily dosage in liquid form, mixed with orange juice, under the direct supervision and presence of a staff member.

—Requiring the patient to sign a contract with the clinic in which he agrees not to involve himself in other programs or get any other sources of drugs from anywhere else, including alcohol; that he will not involve himself in any antisocial or criminal activities, and that he will obey all rules and conditions of the clinic.

A small fee also is charged for each dose of methadone, usually about 25 cents, which gives the patient a feeling of having an investment on his part in the program.

BALANCE SOUGHT

But—most important of all—Dr. Osberg pointed out that usually the clinic can arrive at a dosage for an individual sufficient to block his craving for heroin, but not sufficient enough for him to get a euphoric effect from the drug.

He also stressed that if the patient does take an opiate drug on top of the methadone, so to speak, it has no effect; he won't get a "high" on an opiate if he is on methadone.

While the CSH program is still in its formative stages, Osberg reports he is greatly encouraged and impressed by its early results.

"Most of the patients have become alert, cheerful, have obtained jobs and 'shaped up' in appearance," said Osberg.

Osberg and his staff are hopeful of expanding the present program upward to about 50 soon.

And so, at least in the area of heroin addiction, some progress is noted.

VI—PROGRAMS HELP CURB DRUG ABUSE

(By Bill Gagnon)

While drug abuse continues to increase at an alarming rate in Pueblo County, several programs are now under way in an attempt to stem the tide.

Among these is the La Raza Unida drug control program which is using a "La Familia (the family) approach—a combination of love, constructive criticism and understanding in helping young addicts.

Aimed at helping young people, especially Chicanos, to get off drugs and to prevent others from using them, the La Raza Unida program also institutes a "hard line" stand, including the "cold turkey" method of getting off drugs.

Pride in national origin also is invoked to install a sense of responsibility to others in young Chicano drug users, and an unofficial "war" has been declared by Chicano leaders against the drug pusher.

COMPASS, INC.

Another program designed to assist those using drugs is Compass, Inc., described as a "community venture in helping people understand the issue of drugs, drug abuse, drug treatment and a host of other related issues involving society."

The name of the organization was selected to designate the flexibility and multidirectional thrust of this group of professionals and other interested members of the community.

Compass president is Dr. Franklin G. Osberg, coordinator of drug treatment at Colorado State Hospital.

Among the group's recent accomplishments is the establishment of a "hot line" which is staffed by volunteers offering understanding to those seeking help as a result of or in resisting drug abuse, or information concerning drugs.

A series of seminars has been conducted by Compass to assist those volunteers in adequately staffing the "hot line" and to provide vital information and educational programs on drug abuse to parents, teachers and civic, fraternal and other interested organizations.

PARENT INTEREST ESSENTIAL

"The major problem is in getting parents interested and involved in drug abuse problems," said a Pueblo policeman at a recent Compass meeting. "We get the opportunity to talk to the kids about this problem, but not the parents.

The officer pointed out that the real need is for parents to get together when they have a drug abuse problem in their family and to realize that there are many other families in Pueblo "who are in the same boat."

Several constructive informational programs concerning drug abuse have been aired, or are planned by Compass over Channel 8, the educational television station operated by Southern Colorado State College.

SCHOOL DISTRICTS ACTIVE

Also stepping up drug-education programs are School Districts 60 and 70, which participated recently in a federal Health, Education and Welfare program under the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Act of 1970.

Just prior to the close of schools for summer vacation, a new discipline policy involving a crackdown on student drug users was announced by public school officials. And this policy is expected to be enforced when classes resume in the fall.

These and many other preventative programs concerning drug abuse are now in effect in Pueblo County. But little result is noted at this time.

VII—CONFIDENTIAL TREATMENT AVAILABLE

(By Bill Gagnon)

Confidential medical treatment for drug abuse is now available to youngsters, regardless of age, without the consent—or knowledge—of their parents or guardians.

This infringement on historically parental rights was enacted into law last March by the signature of Gov. John A. Love on legislation passed by the General Assembly.

Sponsor of the bill was Rep. Roy Shore,

R-Greeley, a physician, who said the bill would permit doctors to treat minors without receiving parental consent.

Youngsters who are estranged from their parents or guardians, or do not wish them to know they have a drug problem may now receive confidential treatment by a physician.

Shore also successfully blocked an attempt by Rep. Lowell Sonnenberg, R-Fleming, to amend the measure to give the doctor an option as to whether he would notify the parents or legal guardians of minors seeking treatment for drug abuse.

RELIEVED OF LIABILITY

This law relieves a physician providing such treatment from incurring any civil or criminal liability, although such immunity does not apply to any negligent acts or omissions by the physician.

Proponents of the measure are hopeful that it will encourage youngsters to seek responsible medical help for their problem without being inhibited by the fear of their parents or guardians finding out they are drug users.

Other action by this year's legislative session designed to assist in attacking the drug abuse problem is an amended version of Colorado's Children's Code.

Amendments include one which will now allow police officers to pass on information concerning juveniles to other agencies within the state when an apprehension or current investigation is involved.

Previously, no information could be transmitted from city to city. However, a provision that no information on persons under 18 be given to the Federal Bureau of Investigation remains in effect.

INVESTIGATION HAMPERED

Earlier this year local officials were stymied in their attempt to secure such information during a coroner's inquest into the narcotic overdose death of a teen-age Pueblo youth.

Dr. Harvey Phelps, Pueblo County coroner, was highly critical of the Children's Code restriction which added to the burden of officials in attempting to point out the seriousness of the drug abuse problem here to the public.

At that time Phelps charged that the code cloaked youthful drug offenders in immunity which contributed to rather than helped to alleviate, the problem.

FEDERAL LEGISLATION

Legislation also was enacted on the federal level in recent months which has now gone into effect and is expected to help in relieving the many problems of drug abuse.

The new federal regulations contain strict guidelines concerning by whom and under what conditions methadone maintenance programs may be certified. This already has eliminated several private physicians from distributing the synthetic narcotic drug indiscriminately to youths and others not actually addicted to opiate-type drugs.

It also has curtailed to a great extent sources of supply for methadone pushers who charged highly inflated prices for methadone sold on the black market.

More rigid and stringent federal controls also are now in effect concerning the dispensing of prescription drugs by pharmacists and the issuance of drug prescriptions by physicians.

VIII—CORONER SLAMS HANDLING OF JUVENILE OFFENDERS

(By Bill Gagnon)

"How can a 14-year-old kid buy and get hooked on heroin?"

This unanswered question was asked recently by Dr. Harvey W. Phelps, Pueblo County coroner, during an investigation into the death of a teen-age youth from an overdose of illegal narcotics.

It is through Phelps' efforts that the pub-

lic recently was made aware of an increasing drug abuse problem in Pueblo County, especially among youngsters down to the tender age of 12.

Phelps believes that part of the problem here is due to the lack of a full-time juvenile court and a juvenile detention home for delinquents.

"The county jail isn't fit for human habitation," Phelps charged. "It's impossible and I can't see how individuals can be kept there for any length of time."

MORALE PROBLEM

He said the so-called "exercise" area at the county jail is "totally inadequate" and the lack of fresh air and dungeon-like atmosphere of the jail facility itself creates a serious morale problem among inmates.

"I certainly wouldn't want to be responsible for putting a juvenile inside there (County Jail)," said Phelps.

"We have a mechanism, of sorts, to deal with adult drug offenders but no real way of handling juveniles," he added.

Frequently, according to Phelps, the big problem in drug overdose cases is in getting doctors to list the type drug involved in such cases. He said many physicians shy away from noting such information on summary sheets for fear of becoming involved in civil litigation.

But Phelps is deeply concerned by the lack of facilities, manpower, and the "hohum" attitudes of both the public and responsible officials to deal with the growing problem.

"How can you evaluate a person on drugs in Pueblo County?" he asked.

14-YEAR-OLD CONFIRMED ADDICT

The 14-year-old boy to whom Phelps previously referred, now 16, is a confirmed narcotics addict currently confined to the Look-out Mountain School for Boys in Golden.

The youth, committed there recently by Dist. Judge Hubert Glover after probation failed when the youth stole a large quantity of methadone from Colorado State Hospital, and admitted giving a quantity of the synthetic narcotic drug last December to a teen-age friend. The drug caused the friend's death.

During an inquest conducted by Phelps into the youngster's death, a sordid—and frightening—drug abuse problem surfaced in Pueblo County.

COOPERATION WITHHELD

And even more frightening was the lack of official cooperation encountered by Phelps from some individuals, including the top official of a wholesale drug firm.

Asked for general statistics on various narcotic and dangerous drugs sold legally by his firm, the drug company official refused to discuss or disclose such information to authorities.

And when asked whether he felt his firm had a moral responsibility to the community and to the people it serves, the official replied: "Our only responsibility is to the Justice Department."

IX—REASON FOR GROWING DRUG ABUSE PROBLEM REFLECTED IN ARRESTS

(By Bill Gagnon)

One reason for the growing drug abuse problem in Pueblo County is reflected in a comparison of official police arrest records for narcotics offenses and their eventual disposition.

For the record reveals that of a total of 101 arrests by narcotics squad officers during the year for drug-abuse offenses, 21 were released for lack of evidence or referred to juvenile authorities.

However, of the remaining 80 referred to the district attorney's office for prosecution on felony charges, the record shows:

One was charged with a misdemeanor.

The courts ruled evidence was "illegally" seized by police and suppressed its use resulting in the release of 11 suspects.

The district attorney's office dropped charges against 20 suspects without prosecution.

Felony charges were reduced to misdemeanors by the district attorney's office against 22 suspects, all of whom pleaded guilty to the lesser count.

One was acquitted of felony charges after trial by a jury.

19 CASES PENDING

As of the end of last April, there were 19 of last year's narcotic-arrest cases pending in various phases of court hearing.

But it is significant to note that of the total number of narcotics cases referred to the district attorney's office by the police department for prosecution, only six resulted in felony convictions; four by guilty pleas being entered, and two by verdicts of guilty by juries.

Underscoring this is the fact that additional arrests for narcotics violations were referred for prosecution to the district attorney's office by the sheriff's office, and perhaps another 15 to 20 by other Pueblo law enforcement agencies.

The mere six convictions on felony narcotics violations indicates an apparent breakdown in the district attorney's office in a lack of aggressive prosecution of such cases.

JURISTS LENIENT

Adding to the problem are overly lenient jurists, often acting on the approval and recommendation of the district attorney's office, who grant personal recognizance bonds to a majority of narcotics offense suspects, allowing them to return to the streets in a matter of hours and resume "pushing" or using illegal drugs.

An example of this was noted earlier this year following the arrest of three Southern Colorado State College coeds for possession of narcotic drugs.

In this particular case the three girls came close to beating the arresting officer back to the college campus after they were given their release on personal recognizance bonds within minutes after they were booked on the charges.

CHARGES WATERED DOWN

What is particularly disturbing to police and sheriff's officers is the staggering number of cases being reduced by the district attorney's office from possession to use.

Possession of narcotic drugs—a felony—is usually filed against a suspect by police when they believe he is involved in the sale (pushing) of illegal drugs to others.

However, "use" of such drugs—a misdemeanor—is filed by police when they believe a suspect is not involved in sales but has obtained illegal drugs for his own, personal use.

Veteran police officers point out that indiscriminate reduction of charges from "possession" to "use" by the district attorney's office, merely to entice a suspect to enter a guilty plea to a lesser charge, defeats the purpose and intent of the law.

They charge that such "deals" between the suspect and prosecutor results in the pusher receiving a "slap on the wrist" in the courts, after which he returns to his illicit trafficking in drugs where it is "business as usual."

And, meanwhile, the drug abuse problem continues to grow, and grow, and grow.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—As a matter of clarification of Monday's article in this series a young heroin addict, who admitted giving a fatal overdose of methadone, stole the drug last December shortly before his friend's death. The admitted "pusher" subsequently stole another quantity of methadone in January from Colorado State Hospital, but all of his second theft but a dose which he took himself was recovered.)

X—HANDICAPPED POLICE UNABLE TO STEM DRUG ABUSE

(By Bill Gagnon)

Handicapped by limited resources, Pueblo police slowly but surely are fighting a losing battle in their attempt to stem the drug abuse epidemic here.

And lack of money, manpower and equipment is starting to take its inevitable toll.

Despite the best efforts of the Police Department's six-man organized crime and intelligence unit, narcotics and dangerous drug abuse offenses are soaring to an all-time high.

Police Chief Robert L. Mayber expressed his concern over the tremendous increase in illegal drug use, especially by teenagers and young adults.

UNDERCOVER EXPERTS NEEDED

Vitaly needed by police to cope with the alarming problem are funds to employ additional personnel, some of whom could be trained in undercover roles to infiltrate the twilight world of the drug pushers and users and ferret out the sources of supply.

Also needed are laboratory facilities, either operated by, or readily available, to the police to immediately test individuals suspected of illegal drug use and analyze contraband seized from suspects.

Additional electronic equipment, special radios, vehicles and other aids are necessary for undercover and surveillance work to strike at the heart of the problem—again, the source of supply.

Only meager funds are available to local police to pay for information from informers. And few—if any—undercover officers are operating in the field because of severe restrictions on police manpower.

Pueblo police are forced to rely heavily on local hospitals, the City-County Health Department or the Colorado Bureau of Investigation in Denver for laboratory analysis. This complicates narcotics investigations, long and unavoidable delays encountered by such means.

SIGNIFICANT FUNDS VETOED

Recently, local law-enforcement problems were multiplied here by the refusal of the Governor's Council on Crime Control advisory board to allocate any significant amount of federal funds to Pueblo this year.

Only a token of \$13,260 of the whopping \$3.6 million allocated to Colorado for distribution to local agencies statewide from U.S. Justice Department Law Enforcement Assistance Act (LEAA) funds is earmarked for Pueblo this year.

The state advisory board has turned thumbs down on pleas by Mayber for additional federal grants to continue funding the organized crime and intelligence division and other vitally needed projects designed to beef up police operations in Pueblo.

It was a portion of the \$77,167 LEAA funds allocated to Pueblo last year that enabled Mayber to establish the organized crime and intelligence division to concentrate on illegal narcotics and drug trafficking and other specialized crime problems.

It's apparent that with the ever-growing drug abuse problem here the organized crime and intelligence division is needed now more than ever before.

Ironically, this special unit which was created with federal LEAA funds is now threatened with extinction from the same quarter—only this time due to lack of funds.

Conspicuous by its absence in Pueblo County is the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. For, despite this agency's maintaining a regional office in Denver, none of its agents, for some unknown reason, has been active in the Pueblo area for more than a year.

There is little doubt that if Pueblo is going to bring the present drug-abuse epidemic under some semblance of control, it's

going to take funds and the cooperation of officials and leaders at the local level.

"Give us the tools we need and we'll get the job done," Mayber vowed.

FATE OF WEST BERLIN

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, as negotiations over the fate of West Berlin continue, I wish at this time to call to the attention of the Senate a very thoughtful analysis by the noted West German journalist Axel Springer which was published in the *Welt am Sonntag*, June 27, 1971.

As usual Mr. Springer develops the history of the situation in Berlin with great clarity. He presents a perspective of Chancellor Brandt's policies with respect to the "divided city" not often found in the American press.

So that all Senators may benefit from this outstanding contribution to a better understanding of what is at stake in Berlin, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the *RECORD* at this point.

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

OFFENSIVE AGAINST BERLIN

(Translation of an article by Axel Springer, *Welt am Sonntag*, June 27, 1971)

In 1945 American and British forces evacuated the areas they occupied in Saxony, Thuringia and Mecklenburg. They withdrew from Magdeburg, Leipzig, Plauen, Erfurt. In accordance with agreement they handed over these areas to the Soviets to assume their own equally contractual rights in "Greater Berlin." The entire city of Berlin—as provided in the Allies' war agreements—was to be a unit under the joint control and administration of the four victor powers.

The legal position is clear: it was created by allied decisions in London (September 12, 1944), Yalta (February 11, 1945) and Potsdam (August 2, 1945) and laid down in the Constitution of Greater Berlin, to which the Russian General Kotikov was a signator and which to this day has not been legally altered. Actually, however, enormous changes have been made.

The first of these came on November 30/December 1, 1948, when the Soviets forcibly cut off the eastern part of Berlin from the rest of the city. A further climax was reached almost exactly ten years ago, on August 13, 1961, the day the Wall was built. In addition, breaking all agreements made, East Berlin was declared to be the capital of the "German Democratic Republic" (East Germany) and was remilitarized. The Western Powers were deprived of any right to a voice in the Soviet sector of the city.

The Soviets are now preparing the next blow: they want, even in matters of detail, a voice in the control of West Berlin. The first, though by no means the only objective in this context is to eliminate the Federal presence, that is the presence of West German institutions in Berlin.

This long persistent demand is now no longer being resisted with the firmness which until recently was a matter of course. Contradictory utterances from the Bonn Government camp are hampering the fight for the freedom of Berlin. The city as a whole has long ceased to be discussed. And the freedom of its citizens is now hardly mentioned; discussion centers solely round securing the access routes to the city. In other words, Berlin is in deadly peril. That is the subject of this article.

Chancellor Brandt has returned from the United States. He has spoken of "complete harmony" between himself and President

Nixon. "There is a good chance of reaching a satisfactory Berlin settlement," he said.

But about the answer to the Berlin problem we heard nothing definite. For all our trust in the proved reliability of the Americans and in the Chancellor's good intentions, we cannot close our eyes to the Soviet Union's full-scale political attack and that of its East-German vassal on Berlin.

While in Washington Willy Brandt was calling for a "dismantling of confrontation," Erich Honecker, First Secretary of the East German communist party (SED), spoke of "ever profounder demarcation" and "ever growing differences" as against West Germany. Leonid Brezhnev, the Soviet Communist Party chief, harped on "East Germany's legitimate and sovereign rights." Once again, Western credulity is faced with an Eastern offensive.

American trade union leaders were in the van of those who warned Chancellor Brandt of the risks involved in his Ostpolitik. They are filled with concern for Berlin, and nothing the German visitors said sufficed to dispense the doubts of the American workers' leaders.

Sharpened by long experience, they descry more clearly than the myopic German Ostpolitik that marked cards in Moscow's hand.

But another who warned the Chancellor was John J. McCloy, the former High Commissioner in Germany and adviser on foreign policy to all U.S. Presidents since the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt. He said: "I see no signs that the Soviet Union has given up its plan to drive the USA out of Europe." It seems, he goes on, that the Kremlin has found unexpected aid among "certain elements" in western Europe who wish to eliminate or at least weaken America's interest in Europe.

Worried Americans are warning. Must protest against the jeopardizing of Berlin be left to them alone?

It is high time now and today to do more than raise mere critical objections and to offer determined opposition. To say "No", as Ernst Reuter advised and not "Yes, but . . ."

If we do not say no now it will be too late. For what we are witnessing now is nothing but a new grand political attack by the Soviets on Berlin which the West German Government is mistaking for concessive advances. Indeed they are advancing toward us, with great strides on a broad front. But this approach is aggressive, aimed at driving the West from its positions.

All this is not new. Berlin is familiar with it all. It has resisted it since the war ended. The new feature is that Moscow—and in the shelter of its might East Berlin—is being encouraged by Bonn.

What other interpretation can be drawn when a man close to the coalition government—concealed behind a pseudonym—points out the "dissent", i.e., the disunity, between the Western Powers and West Germany in questions of the West German presence in Berlin? When Government spokesmen, concurring with declared enemies of this state, tirelessly describe the fragility of the "legal positions" on which Berlin's viability, its political strength, have so far been firmly built?

Displays of legalistic weakness—real or imaginary—signify nothing but waving the white flag. The other side sees it in a flash. They need no second invitation.

The keenest critic of these goings-on is Chancellor Brandt himself. He was prompt in criticising "the policy his Government is pursuing today—he did so several years ago. It is not unfair to recall his attitude; a man must be taken by his word.

Willy Brandt said this:

"We must get used to the fact that Russia insists on treating and denouncing Berlin as an alleged focus of danger, a cancer, as they say, a fuse in the powder barrel, a foreign body. But behind the Soviet demand for a treaty with the two forms of state on German soil there is not merely the—under-

standable—desire on the Soviet part to pocket Berlin, immediately or bit by bit; there is also the idea of globally fixing the results of World War Two as the Soviet Union sees them."

Nobody could have put it more clearly, more aptly. Nor this—

"For anyone who put up with the partition of Germany, Berlin would be superfluous. Berlin upsets the all too comfortable concepts. For it is clear that that miserable satellite regime which is neither German nor democratic nor a republic cannot be consolidated as long as the reddening evening sky over the free part of Berlin draws the hopes of men beyond the Wall."

And another time—

"The close bonds between Berlin and the Federal Republic must be preserved. That West Berlin belongs to the free part of Germany . . . represents its vital arteries."

But today there remains only talk of "administrative gearing", as though what was once right were now wrong. Or has anything material changed? Nothing has changed. Much time has passed. But the time which has since passed has not revised, it has confirmed, the vital need for the political bonds which are now to be sacrificed. This time which has passed confirms what Willy Brandt said in 1962—

"To the same extent as the Four-Power status has been reduced for East Berlin it must—in as far as the Soviet Union's rights in West Berlin are concerned—also be reduced here."

East Germany is governed from East Berlin. The mock-parliament of the SED "state" has its permanent seat in East Berlin. Soldiers of the SED army march on East Berlin drill squares, parade through its streets. East Berlin is described and claimed as the "capital of the GDR".

Once Willy Brandt commented on this: "What has happened in East Berlin is the invasion of an army into a territory where it has no right to be. The so-called People's Army with its auxiliary organisations has annexed East Berlin."

Today the Chancellor is silent about these facts. He accepts them—and encourages the Powers protecting the free part of Berlin to accept them.

For over a year they have been negotiating with the Soviet Union—urged by the West German Government—solely about West Berlin. And they are about to fulfill Moscow's demands for a reduction of the West German presence in Berlin. That is, they are about to concede the Soviet Union a voice in control of the free part of Berlin—naturally without even attempting to resume use of their rights, as victors, in East Berlin.

However nobody can expect Americans, Britons and Frenchmen to be more German than the Germans. For decades the Western Allies have held the umbrellas of their guarantee over the freedom of West Berlin and also over its belonging to West Germany, which the allies have not only tolerated but—with formal limitations respected on the German side—approved.

Now when a freely elected German government advises the protecting powers certainly to go on holding the umbrella over Berlin, but to close it a little to the sharpening east wind because you can hold it easier that way, the temptation is hard to resist for long.

And again there is no clear contradiction for the West German Government than the words of the old Willy Brandt:

"The task facing us today is to recognize and acknowledge that Berlin is the focus of the struggle for all Germany. The fate of Berlin will be the fate of West Germany as well. The erection of leading Federal (West German) authorities in West Berlin will, we consider, express the claim entered by the Federal Republic of Germany to the German capital and to the whole of Germany."

Nothing need be added to that—had not this Federal Government and its Chancellor ceased to speak of Berlin as the capital of all Germany.

Instead we hear other things. For instance the Chancellor's reproach to Opposition politicians that they give "continuous performances" in Berlin. He called the working sessions of West German parliamentarians and members of the Government "visits"! Now visits are paid to strangers. But under the Constitution Berlin belongs to the Federal Republic of Germany.

Again, the best answer to the Chancellor's "visits" is in the words of the old Willy Brandt:

"One may not abandon a precept of the Constitution, even if it cannot be realized overnight. We Germans have bitterly learnt whither flouted right and morality lead. I hope we will never forget this lesson."

And yet the lesson is threatened with oblivion. Reason enough to recall it to memory. This utterance of Willy Brandt deserves remembering:

"Partition can be imposed on a nation, as we have seen in these past years; but that nation cannot be brought to accept partition, to put up with it, to subscribe to it. The result would be no service to peace."

Now the self-same lips pronounce that the Moscow Treaty, in which the West German Government subscribed to partition, serves peace. It is said that ratification of this treaty is to be made possible by a "satisfactory Berlin settlement"! "Satisfactory" for the West German Government, however, means that "demonstrative Federal presence" not only can but must be reduced.

Imagine: to enable the unilateral concessions to Russia in the Moscow Treaty to become effective, further concessions are to be made in Berlin. The possibility of finally being allowed to make one sacrifice is tied to the prerequisite that further sacrifices must be made.

"Federal presence"—a cool, dry word. It is no strain on the individual's imagination and has recently been interpreted to death. Its meaning has been ground down in floods of verbosity and garrulity only to present its contents to the other side on a platter.

"Demonstrative Federal presence" is to be abandoned. Do they think it will help Berlin to survive if the Federal flag is hauled down forever from the President's Berlin residence? If the freely elected West German parliament and its committees only wave to us from the banks of the Rhine? If the Federal Assembly (the upper and lower houses) in future elect the Federal President—the President sworn to all of Germany—in Baden-Baden or Hanover?

"Federal presence"—it is not a status symbol for the arrogation of questionable rights, not a superfluous gew-gaw flaunting a nationalistic policy for Germany. Federal presence means the lodging of a claim to a future, perhaps only a very distant future, in which this Berlin is again the capital of a free Germany. At stake is the residue of the substance of survival and the surmounting of that which partitioned Germany suffers. And now this substance is to be abandoned, piece after piece? Berlin could not endure that without the risk of political death.

None who warn of this danger must be put off by being branded as mischief-makers or provocateurs. The real provocation is the surrender of what was once comment to all, of what was for all of us inalienable. Not those who hold fast to this endanger Berlin, but those who renounce it.

Since the Erfurt (in East Germany, where he consulted with the East German head of government Willi Stoph) Chancellor Brandt uttered the monstrous words about there being "two German states of one nation", this common worth has been dissolving with increasing rapidity. The wording of the Moscow Treaty had already broken it. The signature under the partition of Germany and the political retreat from Berlin mark the

cracks. Here accounts are being paid which the victorious powers did not even present to Germany in the hour of victory.

The victors promised to preserve the unity of Germany and its capital. They promised the Germans also the right to self-determination. In 25 years the German people through their policy of freedom and peace, have earned these rights from the victors' hands—to possess them, not to surrender them for vague reliefs which breaches of interpretable agreements can jeopardise at any time.

It cannot be disputed that a settlement on the access routes to and from Berlin is desirable. But is it a responsible settlement if Berlin is allowed to wither as a political entity, is bereft of its symbolism and its role, merely in the hope that traffic will not have to stand so long at the checkpoints and freight-train inspections will be speeded up? It would be disastrous to misinterpret the survival of Berlin as a question of milk and vegetable supplies.

The moral respect earned by Germany all over the world since the war is above all founded on Berlin. Not by "settlements", however useful and desirable, but by the morale of the people of Berlin.

What has changed of this since 1948, 1959, 1961? Nothing. A few years have passed. That is all. Years in which the eastern neighbour has demonstrated to us what it means to be consistent.

It is objected that the consistency of free Germany's policy before its retreat from positions of right failed to produce complete success. Well, did anyone seriously believe that after 25 years at the latest everything would be all right again, everything achieved? Did anyone really believe that, after what was done in the name of Germany to other nations and to the German nation?

The time will appear short to Moscow and its aides in East Berlin. Now that after only 25 years they have almost gathered in the harvest of their political aggressions.

They rub their hands in glee in East Berlin when people in the West talk about "territorial rights" which the "people's Army" exercises when its "frontier guards" fire on fugitives. They chuckle complacently when the West German Government moves its Berlin representative's seat to Bonn on the Rhine. They jubilate and prepare for more successes when meetings of the economics ministers of the West German Federal states and even of the Bundestag committee for inner-German affairs, planned for Berlin, are cancelled or postponed.

Does East Germany honor all this? Only political adlepatates could suppose so. The slogan now valid in East Berlin was issued within the past few days by the defense minister of the "GDR," Heinz Hoffmann. He is preaching hatred and hostility. It is not enough, he states, "to educate the youth of East Germany merely in the spirit of socialist internationalism; at the same time it must learn hatred of imperialism and its putrefying social system."

In these words the minister called for total militarisation: "For every citizen—old or young, man or woman—there is a duty to develop to a far more comprehensive extent ways of thought and conduct oriented to the demands of defense in peace as in a possible war."

Who—one must ask—is planning a war?

While in Bonn the talk is of "symbolic troop withdrawals," the "demarcation" at the Wall and along the barbed wire is being perfected. The Frontier Defense Command South, Munich, now reports "complete restructuring" of East German defense along the demarcation line and "the most radical measures since reinforcement of the defenses in summer 1961."

Lastly: Sportsmen recently learned once again the state reduction of tension is in. For West Berliners will still not be granted visas for the Soviet Union if they wish to travel there as members of West German national sports teams. The West Berlin city au-

thority made it known that in this matter it would "not yield an inch." Will the West German Sports Association follow suit? As the Trade Union Council (DGB) did in staunchly rejecting East German attempts to discriminate against its West Berlin group?

Faced with such facts nobody can say where the West German Government finds its trust in the Soviet Union and the "GDR," the trust that the enemies of West Germany and of the free part of Berlin should suddenly be interested in preserving and strengthening the viability of the city.

Signor Brosio, Secretary General of NATO, said lately what drives the Kremlin in these activities: not reduction of tensions, but the wish for recognition of the frontiers of its sphere of power and the hope of greater influence in western Europe. Exactly. That is, and has been since World War Two ended, the core and aim of Soviet policy for Germany and above all its policy for Berlin.

Perhaps the Bonn executives sitting at their desks have forgotten what Lenin once said (the Soviets bear it in mind still): "Whoever has Berlin, has Germany; and whoever has Germany, has Europe." If what is now headlined as a policy of détente comes about, Berlin will not become Soviet property at once, but an important step along the way will have been taken.

It is time to consult the Berliners themselves once again. If the word "self-determination" is not to be a hollow delusion, the will of those directly affected must be heard.

It would be intolerable if the lines binding Berlin to the Federal Republic and the Republic to this city were cut through the workings of secret diplomacy. The Western Powers' guarantee for Berlin is after all largely a consequence of the morale Berliners have displayed.

To his credit, Willy Brandt has uttered decisive words on this as well:

"In the minds of its people Berlin has remained indivisible. Before the eyes of the world our city upholds the claim of all Germans to self-determination."

But if now the Federal Republic drops its political bonds with Berlin, then this city will be abandoned by many. It will see its people go away, a migration that no material subsidies could offset. Only the furniture removers would profit—and they only on the petty cash account.

Robbed of its role as the German capital of the future, stripped of its significance as a centre of the right of Germans to self-determination, Berlin would be condemned to death.

The danger that its lights will go out is near. The switches are being turned. Whoever looks on in silence will be among the guilty.

TURKEY ANNOUNCES END OF PLANTING OF OPIUM POPPY

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I want to express the heartfelt thanks of all Coloradans, and all Americans, to Prime Minister Nihat Erim, of Turkey, for his humane and statesmanlike action in announcing a prompt end of the practice of planting the opium poppy in his country.

As President Nixon noted in his statement on this action, opium and its heroin derivative constitutes an "international epidemic." This epidemic is one of the most dehumanizing social catastrophes of our time.

This step by Turkey can be expected to contribute mightily to the worldwide attack on the illegal heroin traffic. As

such, this is one of the most significant acts of international neighborliness in recent years.

SENATOR THOMAS DODD

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I join with other Senators in expressing my sadness over the death of Senator Thomas Dodd.

Senator Dodd was a man who believed that it was man's first duty to fight for those principles on which a free society depends. He was an unrelenting enemy of the dark despotism which descended on Eastern Europe after World War II. He never spared himself in the unending battle to keep Americans strong in their determination to resist tyranny.

All of us who knew Senator Dodd—his friends in the Senate and his legions of friends across the Nation—remember him for invaluable service to the Nation he loved.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 12 noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the program for tomorrow is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 12 noon.

After the standard recognition of the two leaders, the following Senators will be recognized in the order stated, each for not to exceed 15 minutes: Senator TALMADGE, Senator AIKEN, Senator HUMPHREY, and Senator YOUNG.

The next item will be routine morning business for a period of not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

Following the close of routine morning business and until 3 p.m., the Senate will consider items on the legislative calendar or other business which may be made pending or it may resume consideration of the unfinished business, S. 1828.

At 3 p.m., the unfinished business, S. 1828, legislation dealing with cancer, will go under controlled time. Debate thereon will be limited to 3 hours, with 1 hour on each amendment thereto and 20 minutes on any amendment to an amendment.

The yeas and nays may be ordered on any amendment.

The yeas and nays have already been ordered on passage of S. 1828, so there will be at least one ye-and-nay vote tomorrow—maybe more.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate now stand in adjournment.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 7, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 6, 1971:

ACTION

Joseph H. Blatchford, of California, to be Director of Action; new position.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Charlotte T. Reid, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1971, vice Thomas J. Houser.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Peter G. Nash, of New York, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 4 years, vice Arnold Ordman, term expired.

U.S. PATENT OFFICE

Brereton Sturtevant, of Delaware, to be an examiner in chief, U.S. Patent Office, vice George A. Gorecki, resigned.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

STATEMENT ON OAKLAND POLICE DEPARTMENT OFFICERS' PETITION TO THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, a case regarding the Selective Service's classification system has come to my attention which warrants the examination of all branches of this Government because of its influence on a problem with which we are all only too familiar; that of crime in our urban areas and the ability of the various police forces to cope with its rising incidence.

The Selective Service has traditionally placed police officers in the II-A category. This classification is given to those in occupations "necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, and interest." The issuance of Executive Order 11527, however, has created a situation under which new officers are no longer able to obtain this type of deferment.

The order cited above requires men receiving the II-A rating to have first, held or applied for the deferment prior to April 23, the date the order was issued; second, continued to hold the occupation under which they were granted the deferment; and third, the continued support of their local draft board as to the validity of the deferment.

I think we can all agree that the latter two of these new requirements are not excessive. The problem, as it relates to

the police, arises with the first of the regulations.

This problem is exemplified by the plight of the Oakland Police Department and, more specifically, 30 of its younger members. These men are now petitioning the Selective Service for classification in the II-A category and I think it imperative for all of us to support their petition since it has implications which reach into most of our States in one way or another.

Oakland's crime problem is one of the most severe in the Nation. In fact, according to FBI statistics as of October 1970, it had the highest crime rate of any major urban center in this country. The causes of Oakland's crime rate are similar to those found in other urban centers, but I would like to quote a portion of a report I received from the chief of the Oakland Police Department, Mr. C. R. Gain:

WHY THERE IS CRIME IN OAKLAND

Oakland has a high incidence of crime because, in common with all core cities, it is disproportionately burdened with crime breeding conditions: both the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders and the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice have identified factors which contribute to high crime rates. These factors are a virtual catalog of conditions in our City.

In its report, "Challenge of Crime in a Free Society," the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (herein referred to as the Crime Commission) states:

"Violent crime, its offenders and its victims, are found most often in urban areas characterized by low income, physical deterioration, dependence, racial and ethnic concentrations, broken homes, working mothers, low levels of education and vocational skills, high unem-

ployment, overcrowded, substandard housing, and high population density.¹

The Eisenhower Commission on Civil Disorders (herein referred to as the Eisenhower Commission) concluded that although:

"Violent crime is to be found in all regions of the country, it is primarily a phenomenon of large cities. . . . These crimes are overwhelmingly committed by males . . . most often between the ages of fifteen to twenty-four . . . committed primarily by individuals at the lower end of the occupational scale . . . disproportionately from the ghetto slum where most Negroes live . . ." and, "by far the greatest proportion of all serious violence is committed by repeaters."²

Studies by both committees show that most crimes are committed by males between the ages of fifteen and twenty-four. Options for Oakland, a Summary Report on the Oakland 701 project, states:

"Oakland's population became younger in the 1960-1966 period, with the median age dropping from 35.7 to 31.9 years. Projections indicate that the median age will continue to drop—to at least 24 years by 1985.

Accordingly, persons under 18 years of age, representing 29 percent of the population in 1960 and 31 percent in 1966, will comprise from 38 to 42 percent of the population in 1985."³

In 1969 in Oakland, 63.8% of the arrests for FBI Index Crimes were of youths between the ages of 15 and 24. The dramatic increase in the youth population of Oakland has significantly contributed to the rise in crime.

Poverty is another condition affecting crime rates.

¹ *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*, A Report by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, p. 35.

² *To Establish Justice. To Insure Domestic Tranquility*, op. cit., pp. 20-26.

³ *Options for Oakland*, A Summary Report on the Oakland 701 Project, p. 8.