

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CAN AMERICA GROW UP

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on June 2, the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) and I were joined by 25 Senators in introducing Senate Joint Resolution 108, which commits our Nation to the voluntary stabilization of population growth. We are convinced that this resolution, with its wide bipartisan support, will be instrumental in developing a national policy for population growth.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "Can America Grow Up," published in the New York Times of June 17, be printed in the RECORD. The editorial explains and refutes several misconceptions about our population problem.

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

[From the New York Times, June 17, 1971]

CAN AMERICAN GROW UP?

In 1950, there were 151 million Americans. Today, there are 208 million. By the year 2000—only 29 years from now—that number is expected to swell to roughly 300 million. In other words, if present growth patterns persist, the population of the United States will double in the last half of the twentieth century.

Citing these statistics, Senator Cranston of California and 26 other Senators have introduced a joint resolution putting Congress on record in favor of zero population growth. The fact that the co-sponsors come from both parties and across the political spectrum from Barry Goldwater to George McGovern is positive proof that the population issue has moved to the forefront of public concern.

There are several misunderstandings concerning this country's population problem. There is the belief that the introduction of the birth control pill and the wider availability of abortion are rapidly reducing the birth rate. It is true that the birth rate which stood at 25 live births per thousand in 1957 declined during the subsequent decade. But that decline leveled off in the last two years. Last year, it was approximately eighteen per thousand or nearly twice the death rate. As we noted yesterday, multiple births are rising because of increased use of hormones to combat infertility, and in other respects as well there is nothing less than a scientific revolution going on at the present time in the field of human reproduction.

Women in their twenties produce the most children. This country is beginning to have a rising number of women in that age bracket. These young women and their husbands are the babies born during the population boom of the late nineteen-forties and early nineteen-fifties.

A second myth is that excessive child-bearing is primarily a phenomenon of the least-educated, low-income elements in society. It is true that this group has proportionately more children. But seven out of every ten children are born to middle- and upper-income families. In other words, even if the poor began to have children at the same rate as the society as a whole, this country would still have a rapidly rising population.

Yet a third mistaken belief is that if

every American family began immediately to have just two children, the problem would be solved. Because of the post-World War II population boom, even the two-child family would mean continued population growth until the year 2037, when America's population would level off at 277 million, more than one-third greater than it is now.

The joint resolution introduced in the Senate proposes no drastic remedies. It urges stabilizing the population by voluntary means consistent with human rights and individual conscience. Its objective is to provide a declaration of national policy as well as a positive context in which the necessary attitudes, policies and research can evolve.

If zero population growth is to be achieved, many popular attitudes and expectations will have to change. For three centuries, Americans dwelling in a nearly empty, richly endowed continent developed a cult of growth. Small towns dreamed that the railroad would bring growth or that new industry would boom land values. The "booster" became an American stereotype and unending growth a national obsession. But now Americans have to develop the self-discipline to prevent an overcrowded and impoverished society. The question is no longer whether America will grow but whether Americans can grow up.

BETWEEN US

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the dangers of unrestricted foreign steel imports to American steelworkers grows greater each day as the present voluntary restraint arrangement inches toward expiration with no acceptable substitute yet in sight.

No one stands to lose more than the steelworker himself. Each ton of steel imported means one less he will produce. The loss of domestic steel orders is reflected in the loss of domestic steel production which means fewer work hours for the steelworker and fewer dollars in his paycheck. Eventually, it could mean his job.

In a recent issue of U.S. Steel News, Mr. Edwin H. Gott, chairman of United States Steel Corp., pointed out that firm's American Bridge Division had to withdraw bids for erecting a large building in the West, because another construction company planned to use Japanese-made structural steel, which made all other bids noncompetitive. He also said a study of major construction projects on the west coast, representing more than 160,000 tons of steel, have been built with fabricated foreign materials since 1969. This tonnage, Mr. Gott points out, represents 2 million man-hours of steel production and 2¼ million man-hours of steel fabrication.

Another less publicized threat to the American steelworker is tied to the present contract negotiations now under way in the domestic industry. American buyers have placed large orders with foreign firms in anticipation of a work

stoppage here. However, it is common for the foreign producers to link an order for steel now with future steel orders. Handcuffed by this legal obligation, it means American firms will be restricted from buying American steel products once the present negotiations are settled.

Mr. Speaker, I am including Mr. Gott's remarks in the RECORD and I urge my colleagues to read them. The steel import problem is too serious to be ignored any longer.

The remarks follows:

BETWEEN US

A few months ago, our American Bridge Division had to withdraw bids for fabrication and erection of the structural framework for two large bank buildings to be erected in the West. The reason: another construction firm planned to use structural steel from Japan, making all other bids on these projects noncompetitive.

About the same time, a group on the West Coast that is concerned with the problem of steel imports reported that, since 1969, major construction projects in that area representing more than 160,000 tons of steel have been built with fabricated foreign materials. They estimated that the total tonnage of foreign materials used in these projects represented 2 million man-hours of steel production and two and a quarter million man-hours of steel fabrication.

These instances are further evidence of how the problem of steel imports is growing more serious month by month. In March, more than one and one-quarter million tons of foreign steel mill products entered the United States—a new record for that month. More than three and three-quarter million tons were imported into this country during the first three months of this year—another record and 60 per cent greater than steel imports of a year ago.

These figures, of course, do not represent all of the foreign steel that is lowering demand for our own domestic products. They do not include foreign fabricated steel or foreign consumer products made of steel that can enter American markets with relative ease under this country's current tariff and trade policies.

And, regrettably, steel imports may continue to rise in the months ahead. Steel customers are known to be placing orders with foreign suppliers for delivery later this summer, in anticipation of a possible shutdown of steel-making operations in the United States at the end of July.

It is common for foreign steelmakers, under these circumstances, to insist on future steel orders, before they will agree to supply so-called "strike hedge" steel. And where this happens, it means that many months may pass before customers are again in the market for our products.

Because this problem of steel imports has been around for a long time—too long, in my opinion—it is a subject that has lost interest for some people. But the fact is that imports are a very real threat to the jobs and income of the people of U.S. Steel.

Every ton of foreign steel bought by an American customer—every foreign car or other consumer product made of steel that is bought by Americans—every piece of fabricated foreign steel that goes into a construction project in this country—means there was an order somewhere that we might have gotten, but didn't. And every possible order we lose means that many fewer hours of work, that many fewer dollars in pay for the people who might have produced or fabricated that steel.

I realize that many things will have to be done before this complex problem of imports can be resolved. The entire philosophy of this country toward supporting foreign economies and giving foreign industries easier access to our markets will have to change.

Companies like U.S. Steel must continue to find better and more efficient ways to produce through continuous research and investment in the technology made possible by research. Most important, we must avoid uneconomic increases in employment and other costs which can only impair still more our ability to compete against foreign products.

Meanwhile, and for the long pull, the ultimate answer will require everyone doing his job as best he can. It will be up to us to prove to our American customers that they can get the most value—the highest quality, the broadest range of products, the best in service—when they buy from us.

TEENAGE CALIFORNIA HEROES

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, on June 29, two teenage boys in Palmdale, Calif., risked their lives to save a California highway patrolman who was being physically attacked and threatened with a gun.

One boy, Guy Tinder, is 15 years old; the other, Don Stafford, is 16.

In recognition of their courage, alertness, and high civic-mindedness, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the June 30 issue of the Antelope Valley Daily Ledger-Gazette, whose news editor, Don Hanson brought this remarkable incident to my attention, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Daily Ledger-Gazette, Lancaster (Calif.), June 30, 1971]

YOUTHS CREDITED WITH SAVING LIFE OF OFFICER IN PARKING LOT SCUFFLE

It was all over in about five minutes shortly after noon yesterday, but two Palmdale youths and a California Highway Patrolman have already spent many times that amount of time talking it over with friends, strangers and newsmen.

Patrolman L. Dean Biss credits the two youths with saving his life in a brief scuffle with a drunk driving suspect who had snatched Biss' gun from its holster and threatened his life with it, as all four wrestled on the ground in a Palmdale parking lot.

Don Stafford, 16, 2149 East Ave. Q-6, somehow thrust his thumb between the trigger and the trigger guard rendering the weapon impossible to fire.

Stafford and his companion Guy Tinder, 15, 38844 Juniper Tree Rd., ran to Biss' aid when Gary Joe Garrett, 18, 38444 Fifth St. East, Palmdale, screamed and jumped Officer Biss after Biss had asked to see Garrett's driver's license.

According to Biss' report on the incident, he first saw Garrett as he was patrolling on Palmdale Blvd. near Fifth St. East at 12:20 p.m. yesterday. Garrett was driving erratically, Biss said, and drove off the roadway into a vacant lot on the north side of the road and to the west of Fifth St. East.

Garrett reportedly spun his car around in the dirt field several times. Biss had to go

to Sixth St. East to make a U-turn to go back to the vacant lot. As he stopped for the U-turn a man stopped behind him and ran up to Biss' patrol car and told Biss that he had narrowly missed being hit by the car.

When Biss reached the vacant lot Garrett was gone. Biss called for a back up police unit and began a search pattern to find the subject's blue car.

The patrolman spotted the vehicle as it turned from westbound Palmdale Blvd. into the Alpha Beta supermarket parking lot. As it turned it bounced off to the center divider, Biss reported, and drove through the parking lot area at an estimated 40 miles per hour.

Garrett stopped when Biss turned on his red spotlight and got out of the car. When Biss told him that he appeared to be having a little difficulty driving and asked for his license, Garrett reportedly screamed and jumped at Biss from a short distance.

As they grappled on the ground, Stafford and Tinder left the car in which they were riding and ran to Biss' aid. Biss was attempting to handcuff the struggling Garrett and Tinder was trying to do the same with the free cuff. In the struggle, Biss wound up with his own right hand handcuffed.

At that point Garrett snatched Biss' service revolver from his holster in spite of a safety strap snapped across it. Garrett reportedly pointed the gun at Biss' stomach as Biss straddled him on the ground and shouted "I'm going to kill you, you son-of-a-bitch."

Biss grabbed the weapon with both hands, holding the firing hammer and Stafford grabbed for the pistol thrusting his thumb into the trigger guard behind the trigger. Garrett bit Biss on the thumb in an attempt to get the gun free.

Yelling for everyone to get back, Biss hit Garrett in the side of the head with his knee twice shoving Garrett's head into the pavement rendering him unconscious.

Biss handcuffed the unconscious man, replaced his revolver in its holster and called for assistance.

During the scuffle, an unidentified man attempted to call for help on the patrol car radio, but could not remember the location in the excitement.

Biss and Garrett were taken to Antelope Valley Hospital in a patrol car for treatment of minor scrapes and bruises, then Garrett was booked on charges of assault with a deadly weapon on a police officer.

Tinder and Stafford, both seniors at Quartz Hill High School, were riding with Tinder's mother at the time of the incident, and had seen Garrett's erratic driving and were following him to get the car license number, when Biss stopped Garrett's light blue car and the scuffle began.

This morning the two youths and Biss were being interviewed by television and newspaper reporters at Palmdale High School, where both youths are enrolled in summer school courses.

It is expected that portions of the interviews will be seen on this evening's news program on several Los Angeles channels.

"COUNTERBUDGET: A BLUEPRINT FOR CHANGING NATIONAL PRIORITIES 1971-76" AS PROPOSED BY THE NATIONAL URBAN COALITION

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, this spring the National Urban Coalition

made a great contribution to the campaign to reorder priorities in Federal spending with the publication of a historic document—"Counterbudget: A Blueprint For Changing National Priorities 1971-76."

Drawing from a number of expert sources, Editors Robert S. Benson and Harold Wolman, of the National Urban Coalition staff, prepared a 25-chapter discussion of the issues confronting the Nation and how our tax dollars can best be expended to meet our needs.

Because we believe the National Urban Coalition "Counterbudget" is a significant study and deserves to be heard in the national dialog on priorities, 24 other Members of Congress and I joined in inserting the entire document in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like again to call to the attention of my colleagues that the "Counterbudget" appears on pages 16452 to 16504 of the RECORD of May 21, 1971.

As I said in introducing the document:

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, there is no lack of problems in America which we must meet if the American people are to build the kind of free society which the Founding Fathers of this Republic intended. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, these problems cannot always be reduced to politically partisan issues.

I was pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the group inserting the "Counterbudget" proposals was bipartisan—15 Democratic and 10 Republican Members of the House of Representatives.

The Members who each inserted a chapter into the RECORD were:

John Brademas, Democrat of Indiana.
James G. O'Hara, Democrat of Michigan.
F. Bradford Morse, Republican of Massachusetts.
Louis Stokes, Democrat of Ohio.
Martha W. Griffiths, Democrat of Michigan.
Orval Hansen, Republican of Idaho.
Howard W. Robison, Republican of New York.
Thomas L. Ashey, Democrat of Ohio.
William S. Moorhead, Democrat of Pennsylvania.
Edward I. Koch, Democrat of New York.
Fred Schwengel, Republican of Iowa.
Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., Republican of California.
Gilbert Gude, Republican of Maryland.
Charles A. Mosher, Republican of Ohio.
Abner J. Mikva, Democrat of Illinois.
Ogden R. Reid, Republican of New York.
Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Democrat of New York.
Charles W. Whalen, Jr., Republican of Ohio.
Jonathan B. Bingham, Democrat of New York.
Shirley Chisholm, Democrat of New York.
Henry S. Reuss, Democrat of Wisconsin.
Donald W. Riegle, Jr., Republican of Michigan.
James C. Corman, Democrat of California.
Thomas M. Rees, Democrat of California.
Richard Bolling, Democrat of Missouri.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the various Members listed above do not necessarily endorse all of the recommendations included in the "Counterbudget." Rather we inserted the document in its entirety in order to draw attention to the crucial questions it raises in the consideration of national priorities.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include in the RECORD the review of "Counterbudget" which appeared in today's edition of the Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post, July 7, 1971]

BUDGING THE BUDGET, PRYING PRIORITIES

(Counterbudget: A Blueprint for Changing National Priorities, 1971-1976. By The National Urban Coalition. Edited by Robert S. Benson and Harold Wolman. Foreword by Sol M. Linowitz)

(Reviewed by Walter Pincus)

How do you praise a book that should be required reading because it provides the most cogent and thus compelling analysis of the myriad domestic problems facing this country—yet completely fails to accomplish its stated goal of providing a "blueprint for changing national priorities?"

That, frankly, is my problem with "Counterbudget." The National Urban Coalition apparently sees the book, according to the foreword by its chairman, Sol M. Linowitz, as an effort to provide a "new set of national priorities" accompanied by a proposed five-year federal budget that "represents a milestone in the growing national debate over what our priorities should be." The proposed budget may be a milestone, but it is one that hangs around the necks of readers like a millstone.

I believe in following the federal dollar and thus retain great respect for authors who approach the problem of reordering today's America by choosing "the federal budget as our vehicle for examining priorities." I firmly agree with them that "unread as it may be, the federal budget is the single most important instrument for the setting of national priorities."

One also cannot argue with their analysis that "budget allocations are too often determined through what might be called the let's-see-what-we-gave-them-last-year-and-give-them-a-little-more-this-year approach. This practice," the authors continue, "militates against new ideas and tends to preserve programs that may no longer serve their original purposes." They should have added that such an approach also meets the needs of a Congress that has ultimate power but little time to hold extensive hearings, to debate and approve substantial changes in more than a few programs of major significance each year.

"Counterbudget," by eliminating the political realities, takes you from today's governmental situation to Utopia with no explanation of how the country and particularly the Congress will be driven or tempted to get there. Thus the brilliant presentation of today's problems is magically wiped away by the proposed budget that fails to take into consideration the very political process that put us where we are. Take, for example, the chapter on national defense, which calls for a cut in fiscal 1972 defense spending of over \$15 billion. Only last week Sen. William Proxmire's amendment to cut less than \$7 billion was demolished by 40 votes in the Senate—the house of Congress most likely to initiate reductions.

No, the guts of the book—and they are in the impassioned chapter-by-chapter recitation of where this country is domestically—from its troubled schools, hospitals and homes to its failing transportation systems to its farms to its aging system of laws and administration of justice. The detailing of situation after situation, many of which have been buried from public view for years under Vietnam stories, serves as a sharp reminder of how the war has had its effect here at home.

Of particular interest are the analyses of health, education, metropolitan and rural development, and criminal justice.

The summary of health problems, which subsequently are developed at some length, illustrates the breadth of this book's approach and its even-handed yet forceful manner of presentation:

"These problems generally can be summarized under four headings:

"An absence of national health policies out of which goals, objectives and strategies can emerge;

"A shortage of manpower, equipment and facilities;

"An uneven distribution of services; and

"Spiraling medical costs that do not result in increased services."

Responsibility is assigned to "many institutions" including the "private insurance carriers," "hospitals and medical schools" and "the federal government." But in the end, it is the reader—the concerned citizen whose own life has not been troubled by a lack of health facilities and who thus has failed to concern himself with the plight of others—who suddenly feels a new responsibility.

Proposed solutions then pour forth across the pages, but they tend to stimulate thinking rather than persuade acceptance. They also force forward the questions that hang as a cloud over the entire presentation: How much can be changed? Who are the political and bureaucratic principals? How could their support be secured to bring about the basic changes necessary to meet the problems expressed?

In a few pages, "Counterbudget" gives a tough criticism of the present patchwork of programs that govern what is called the federal government's farm policy. Price supports are "poorly suited for easing the economic hardship of low-income farmers—the richest 10 per cent of all farmers receive more than 50 per cent of price support payments." The book describes land diversion, or payments for taking farmland out of production, as "analogous to balling water from a boat in preference to fixing a leak." Three programs that cost the taxpayers over \$750 million are deftly chopped up as having "outgrown or subverted their original purposes and now aggravate the agricultural capacity problem."

This chapter, in particular, cries out for the political input. For agriculture policy is a captive of Congress and it is to the men on the Hill, particularly Reps. Jamie Whitten, (D-Miss.) and W. R. Poage (D-Tex), with their hammerlock hold on agricultural legislation and appropriations that one must look for change—or lack of it.

There are limitations—or gaps—in some analyses. Though the authors come down hard against subsidies for transportation services that "benefit specific groups—particularly higher-income groups," they never detail today's \$1.6 billion in federal aid to aviation. Furthermore, their projection of that aid in 1976 rises to \$3 billion, again with no explanation of where the money should go or why.

The weaknesses in presentation are, however, minimal and the overall effect of a concentrated reading is either depression at the state we are in or determination to help make it better—or both.

We have always been a society of study groups, academic research efforts, foundation grant projects, congressional investigations and Presidential blue ribbon commissions. Thus it is not surprising that today, when the country finds itself in trouble abroad and at home, these institutions uniformly have turned to inquire into the problems seen developing. The result is a weighty steady flow of speeches, pamphlets, reports, books and even series of books. "Counterbudget" is clearly one of these—but one worth reading.

One would hope that the Urban Coalition now turn its funds and its personnel toward the challenging job of determining how we take the steps toward the utopia they have seen. Today's America, as seen in "Counterbudget," suggests we have not too much time for study.

NOTE.—The reviewer was chief investigator for the Symington Subcommittee inquiry into American military commitments

abroad and their influence on foreign policy and recently reviewed the Federal Budget for this newspaper. A former investigative reporter for The Washington Post and Washington Evening Star, he is now organizing a national daily newspaper, The Morning News.

GENERAL THOMAS WHITE TROPHY AWARDED TO IGOR SIKORSKY

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Air Force this year awarded to Igor Sikorsky the General Thomas White Trophy. It was in recognition of Mr. Sikorsky's great contributions to aviation probably as great as any living man. After the presentation Mr. Sikorsky delivered a wonderful résumé of his life in aviation accompanied with slides. It is impossible to use the slides in the RECORD but the words should be there for history to remember.

I ask unanimous consent that this outstanding résumé by Mr. Sikorsky be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

RECOLLECTIONS OF A PIONEER

This audience, which it is my honor and privilege to address, includes many who are better informed on the history and the present development of aviation than I am. However, there were very few left who lived and worked in those dramatic, pioneering years of aviation. Therefore, it is not as an historian but rather as a witness and participant, that I speak to you.

By way of introduction, it is interesting to me to speculate why man, who dreamed of flying for literally thousands of years, certainly experimented for hundreds, only flew successfully in this century. At least three types of "aircraft" could have been built and flown 2 to 4 thousand years ago. These are the hot air balloon, the large mancarrying kite, and the glider. Excellent craftsmen, capable of sophisticated work in wood and fabric, lived in Greece, Rome and Egypt. However, the time was not yet ripe. Man could dream of flying, but could not progress beyond legends and fairy tales.

Two centuries ago, in June 1783, the Montgolfiere hot air balloon appeared. In November, only five months later, Pilatre and D'Arlandes became the first human beings (that we know of) to fly. Though balloons were steadily perfected since then, inherent limitations, such as complete dependence on wind, made practical transportation a hit-or-miss affair at best.

Then, at the end of the last century, driven by some force or intuition, a few isolated pioneers began to approach the problem of heavier-than-air flight in a scientific manner. Though there are many others, three names seem particularly important to me. . . .

The Frenchman Clement Ader, who was, in my opinion, the first man who actually lifted briefly, for seconds, from the ground in a mechanically-powered flying machine.

Shortly afterwards, the Englishman Hiram Maxim also left the ground in a huge steam-driven aeroplane.

However, both these aircraft were hopelessly, uncontrollable and incapable of true flight.

Otto Lilienthal of Germany approached the problem in a different manner. He first ex-

permented with gliders, and taught himself piloting at the same time. He made over 2,000 flights before his death in a crash in August of 1896. His brilliant work stimulated many men, among them a young French army officer and two brothers building bicycles in Ohio.

Despite this, the century ended with the great majority of scientists convinced that flying would forever remain an impossible dream. At that time, 11 years old, I was told that man had not yet reached the North or South Pole (but probably would); no-one had climbed Mt. Everest (and probably never would) and no-one had successfully flown (and very definitely never would).

At the turn of the century, the Wright Brothers started serious experiments. After only four short intense years of work, they made their first flight on December 17, 1903. Now why was it that the Wright Brothers succeeded where so many had failed before them?

Probably, because they were the first pioneers (with Lilienthal) to realize that building a successful flying machine was only part of the problem . . . learning how to fly it was an equally great challenge.

Therefore, the correct approach by way of gliders. Equally important, the primitive gliders would not have been successful without optimum gliding conditions during the difficult training phase. The Wrights realized this, and after considerable research, found the proper combination in Kitty Hawk, North Carolina, with its desolate, rolling hills and reasonably strong, uniform winds. And just as many of us admire the natural wonders of the world and give them names (such as the Natural Bridge in Virginia) I would refer to Kitty Hawk as the "natural wind tunnel", because that's exactly what it is.

Their work showed very practical thinking and brilliant compromises. For instance, they placed the pilot in a prone position, to reduce air-resistance. To reduce weight, they left their wheels on the ground. Now, every practical engineer knows that one can cross a belt but that one should not cross a chain. It is wrong to cross a chain, and the Wright Brothers, with years of experience as bicycle mechanics, knew this better than anyone else. But, they crossed the chain, eliminated torque and made their successful flight.

However, even after the first news of the flights, many considered aviation impossible. A prominent American newspaper dismissed the first news of the Wright Brothers flights with the following statement "When a man of profound scientific wisdom has demonstrated with unassailable logic why man could not fly, why should the public be fooled by silly stories about two obscure bicycle repair men, who have not even been to college . . ."

Reports of their work began to reach Europe and France, birthplace of the balloon, became the center of European aviation. A young French officer, Captain Ferdinand Ferber, has visited Lilienthal before his death. Ferber began constructing gliders and testing them. His enthusiasm stimulated others; when rumors of the Wright brothers flight reached France, they generated a new wave of experiments.

In September 1906, a wealthy Brazilian named Santos Dumont, living in Paris, made the first "flight" in Europe . . . a hop of 80 feet (25 meters). In November, he made a 21-second flight that covered flights of over 1/2 hours' duration in Ohio . . . but avoiding all publicity.

In 1907, the Voison brothers built two identical airplanes . . . one for an art student turned racing driver named Henri Farman, the other for his friend, a sculptor named Leon Delagrang. These two began to make "hops"; by November Farman has succeeded in keeping his modified Voison in the air for one minute fourteen seconds; in January of 1908, he won a 50,000 fr. prize by

staying one minute 43 seconds in the air while flying a one-kilometer distance.

Then, in August of 1908, Wilbur started demonstrating the Wright "flier" at Le Mans France. The first flights were a sensation . . . a sensation that continued as Wilbur began carrying passengers, making flights of one hour and more. An amazed and enthusiastic world recognized their unchallenged technical knowledge . . . and piloting experience. From August to December, Wilbur flew over 26 hours and carried some 60 passengers. A number of flights were of one or more hours' endurance; in September he established a record of 1 hour 31 min.

That summer, I was vacationing with my father in the Alps. I had always been interested in aviation, especially after a dream I had at the age of twelve. In this dream, I saw myself walking down a passage way, walking slowly over an attractive carpet, I felt a slight vibration under my feet, but different from a ship or train. Just as I reached the end of the corridor I suddenly realized that I was in a flying machine, and woke up, the dream crystal-clear in my mind.

This dream so impressed me that when I saw the articles and photographs describing Wilbur Wright's first flights in France, I made the immediate decision that somehow, someday I must fly. I was, at that time, 19 years old.

I determined to build a helicopter, but soon realized that I needed practical know-how. My main occupation then became that of convincing my family to send me to Paris to study aviation. Paris had a "doubtful" reputation; friends warned that a nineteen-year old boy in Paris with a fair sum of money in his pockets was a very risky proposition. They said that I would no doubt return with a number of interesting experiences—but few of them connected with aviation. However, my parents gave their permission, and I came to Paris in January of 1909.

Paris was then the aeronautical center of the world. However, aeronautics was neither an industry nor a science . . . Too little was known. Aeronautics was an "art" and a "passion" . . .

And to many, a miracle. At Juvisy and Issy, dozens of weird and wonderful airplanes were being built. Luckily for their pilots, most of these aircraft, never got off the ground. Others could not rise more than a foot or so . . . and flew short hops (measured in seconds) across the field. However, even the brief, unsteady flights were deeply impressive. Many times I observed expressions of exultation and tears in the eyes of witnesses, who, for the first time, watched a flying machine carrying a man in the air.

About the same time began the period that I like to call the "era of engineering impossibilities". Wise and respected scientists began to prove conclusively a number of facts such as . . .

It would be impossible to fly aircraft heavier than one ton,

Impossible to build aircraft with more than one engine,

Impossible to fly any significant altitude or distance, such as over the Alps or across the Mediterranean,

Impossible to equal speeds already reached by a number of racing cars and trains.

In Paris, I met Captain Ferber who gave me valuable advice and inspiration. He advised against the construction of a helicopter, insisting that fixed wing aircraft were the logical way to go. Ferber recommended an aviation "school" at Juvisy, where he was one of the instructors. It was an extraordinary school, no text-books, no examinations . . . not even a program. I would compare it to the discussion schools of the ancient Greek philosophers! On one hand, a small group of students eager to learn something about a

subject of burning interest to them, about which at that time there existed no science, no reliable books and frighteningly little practical information. On the other hand, a few men, including Captain Ferber, who *did* know something and were willing to talk about it. The students would assemble, on the field or in a hangar, gather around one of teachers and listen to whatever he would be willing to talk about.

We watched every second of every flight we could, no matter how short, and learned much from the landings.

I determined to buy a motor to take back to Russia. I asked an experienced pilot: "What is a good aero engine?" He answered: "There is no good aircraft engine." I continued: "Well, what is the least bad engine?" His answer was: "Probably the Anzani, because it has the least number of parts. Thus, even if every part is bad, it will at least have a lesser number of bad parts."

I remember purchasing a 15-horsepower engine at the Anzani factory (a large organization of 35 workers) and meeting another client who was just purchasing a similar engine. This man, Louis Bleriot, was becoming well known in Europe as a designer of a new increasingly successful family of monoplanes.

In May, I returned to Russia, with Captain Ferber's motto ringing in my ears "to design an airplane is nothing . . . to construct it is very little . . . to make it fly is everything."

Despite Ferber's advice, my first project was my first love . . . the helicopter. Powered by the 15-hp. Anzani, it demonstrated many of the characteristics of the modern helicopter; it cost much money, made a great deal of noise, and much vibration. It had one minor technical problem . . . it would not fly . . . but otherwise it was a good helicopter.

That summer, aviation was attacking one of the great "impossibilities" . . . flight across the English channel. On July 19th Hubert Latham was the first to try. This chain-smoker, it was said, had been told by his doctors that he had only one year to live, and took up flying to live it fully. Shortly after leaving France, the engine of his Antoinette stopped. He ditched, 5 miles out, and was rescued.

Then, during the night of July 24-25 Louis Bleriot, unable to sleep because of pain from a leg injured in a previous accident, realized that the weather was improving enough to try the flight. At dawn, July 25, he took off. Flying by pure guess, for he had no compass or other navigation instruments, he flew across the channel and landed in triumph at Dover. His flight created headlines around the world and won him a firm place as one of great pioneers of aviation. He received orders for over 100 of his aircraft in the next two weeks . . .

One week later, Latham tried again, and made it to within two miles of the English coast before his engine quit. Again, he was fished out of the water, still smoking his "permanent" cigarette. Latham went on to fly the Antoinette all over Europe, becoming quite famous. After outliving some of his doctors, he was killed . . . big-game hunting in Africa.

(The next crossing of the channel was one year later again a Bleriot, flown by Jacques Delesseps, son of the man who "dug" the Suez Canal!)

In September, Captain Ferber died when his Voisin Pusher aeroplane ran across a small ditch while landing. The gear collapsed, the rear-mounted engine tore loose and crushed him. His last words as he died moments later, were ". . . quel stupide accident!" ". . . what a silly accident!". It was this tragedy that convinced me to design my future aircraft as a tractor aircraft; that is, with the engine mounted in front of the pilot. This decision probably saved my life in a number of later crashes.

In October, I returned to Paris for a few months, saw the flight of Count De Lambert on October 18, 1909. He took off from Juvisy, flew over the city of Paris, circled the Eiffel Tower and returned. During his flight he reached the incredible altitude of 1,300 feet, all Paris was mad with enthusiasm; it was the first time an airplane had flown over the city.

I remember a debate in a Paris magazine entitled: "Is Flying Dangerous." I read Leon Delagrangé's article insisting that flying was dangerous and Bleriot's answering to the effect that flying was not. Delagrangé (who insisted flying was dangerous) died in a crash two months later; in January of 1910. Bleriot lived to a ripe old age.

That winter I built my second helicopter, which proved unsuccessful and I temporarily postponed further experiments, little knowing that my "temporary postponement" would last nearly 30 years.

My first airplane, built that same winter, rolled along the ground rather well . . . but that was all it did well. My second aircraft, the S-2, could make very short hops lasting a few seconds. It had fairly unique control characteristics. If you pulled back the stick a little bit, it would go up. If you pulled the stick back a little bit more, it would go down; if you pushed the stick forward, it would also go down.

I crashed and rebuilt the S-2, S-3 and S-4 in rapid succession. Fortunately, none of these aircraft could fly very well, but I did become expert at rolling on the ground at impressive speeds and tried to learn to control them during the very short hops they made. I might add that I had never been in the air, even as a passenger, until my first hops in the S-2. This was the case with all the early pioneers, who built an aircraft without knowing how to build it, and then climbed into the cockpit and tried to fly it, without knowing how to fly.

We were learning by trial and error, by triumph and tragedy. Chavez, the first pilot to fly across the Alps, in September 1910, was just about to land in Domodossola to a hero's welcome, when his aeroplane was caught in a sharp downdraft or gust! His wings failed downwards, and he crashed to his death. This catastrophe proved the necessity of introducing reverse load factors in the airplane . . . negative G was not known before.

In those days, I would estimate there was about one fatality for every 2,000 miles of flight and probably two to three crashes for every 100 miles. In other words, the average pilot could expect approximately one serious crash per flying hour, and only the exceptional pilot survived more than fifty flying hours before killing himself!

Much of the design and flight knowledge that is now taken for granted was then unknown.

Thus, misfortunes of another nature became numerous. Multitudes of inventors became convinced that they had invented an outstanding flying machine. They mistook uncontrolled imagination for creative intuition. When warned of obvious errors, they replied with confidence that all great inventions had been scoffed at. They would spend their lives' savings, mortgage their homes and borrow to the limit, in order to construct a total failure. A series of tragedies and ruined fortunes were left on the road of aviation progress!

In 1911, one year, four aircraft and innumerable crashes later, the S-5 was a success and I began to gather flying experience. After a series of increasingly successful aircraft (such as the S-6) I became associated with the Russian-Baltic Railroad Car Company, and convinced them to build a large four-engined airplane.

Many obstacles were mentioned: First, no four-motored aircraft had ever flown, despite several attempts in the past and many aviation authorities could prove conclusively (on paper) that a large aircraft would never fly.

Lacking scientific data, I was guided by intuition and insisted on the more difficult solution of building a biplane of extremely high (for that time) aspect ratio. Here, I had little scientific data to draw upon, but somehow felt that this was the right course. In retrospect, there is no doubt that any other solution would have been a failure.

I made the first flight in the late evening of May 13, 1913. It was the first successful four-motored aircraft in the history of aviation, it weighed some 9,000 lbs. (4 tons), and flew at approximately 65 miles an hour. In fact, it took off at 65, flew at 65 and landed at 65!

It was also the first aircraft to have an enclosed pilots and passenger cabin, which again violated a number of long-standing aviation taboos. In passing, however, I would like to deny one rumor, to the effect that I tested the structure for strength by placing a chicken between the struts and wires and timing how long it took it to get out. The active life of the grand turned out to be just over four months and included a 25-mile cross-country to an army airfield where it was inspected by the czar.

The experience gained in the "grand" permitted the construction of a larger and more successful airplane called the "Ilya Mouronetz". It first flew in January, 1914. In the following six months, it established a number of world records. On one flight carrying sixteen persons. To prove the safety of the multi-motor concept, a motor would often be shut down in flight, then the mechanics would climb out of the wings and change the spark plugs as a demonstration.

In late June, the aircraft made a cross-country flight from St. Petersburg to Kiev, a distance of over 800 miles. A number of stimulating incidents occurred, including an engine fire in mid-air (put out by two men climbing out on the wings and beating out the flames with their coats). The aircraft continued flight on the remaining three engines and averted disaster.

Two weeks after my return flight from Kiev, World War I started. The Russian Government ordered the aircraft into production as a heavy bomber. Constant improvements in performance were made during the war years. To my knowledge, it was the first aircraft to fire a 37 mm. cannon in flight; and the first aircraft to have a tail gunner's position. Over a hundred of these aircraft were built; only one was shot down by enemy fighters. Many however, fought their way to their targets and back, riddled with holes. One bomber was so badly damaged by flak that the wires supporting the reverse load for the aircraft were shot away. The bomber limped home to a safe landing and as it rolled to a stop the wing, deprived of lift, slowly collapsed.

After the Communist revolution in 1917, I emigrated to France, and then travelled by ship across the North Atlantic to the United States. This ocean had already begun to challenge the imagination during the war. However, many qualified technicians kept repeating that successful transatlantic flight could only be accomplished by the dirigible, if at all.

In May of 1919, a United States Navy NC-4 seaplane, was the first aircraft to cross the Atlantic to Europe, but with refueling stops en route. Then, on June 14, 1919, the British team of Alcock and Brown made the first non-stop flight across the Atlantic. Starting from Newfoundland and landing in Ireland, their 1960-mile flight dramatically shattered yet another "Aviation Taboo."

My work in America started under extremely difficult conditions. Following World War I, military aviation was virtually discontinued and commercial flying was yet to come. However, I organized a company with \$800 in cash and \$2,000 in questionable subscriptions. Our first airplane, known as the S-29A, proved a success. After I finished test-flying it, we

were able to earn a few dollars now and then on charter work. Eventually, we sold it to Roscoe Turner, who flew it extensively for numerous charter and advertising contracts, he was so busy in so many different places that people thought he owned a whole fleet of S-29's.

He then sold it to Howard Hughes, who disguised it as a German bomber and deliberately crashed in his famous aviation movie, "Hell's Angels".

With enormous difficulties the Sikorsky Aero Engineering Corporation constructed a small number of other designs through 1927. It was this period in America that inspired one person to say, "The greatest danger in aviation today . . . is starvation". It was a fact that many of us only really ate well when invited to a banquet as an after-dinner speaker.

Then in May 1927, Charles Lindbergh made his dramatic solo flight across the Atlantic. The brilliant flight was a milestone because it was not merely another attempt to fly across the ocean, but a take-off from a specific point and a non-stop flight to a specific, predetermined airfield in Europe. This flight ended what, I believe, was the pioneering age and opened a new era. The world, and particularly America, became "aviation-minded" overnight.

Other successful aircraft were produced by our company among them the twin-engined S-38 amphibian which flew throughout South America, Hawaii and many other corners of the world. The unusual configuration of the S-38 earned it a variety of descriptions, one of which was "a collection of aviation spare parts flying in close formation". Over 100 were built, which was a huge production run in those days.

In 1929, the Sikorsky Aviation Corporation became, first, a subsidiary and later a Division of the United Aircraft Corporation. With their backing and support, the development of large flying boats and later the helicopter was successfully carried out.

In the fall of 1931, Sikorsky Aircraft delivered the first four-engined flying boat to Pan American Airways. On the formal acceptance, with Pan Am pilots in command, I had no duties and enjoyed the flight. As the sun sank below the horizon, I walked back from the cockpit into the darkening passenger cabins, then stopped, surprised. The lighting, the corridor, the vibration . . . all was disturbingly familiar. Then, suddenly, I realized that this was exactly the cabin I had seen in my boyhood dream, 31 years before.

Later came the S-42, which established several world records; then pioneered trans-ocean routes to Asia, and in 1937, began commercial trans-Atlantic service.

The last of the Sikorsky flying boat types was the S-44, several of which made non-stop flights across the Atlantic during World War II. For several years one held the blue ribbon for the fastest seaplane trans-Atlantic crossing, 14 hrs. 17 minutes. One of these aircraft is still flying today in the Virgin Islands.

The 1930's were marked by increasing attention to rotary-wing aircraft. One of the great pioneers was Juan de La Cierva, who developed the autogyro in 1923. In creating this machine, he perfected the flexible, rotating, wing, later used by the helicopter and was first to prove that autorotation was possible.

A number of helicopters were attempted; Pescara and D'Ascanio were moderately successful; Breguet's successes were greater still.

However, in my opinion, the first real success belongs to Dr. Henrich Focke, who, between 1937 and 1939, created a helicopter which flew to 11,000 ft., made power-off landings from various altitudes and was flown inside an exhibition hall. This prototype was followed by a considerably larger helicopter,

which, however, was just starting production as the war ended.

In the mid-thirties, I also returned to my first interest—the helicopter. In early 1939, (after four years of design studies) we built a prototype, the VS-300. It was a very challenging problem, and a most interesting chance to live one's life again; to conceive a new type of aircraft, to build it without really knowing how to build it and then to climb into the cockpit and test-fly the machine without really knowing how to fly it.

The first tentative hop was made on September 14, 1939. Control and stability were serious problems. The first motion pictures of the helicopter showed such an unstable machine that we never showed the films, except in slow motion, which slowed the darting movements to a graceful weaving and bobbing.

We experimented with a variety of configurations including two, three and four-rotor combinations. After one of our early demonstrations to a few guests, one of them asked me "Mr. Sikorsky, it's a remarkable machine. It hovers, flies sideways and even backwards. But I haven't seen it fly forward". I was forced to answer: "... Yes... forward flight is a minor technical problem we have not solved yet".

However, by steady, patient work we solved the problems and began to fly satisfactorily, and by May of 1941 were able to establish a number of world records for the helicopter.

The subsequent development of the helicopter, and recent achievements, are too well known to be discussed here in detail. However, one highlight will always remain of interest to me...

Almost from the start, the helicopter proved its unique talents for the saving of human lives, and in its short life to date, has saved well over half a million people. Many of these rescues required brilliant piloting and a high degree of heroism. We, in the helicopter industry, are very proud of these pilots, and humbly grateful to them for the skill and courage they are demonstrating day and night, around the world.

Today, the conventional helicopter has become a valuable tool and is being used around the world. The helicopter, and particularly the crane, is helping to move and supply remote drill rigs, is building transmission towers across inaccessible terrain and literally carrying houses from one site to the other. Quite simply, it will allow man to live and work in areas that were virtually inaccessible before the helicopter.

In the near future, a significant improvement in helicopter cruising speeds may be predicted by the introduction of compound helicopters. This concept would permit the development of 80-passenger helicopters, cruising at 250 to 300 knots for distances of several hundred miles.

In this address I have mentioned traveling above the surface of our planet. Recently, yet another of those great "impossibilities" has been successfully realized by men leaving the earth; first by short hops into orbit. Just as we hopped into the air during the birth of aviation... then recently successfully traveling to the moon, and finally stepping on its surface.

It is my personal conviction that our solar system contains no other intelligent life, except for that on the earth. Therefore, while other planets or satellites could be visited, such visits would be made only in the interest of furthering scientific study by earthly men.

However, I am equally convinced that intelligent life must and does exist in many, many other places throughout this magnificent universe.

I also venture to make the totally heretical statement, from the standpoint of modern science, that the velocity of light is not the upper limit of speed. Much greater velocities

can exist in the universe even though we have never observed them and cannot imagine them. Nevertheless, for man-kind, even the velocity of light is out of the question for travel, at least into the foreseeable future.

I am aware of the dangers of making scientific predictions, since I have made a few myself in my career. In general, my conservative forecasts proved to be more often wrong than the optimistic or extravagant ones. After all, while a boy, I was told that man would fly... recently, I had the honor of meeting the first man to have walked on the moon.

To participate in the birth of aviation has been a challenging and satisfying profession. The memories of the pioneers and their machines are still vivid in my mind today.

Perhaps the greatest truth that these pioneers have given me is to appreciate the importance of free work performed by free men. Now, once a man creates an idea, the development and mass production requires large organized groups of men, working to some common objective. Nuclear power and space travel to mention two fields, could not have become realities without it. Nevertheless, as the initiator, it is the man who is the greatest and most important element and in order to do the job and to do it right, he must have freedom—freedom of initiative, freedom of choice, freedom of work and freedom of thought.

That is where all progress starts.

RESULTS OF CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE SUBMITTED BY RESIDENTS OF EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF OHIO

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, residents of the Eighth Congressional District of Ohio have responded in overwhelming numbers to a questionnaire which I circulated this spring. Approximately 25,000 completed questionnaires have been returned to my office and these were recently tabulated. Actually, the number of participants in this poll could run as high as 40,000 because the questionnaire form contained an answering space for only one respondent, and in many cases the form was signed by both husband and wife. In fact, I received one form signed by 12 people.

As in the case of any public opinion poll, the sampling may not necessarily reflect the attitude of the eight district. Nevertheless, on the basis of opinions expressed in accompanying letters and comments to the questionnaire as well as my personal conversations with constituents, I believe the answers are representative. One thing is for certain: Ohioans are vitally concerned about the issues of the day, because over 2,500 questionnaires were returned with letters.

Mr. Speaker, after several weeks of tabulating, the results are complete, and I would like to bring them to the attention of my colleagues and the Nation. I am also sending a copy of the results to the President. At this point in my remarks I include the questions and answers. The answers are on a percentage basis.

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you approve revenue sharing of Federal funds by direct payment to States and local governments without Federal control?	51.6	42.6	5.8
2. Should persons who voluntarily strike be entitled to food stamps?	13.2	85.5	1.3
3. Would you favor a federally controlled program of national health insurance financed by increased social security taxes and other Federal taxes?	26.2	69.1	4.7
4. Should the President have additional authority to control strikes in the transportation industry?	70.1	27.7	2.2
5. Do you believe in limiting foreign imports if they are found to unduly hurt American industry and jobs?	85.8	11.4	2.8
6. Do you approve of the present administration of welfare programs?	5.8	90.2	4.0
7. Do you favor lowering the voting age to 18 years?	38.6	59.6	1.8
8. Which of the following best indicates your position toward the Vietnam war?			
(a) Gradual withdrawal	39.3		2.0
(b) Firm date for complete withdrawal	18.5		
(c) Immediate withdrawal	16.4		
(d) Resume bombing of North Vietnam and attempt a military victory	23.8		
9. What policy should the United States take in regard to the Israeli-Arab dispute in the Middle East?			
(a) Furnish arms to Israel	26.7		2.1
(b) Active military support to Israel	1.9		
(c) More friendly to Arab nations	3.4		
(d) Hands off	65.9		
10. Please indicate in order of priority steps you feel should be taken to combat inflation.			
(a) Reduce Federal domestic spending			3
(b) Reduce military spending			4
(c) Reduce space spending			2
(d) Reduce foreign aid			1
(e) Wage and price controls			5
(f) Increase taxes			6

Mr. Speaker, as might be expected, the war in Southeast Asia was the dominant topic in the area of foreign affairs in those questionnaires which contained additional comments or letters. A principal reason for this was the Calley decision which was handed down just after the questionnaire was mailed. However, two areas of domestic concern—welfare reform and inflation—occupied the greater percentage of those added comments. This was, to a large degree, I believe, because the questionnaire coincided with income tax time. The Ohio General Assembly is debating a State income tax proposal and many Ohio counties recently increased real estate taxes, so spending at all levels of government prompted a flood of criticism from my constituents.

Obviously, every national issue cannot be covered in a questionnaire. For this reason, I try to vary the questions from year to year, except on the Vietnam war and the state of the economy. Then, too, the attitudes of people also vary in different areas of the country but I think you can get a good cross-section of opinion in the Eighth Congressional District of Ohio. For this reason I want to discuss each question separately in order to give a clearer perspective to the responses.

First—Revenue Sharing. The questionnaire indicated that many people are not certain what revenue sharing is all about. On this question the undecided tally was 5.8 percent, which was by far the largest undecided response to any question.

I found no widespread opposition to revenue sharing as a concept; however, numerous respondents felt that the funds to be shared had no business in Washington in the first place. As a fiscal conservative, I support this view. Nevertheless, as a practical matter, once various government spending programs are inaugurated, one of the most difficult tasks imaginable is to rescind them or even to curtail them. Even if a program has merit, often it is so entangled in the Federal bureaucracy that the intended beneficiaries are totally frustrated in their attempts to get assistance.

Of course, I feel that Congress must share the blame for this problem, because too often Congress agrees to create various grant-in-aid programs without first seeking to consolidate those in existence. Bureaucracy only perpetuates itself when additional programs are launched to supplement those already in existence whose performance fell short of expectations. Certainly, nothing is more infuriating than to have a locality apply for a grant, discover that there are untold programs in numerous agencies with provisions that might be applicable for eligibility and then be turned down on some bureaucratic technicality.

I have seen no evidence that the Federal Government would be superior to States and localities in administering grant programs. On the contrary, confusion, duplication, and overlap are the rule rather than the exception in Federal administration of grant programs, and in some instances, administrative costs are greater than the actual funds distributed.

Quite frankly, I am so opposed to an unnecessary and excessive bureaucracy that I feel any opportunity to bypass it is in the public interest. With revenue sharing we can make a stab in this direction and when I discuss this aspect of revenue sharing with those who are either uncommitted or downright skeptical, I find that interest in the program increases and opposition diminishes.

Second—Food Stamps for Strikers. There was absolutely no doubt how my constituents felt on this issue. Not only did 85.5 percent vote "no" on food stamps for those who strike, but this question had the lowest uncommitted vote—just 1.3 percent.

Now, I do not interpret this vote as being hostile toward union employees. In fact, many union workers wrote to express their opposition to the handing out of food stamps to strikers. Rather, the vote was a resounding indictment of the entire food stamp program, which the average person intensely dislikes. The wage earner with no food stamp supplement can get pretty wrought up about this program when he goes through the checkout counter of the supermarket with his wife and observes the person in front of him using food stamps to pay for steak when he can only look forward to ground beef for dinner.

Rarely, if ever, has a Federal program been so fraught with mismanagement and corruptive practices as in the case of food stamps. In most cases of Government scandal, people only see it through the eyes of the news media, but food stamps are an everyday proposition and people actually witness the abuses.

The basic disagreement does not seem to be with the food stamp program per se. I find little, if any, views that might be construed as a callous disregard for the plight of those who are victims of misfortune. In areas where malnutrition exists as a result of extreme poverty and ignorance, the issuance of food stamps can certainly be justified. But, I believe my constituents are saying that the program should not be used as a tool to perpetuate a strike or to enhance the publicity of a politician, especially since the program is financed by the taxpayers.

Food stamps for strikers did not begin until after 1968. It is interesting to note that the number of persons receiving food stamps grew from 3.34 million in 1968 to 7.17 million in 1970. The number of persons receiving food stamps in January, 1971 was a whopping 157 percent above the total for the preceding January. These percentages are alarming, and it is evident that that is the feeling of most of my constituents.

Third—National Health Insurance. Despite a great deal of fanfare and political rhetoric extolling the virtues of a government-controlled national health insurance program, the voters in my area of the country are opposed to such a scheme because they realize how much it would cost the American taxpayer.

So often when arguments are made for passage of the so-called Health Security Act under which the Federal Government would take over virtually all U.S. health care, there is rarely a corresponding explanation by its advocates as to how such a program would be financed. This is why my question stated: "Would you favor a federally controlled program of national health insurance financed by increased social security taxes and other Federal taxes?" The Social Security Administration estimates that the cost of the much publicized plan would be \$77 billion by 1974. This would mean that the payroll tax base on social security would rise to \$15,000. I'm hearing from a lot of young people these days about social security and they are unalterably opposed to increasing the base.

Everyone recognizes that we are rapidly approaching a health care crisis in this country, but Congress is challenged to come up with a health plan that is fiscally solvent. In doing so, I feel it is necessary to utilize every possible resource of the private sector in conjunction with the Federal Government. Emphasis must be directed at prevention of illness in addition to caring for those who are ill.

People in our rural areas are greatly concerned over the shortage of doctors and trained medical personnel in smaller communities. There are many communities in America in the 5,000 population class that do not have a physician. There are other concerns too, such as providing more extensive systems of emergency medical transportation, updating health care facilities, and improving the administration of health care resources. These and numerous other points were mentioned by my constituents and they are looking to Congress for solutions. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I recognize that the solutions

will not come easy as we prepare to hold hearings on the various health proposals that have been offered.

Fourth—Emergency Strike Legislation. While just over 70 percent of those who responded felt that the President should be given additional authority to control strikes in the transportation industry, there is a possibility that the percentage would have been higher inasmuch as about two-thirds of the questionnaires had been returned by May 17, the day approximately 13,000 members of the Brotherhood of Railway Signalmen struck the Nation's major railroads.

Like my constituents, I feel that we have got to find a permanent method of responding to emergency strikes or lock-outs. It seems to me that we are not meeting the needs of the public when Congress must pass special legislation every time we have a strike in the transportation industry. Since 1963, Congress has been forced to rush through five stopgap measures to deal with railroad strikes alone. It has been almost 1½ years since President Nixon recommended legislation in this crisis area and Congress alone is to be blamed for failure to enact permanent strike legislation.

Fifth—Limiting Imports. Foreign imports have had a particularly devastating effect on industries in my congressional district and when cheap, low-wage imports hit American jobs, we should expect to hear from our workers. Over 85 percent of the respondents feel that imports should be controlled if they are hurting American industry and jobs and I agree completely.

Unfortunately, the whole concept of free trade has been abused by our trading partners in recent years. The truth of the matter is that every other country in the world is protectionist-oriented except the United States and I think the majority of the American people believe the time has come for Congress to act to protect American industry, labor and American institutions until other nations remove some of the nontariff or artificial barriers against our exports. The loss of jobs for American workers, an increase in the balance-of-payments deficit and the dependence of our national defense upon the friendliness of foreign nations are all results of topheavy imports.

Sixth—Welfare Reform. I asked a very simple and direct question about welfare in the hope that it would generate some additional comments. Quite frankly, we weren't prepared for the avalanche of observations in connection with welfare. For every letter written in regard to Vietnam, we received three concerning the need for welfare reform. As expected, only about 6 percent of the respondents were satisfied with the present administration of welfare.

Subsequent to the final tabulation of the questionnaire the House passed H.R. 1 with the welfare reform provision intact. While I supported the FAP section, I have not argued that it will be a panacea for the welfare problems that beset us. Nevertheless, unless Congress takes positive action, the present system of unrestricted, unruly, and unproductive welfare is a threat to our very economic system.

Seventh—Eighteen Year Old Vote. This issue was the real sleeper in the poll. Quite frankly, I thought that the response would be about evenly divided, but almost 60 percent of the respondents said that they did not favor lowering the voting age to 18, and I received a great many additional letters to this effect. There is no doubt that the wave of anti-everything demonstrations on the part of a small minority of misguided young people has hurt the image of our youth, the overwhelming majority of whom are law abiding, patriotic and dedicated Americans. This is a real tragedy, and unfortunately the national news media has done precious little to help correct this error.

Eighth—Vietnam. There are almost as many varied opinions on the subject of Vietnam as there are people willing to discuss the issue. For this reason, I asked a multiple-choice question that reflected the four most prominent views of the war and how best to achieve disengagement. Interestingly enough, 23.8 percent felt that we should resume the bombing in North Vietnam and attempt a military victory.

The majority of those who favored immediate withdrawal, according to their added comments, were not dovish toward the war but simply frustrated that everything had not been done militarily to achieve victory. I suppose the closest thing to a dove position would be the selection of a choice of a firm date for complete withdrawal, and here again, many people chose this because of their view that a military victory would not be attempted. The largest vote—39.3 percent—was in favor of gradual withdrawal, or the President's program.

Any number of factors that have occurred this year, such as the Calley case, the Laos incursion, withdrawal resolutions, et cetera, no doubt influenced the vote on this question. Nevertheless, one thing stands out in my mind, the overwhelming majority of my constituents are not impressed with the continuous, carping criticism of the President by some well-known individuals and organizations. It is significant to note that both the democrat and republican leadership in the House have displayed bipartisan support for the President's withdrawal program, and I think people appreciate and applaud this show of unity.

Ninth—Israeli-Arab Dispute. Here again, I posed a multiple-choice question. There is no doubt that the long, bitter experience in Vietnam has left people with a hardened view toward involvement in other disputes. Almost two-thirds of the respondents said hands off in regard to the Middle East. As a part of this question, I wanted to get an idea of how many people would be willing to give active military support to Israel, and only 1.9 percent replied in the affirmative. This indicates how people feel about committing American fighting men to this conflict.

Tenth—Controlling Inflation. Inflation remains a major problem for the U.S. economy and the questionnaire was a good indication of how acutely aware the public is of this problem. This is al-

ways a difficult question to ask, because so many factors enter into the inflation control picture. Thus, I suggested six steps that could be used to control inflation and requested that they be listed in order of priority.

There was little, if any, element of surprise in this question. Despite a great hue and cry from some quarters in society that military spending should be drastically reduced or even eliminated, my constituents feel that a reduction in Federal domestic spending is preferable to reducing military appropriations. However, a reduction in spending for most Federal programs, even the military, should be undertaken, according to my constituency.

While there have been some hopeful signs that inflation is being curbed and overall economic growth is on the upswing, it is evident that the ordinary citizen is not convinced. Significantly, I find most of the ire for this situation directed at Congress. There is widespread dissatisfaction with the salary increase voted for Members of Congress and I find that people are incensed over useless unnecessary items in the budget, especially funding for the Office of Economic Opportunity and other controversial programs. As usual, the housewife feels the burden of increased costs more than anyone. While food prices have remained somewhat steady in the past few months, the trend is still upward.

It seems to me that the average American wage earner is beginning to question in earnest the proposition that the Federal government can always spend us into prosperity. The New Deal philosophy of substituting Federal programs or solutions for all phases of activity is being challenged from every corner, especially the young. My questionnaire is ample proof of the mounting suspicion with which the American people view big government. The President seems to be especially aware of this trend, and while final enactment of his visionary programs for government reform may be months, even years, away, I feel he is on the right track. My questionnaire would seem to add the firm support of the people of Ohio's eighth district to that view. The expression of opinions on revenue sharing, national health insurance, welfare programs, Vietnam, and control of inflation all indicate, either directly or indirectly, backing for the policies and programs of President Nixon.

THE BURNED CHILDREN—MORE GOVERNMENTAL CALLOUSNESS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, it is hardly a secret that my principal domestic interest as a legislator, has been the protection and representation of the American consumer. H.R. 14—together with H.R. 15 by Mrs. DWYER and H.R. 16 by Mr. HOLFIELD—which would establish a strong Federal Consumer Protection

Agency and White House Consumer Office, represents the culmination of that interest to date.

I am hopeful that the House Committee on Government Operations and the full House will act favorably on that measure in this session of Congress.

Hardly a day passes that there is not further dramatic proof of the desperate need for a new Federal consumer agency. Unfortunately, each day's delay in enacting such legislation can be measured in product-related deaths and injuries and fraudulent practices that cost the buying public millions of dollars.

The latest example of governmental inaction in a vital consumer protection field—flammable fabrics—is contained in an article by Ralph Nader in the July 3, 1971, issue of the New Republic. That article, entitled "The Burned Children, 4,000 Fatal Fabric Fires," shows how the Department of Commerce has delayed in enforcing the Flammable Fabrics Act. Their inaction has had tragic consequences for thousands of victims of burns from flammable fabrics.

Because existing Federal departments and agencies which administer consumer laws are far less interested in protecting consumers than they are in promoting industry's products and services, we need to institutionalize a voice for the consumer in Washington. We need a vigorous consumer advocate in an independent consumers agency to prod and bolster the backbones of existing agencies. H.R. 14 would, in my judgment and in the judgment of the leading consumer groups around the country, accomplish that purpose.

I would like to include in the RECORD at this point, the full text of the Nader article:

THE BURNED CHILDREN: 4,000 FATAL FABRIC FIRES

(By Ralph Nader)

A five-year-old boy was playing in the kitchen while his mother was outside putting wash on the clothesline. The next time his mother saw him, the child was running into the yard and his body was totally black. At first she thought she had been playing with ink or paint. But as she got closer, she realized that his pajamas had burned. All that was left of them were the cuffs burning around his ankles. Later she found bits of charred cloth scattered through the house where the child had run wildly after the pajamas caught fire, apparently on the stove. Four weeks later, the boy died.

This tragic incident occurred just before Christmas last year. It is not an isolated case. Approximately 3000 people die every year after their clothing catches fire. Over 150,000 are injured in the same way. When all fabric fires are included more than 250,000 people suffer injuries and 4000 die each year. An unusually high proportion are children and elderly people. More children under the age of five die from fires and explosions than from any other kind of injury.

Despite the fact that physicians and public health officials have been pointing out these facts for years, and citing instances as shocking as the case of the five-year-old boy, consumers still have little protection against the hazards of flammable fabrics.

The Flammable Fabrics Act passed in 1953 has long been recognized by safety experts as a sham. William White, former chairman of the National Commission on Product Safety,

has noted that the Act "is famous for allowing 99 percent of all fabrics marketed in this country to pass the test. It is well known to the plastic surgeons who repair the burned children who were wearing the clothing made from fabrics that always pass this test."

In 1967 attempts were made to correct this situation. The Flammable Fabrics Act was amended to include home furnishings and wearing apparel such as shoes and hats which were not previously covered, and to provide for new flammability standards to be set by the Department of Commerce. Today, three-and-a-half years later, only one new standard has been set and not a single new standard for clothing. The Secretary of Commerce did not even call a meeting of his advisory committee on flammability standards until May of 1969, nearly one-and-a-half years after the amendments were passed.

All the department has done with regard to clothing is to propose a standard for children's nightwear which is so restricted that by industry's own count it will eliminate only 1 percent of the total clothing-related burns. The standard applies only to sleepwear up to the size of 6X. (Yet even many five-year-olds wear larger sizes.) It is less inclusive than England's regulation, in effect since 1967, that all children's sleepwear be flame-retardant and that all adult sleepwear be labeled if it does not pass the tests.

The formal administrative procedures to set a new standard for children's sleepwear began in January, 1970. Department of Commerce officials, after many unwarranted delays, now say that a mandatory standard will be set within a few weeks. However there may be yet another delay; the effective date of the standard may be extended from 1972 to 1973 to allow more time for industry to comply.

The only standard the Department has actually set under the 1967 amendments is a test for rugs and carpets that went into effect April 16, 1971. This test was heartily endorsed by the carpet and rug industry because it is so weak most of their products can already pass it. Even the National Bureau of Standards, not known for its vigorous safety efforts, considers the "pill" test for carpets to be inadequate. This test utilizes an aspirin-sized methanamine tablet as a timed ignition source. The National Bureau of Standards calls it a "first generation test," since it "falls" only those carpets that can be easily ignited by a flame as small as that of a cigarette. It does not measure the reaction of a carpet to a larger fire. The carpet that contributed to the deaths of 32 nursing home patients in Marietta, Ohio, in 1969 would have passed the "pill" test.

Rugs that might have trouble passing the test—small machine-tufted carpets—are virtually exempt. The Commerce Department has ruled that such rugs can still be sold whether or not they pass the pill test. The only "safeguard" for the consumer is a requirement beginning December 8, 1971, that small rugs which fail the test be so labeled. These small rugs, less than 4 x 6 feet, account for 18 percent of the market, with approximately 55 million sold every year. Shag rugs, some of which present the greatest flammability hazard of all rugs, are often made in this size range. According to industry's own statement, 80 to 90 percent of these small rugs are made of cotton or rayon and would fail the pill test.

The final loophole in the standard is that carpets produced before April 16 may be sold without being tested or labeled, so consumers can't tell whether a rug has even undergone the pill test. The Department of Commerce hasn't alerted the public to this fact.

The industry has successfully resisted meaningful flammability standards primarily by persuading the Department of Commerce that consumers should bear the burden of protection. The remarks of George S. Buck,

Jr., research director for the National Cotton Council, are typical. Mr. Buck alleged at hearings before the Department of Commerce in January, 1971, that "consumers don't give a damn about inflammable fabrics. . . . They are much more interested in comfort, wear-life, and style than . . . fire-resistance."

Even more blatant was the statement of an industry representative who wrote to the Department of Commerce protesting proposed flammability standards for children's nightwear: "It is impossible for industry or government to completely insulate a child from the hazards caused by careless and negligent parents or guardians that allow a child to become dangerously close to a source of flame. This small minority of parents and guardians who fall in their duty should not force the majority of careful and sensible parents to bear the cost of the hardship."

Passing the burden to the consumer is one of the oldest tricks of the marketplace. In reality, the consumer has almost never been offered a meaningful choice in flammable fabrics. It is virtually impossible to outfit a family and furnish a home in flame-retardant material, even though many fabrics can be made flame-retardant. Nor does the consumer have the information to enable him to make a choice between safe and unsafe fabrics. Few consumers think about flammability when they read advertisements that talk of nothing but style and comfort. How many manufacturers have attempted to sell safety in the way they sell fashion and convenience? The answer is virtually none. Even the Department of Commerce, charged with regulating flammability hazards, devotes an entire page in its textile "consumer guide" to "the exciting world of fibers and fabrics" and another page to wash-and-wear miracles. No page is devoted to warning the consumer about the hazards of flammability.

Most people learn about the hazards of flammable fabrics when tragedy strikes their own family. It is almost inevitably a costly lesson. One family in the state of Washington lost two children—a 13-year-old girl and her younger brother—in separate incidents that involved clothing that caught fire.

There are few injuries more traumatic than severe burns—and few burns more serious than those involving clothing ignition. The pain, the scars, the difficult and expensive medical treatment are excruciating burdens for burn victims and their families. And the opportunities for fires are all too prevalent in the home, where 80 percent of all burns occur. Another family lost their only child after his pajamas ignited from touching or coming near the burner on an electric stove. The two-year-old child lived for 69 days with third-degree burns over a large part of his body. In most of these cases, it would have been difficult for the parents to protect their children without totally unrealistic precautions.

Such accidents are not restricted to the young. An 86-year-old retired physician sustained burns over nearly half of her body when the sleeve of her nightgown caught on fire after coming in contact with the burner on an electric hot plate. She died after 22 days in the hospital.

Even when burns are not fatal, in addition to their anguish, families often have astronomical medical bills. One girl was burned when her jacket caught fire; she sustained second and third degree burns over 45 percent of her body. A HEW report stated that reconstructive surgery for her face, hands, and arms could cost \$50,000 or more.

Time after time, physicians have brought in evidence of severe burns that could have been less serious or even avoided if the clothing had been flame-retardant. Two electricians were burned when a flash emitted from the high-voltage fuse panel they were servicing. One suffered a severe 40 percent body burn because his flannel shirt caught

fire. He was in the hospital for three months and required several skin graft operations. The second man was wearing a heavy cotton work shirt and suffered only second degree burns to his hands and face. He was in the hospital for 25 days and required no grafts. Dr. Abraham Bergman, a Seattle physician, asked at Senate hearings in June 1970: "How many bodies have to be stacked up before effective action is taken to prevent clothing burn injuries?"

Efforts to improve consumer protection have been hindered by the fact that the magnitude of the fabric-burn problem has been concealed through lack of precise data. Statistics are still collected so haphazardly that current figures on burn injuries may underestimate the real picture. The National Commission on Product Safety took an important step toward correcting the dearth of injury information by instituting a system of hospital reporting, now operated by the Food and Drug Administration. But there are ominous signs that FDA is actually regressing in the investigation of reported burn cases. It has allowed its specialized teams that make in-depth investigations of injuries to deteriorate to the point where both the Boston and Denver Injury Study Units are operating at half their former level. Many injury investigations are now being carried out by FDA field inspectors who have no expertise at all in the area of consumer product safety.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been woefully inefficient in submitting its reports to Congress on injuries and deaths associated with the use of fabrics. These reports should be made annually under the 1967 amendments to the Flammable Fabrics Act. The first report was due in 1968 and was not delivered until after the second report was due in December 1969.

A chief block to greater safety remains weak government standards, often with loopholes so that manufacturers can avoid meeting even those regulations. The setting of weak standards initially makes it even harder to improve them, a fact recognized by the industry since 1953. The Department of Commerce, one of the least responsive of all government agencies to needs of consumers, has gone along like putty in the hands of manufacturers. Senator Warren G. Magnuson, author of the original Flammable Fabrics Act and Chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, commented recently on the performance of the Department of Commerce in implementing the Act. He said: "No single bill with which I have been associated has been so bitter a disappointment. . . . A National Commission on Product Safety report last year reached two basic conclusions: the powers contained in the Act are adequate; the Department of Commerce is grossly inadequate."

Regulation has been reduced to an impotent approval of products that are cheapest for industry to make and will yield the highest profits. Low or nonexistent standards have made possible a controlled market where the innovative manufacturer who develops a safer fabric can be undercut by competitors who lower their prices temporarily and drive him off the market. Furthermore, manufacturers have frightened consumers by telling them that prices will go up for flame-retardant clothes (without mentioning that millions of dollars would be saved if burn injuries decreased). The available evidence suggests that the projected price increases are, in large part, either bluff or so much in excess of costs that manufacturers would be able to sustain them only by colluding. One garment manufacturer we contacted, for example, anticipates a \$1.70 price differential between flame-retardant and regular pajamas. But cost data which he later provided shows that the additional cost of producing flame-retardant pajamas amounts to little more than the extra 55 cents per pair required to buy chemically treated fabric.

Instead of intervening on the side of the innovative manufacturer and the consumer, Commerce has been a loyal defender of these textile interests who say they "cannot afford" to provide safety.

Two things are urgently needed if there is to be any change. First, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is going to have to provide more vigorous data collection on burn injuries and renew its almost dormant research function. Consumers will have to demand that information collected by HEW be made public and that specific brands be named as market guides, according to their flammability hazards or their safety improvements.

Second, concerted consumer pressure will be required if the Department of Commerce is to be moved to enforce the law. Congressional hearings to inquire into the protracted delays in setting standards is one step. Another step is citizen petitions to the Department to activate administrative procedures to set meaningful standards. The insurance industry could be of key assistance here. It may well be that a legal challenge to the Department's failure to move expeditiously in this area will be required or that the regulatory function should be placed elsewhere. It is Senator Magnuson's firm judgment that "the flammable fabrics program should be taken from the Department of Commerce and merged with the overall product safety program in an agency which is willing and capable to do what must be done."

Many deaths could be prevented and injuries greatly reduced in severity. We know how to make fabric less flammable. We know too that it is more efficient to make clothing safer than to keep children from climbing on stoves or persuade mothers not to buy frills for little girls. In few areas have industry and government been less responsive to consumers.

INDIANAPOLIS POLICE CHIEF SPEAKS ON FIREARMS CONTROL

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, recently, Winston Churchill, chief of Indianapolis Police, was asked for his comments on more restrictive firearms legislation. With his permission, I am happy to insert his letter to the National Council on Crime and Delinquency:

APRIL 6, 1971.

MILTON G. RECTOR,
Executive Director, National Council on
Crime and Delinquency, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. RECTOR: I appreciate sincerely the opportunity you provide for me to express to you my thoughts, relative to firearm legislation, or a policy relative to use and/or control of the use of firearms.

Let me assure you that I have for some time, been concerned about the number of persons arrested in Indianapolis, carrying firearms.

I have had several conversations with the Prosecutor and the Deputy Prosecutors, and likewise conversations with the Judges of our Municipal Courts, relative to the problem.

Clearly, we must be doing something wrong when a person arrested for carrying a concealed weapon says, and I quote, "I'd rather get caught with it than without it."

In response to your questions:

1. Do you favor the registration of each rifle, shotgun, or handgun by the owners of such weapons?

Answer: No.

2. Do you favor requiring permits for those people who wish to purchase, possess or use handguns, rifles, or shotguns?

Answer: No.

3. Do you favor restricting the ownership of handguns to police, bank guards, or those in similar occupations?

Answer: No.

Before you believe that my remarks and my answers to your questions do not coincide, let me explain. I firmly believe the answer to our gun problem will be found in local levels, not in federal legislation.

Indiana, in my opinion, has good, sound, enforceable laws relative to carrying firearms, but we don't use it. The law clearly states that anyone found carrying a concealed handgun, on conviction, shall be imprisoned not less than one year, nor more than ten years.

In the vast majority of such arrests, we find that the charge is being reduced in court to carrying a concealed weapon, a misdemeanor, and the individual often walking out of court paying a meager fine, or receiving a few days jail sentence, which is often suspended.

I hope for the day when all of our laws, including this one, is not used as a threat, but in fact, used as I believe our legislators intended it to be used.

I don't believe my thoughts would be much in error, if in fact, it was widely known that we intended to put people in prison for not less than one year nor more than ten years, if they were carrying a gun, and then did so.

If someone, the attitudes of the Prosecutor and Judges were to change, we would benefit. It would not appear that I have been too successful. Their answer to me is that to apply our 1935 Firearms Act as it is written, would flood our already burdened Criminal Courts. This is, to me, a back door and totally unacceptable answer to the problem.

If we would use our existing 1935 Firearms Act as it is written, I firmly believe we would no longer feel a necessity for federal legislation, or a policy statement from your council on the subject.

Again, thank you sincerely for allowing me to express my views.

Very truly yours,

WINSTON CHURCHILL,
Chief of Police.

RECONFIRMATION OF FEDERAL JUDGES

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I recently received a letter informing me of the support of the District L Retired Teacher's Association of Virginia for my proposed amendment to the Constitution which would require reconfirmation of Federal judges by the Senate every 8 years.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter, signed by J. J. Brewbaker, president and P. H. O'Hara, corresponding secretary of the association, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

NORFOLK, VA.
Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Jr.
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: The District L Retired Teacher's Association went on record

at the June 3rd meeting as unanimously endorsing your proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution, which would require federal judges to undergo Senate reconfirmation every eight years.

That group seemed to be in complete agreement with you when you stated: "Federal judges are appointed for life. They are accountable to no one. It is time that we restore balance in the government by making federal judges more responsible to the will of the people."

Members of our organization feel that Congress and not the federal courts should possess legislative powers, and believe that the passage of the amendment that you recommend would be a much needed step in the right direction.

Our association also went on record as requesting that this letter be made public.

Yours sincerely,

J. J. BREWBAKER,
President.
P. H. O'HARA,
Corresponding Secretary.

REGULATION DESIGNED TO PREVENT AND OUTLAW CHANGE: THE SOUTH AFRICAN LEGAL SYSTEM

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on June 24 I placed in the RECORD, page 22121, Mr. Joel Carlson's essay, "Why I left South Africa." I recently received a copy of his April 30, 1971, speech before the Section of Individual Rights and Responsibilities of the American Bar Association and the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law.

His speech, "South Africa 1971: The Security of the State Versus the Liberty of the Individual, a Precedent," describes a legal system obsessed with "state security." He describes what happens to individual liberties when "state" or "national" security is defined and enforced by the state alone in the person of a police official. It is a chilling tale Mr. Carlson relates.

Mr. Speaker, I thought it might be useful to include with the speech additional information about Mr. Carlson. The biographical sketch from the November 1970 "Drum" indicates that, "From the look of things, nothing will make Mr. Carlson move." As we know, Carlson has left South Africa and is now in this country. The newspaper clippings describing the several violent attacks against him make it clear why he finally had to leave.

His return to South Africa depends upon fundamental changes taking place in that society. As long as the United States—by official deed and unquestioning business investment—contributes to the international respectability of South Africa these changes will not occur. They may not occur in any event. But the citizens of the United States should not make the tasks of South Africa's Joel Carlsons more difficult than they are already.

The speech and additional information follows:

SOUTH AFRICA 1971: "THE SECURITY OF THE STATE" VERSUS "THE LIBERTY OF THE INDIVIDUAL"

"A PRECEDENT"

(By Mr. Joel Carlson)

Mr. Chairman, Brothers in Law, ladies and gentlemen: You have both honored and challenged me by your invitation to me to address your two august law bodies. It is an honor which is more than I deserve, for what I did in South Africa was to react as any civilized person would respond, but may I accept the honor gratefully and humbly. It is a challenge for you to have asked me to speak to you on the eve of "Law Day" and South Africa has a lesson to teach. It is a challenge I accept. Let me tell you then of South Africa today.

The Republican Constitution Act No. 32 of 1961 created S. Africa a Republic. A Parliament of 166 white members elected from 4 provinces and from S.W. Africa—now called "Namibia" constitute a Sovereign Legislature.

Out of a population of just under 22,000,000 people, 2,028,000 whites are permitted to vote to elect members of Parliament. At the last election in 1970—1,493,000 white voters cast their votes for the white candidates of the legally exclusively white parties.

96.5% of this electorate voted for the continuance of the present white supremacist society. 3.5% of this electorate voted for the most moderate change to be made within the existing framework. These moderate conservatives have one member of Parliament, Helen Suzman, who is elected more for her personality than her party policies.

It is true to say, given the alteration of a detail here or there, that the whole white electorate wish the status quo to be maintained.

The question is: Can it be?

There are 22 million people in S. Africa and Namibia but only 2 million have a voice in its supreme legislative authority.

I as a lawyer, brought onto the frontiers of change, was able to witness the struggle between those forces maintaining the status quo and the forces urging some real and more equitable system of government. As a result I can tell you something about how the status quo is maintained.

In examining how this is done we are able to see what is done. It is necessary therefore to appreciate that it serves little to maintain law and order by such force of law that in the process individual liberty and fundamental freedoms are destroyed.

In South Africa there is little left of fundamental liberty, liberty of the individual that can be enjoyed. This applies, as indeed it must do, to all the population. Black and White are deprived of their liberties.

In order to uphold, by force of law, the rule of the whites and their supremacy, these rulers have needed to substitute for the "concept of the fundamental liberty of the subject," the "concept of the security of the State." The Whites, happy to enjoy their privileges and the highest standard of living anywhere in the world, have accepted the replacement of "liberty" by "State security."

To the Courts, to the White public, to all authority the use of the magic phrase "this constitutes a threat to State security" silences all questions and justifies all police actions.

I have seen Bishops accept it when their Deans are arrested and detained: I have seen lawyers accept it when their brothers are detained, and editors accept it, as well as the White public authority, accept it, and most unforgivable I have seen Judges not only accept it but lean over to uphold the patently unjust and irregular actions of the executive and police.

It is most unforgivable for Judges and lawyers to accept blindly this concept of "State security" when harsh executive action is taken. For lawyers are above all the Guardians and watchdogs of our liberty. In

looking back at South Africa, my country of birth which I dearly love, I can tell you how the status quo, the security of the state, has been maintained at the cost of human dignity and liberty.

A prerequisite of any examination of South Africa is the appreciation that "the State" rest squarely on a concept which featured largely in Europe in the thirties and forties—that is Race Classification.

After 20 years of legislation the "Population Registration Act No. 29 of 1970," is the streamlined basis of rigid race discrimination. In terms of it, every single person alive or dead is classified according to race. It is necessary on birth, during life, and on death for every person to be classified, for on a person's classification flows all his rights and privileges or lack of them. The Act provides that every person shall be issued with a race classification document immediately after registration of birth; this replaces the old birth certificate.

On reaching 16 years of age every person is photographed and shall apply for a more comprehensive document setting out identity numbers. This number is part of a code which will indicate sex, date of birth, race classification and citizenship.

For Africans only such documents shall register:

- his district of ordinary residence
- his ethnic group or tribe to which he is attached
- further details concerning his birth
- his fingerprints

In addition provision is made for a "record of voting" for all those who are entitled to vote but this has not yet been promulgated by the State President. Why is there a delay? Not because of any hesitation on the part of the State to implement the law, but only because the state has not yet "computerized" all this information it wishes to keep. Who, I wonder, will be the lucky supplier of this computer—an English firm, an American one, a French one? I do not know.

There are just over 15 million Africans in South Africa and Namibia—all classified according to ethnic origin and tribe. Over a ten year period 8,000,000 of them have been arrested and jailed for pass offenses. These "Pass" offenses are crimes nowhere else in the world. They are crimes relating only to color of skin—the Blackness of Africans. This is part of the race classification pattern—part of the discrimination based on race.

Every single day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, and on Sundays too for this super Calvinist regime, a daily average of 2500 Africans are arrested under the Pass Laws in South Africa: The average time for a case is 2 minutes.

In Parliament in 1969, a Parliamentarian was shocked and disclosed that 1,777,862 Africans had been arrested. But the average yearly figure is 750,000. Our prison population on a daily average basis is presently on last known figures 90,555, that is 2½ times that of the United Kingdom which is 38,000. Britain population is 55,000,000 which is more than double that of S. Africa's. 47% of the world's hangings take place in S. Africa.

The degradation of police and of their victims is an inevitable result. Pass Laws and their execution act like acid corroding human relationships of society and destroying respect for law. The feelings and concern for one another which I believe all men and women have and exhibit in all civilized society is eaten away.

Increasingly there are Africans and others no longer willing to accept the state of affairs in South Africa who seek changes. The State security forces armed by the many laws already passed strive to prevent any such change. I say any quite deliberately. Parliament has designed laws to prohibit the bringing about of any political, social or economic change to the present structure.

A body of laws exists to deal with such

matters and is called "Security Legislation." It may also be called "Regulation Designed to Prevent and Outlaw Change." It is a crime punishable by death, or by long imprisonment, one year being compulsory, to advocate political, social or economic change where this involves any unlawful act or omission, whatever the nature of the unlawful act or omission (Suppression of Communism Act which creates "Statutory Communism.")

It is a crime punishable by death or a minimum of 5 years imprisonment, to commit any unlawful act whereby the maintenance of law and order is endangered, any property damaged, the movement of traffic obstructed or the administration of the affairs of state embarrassed unless the defense can prove various listed circumstances.

It is a crime punishable by death or a minimum of 5 years imprisonment, to commit any act—and here no qualification of unlawfulness is present—if done with intent to endanger the maintenance of law and order, such intent be presumed where the act is likely to have had any one of a number of listed results, such as the achievement of any political, social or economic aim—the cause of financial loss to any person.

In order to escape conviction a defendant must prove beyond reasonable doubt he did not intend any of the listed results. These are crimes of "Terrorism."

Having classified a person by calling him a nasty name "Terrorist" "Communist" "Subversive" it is easy to deal with him and deprive him of all his rights and his liberty.

The law assists too by providing definitions of crimes which are vague, wide and all embracing—[as see above what a terrorist is].

To assist further the law legislates backwards. An act committed in 1962 may have been legal then but is now made illegal in 1967, e.g. [Sec. 9(1) of the Terrorism Act 83 of 1967, Sec. 23 of the General Law Amendment Act No. 62 of 1966 and others].

The law permits special courts and special procedures providing for instance for the prosecution to join in the same indictment a number of charges not necessarily relating to the same offense or arising out of the same transaction against a number of persons. Even although the offense is committed by different persons at different times and places and different offenses are committed persons may be charged in the same charge and all tried together. [Sec. 327(1) and 328 of the Criminal Procedure Act No. 56 of 1955, Sec. 5(c) of the Terrorism Act, Sec. 12(6) (a) of the Suppression of Communism Act No. 37 of 1963.]

The right to bail is removed merely by the Attorney General handing in a certificate and the Court may then make no inquiries into the matter.

The burden of proof is made easy for the State and since 1953 (General Law Amendment Act) an accused is more and more frequently required to prove his innocence and the Court may presume his guilt.

Furthermore whether the crime is committed in Los Angeles or Miami the trial can be held in Syracuse.

The above 1953 law outlaws organized protest and processions and imposes heavy fines, imprisonment or whipping or both for any offense "committed by way of protest or in support of any campaign for the repeal or modification of any law." [Criminal Procedure Act No. 8 of 1953].

Thus 354 students, lecturers, churchmen, and others were arrested and charged under this wide ranging law when they marched in orderly fashion to the main police station in Johannesburg to protest re-detention of "The 22" last year. The 22 Africans had been detained originally over a year earlier as "Terrorist detainees." They were then brought to Court and charged, not as "Terrorists" but as "Communists." Then in February 1970 they were acquitted by the Supreme Court when the Attorney General withdrew his prosecution. Immediately the Judge left

the bench, the Security Police moved in, and in Court, redetained "The 22."

12 weeks after their redetention, again under the Terrorism Act, the students after a meeting at their university spontaneously walked in procession to John Vorster Square. They were arrested and charged. Of the 354, 30 were charged and 29 of them pleaded guilty to a municipal by-law contravention and paid a R50 fine. But as with all those who show opposition in S.A. the punishment did not end with the Court conviction and sentence. The Security police pursued and still pursue everyone of those marchers. When they apply for passports they are called in for questioning. If they need Government approval for any action—a bursary, a grant, a visa, the Security Police interferes. The arm of the law is long and so is its vengeance.

Concerning "The 22," after all the protest, 19 of them were brought to trial after a further 5 month redetention. 3 had mysteriously disappeared, one of these being found in a mental home. Eventually in August 1970, some 15 months after their detention and remaining in custody they were retried. But with all the powers of the law the inept Attorney General and his inefficient prosecutors brought 540 allegations against the same accused who had been acquitted in February. Of these allegations about 538 were identical and not even the Judges could help the Attorney General and the Security Police in finding the differences in allegations which originally said "Accused 1, 2 and 3 consented to do this and that" to "Accused 1, 2 and 3 agreed to do this and that." The Judge found he had no alternative but to throw the new charge out and did so.

This upset the Security Police and on their suggestion the Justice Minister immediately issued Banning and House Arrest orders on all those twice acquitted. They were all placed under restrictions for 5 years. In addition the State lodged an appeal to the highest Court in the land and arranged for an expeditious hearing. The 3 Appeal Judges deliberated long and cautiously but found that they could only come to one conclusion. In reality, try as they might they could find no difference in the 2 indictments, so in December 1970 they dismissed the Appeal.

But the 19 were still subjected to constant harassment, intimidation and persecution and their families too suffered.

It must be emphasized that acquittal does not mean a defendant is free. Despite long periods of detention and interrogation the accused is still considered guilty—guilty in the eyes of the Security Police and in the eyes of the Justice Minister. So there is the whole practice of "Punishment without charge or trial"—Banning, house arrest, banishment or indefinite detention.

Moreover, a man who has been punished after his conviction and sentence—and having served his sentence, is punished twice. Before such a man, a political prisoner who serves his full sentence without any remission and in the harshest maximum security conditions, leaves jail he is served with house arrest or banning orders. Or he may disappear from society into banishment. The Security Police never forgets or forgives and is ever vengeful of the threats passed to it by anyone.

Yet with all these powers the Security Police were not satisfied. As a lawyer in S. Africa I saw the Security Police ask for a relaxation of the rule of law to permit aberration (a). Then having been given (a) they said in fact it wasn't sufficient and they needed (b) and (c). Then they said with the knowledge they now had managed to obtain, and their own judgment which was of course sound and necessary and in the interest of State security they needed (d) (e) and (f). They, of course, had to get that too.

Now the position is that the Security Police are a law unto themselves. Their actions are the law.

It is the head of the Security Police as it happens who tells the public and all authority—that in future all political trials will be held in such a place. The Minister of Justice and the Attorney General listen.

If you are to be punished without trial, the Minister acts on the advice of his Security Police.

If you are to receive a passport or not, or you have your passport withdrawn, it is a matter of security and the Security Police believe this is necessary so the Minister acts.

If you are to hold a procession or a meeting it is not the Mayor or the Chief Magistrate who must be consulted and finally determine the matter—it is referred to the Security Police and the Mayor or Chief Magistrate acts on the recommendations of the Security Police.

The Security Police are everywhere and with large secret funds of undisclosed amounts, in the Universities, as informers in political parties, as spies, informers in churches, and everything you say may be heard. There is telephone tapping and bugging and surveillance of people. There are agent provocateurs, there is intimidation, warnings, questionings, late night visits, harassments of all kinds. But State Security is maintained and police power has gone mad.

What is the limit of the power of the Security Police? Do they themselves know and accept any limit?

Section (6) of the Terrorism Act permits indefinite detention of a person without trial.

If the Security Police will it, such a person is held in solitary confinement. If the Security Police require it, he is held incommunicado or allowed visitors, as Security Police decide.

If Security Police consider it necessary a detainee may not be allowed to wash or shave or change his clothing or have eating utensils—it all depends on them.

A detainee may be interrogated endlessly or not for months after his detention.

No Court may inquire into or pronounce upon the validity of any such action taken by the Security Police (Sec. 6(1) of the Terrorism Act).

Professor Arthur Larson of Duke University attended one trial in Pretoria as observer for the World Lutheran Federation—the trial of the 37 Namibians and said,

"If you pass a statute which gives the police . . . free reign to do almost anything they please in the way of human rights, and then excuse this by saying that you will of course rely on the discretion of the authorities not to abuse this power, you have for all practical purposes, thrown away law and substituted unlimited personal tyranny."

It is not surprising and not unexpected that time and again serious allegations have been made of unlawful assaults and tortures during interrogation.

It is not surprising too that the Minister when called on to investigate declines to do so and no judicial enquiry is held.

Detainees have said on oath that they have been stripped naked, suspended above the ground, electrically shocked after being blindfolded, and made to stand endlessly.

It is known that at least 14 detainees have died in detention but the figure of 18 has substance too. It is hard to ascertain how many have died as a result of detention. Inquest Magistrates have held that at least 7 detainees died by "suicidal hangings."

One detainee jumped from the 7th floor window of his interrogation room. The Security Police have said others have died as a result of "falling in a shower" or "slipping on a piece of soap" or "falling downstairs."

The most poignant record of the death of a detainee which speaks for all is the statement in Parliament which simply records: "An unknown man died on an unknown date of a cause unknown."

How can the unbridled, power and Security Police now be controlled. The answer for S. Africa and S. Africans is not an easy

one and it may be that peaceful ways of change are outdated.

But the lesson to be learned is not to start on this road to ruin, this self-destructing plague of arbitrary powers being granted to Security Police or executive authority. Make everyone subject to the law and equal before it. The words of an American Judge were:

"The history of liberty has largely been the history of observances of procedural safeguards."

It is not new but it must be said again and again so that it is remembered and applied.

Lawyers must invoke the protection of the laws guarding the subject's liberty. Lawyers must ensure that the Rule of Law is supreme. Lawyers must be awake to any threat to liberty. Lawyers must reject all laws which do not observe and provide for procedural safeguards.

Lawyers must ensure that the liberty of the individual is upheld under the Rule of Law.

WHO IS JOEL CARLSON?

[From Drum, November 1970]

(A lanky sensitive youngster just out of school worked as a clerk at Fordsburg where thousands of pass defaulters are prosecuted. He wrinkled his youthful brow while listening to the tales of woe of pass laws and farm labour victims. With scholarly objectivity he decided to carry out his own investigations. This is Joel Carlson, backroom boy behind the acquittal of the 19 held under the Terrorism Act, the man so many know about, but few really know. Stan Motjuwadi finds out the true character of this tireless lawyer.)

Now 41, dapper Joel Carlson's brow is still wrinkled and it gets even more so when he laughs—something he often does in spite of the things that have happened to him over the years.

Two years ago during the case in which he appeared for Gabriel Mbindi, the detainee who sued the Minister of Justice claiming assaults by the Security Police, Mr. Carlson was missed by a sniper's bullet and a car tried to run him down while walking in a street in South West Africa.

He and his family escaped four blasts from a shotgun and a petrol bomb thrown into his study in February this year.

Over the years he has got used to getting up late at night to answer threatening anonymous phone calls or abuse. His poison pen fan mail has also grown.

Enough you might say, to dampen the enthusiasm of an ordinary mortal, but Joel Carlson goes about his business as though nothing has happened, taking everything in his very fast and long stride.

"On the other hand Joel feels compensated by the many sweet letters and phone calls he gets from well-wishers, urging him to carry on. It is also surprising that there are more of these than the nasty ones. In spite of everything we have made many friends," Mrs Jeanette Carlson, mother of four and wife of the lawyer, told Drum.

Studying law always had been an obsession with Joel Carlson while still at school. After matriculating, just for experience he took up a job as clerk of the court at the Bantu Commissioner's in Fordsburg.

For the first time the youngster came face to face with blood and flesh evidence of the cruelty of the laws and the farm labour system which he was later to fight in a one-man crusade.

"I was nauseated by what I saw and heard and conducted my own investigations. To me it represented slavery, and the Native Commissioner's Court at Fordsburg was like a slave market with farmers competing for these men as labourers," Mr. Carlson said after dumping the job he detested to further his studies at the university.

This was during the late '40s after Mr. Carlson had spent a year working from inside with a department that enforced passes and influx control. By then he was something of an expert having collected as much data as he wanted in his private investigations.

After varsity, Carlson became articulated to a firm of lawyers, and when he completed he struck out on his own in 1954.

Any lawyer starting on this lonely road needs money to establish his practice. But not Carlson. With an unbusinesslike disregard for money he started on the mission he had set out for—to fight pass laws and the farm labour system.

I remember those days when I used to visit his office as a young reporter. The whole place was in a shambles all the time, furnished with rickety tables and chairs and crowded with men who had fallen foul of the intricate pass and influx laws. It was more like a Pass Advice Bureau than anything.

"The youngster will never make it. He's ruining his practice and forgetting that he must live," established colleagues sniped behind his back.

In the old days pass fenders used to be sold to farmers for labour. They would be huddled in the big yard at Fordsburg for farmers to make their choice. This was something Carlson had sworn to fight.

As a lawyer he appeared in many cases for pass offenders. He also challenged the legality of the farm labour system. In 1959 he wrote to the Minister of Bantu Administration and Development.

One of the greatest days in Carlson's life was when the system was scrapped.

Over the years Carlson has appeared for many political offenders and has accepted briefs that many of his colleagues would not touch.

What he can't fight in the courtroom, Carlson always takes up with the highest authorities. After complaints by 90-day detainees, Carlson wrote a letter to the then Minister of Justice, Mr. Vorster for an investigation into the treatment of detainees.

As a champion of the underdog Carlson had to travel widely but in 1969 his passport was withheld. It was then that he got letters of support from the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, formed by the late President John Kennedy, British lawyers and the International Commission of Jurists, of which he is a member.

What does Mr. Carlson himself think? After the latest attempt on his life and property this is what he said, running his fingers through his unruly blond hair:

"I've been threatened before, but this is the first case of physical violence. But I certainly don't intend to move," he replied.

Once he had to work for a machinery enforcing the law he detested; now he seeks better justice. From the look of things, nothing will make Mr. Carlson move.

[From the Star, Oct. 23, 1970]

CARLSON'S OFFICE HIT BY BULLETS

Mr. Joel Carlson, the Johannesburg attorney who represented detainees at their recent Terror Trial, walked into his office today to find seven or eight bullet holes in two windows and in the walls of the offices facing the windows.

Mr. Carlson has had his property damaged before. On January 30 this year he found bullet-holes in his car. Then later this year an explosive was thrown into his study at his Oaklands home and his car was again shot up.

HEARD SHOTS

Mr. A. S. MacGregor, the caretaker of the office building, said he had heard several shots about 9 o'clock last night.

There were at least five shots into the room housing Mr. Carlson's copying machine.

Mr. Carlson said he often worked in the room late at night.

On November 2, at the Supreme Court in Bloemfontein, Mr. Carlson will handle the case of 19 Africans at an appeal lodged by the State against the Africans' acquittal of charges under the Terrorism Act last month at the Pretoria Supreme Court.

[From the Express, Oct. 25, 1970]

U.S. LAW COMMITTEE CONDEMNS ACTION

Mr. Joel Carlson, the Johannesburg attorney who had several shots fired at his office this week, has received a telegram from the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law, expressing their concern at the shooting.

The committee, whose headquarters are in Washington, yesterday sent the following telegram to Mr. Carlson: "Committee most distressed to learn of further deplorable violent attempt to intimidate you for professional representation of accused. Committee reaffirms its view that your work is in highest tradition of legal profession.—Peter J. Connell."

The committee which, according to Mr. Carlson, is "one of the most fastidious legal bodies in the world", was formed at the request of President Kennedy and blessed by President Johnson. Among its members are deans of all prominent law faculties in the United States, past Supreme Court judges, ambassadors, secretaries of state, and past presidents and the president of the American Bar Association.

Mr. Carlson, who recently defended the 20 detainees held under the Terrorism Act, is the only lawyer outside America to be instructed by the committee.

Yesterday Mr. Carlson criticised the Minister of Justice for being "quick off the mark" to criticise judges, condemn liberals and Communists, and to make statements in and out of Parliament concerning his clients whilst their cases were still before the courts.

But yet, added Mr. Carlson, he had not said a word about "these violent attacks" in the past or now.

"Does terrorism only apply against the State, and not against the individual?" asked Mr. Carlson, who was dismayed at local police taking fingerprints at his offices after the shooting.

"It seems as if the shots were fired from a floor below me, or certainly at a much higher level than ground floor. The police have shown very little interest so far, and despite their powers they haven't found the criminals who attacked my home earlier this year."

In January this year, Mr. Carlson's car was extensively damaged when thugs attacked his Oaklands, Johannesburg, home. Three blasts from a shotgun were fired at his car and a petrol bomb hurled at the window of his study.

"The Minister is always condemning terrorism", he said, "so why doesn't he condemn this type of violence? If he cannot countenance this, why doesn't he condemn it?"

"If the Minister doesn't take firm action to prevent local terrorism, he will be encouraging it."

Local churchmen, university lecturers, professors, friends and clients had expressed their concern and alarm at the shooting incident, added Mr. Carlson.

"I am only a professional man, carrying out professional duties, and I will continue to work late at night as is required in my profession."

During a telephone interview with Mr. Carlson and the Express, the call was suddenly cut off. Commented Mr. Carlson afterwards: "Strange things are happening on this line."

[From the Star, Nov. 9, 1970]

CARLSON FINDS BOMB IN POST

A bomb, hidden in the cut-away pages of a book, arrived in the morning post at the offices of the Johannesburg attorney, Mr. Joel Carlson, today.

Less than an hour after Mr. Carlson had opened the parcel, a warrant officer from the Security Police told him: "You were lucky the bomb did not go off!"

The parcel, stamped with a Lusaka, Zambia, postmark, contained the "Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung," a hardcover book about the same size as legal books which Mr. Carlson receives regularly from Pretoria.

"As soon as I saw the title, I realized that someone was making mischief for me," Mr. Carlson said. "When I opened the book I saw the electronic device and immediately called the police."

The centre pages of the book were cut away to make room for two small batteries and a complicated wiring mechanism.

This is the third violent attack this year on Mr. Carlson, who is well known for his defense of accused people in trials of a political nature. The walls and windows of his city offices still bear the bullet marks of a shooting attack a fortnight ago.

A Molotov cocktail petrol bomb was thrown at the study window of his home earlier this year, and his car was also shot up.

When a police expert arrived at Mr. Carlson's offices today, he dismantled the wires leading to the batteries in the bomb, and took the book.

POLLING THE PEOPLE

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, each year, since being elected to Congress, I have conducted a poll of my constituency. The poll has become a useful and important instrument of exchange between myself and the nearly half million Philadelphians I am proud to represent.

Once again I am mailing the questionnaire to every household in my congressional district, a total of 144,093 households.

With the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I enter my 1971 congressional questionnaire in the RECORD:

CONGRESSMAN JOSHUA EILBERG WANTS YOUR OPINION, JULY 1, 1971

Dear Friend:

This is the fifth consecutive year I have sent a questionnaire to every household in Northeast Philadelphia. I have adopted the practice of sending out an annual questionnaire because of the sheer number of people I represent, 471,271 according to the 1970 census. The Fourth Congressional District is the largest in Philadelphia.

Because ours is such a large community, it is difficult to know at times how its residents view the issues that touch all of our lives. Attitudes always are changing. And so are the issues.

In years past, each Congressional district was much smaller and Congressmen spent as little as three months in Washington, returning home for the rest of the year. Now, Congress sits year 'round, from early January through Christmas, and each Congressional district is much larger.

I am home every weekend and I take every chance to speak with as many of our North-

east neighbors as possible. But clearly, I can only meet and talk with a small percentage of the 471,271 people I represent.

That is why this questionnaire is important to me—and to you. I want to know how you think, so that I can do my job, representing you in the Congress, better. Your views are important because this finally is your country and your government, no matter how large and how impersonal it may seem at times.

So please sit down and take five minutes to answer these questions. Then fold the questionnaire according to the instructions and return it to me. Your answers will be confidential. As in the past, the results of the poll will be mailed to every household in Northeast Philadelphia.

Because the technical requirements of a poll like this sometimes restrict the range of possible answers, I welcome any additional comments you may have. Thank you for your consideration and attention.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

JOSHUA EILBERG.

CONGRESSMAN JOSHUA EILBERG WANTS YOUR OPINION

1. A. Do you believe that inflation is under control?

B. Do you believe that the recession has eased?

C. Do you believe unemployment is in check?

2. Non-essential government spending must be cut. If you were writing the Federal budget, which program would you cut first? (Check one.)

- (a) Crime.
- (b) Defense.
- (c) Education.
- (d) Foreign aid.
- (e) Health.
- (f) Highways.
- (g) Housing.
- (h) Pollution control.
- (i) Space.
- (j) Welfare.

3. Would you increase, cut, or leave the same Federal aid to:

- (a) Elementary and secondary public schools?
- (b) Private and parochial schools?
- (c) Colleges and universities?

4. Federal revenue sharing would return millions of dollars to Pennsylvania and Philadelphia to spend according to the best judgment of local officials. Revenue sharing would relieve some of the continuing pressure to raise local taxes. Do you support this plan?

5. A. Are you in favor of a national health insurance plan administered by the Federal government?

B. Are you a member of a private health insurance plan, like Blue Cross/Blue Shield?

C. If you are a member, are you satisfied with the services of your plan?

D. If you are a member, are you satisfied with the costs of your plan?

6. A. Do you think the present level of Social Security benefits is adequate?

B. Do you favor my proposal to include prescription drugs under Medicare?

7. A. Do you feel personally threatened by crime on the streets?

B. Which of the following approaches do you think promises the most chance of success in dealing with the narcotics and dangerous drugs problem? (Check one.)

- (a) Education.
- (b) Rehabilitation.
- (c) Law Enforcement.

C. Would you reduce first offender penalties for possession of marijuana?

D. I have sponsored legislation which authorizes economic sanctions against foreign countries who refuse to cooperate with the United States in eliminating the international traffic in illicit drugs. Do you support this proposal?

E. Opium is the major crop for many farmers in Turkey. That opium is sold on the international market and converted into the heroin which eventually is smuggled into the United States. As an American taxpayer, would you favor a proposal to have the United States government buy up Turkey's total opium crop at local market prices and destroy it?

8. A. Do you feel that some progress has been made in the past year in cleaning up our air and water?

B. Are you satisfied with the progress being made to clean up the environment?

C. Are you prepared to bear some of the cost of cleaning up the environment, either in the form of increased taxes or higher prices for some goods and services?

9. I have been engaged with the Federal government in debate on the future of North Philadelphia Airport. Are you personally concerned about the development of the airport?

10. A. Construction of a nuclear power generating plant has been proposed for Newbold Island, up the Delaware River from the Northeast. Do you feel that such a facility is dangerous?

B. Do you believe that such facilities can provide vast reserves of electrical power without polluting the water or the air?

C. Do you think the draft system should cal power shortages. To assist in conserving electrical energy would you be willing to sacrifice some of your electrical appliances, like a television set or an air conditioner?

11. A. Do you think the present draft system is fair?

B. Do you think the draft system should be abolished in favor of an all-volunteer army?

C. Do you think the draft system should be abolished even if the alternative, an all-volunteer army, is not available?

12. A. Do you support the present United States policy in Vietnam?

B. Do you think the campaigns in Laos and Cambodia will bring to a more rapid close American participation in the war?

C. Do you support the principal of a fixed timetable for American withdrawal from Southeast Asia?

13. A. Do you think that Israel should withdraw from all territories it occupied in the Middle East during the 1967 Six-Day War?

B. Do you think it should withdraw from some of these territories?

C. Do you think Israel should withdraw from occupied territory before or after it negotiates a peace agreement with the Arabs?

Before.

After.

D. Do you think the United States should continue to lend Israel money?

E. Do you think the United States should continue to sell Israel arms?

F. Do you think United States troops should participate in an international force to keep the peace in the Middle East once the Arabs and the Israelis sign a treaty?

14. What do you think are the three most pressing problems facing America today? Please list in order of urgency.

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____

15. What one problem in Northeast Philadelphia is of most concern to you?

PRESIDENT NIXON IS KEEPING HIS WORD

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, last week the President of the United States with-

drew an additional 2,200 soldiers from Vietnam.

On January 20, 1969, there were 532,500 Americans enduring the perils of an Asian war. Today, there are 239,500 Americans in Vietnam who are planning to come home.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon is keeping his word.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 492

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with some reluctance that I rise in opposition to House Resolution 492 which would require the Secretary of State to furnish the House with certain information respecting American involvement in Laos. In hailing the Supreme Court decision in the Times-Post case involving publication of the Pentagon Papers last week, I cited the concurring opinion of Justice Stewart to the effect that an enlightened citizenry may provide the only effective restraint upon executive policy and power in the areas of national defense and international affairs. I pointed out at that time that—

There is a tendency in government to over-classify and to keep from the people, and the people's representatives, information which is essential to the proper functioning of a democratic system. When there is secrecy for the sake of secrecy, or for self-protection or self-promotion, then credibility is seriously undermined and the real security of that system is strained to its very limits.

There is understandable concern that Laos may prove to be another quagmire trap as perilous as Vietnam and that we may already be in too deep. I am not saying that we are, but I am saying that we in the Congress have a right to know just how deeply we are involved. We have learned from our Vietnam experience just how easily military and economic assistance can balloon into a major military commitment. That is not to say we should avoid the former for fear of the latter; obviously, there must be a middle course between playing world policeman and international ostrich, and I think the Nixon doctrine provides such a middle course.

But at the same time we must carefully examine the apparent contradiction between the dual theses that we are presently overextended and that we will honor all of our present commitments. We must ask ourselves how extensive are our commitments, and what is the exact nature of those commitments. There seems to be a firm resolution in this country, which I am sure is shared by the administration, not to stumble into another Vietnam. And central to this resolution is the realization that if we are to avoid another tragic mistake, the Congress and the people must have the answers to the questions I have just raised—we must be fully and periodically informed as to the extent of our involvements overseas. Without such information, we could easily find ourselves con-

fronted in the future with another back-door war and another internal crisis of confidence and divisiveness.

I can therefore sympathize with those who support this resolution. Their intentions are honorable and not without merit. At the same time, there are certain aspects of this resolution which trouble me deeply, and which have led to my decision to vote against it. First, from what I can determine, this represents an unprecedented attempt on the part of the Congress to obtain current confidential communications from the Executive to an ambassador, something which I believe is a matter of Executive privilege. It seems to me this would provoke an unnecessary confrontation, especially when the Department of State has expressed a willingness to provide an oral briefing on this subject to the Congress.

Second, two of the requests included in the resolution are misdirected to the Secretary of State when they should in fact have been addressed to the Secretary of Defense—those relating to bombing operations along the Ho Chi Minh trail and U.S. Armed Forces operations in Laos.

And third, it is my understanding that the Director of the CIA has already briefed the appropriate committees of Congress on that Agency's involvement in Laos.

And again, several committees of the Congress have been briefed on the nature and extent of USAID operations in Laos.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I think it might be better for this Congress to compile the information with which it has already been presented on these issues, and build future hearings and investigations on the gaps and questions arising out of that compilation, calling in the appropriate Government officials to fill those gaps and answer those questions. This is the way to proceed it seems to me. I am not suggesting for a moment that we have all the facts on our involvement in Laos, and I am not suggesting for a moment that we should not vigorously pursue this subject. Quite to the contrary, I welcome a full-scale congressional investigation and appraisal of all our overseas commitments and involvements. It seems to me that such a comprehensive appraisal could prove most useful in helping to shape the specifics of the evolving Nixon doctrine. I have long been a strong advocate of restoring to the Congress its co-equal status with the Executive in matters both foreign and domestic. But I think this can best be done through a spirit of cooperation rather than confrontation. I therefore think the resolution before us today is ill-advised because it would tend to provoke the latter rather than promote the former.

JOB TRAINING SUCCESS STORY

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. Boggs) recently wrote an excellent editorial entitled "OIC: Job Training Suc-

cess Story." The editorial, published in the Ripon Forum of July 1971, featured the tremendous accomplishments of one Philadelphia minister, Dr. Leon H. Sullivan. Dr. Sullivan has in many ways surpassed the titanic efforts of the Federal Government by providing a low-cost, highly effective job-training program.

Dr. Sullivan's program, called Opportunities Industrialization Center (OIC), has been operating since 1964 with very low Federal subsidy and the program is providing the urban poor with a light of hope in their struggle to obtain training and a decent job. I ask unanimous consent that Senator Boggs' editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

OIC: JOB TRAINING SUCCESS STORY

(Guest editorial by Senator J. CALEB BOGGS)

For nearly a decade the Federal Government has been trying to train the disadvantaged for gainful and useful employment, and for the entire decade the results have been, at best, mixed.

Federal participation in job training began with the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 and was greatly expanded with the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 and the Economic Opportunity Act of 1962 and the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Along the way, programs have included MDTA Institutional training, On-the-Job Training, Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Mainstream, New Careers, Concentrated Employment Programs and NAB-JOBS.

Not surprisingly, Federal expenditures have expanded to match the proliferation of programs. From an infinitesimal \$4 million in 1959, funding has grown to a proposed \$2.9 billion for Fiscal Year 1972.

Thus, it is evident that there has been a sincere intent on the part of Congress and succeeding administrations to do something about the problem—to provide valuable training for the unemployed and the underemployed.

Unfortunately, the well-intended programs and the nearly \$10 billion spent during the decade have not always produced satisfactory results. Program costs often have been exorbitant; men and women most in need of training often have not been reached, and the percentage of those who actually find jobs after training or who keep the jobs they find has often been far too small.

PRIVATE GENESIS

There is, however, a very successful job-training program begun seven years ago, not in Washington, but in the inner city in North Philadelphia. Its genesis came, not from a Federal executive or a Member of Congress, but from a Baptist minister and his congregation.

The minister is the Reverend Doctor Leon H. Sullivan, pastor of Zion Baptist Church. He named his program the Opportunities Industrialization Center. Started in 1964 in a former jailhouse leased from the City of Philadelphia and backed by \$100,000 raised by the Zion Baptist congregation, OIC organizations now exist in more than 100 American cities.

Those in operation are providing effective and efficient job training at relatively low cost, and they are doing it with very little support from the Federal Government.

Doctor Sullivan, who recently became the first black man to serve on the board of directors of the General Motors Corporation, has raised most of the money which supports OIC through contributions from private industry and local governments.

The Federal support of OIC over the years has averaged \$7.5 million channeled through existing manpower programs.

HIGH RATE OF RETURN

Despite inadequate or sporadic funding, OIC's have attained success in very large measure. Of trainees completing the OIC course, 71.2 percent have been placed in jobs. As further evidence of its successful record, OIC's have a one-year job retention rate of 76 percent, the highest, to my knowledge, of any manpower training program in the country.

Dollar for dollar, the return has been far greater than money spent in most other programs. Cost per OIC trainee has been about \$1500, which is about one-third of the cost of many Federal programs.

The reasons for OIC success are many, but they start with Doctor Sullivan. His tireless work and apparently limitless energy give the OIC's a vitality not often found in the more staid Government programs.

The key, however, is that OIC's are not merely job training enterprises. They are comprehensive programs which begin with pretraining counseling and end with job placement and follow-up at regular intervals.

OIC's also are located where the need for job training is greatest—within our urban centers. The trainee remains with his family and friends in his own neighborhood. OIC's prepare the individual for actual job training by means of a prevocational feeder program designed to provide basic reading and writing skills and to build self confidence.

Following completion of the feeder program, the trainee learns a skill which is in demand by businesses in the area. The trainee thus has a realistic goal for which to strive. Many times he is guaranteed employment before his OIC training is completed.

In addition, OIC in some instances has ventured into black capitalism. In Philadelphia, OIC has built a multi-million dollar shopping center and it opened Progress Aerospace Enterprises, which employs 150 people on a NASA sub-contract, and Progress Garment Manufacturing Company, where 100 employees turn out 2000 garments a week.

It is evident, I believe, that OIC with relatively little financial help has accomplished much. How much more could it accomplish with only a small share of the proposed \$2.9 billion manpower budget?

I believe it is time we give Doctor Sullivan and his colleagues the opportunity to prove what they can do on a larger scale. That is why I introduced this year the Opportunities Industrialization Assistance Act, which would authorize \$432 million in Federal funding for OIC's over the next three years.

Doctor Sullivan estimates that his organization would reach a level of 51,000 trainees within the first 12 months of funding and that at the end of three years OIC would be serving 100,000 persons.

This legislation would make OIC funding the exclusive responsibility of the Secretary of Labor, removing the current problems of multi-agency funding.

This legislation is not new. I introduced similar legislation last year and it was adopted as an amendment to the Employment and Manpower Act of 1970 which was vetoed. The OIC provision of that bill was not a cause of that veto. It was, I believe, the only section of the bill to enjoy near unanimous support of the Senate.

The report of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee said of the OIC: "The facts clearly seem to justify the conclusion that this is an unusually successful and surprisingly low-cost manpower program, solidly accepted by the poverty community and the private sector."

The Labor and Public Welfare Committee again this summer will hold hearings on a comprehensive manpower bill, and OIC again will be under consideration.

The Senate Labor Committee is not alone in its appreciation of the OIC. I have been pleased to have a long and impressive list of co-sponsors of this legislation. They include

Senators Bayh, Harris, Kennedy, Muskie, Pell and Mondale from the Democratic side of the aisle and Senators Javits, Schweiker, Scott, Taft and Bellmon from the Republican side. Without them, I know this legislation would not have received the attention it has.

It is my great hope that this year the aspirations of Doctor Sullivan's great program will be realized and that the Federal Government will provide it with the means for orderly and constructive expansion.

With that aid, I am confident the OIC will prove to be the most effective job-training program in the country.

J. CALEB BOGGS.

THE POWDER PUFF DERBY

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Powder Puff Derby is on again.

Eastern Illinois has been represented for the past 12 years by Mrs. Barbara Jenison of Paris, Ill. She has always given a good account of herself and one year came in third. This year Mrs. Jenison and Mrs. Eula Schmidt of Robinson as well as Mrs. Kathleen Wood of Sullivan will also represent eastern Illinois in the derby.

Everybody is talking about "Women's Lib" as if it were something recent. Mrs. Jenison has been in that category on ability and experience for a long time.

This year's route is a new one but tremendously interesting starting at Calgary, Alberta, to Great Falls, Billings, Rapid City, Denver, McCook, Lincoln, St. Louis, Little Rock, and ending at Baton Rouge. I would think that they would experience almost every kind of weather condition. It should be a tough contest and I am sure it will be. Following is an article from the Paris, Ill. Beacon-News, regarding the Powder Puff Derby of 1971. The route is a distance of 2,444 miles and it starts the day after the 4th of July. I am sure all of us wish these fine women the very best of luck.

I include the article as follows:

FROM CALGARY TO BATON ROUGE—PARIS, ROBINSON PILOT TEAM IN POWDER PUFF RACE AGAIN

Eastern Illinois will be represented once again in the famed "Powder Puff Derby," all-women's transcontinental air race, when the annual event marks its twenty-fifth anniversary this year.

Mrs. Barbara Jenison, Paris, and Mrs. Eula Schmidt, Robinson, are enroute to Calgary, Alberta, Canada, where the 2,400 mile race will start on July 5. For the first time, the course will run from north to south, with the end of the race set at Baton Rouge, La. Previous races have been flown east or west from coast to coast.

This year's course follows a "zig-zag" route from Calgary to Great Falls and Billings, Mont., on to Rapid City, S.D., Denver, Colo., McCook and Lincoln, Neb., St. Louis, Little Rock, Ark., and Baton Rouge.

For the Paris pilot, the 1971 race will mark her 12th year of competition in the event and it will be Mrs. Schmidt's fourth. They have flown together in three previous races, and finished third in one of them.

The silver anniversary race has drawn the largest field in history—150 planes—attract-

ed by the largest cash prizes in history, a total of \$22,500, with \$10,000 for first place. For that reason, this year's entry list includes many aviation "pros" who are full time pilots, instructors, charter pilots and airport operators. Among them are several who have logged from 10,000 to 20,000 hours in the air.

The field had to be limited to 150 planes, and on the first day to enter there were 141 entries. The field filled up and there has been a standby list of hopeful entries ever since. Accepted "standby" entries will get to compete only if some of the original starters fail to qualify by arrival at the race starting point in time, or should be "scratched" for other reasons like mechanical problems prior to race time.

Numbers for the race entries were assigned by lot among the first day entrants. The Paris-Robinson team drew No. 26. Numbers are not important except that original take off is by the numbers, and those with the high ones must wait longer on the airport as planes are flagged off at 20 second intervals.

Only elapsed flying time is counted in the computation for winning. Electronic devices time each plane at lift off, and similar devices at each of the authorized stops mark arrival and departure time. The planes range in size from single to twin engine, and from a minimum of 145 to a maximum of 600 horsepower. A handicap system equalizes the competition, based on performance above rated speed for each size of aircraft. Only stock models, built in the past ten years, can be entered.

The race is flown only in daylight hours under visual flight conditions, and the contestants have four days to complete the course. Stops at other than authorized points eliminates them from contention. Both Canadian and American aviation agencies supervise the race and flight and safety rule violations result in disqualification.

Winners are not determined for certain until the deadline for completion of the race by all contestants. Awards will be presented at a banquet for all the fliers in Baton Rouge Saturday night, July 10.

Illinois has a larger number of entries than usual this year, a total of ten, four from the Chicago area and the remainder from the rest of the state.

A nearby contestant is Mrs. Kathleen Wood, Sullivan, Ill., who with her husband once operated the Shelbyville airport. Her co-pilot will be Mrs. Clarissa Holcomb of Marissa, formerly of Danville.

There are two "mother and daughter" entries from Illinois. Mrs. Lois Feigenbaum of Carbondale and her daughter, Mrs. Sue Long of St. Louis, constitute one team. The other includes Mrs. Mary A. Lowe of Greenville and her daughter, Miss Sylvia E. Lowe.

The other entries are: Mrs. Pat Clark, Calumet, with Mrs. Elinor Johnson, Dallas, Texas, as co-pilot; Mrs. Marion P. Jayne, with Mrs. Mimi W. Stott, co-pilot, both of Palatine; Mrs. Lois Shafer, St. Jacob, with Mrs. Amy Laws, St. Louis, as co-pilot; Mrs. Sharon S. Ehrlich, Pekin, with Mrs. Fern P. Rath, Moline, as co-pilot; Mrs. Charlene H. Falkenberg, Hobart, Ind., with Mrs. Jeanne R. Tellekson, Oak Lawn, as co-pilot; and Mrs. Barbara W. Silagi, Somonauk, with Mrs. Pamela K. Stowell, Arlington Heights, as co-pilot.

Mrs. Jenison and Mrs. Schmidt are flying a Piper Comanche 260, a single engine plane, owned by Louis Dyson's Illini Aviation, Inc., at Urbana. The ship was readied for the race at Urbana airport and flown to Robinson, where the women fliers took off Friday morning. They flew first to St. Louis, and then planned to fly the race route north to Calgary, inspecting race route and facilities at each authorized stop. Earlier this month they tested their plane on the southern section of the route from St. Louis to Little Rock, Ark., and Baton Rouge.

At Calgary all planes must undergo inspection to make sure no modifications have been

made since the race is limited to stock models. Once inspected, the planes are impounded during a four day period prior to the race start. During that time the racers will be the guests of the City of Calgary for a variety of events, including a preview performance of the famed Calgary Stampede, and a civic banquet. One day they will enjoy a trip to Banff.

The race is under the supervision of the Ninety-Nines, Inc., international organization of women pilots of which both Mrs. Jenison and Mrs. Schmidt are members. It is the largest competitive aviation event for women in the world.

Race pilots must hold private and commercial or instrument ratings. Among the 300 contestants age is not a limiting factor for 55 are grandmothers.

There are 35 makes and models of aircraft entered, and all but seven of the 150 planes are single engine ships. Cessna 182's usually predominate but this year there are 29 Piper Comanche 260's to top the list.

Some of the more unusual entries this year include a plane guided by Mrs. Trudy Cooper, wife of U.S. astronaut Gordon Cooper; and a team from Sunnyside, Calif., sponsored by Zero Population Growth, the organization founded by famed Stanford biologist, Dr. Paul Erlich, and featuring the official No. 0 on the fuselage.

There will also be a light craft piloted by Fran Salles of Baton Rouge, who has a monkey for her co-pilot.

There are other entrants from Alaska, Hawaii, Canada, Mexico and South Africa.

LEGAL ASSISTANCE TO THE POOR

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, my position on legal services to the poor in California is, I am sure, well known as a result of the recent controversy in California over the California rural legal assistance program. I submit, however, a letter I have received from Mr. Willie Dorsey, chairman of the Contra Costa County Area Council of OEO.

Mr. Dorsey's letter confirms my belief in the concept of legal assistance to the poor wherever they are found and this letter is demonstrative of the support one program has received in California:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Martinez, Calif., June 15, 1971.

HON. JEROME WALDIE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WALDIE: We, the people of the North Richmond Iron Triangle community of Richmond, California, wish to take this opportunity to inform you of our recent evaluation of Contra Costa Legal Services Foundation, its staff and director, Gene Swann. Our evaluation to us indicates that this organization is providing superior representation to the poor of our community and that the dedication and competency of its staff has been a source of great pride and support to our efforts to improve our lives.

We, unfortunately, have noticed that there are not enough attorneys or staff to do the full job which we felt it can and should do. By its past-proven performance, this organization should be expanded and more funds for additional staff be made available.

Before Legal Services we had a negative impression of lawyers and the law. We felt

that the legal profession and court system were unresponsive and unconcerned about our problems. After four years of contact with the attorneys in Legal Services, we have come to realize that, indeed, the law and lawyers can have a beneficial impact on the quality of our daily lives and offer an acceptable avenue for redressing grievances. For the more than 18,000 people that Legal Services has served throughout the county, we again urge you to provide additional funds to further the concept of justice for all.

Sincerely,

WILLIE DORSEY,
Chairman.

CARS VERSUS MASS TRANSIT— COMPETING FOR THE COMMUTER'S CUSTOM

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, at a recent meeting of the National Conference on Public Transportation, Theodore Kheel, the nationally known labor mediator, delivered a perceptive and provocative address.

Mr. Kheel speaks to the vital urban problem of mass transit, bringing up the startling statistic that now, when the need for mass transit is at its greatest, there are less buses available than at any time in recent years.

At first glance, this situation would appear to give the bus manufacturers an outstanding opportunity to boost their sales, and indeed they probably would were it not for the fact that the single largest bus manufacturer is also the largest automobile producer in the world, and any increase in the available mass transportation would hurt their own automobile sales.

Mr. Kheel reaches the heart of this serious problem and suggests what seems to be a viable solution to it. The text of his speech follows:

STATEMENT BY THEODORE W. KHEEL

(Co-Chairman, Conference on Public Transportation, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., June 1, 1971)

There is a war being fought with increasing intensity between the private automobile and mass transportation and we are all the losers for it. The fight is for the patronage of the urban dweller who must travel from home to work each day and return when he is through. But competition, usually an advantage to the consumer, has here made him the victim, not the beneficiary.

When the Second World War ended in 1945, most everyone came to work by bus, subway, or commuter rail. Since then, the trend has been increasingly to private cars. In 1947, 2,600,000,000 people rode the buses and subways of New York City. By 1970, the number had dropped to 1,700,000,000, almost a billion less. During the same period, automobile crossings of the Hudson River over and through the bridges and tunnels of the Port of New York Authority jumped from 40,000,000 a year to 140,000,000 a year. Automobile registrations in New York City have been soaring since 1947 and are now up to 1,500,000 cars. Other cities have had similar declines in mass transportation and increases in private cars.

It is a war that the automobile is winning overwhelmingly, ironically to its own disadvantage. Those who have switched to personal from mass transportation now suffer from traffic congestion and air pollution just as the riders of mass transportation suffer from poor service and dilapidated facilities. It is a war that must end not in victory but in a balanced system of transportation if urban societies in the United States are to survive.

Time is running out. New transit facilities take years to plan and decades to carry out. And we still have failed to understand the interrelationship of these two forms of transportation, a necessary prerequisite to a solution. If a man decides not to use mass transportation, it does not mean he has disappeared. It means that he has found another way to commute and that way has most frequently been a private car with one person in it. Such switches, often prompted by fare increases, have invariably been followed by a cut in the level and quality of mass transportation, leading, in turn, to further declines. Poor mass transportation not only prevents inner-city residents from jobs in the suburbs and drives other companies to move from the central city—thereby intensifying the burden on those who remain—but the cost of a switch from mass to private transportation, though difficult to measure, means at a minimum a tenfold increase in the real cost to the public for the air pollution, traffic congestion, lost time, street repairs, police assistance, and accidents that result.

This conference proves that a new force, representing the public and capable of uncovering the seriousness of the conflict between mass and private transportation and providing the means of doing something about it, is taking shape. The groups here present, joined by their common interests in environmental protection, in economic development, in better transportation, can, I believe, develop a true commitment to a balanced system of transportation, to the vast improvement of transportation facilities, to new technologies of transportation, to improved inner-city mass transportation, to public transportation in the suburban areas, to better inner-city service, and to expanded service and efficiency of buses.

All these programs must be part of our effort. But we must properly identify our problem and see the war for what it is if we are to succeed. Let me give an important example of what I mean. General Motors, the largest maker of private cars, is likewise the largest maker of buses. These two methods of transportation are in deadly competition with each other. We have not only failed to see this but to do anything about it, even though an unusual opportunity exists.

In 1956, the United States government filed a lawsuit against General Motors, charging that company with monopolizing the manufacture and sale of buses in violation of the Sherman Act. The government suit charged that General Motors had through various illegal devices and practices assumed monopoly power over the bus industry and used that power to force others to discontinue or curtail their bus operations. The government suit stated that in 1955 General Motors sold 2,724 buses or 84.3% of the total market and that only three other companies delivered more than one percent of the total of new buses: the Flexible Company made 215 buses for 6.7%; Mack Trucks, Inc. produced 118 buses for 3.7% of the total, and the Southern Coach Manufacturing Company, Inc. accounted for 73 buses or 2.3%. According to the complaint, General Motors' conspiracy and condonation to monopolize bus making began in 1925 and had these harmful effects: (a) to drive most of General Motors' competitors out of the bus manufacturing business; (b) to curtail the supply

of new buses readily available for purchase; (c) to deprive bus operating companies and the bus riding public of the benefits of competition in the manufacture of buses; (d) to increase prices paid by bus operating companies; (e) to prevent other concerns from entering the bus manufacturing business, and (f) to deny to some bus operating companies access to certain bus models.

In 1965, after nine years of delay and preliminary proceedings, the government finally settled its suit with General Motors through a consent agreement. The company promised to stop some of its restrictive practices and methods of putting pressure on the other bus companies and operators. But the decree allowed General Motors to continue as the dominant force in bus manufacturing, disregarding the built-in conflict between buses and private cars. However, the consent decree also provided that if at any time before 1976 a competing bus manufacturer disappeared from the industry and was not replaced by a new entrant, the Justice Department could return to court and secure an order forcing General Motors to create a competitive company and then divest itself of it or take such other action as would effectuate the purpose of the decree.

I can report to you that not one but two of the competitors which were making buses at the time the suit was begun have now disappeared. The Southern Coach Manufacturing Company, Inc., was acquired by the Flexible Company after the decree and Mack Trucks, Inc., discontinued its bus operations after the decree.

In 1966, the year after the decree was entered, 3,100 motor buses were delivered to transit operators in the United States, according to the American Transit Association's Fact Book. This number has dropped every year since, and preliminary figures for 1970 indicate that the number is down to 1,442—or less than half the 1966 total. Up to the present, the Justice Department has not made any effort to reopen the case and seek relief of divestiture, to which it is entitled under the settlement agreement.

Apart from the merits of the anti-trust suit, there is the additional reason why General Motors should be removed from the bus-making business, a reason not understood when the government brought the suit in 1956. It is, as we now know, the incalculable injury to our urban societies from the war between mass and private transportation. The great automobile maker's domination of bus manufacturing must serve to restrain all development of public transportation by buses in the nation. That is apparent when we see the need for commuter and inner-city public transportation which has soared since 1956 and then find that General Motors and its one remaining competitor are making half as many buses today as they did five years ago.

This should not surprise us, for every bus GM makes potentially increases the capacity of some Americans to get to work or to shopping areas without a car and, despite appearances to the contrary, that is not good for General Motors. If public bus transportation is to develop, it must be developed by companies whose commitment to mass transportation is unqualified, whose wish to improve the technology is uninhibited, whose desire to sell has no built-in limitations.

General Motors should, and I hope will, recognize that it must divest itself of its bus manufacturing and selling operations at once. I believe that the Attorney General should return to the Federal Court in the Eastern District of Michigan immediately to request an order of divestiture as provided under the 1965 decree. Thus we will really gain the fruits of competition in the best American tradition instead of destructive competition in the war between mass and private transportation.

REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT
CONSTITUENTS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following commentary concerning the publication of the Pentagon papers.

In recent days, the Nation has been wrestling with a question of historic importance: Can the courts stop the publication of documents which the Government asserts will damage national security?

The issue grew out of the decision by several newspapers to publish portions of a 47-volume, 7,000-page Pentagon study of the Vietnam war. The action created a legal conflict between those claiming freedom of the press, and the Government asserting its right to maintain national security.

While Washington discussed the impact that the study on Democrats and Republicans . . . on former President Johnson and President Nixon . . . on future presidential candidates, a more serious consequence was being overlooked. The real victim may be the American people's confidence in the integrity of their Government.

I agreed with the Supreme Court's ruling that the documents could be published. While the Government argued that irreparable damage would come from their publication, in my view, greater damage would result from continued secrecy. The Pentagon papers deal with some fundamental questions which need answers if we are going to avoid future Vietnams: What went wrong in Vietnam? How did we get involved? How did we lose our way?

The task before us is to learn from the Pentagon papers. Several lessons already are apparent:

First, we must improve the decision-making process in this country. While our policymakers were involved in raging debates over the Vietnam conflict, very little of it surfaced. The American people, who had the most at stake, were given little or no opportunity to understand the stakes, the difficulties, or the options.

The vital process of policymaking must be improved by raising the quality of debate, assuring that fundamental questions are continually reassessed, and that the whole process be open and responsive to the people. My own bias is that policy which is held up to public debate tends to be better policy, and we must do all we can to open up the process.

Second, the Government classification system is inadequate, and in some instances, absurd. We need a more rational system, with the chief aim of making far more information available to the public, assuring us that relevant documents on any crisis, including Viet-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

nam, are made available. This means establishing regular procedures outside the executive branch of the Government for examining and deciding on the release of documents.

Third, the Congress must become more effective in the foreign policy process, serving as a counterweight to the executive. I served on the Foreign Affairs Committee during several of the years covered in the Pentagon Papers, and I am concerned about the amount of information which was kept from the Congress.

It would appear the Congress was, in the view of the Executive, an obstacle to overcome, a nuisance, and certainly not a partner in policymaking. Hopefully, one of the results of this experience will be a better working relationship between the President and the Congress.

Fourth, the experts deserve more respect. The one Government agency which emerges from the Vietnam debate with honor is the CIA. It consistently provided accurate assessments of our position in Vietnam, and was just as consistently ignored.

Fifth, our policymakers must have time to examine the fundamentals of policy, and not become exclusively involved in the implementation of policy. The Pentagon Papers reveal that the Vietnam debate was concentrated upon the best means of achieving policy objectives, and not what our policy should be. There appears to have been little discussion of the vital question: Is Vietnam in the national interest?

Sixth, it would be a grave mistake for the Nation to engage now in a search for scapegoats. The fact is that most of our top leaders since World War II shared in the decisions which led to Vietnam. Nothing is to be gained, and much is to be lost, in picking out villains among them.

The Pentagon Papers have shown us the Government did not act in a manner in which to earn the confidence of the people, but there is another side to the issue. The people must act in a way to earn the confidence of Government, to be informed, and not to react by instinct to complex questions, or engage in careless rhetoric and name calling.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

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

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

How long?

July 7, 1971

BRaille CURRENCY FOR THE
BLIND: THE NETHERLANDS EX-
PERIENCE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on June 15, 1971, I wrote De Nederlandsche Bank N.V., requesting information relevant to the use of braille currency for the blind by the Netherlands. I was hopeful that their reply might indicate the feasibility of undertaking a similar operation here in the United States, as proposed in my bill, H.R. 9102.

Their reply is most interesting and informative. It serves to indicate that there are no technical or practical problems involved in switching to this type of marking on currency that cannot be overcome.

I am hopeful that this information will enable us to join together to give, to borrow the concluding phrase of Mr. Loeff's excellent lecture, "the visually handicapped a more independent place in the 'paying situation.'"

I ask that the reply I received from De Nederlandsche Bank N.V. and a copy of my bill, H.R. 9102, be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

DE NEDERLANDSCHE BANK N.V.,

Amsterdam, June 29, 1971.

Re: Braille currency for the blind

Mr. JOHN R. RARICK,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of June 15, 1971 we have pleasure in sending you herewith a copy of a lecture by Mr. E. A. M. Loeff on tangible marks on Netherlands bank notes, which we hope will give you all the information required.

Yours truly,

DE NEDERLANDSCHE BANK N.V.

TANGIBLE MARKS ON THE NETHERLANDS
BANKNOTES

(Lecture given by E.A.M. Loeff at a Study Conference of the NBW (Netherlands Association of the Blind) held at Beekbergen in October 1970)

Subject: recognition of Banknotes and their denomination by the Visually Handicapped

The recognition of banknotes is a known problem in the life of the visually handicapped. On the one hand this problem is overcome by the confidence in the person to whom the note is handed, confidence which persons with normal eyesight also have, both in banknotes and in human beings. On the other hand this problem is overcome by the assistance of the shop attendant or of the helping hand of a seeing person who happens to be there at the moment of paying. Some handicapped people have cleverly developed their own method for recognizing banknotes, which method has proved to be very practical: use is made amongst others of the different sizes of the notes, of different ways of folding notes, of folding corners, of a special method to put notes into a purse or wallet, or of a combination of these possibilities.

However, such systems become more difficult when banknotes of various countries are

involved, or when an additional banknote is put into circulation, as for instance the Netherlands "new" 5 guilder banknote. This note is known to have created some problems to some visually handicapped because of the small difference in size when compared to the 10 guilders note and the 2.50 currency note, or because their method of putting notes in wallets or purses had made no allowance for the appearance of a new denomination.

The Central Banks and the banknote printers are well acquainted with the problem of the visually handicapped to recognize banknotes, both on the national and on the international level. So far, however, no solution was found for this problem.

The complaints resulting from the putting into circulation of the "new" 5 guilder note and the development of a new 10 guilder note have led De Nederlandsche Bank N.V., the designer Mr. R.D.E. Oxenaar and Joh. Enschedé en Zonen to join in another thorough study of the problem.

In looking for a solution, they had amongst others to take the following points into consideration:

Requirements for the use of banknotes by the masses (of persons with normal eyesight)

Requirements for the handling of notes by the banks

Requirements for protection against counterfeiting and forgery

Requirements regarding the composition of the notes

Technical possibilities of paper-maker and printer.

First of all a possibility seemed to be the application of a braille mark. This soon appeared unpracticable, not only because the technical means gave insufficient results, but especially because such a mark would soon disappear from the note when in circulation, the body of the paper not being fit for this purpose. A punched-out hole in the border of the note did not appear practicable either, as this would result in technical problems both in the handling of notes by the banks and for the printers, to such an extent that the costs involved would be quite out of proportion.

Finally a solution was sought in the printing forms. This idea was conceived after it had become known that some visually handicapped recognized the Dutch Dfl. 25 note by the heavily printed rosette at the top left-hand corner of the face of the note. This rosette appeared to be sufficiently tangible to identify the note, without however establishing its shape. The printing process used for it is a characteristic feature of banknotes. For those not yet acquainted: the banknote is made of paper with a special watermark on which the design on the face and the reverse and the numbering are printed. For the visually handicapped the printing process used is of great importance. The numbering of the note is printed in the "flat" letterpress technique and is therefore not tangible. Nor are the parts printed by the offset process, which is also "flat".

Those parts of the design which are printed in the intaglio or direct plate process usually the portrait, some line structures and part of the text are tangible through the relief or embossing characteristic to this process.

The intaglio process uses a metal plate in which deep lines are engraved. A solid type of ink is pressed into the lines, after which the paper is pressed into the grooves under high pressure. This print causes a relief in the paper, whilst the (thick) ink accentuates this relief. In order to get the greatest possible relief, the grooves are therefore to be made as deep as possible. One will understand that this depth is limited and has to conform to printing technical standards.

To apply by this process tiny dots of the size used in braille appeared technically impossible. Besides, the application of a recognition mark in braille code would not help

those who do not know braille, still a significant number of the visually handicapped. Hence the functional value of such an aid would be greatly reduced.

For this reason a simpler recognition mark was looked for and found in a large dot of approx. 6 mm in diameter. The study committee who contributed to this result is of the (otherwise modest) opinion that this dot will be reasonably tangible. The tangibility of this dot will be all the more pronounced when it is placed in an area bare of any other relief print. The study committee was supported in this train of thought when proofs of the dots were submitted to representatives of the Dutch Advisory Committee of the Blind, who localized the marks fairly quickly.

This test also showed that the persons involved could discern the difference in the number of dots; thus the various denominations can be indicated by varying the number of dots. For the Netherlands the following arrangement has been chosen: Dfl. 5,—: no mark. Dfl. 10,—: 3 marks. Dfl. 25,—: 2 marks. Dfl. 100,—: 1 mark and Dfl. 1000,—: no mark. A decrease in the number of marks for each higher denomination has been chosen because it is practically impossible to remove a dot without damaging the paper noticeably. In order to prevent any misunderstanding it should be emphasized that the marks applied to the new series, should never be regarded as distinguishing true notes from counterfeits, but solely as a mark to recognize the various denominations.

As regards the durability of the marks on the notes in circulation, we observe that the ink used for printing the dots will no more disappear in circulation than the other printing on the note. The paper will indeed undergo the aging process, but it will have to be seen whether the wear of the paper will affect the tangibility adversely or whether the result will be an increase.

Finally it should be observed that nor De Nederlandsche Bank, the designer or the printers, Joh. Enschedé en Zonen, are of the opinion that an ideal solution has been found for the visually handicapped. However, they have for the time being endeavoured to find a practical solution. The study committee faces the practice with the tangible marks with confidence. How far the marks will improve or deteriorate in circulation only practice can show. The study committee will appreciate from practice, through a central contact organization, which problems the handicapped persons encounter in handling the notes with these marks.

This is not only important for further developments of this subject in our own country, but also for progress on an international level. Through contacts with foreign Central Banks and banknote printers, the development of our tangible marks is in the meantime watched with much interest in other countries.

The study committee hopes that this development may contribute to giving the visually handicapped a more independent place in the "paying situation".

HAARLEM, October 1970.

E.A.M. LOEFF.

H.R. 9102

A bill to provide for paper money of the United States to carry a designation in braille indicating the denomination

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there shall appear on the face of all paper money of the United States which is printed after January 1, 1972, a designation in braille indicating the denomination thereof.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall carry out the provisions of this Act, and for such purpose he may establish such rules and regulations as he determines appropriate.

THE CANCER OF RUNAWAY PUBLIC WELFARE SPENDING

HON. JOHN ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of this Congress the June 28 editorial of the Alhambra, Calif., Post-Advocate.

Following passage of H.R. 1, by the House of Representatives, this Copley chain newspaper editorialized, "Time for Second Thoughts." To this I say, "Amen." I hope that the Members of the other body which now has this measure before it, the President, and his White House advisers, will pay serious attention to this clear warning. May their thinking focus on the keynote of this editorial:

If the staggering welfare cancer is to be controlled, it must be curbed, not expanded.

Where are our working poor taxpayers going to come up with another \$4 to \$6 billion to underwrite the additional welfare funds now estimated for the first year under this plan?

Why should they have to pay the salaries of the 30,000 additional bureaucrats the bill's proponents admit will eventually be needed just to administer this plan when, with sharply rising prices of food, clothing, and shelter, they find it increasingly difficult just to care for their own family needs?

With more attractive incentives to get off welfare and go to work than H.R. 1 offers, only 235 families out of the 200,000 welfare families in New York City chose to accept the alternative of working. Let us give this unreasonable welfare concept deep second thoughts. To help the needy, yes; to exhaust more of our conscientious working taxpayers' hard-earned wages to support the indolent, no.

TIME FOR SECOND THOUGHTS

(The Issue: This is the time to face the truth. If the staggering welfare cancer is to be controlled it must be curbed, not expanded. Strict regulations must be drawn to eliminate the greedy.)

Approval by the U.S. House of Representatives of a so-called Family Assistance Plan of welfare reform is regarded as a critical test of this controversial proposal which has been simmering in Congress for the last two years.

Hopefully, the detailed scrutiny that the American people will receive in the Senate will give that body and the American people occasion for second thoughts about the landmark changes in principle that are proposed.

As we consider the immense problem of runaway welfare in the United States which is taxing all public treasuries to their limits, it is important to remember that mental attitudes as well as figures are involved.

The reason that welfare has been doubling every few years is in a large part due to the fact that the American attitude has changed. Within the life span of the youngest of our voters, welfare was considered a last resort—a necessity for the genuinely unfortunate and a misfortune for those temporarily down on their luck. For the latter, the goal was to become self-reliant as soon as possible.

Today, welfare, which has its roots in humanitarian concepts is hailed as a right, and organizations are formed to give its re-

ipients publicity instead of dignity. The idea is fostered that those with the lowest earnings in our country, or those unable to work, are the victims of the more affluent who must support them. Welfare recipients demand the best lawyers, occasionally live in fine hotels, and want an extra measure of all benefits of our society. The excesses are encouraged by an entrenched welfare bureaucracy which has become a political power in its own right.

The unhappy fact is, welfare is becoming accepted as a way of life and its psychology is expansive.

Unfortunately, the Family Assistance Plan is in the same mold. It would further push welfare in the category of a "right." It would nearly double the welfare rolls as well as the spending. With the increase would come commensurately larger federal bureaucracy, unresponsive to local needs and conditions.

This is a time to face the truth. If the staggering welfare cancer is to be controlled, it must be curbed, not expanded. Compassionate standards must be set to give more and better assistance to those in genuine need. Strict regulations must be drawn to eliminate the greedy.

None of this can occur unless Americans first convince their representatives in government that there is no virtue in exalting poverty.

CLEANING UP ENVIRONMENT IS NO SIMPLE JOB

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a copy of a speech which was delivered recently to the Conservation Councils of Virginia.

The speaker in this case was Mr. John W. Hanes, Jr., vice chairman of Virginia's Council on the Environment, and one of this country's most knowledgeable and effective leaders in the field of conservation and the environment.

Mr. Hanes faces some important realities in this speech. He points out that:

"Cleaning up the environment" is no simple job; on the contrary, it is going to take concerted effort and even more money. This movement cannot be a temporary one, it cannot be a fad, or a "bandwagon" to which thousands rush for a week because they want to be "counted in" as helpful members of the community.

Finally, Mr. Hanes emphasizes that:

We are going to have to be tough if we want to get anything done in this field; we are going to meet inevitable conflicts and perhaps we are going to have to settle for compromise solutions. But if we want any solutions, we are going to have to build up far more expertise than we now have, and use it well.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this speech to the attention of my colleagues:

REMARKS OF JOHN W. HANES, JR.

It is a great pleasure for me to be here with you today and to represent who is actually the top man on the Governor's Council on the Environment—the Governor. He purposely kept the Chairmanship of that Council when he created it, both because of and to demonstrate his own very real interest in the problems of the environment. As some of you will recall, in his inaugural address, Governor Holton set out two major areas in which he hoped some significant

progress could be made during his administration. One of those was the field of race relations and one of them was the field of environment; and in both of them, the Governor said that he hoped we could begin setting Virginia on the path of leadership, as so often before in the history of this country it has been the leader for other states and the rest of our country.

I really want to talk with you today not about the work of the Governor's Council but rather about some of the problems that we in the Governor's Council have come to see are basic as we face the task he gave us. That task is: to provide leadership in beginning to correct some of the things that have not been done or have been done badly in the past, and to plan for the future. We shall try to prevent new mistakes from crowding in upon us as we go about the process of correcting mistakes of the past; and we shall seek to plan a future that will be better-grounded in wisdom than the actions of the past, in many cases, have been.

Our biggest problem, as we approached this job, was really to get our arms around it and find out what is the problem and how do you approach it. Because in a real sense, to say "the environment" is to include everything. Putting this in the context of state government, for instance, if we took the agencies of state government that deal with the environment and put them together, we would have just re-created the state government, because there is no single aspect of government that does not impinge in some way on something that we can call the environment. But that is not a very useful kind of approach. The other problem, however, that we all found is that many people deeply interested in this problem have tended to go to the other extreme, which is to adopt an unduly narrow interpretation of the environment—usually narrow in the context of the particular interest of the persons involved. This is the approach taken by many of the traditional conservation and environmentally-oriented organizations, which have developed over the last half century. It seems to me, however, an inadequate type of approach today.

I would like to suggest to you a few of the broader concepts that seem to me to be important. In doing so, I would also suggest that these are the kind of questions which should at all times be present, underlying every meeting that you may have as individuals, as groups or as organizations—whatever the particular narrow purpose of that meeting may be (and they often have to be narrow to get a particular job done). Only as we approach the answers to these broader questions will we, in my judgment, have any opportunity of really solving any of the particular problems.

The first one that I want to speak about is what I call the measurement of the economic cost of environmental problems, as we are today facing them. The economic cost of cleaning up our environment, keeping it clean and hopefully maintaining such cleanliness into the future. (Obviously you will recognize that I am using certain shorthand words; to say "cleaning up" goes far beyond the physical removal of a physical pollutant. One can have a situation needing "cleaning up" simply because there is overcrowding rather than because there is an infusion of some type of specific liquid, solid or gaseous waste into the environment.)

There is a cost, however, to whatever we do in this area. More accurately, there is a range of costs, because, depending on what you want to do, there is a whole range of responses. We can, in other words, have varying degrees of a cleaned-up environment. Technology today, by and large, can produce almost any desired degree of cleanliness up to and including the sterile chambers that are used for certain types of drug manufacturing processes. It is perfectly plain that such a

degree of cleaning up is neither economically feasible nor particularly desirable. In other words, the maximum available technology is not always the one most suitable to any given situation. As in most other things, this, too, is an area of compromise; but there has been little or no work done on the costs of these options—the economic cost of any of these ranges of possibilities. Most of the debate that has gone into this question has been emotional. I would submit to you that, until there is some good basic "gut work" done in the economics, there is not going to be a lot of real progress made; because in the final analysis, everything costs something, and somebody has to pay for it. What that cost is and who is going to have to pay for it is going to have to be determined beforehand rather than afterwards if you want to achieve a continued stream of progress.

Don't forget that we are not just talking about the cost of cleaning up something that is present, such as a sewage system that doesn't work or a factory that is spewing out some type of a pollutant. We must also consider the cost of alternatives; for if we are to prevent similar problems in the future, we have to do things differently in the future than we have done them in the past. Perhaps a different type of technology in the industrial process. What is the cost? Who is going to pay for it? Perhaps a different type of material; for example, a different type of chemical achieving the same result but with less adverse effect upon the environment. What is its cost? What is its availability? Who will pay for it? Perhaps just a different way of doing something; for instance, a cessation of the use of hard pesticides such as DDT in certain types of agricultural endeavor. This may mean a very real drop in production or a very real increase in the cost of maintaining a similar level of production. Again, what is this cost? Who will pay it? Someone must.

It is important that these questions be faced and answered. It is important that there be a lot more hard work done in this area than has been done up until the present time. The bill that cleaning up the environment will present, and who that bill will be presented to, is by no means clear today to anyone. It is going to be impossible, I submit, to get any meaningful and sustained actions through the legislatures and the other governmental processes—or, indeed, supported over the long-term by the citizens of this country (or any other country) without some basic kind of work of this type, just as it has required that kind of basic economics to produce the intricate industrial, commercial, housing and other complexes which we build today. Very few people build such things without first knowing what the economic bottom line is. Those few who do generally end up bankrupt; and they don't generally build a second one.

If we can think of what I have just been saying as the need to develop an environmental algebra, my second theme is the very real need for the development of what I will call an environmental calculus, going far beyond a measurement of economic impacts. It is perfectly plain today, I think, and increasingly accepted in our country, that economics is not the only measure of value. It is not a measure of value which has produced a tolerable result in our lifestyle today. It is the measure of value, in fact, which in many cases has produced the very things we are talking about preventing, cleaning up and stopping. But we have no good ways of measuring what other values ought to go into this equation. We have no consensus on what those other values are; but even when there is any kind of an agreement, there is no mathematics that enables us to put these various other factors into an equation so that, faced with a particular problem, we can come out with a meaningful result—

namely a set of priorities. Something should be done or shouldn't be done; it should be done with high priority or with low priority. We have no way of "environmentally" evaluating different things on a consistent basis, so that we could weigh one project against some other project, or some other alternative.

I can suggest to you some of the kind of things that should go into such an equation, and they are the kind of things that, it seems to me, we should be trying to develop a mathematics about. Because, in some way we have got to develop such mathematics; it isn't good enough just to say that economics are bad; they are insufficient; let's weigh in beauty. All right, beauty is a perfectly proper thing to weigh in, but how? What weight is it to be given? What weight is it to be given in the building of a housing development? in building a power plant? in preserving a stream? I don't know. But we had better learn some method of getting this kind of thing into the equation or we are never going to have anything more than a series of irrational and unrelated projects, rather than having real priorities or having anything that could legitimately be called a program.

This kind of value measurement affects the entire range of land use policies, for instance, which most definitely includes possible control on population growth. Should we have population growth controls, implemented or encouraged by the state, either directly—by preventing the birth of children—or indirectly, as some states have done, by discouraging the immigration of persons into out states or into our country from other places?

The entire range of questions involving land use comes down to a determination of what is the optimum use of different types of land. But that whole sentence is loaded with things that we don't know. What is an "optimum" land use? Is it the way that you get the "most" on to a piece of land? The most what? Is it the way that provides the most satisfaction to the most number of people? If so, what is the "most" satisfaction? What is "satisfaction"? Is it the way that provides a certain type of satisfaction to perhaps only one, two or a few people? Are we to have a quantitative view of these things? Is a type of recreation more important because ten thousand people want to engage in it than is another because only a hundred want to engage in it? Is there room in our society for all of these things? This type of question is at the heart of land use policies; because merely to say that one should have land use policies is a very, very small, tentative and hesitant step down the road of getting to them in a meaningful way.

What is the measurement of the social and psychological desirables, for instance, such as one I mentioned before: the prevention of overcrowding. You have all probably read of some recent experiments in which it has been rather conclusively shown that a rat colony subjected to a specific amount of overcrowding will, in due course, start a nonreversible trend toward self-extermination by failing to breed; and this reproduction-failure doesn't cease when the population has descended; it persists to ultimate extirpation of the colony. This is a psychological reaction. Some rat colonies studied in the past have had disturbing parallels to human reactions; so this is a troubling type of thing.

How do we value the various types of appeals of things that appeal to different people; things that are important to different people? What kind of quantifying mathematics are we going to apply to aesthetics? Again, how do we define aesthetics?

Is there importance to the maintenance of a certain amount of open space or wilderness? "Wilderness", of course, is a relative term, because Central Park can be a wilder-

ness as far as the kids from the ghettos of New York go; it is also enough of the wilderness for some other people. How do we apply measurements so we may come to decisions about how much "wilderness" we should have—or, perhaps, that we must have?

There are sub-questions, of course, to all of these things. What, as far as that is concerned, is overcrowding? If you don't want to define beauty, what is ugliness? That is something you will have a hard time finding a consensus about.

However, only when we get to the point that we find a way to put these things into our equation will we be able intelligently to face the individual problems we have—a dam here, a power plant there, a factory, a housing development, a new town—and make some sort of a rational decision; make some sort of meaningful priority. Because the one thing that is absolutely certain is that there is already too little of everything to go around, and there is increasingly less of it to go around.

Priorities are going to have to be set; compromises will have to be made. They will be made only as intelligently as our ability to put together this kind of mathematics. In the past, we have had little such ability; and, therefore, they have not been made very intelligently. In general, most have been made with the only kind of mathematics we have been confident of, which is the economic determinant. If you don't think it is good enough, you had better be among those who get on the stick and try and help develop another one that is better.

The third basic matter I would like to suggest to you is the need, in carrying out this kind of program, to assemble and maintain an effective political majority. At the moment, environmental concerns have a good deal of political sex appeal. A lot of people have rushed to get on this bandwagon, to the extent that whereas twenty years ago we might have been concerned about the few people who were interested, today I am equally concerned about the number of people who want to be counted in, who don't really now what they are doing but who, nonetheless, think this is a pretty good thing. But that won't last. This type of public approval is a fickle thing and flits from one to another of the latest fads. It will not last unless there is a sustained effort at education and at building up a true constituency; and the true constituency in this field—that is to say, the informed constituency—is still perilously small. It will also not last unless it is translated, in some manner, into a more effective type of presence on the political scene and in the political structures which, in fact, govern our country and our lives on the local, on the state and on the national level.

The "environmental" movement is still a very fragmentary process today; and probably one of the reasons it is fragmentary is that most of its leaders are persons who, by and large, are inexperienced in the political process—and a number of whom find it actually objectionable. I would submit to you that this type of attitude is also not good enough. Basically, I would not visualize any major change in the political processes of our country over the next twenty, thirty or forty years. If you want to make your point, therefore, you had better work within the system and figure out how to make that political process work toward your objectives, rather than attempting to work outside of it, or merely standing on the outside and complaining about what it is not doing.

I appreciate that the existence of this group and your coming together here today is a recognition of this. I say to you, however, that there is still an insignificant recognition of political facts and political necessities on the part of many individuals and many organizations deeply concerned with environmental matters.

One of the problems is that in order to make the political system work, you have to understand that there are values and value systems different than the ones you are interested in. You have to recognize not only that they are there, but also that they have validity. And a failure to recognize this is a prelude to total failure in the political process. Let me give you just two examples.

Recently, in attempting to develop a child education program in New York City, drawing from the ghetto schools and bringing children together to give them some basic environmental education, some very talented friends of mine ran into a total roadblock. They were holding their classes in, as it happens, Central Park; and they found that the children practically went rigid in these classes, and they couldn't get through to them. Well, I will make this very short, but after a good deal of investigation, what transpired was that these children had never known, in a direct physical way, not only what trees looked like but even what grass was; and the fact that they were being forced to sit on grass was, to them, a traumatic experience that filled them with fear. These were children of around four, five and six years old. To them, this was literally like a city-dweller of old having to go into the deepest, darkest forest.

Unless we are willing to recognize these wide gulfs in the value systems of others, and not automatically to assume that ours exist elsewhere, we are going to have a difficult time relating to the political process. I would point out to you that those children who I have just described are not only voters of tomorrow, but probably very close to the majority of voters of tomorrow. It is in the cities that the voting power of this country not only resides today but is increasingly being made more powerful by reapportionment and other reforms throughout our state and national legislatures, as you all know.

Unless the people with that voting power believe that some of these concerns are relevant to them, the chances of any long-term legislative interest or support of this type of program in our governmental system is remote at best.

A second example: I think there is a very serious lesson involved in at least one aspect of the recent SST battle, and that is the serious alienation of organized labor in this country from the environmental movement on this issue. Labor, as it happens, is a fairly natural ally of the environmental movement. But labor is bitterly against what it sees as a narrow approach, in the matter of the SST, to a problem that involves livelihoods, jobs and well-being to large numbers of people that it considers as its constituency. I am not suggesting any answers to this particular question; I am suggesting that, in this case, there was an awful lot more homework that could and should have been done—probably on both sides. There are a great many more factors involved, in other words, in this kind of thing than just the simple matter of an environmental impact (and that is not so simple, either). Unless those other factors are recognized more fully and recognized earlier; unless there is more attempt to realize that different people not only have different values, but also have valid different approaches to this kind of problem, there is going to be an increasing amount, I am afraid, of this sort of passing in the night. The result will be to end up in a series of political fights, each decided by who has the most political troops. This is not usually the best way of getting an intelligent result, nor of developing a consistent long-term program.

The fact is that, like it or not, there are going to have to be a lot of hard choices, and a lot of them are going to end up being compromises. The population of this country, at least for the foreseeable future, is

going to continue to grow at a considerable, if not an alarming rate. There will be the requirement of more houses; there will be an overwhelming requirement for power, meaning power plants and power lines and many other things of this sort.

There no longer is enough environment to go around without these things conflicting. Somehow or other, we have got to find not only the mathematics of determining how to minimize these conflicts (you can't eliminate them), but then the political methods of bringing that result into the political system so that an intelligent decision can, in fact, become an intelligent result. The two are equally vital.

The last point I want to make is related to the one we have just been discussing, and that is the question of governmental organization itself. What type of organization should we have to handle this sort of problem? I am not here today to give any kind of answer, because not only do I not have, but I think no one else has, these answers; but rather to give you some of the questions.

I would point out only a few things: one of them is that there is a very clear difference between the policy aspect of government, the administrative aspect of government and the enforcement aspect of government. All three happen to be important in the environmental area. An example of the policy aspect would be Russell Train's Environmental Quality Council. An example of enforcement would be the Virginia Water Quality Control Board. An example of the administrative would be the National Park Service. Obviously, there are overlaps in these things, but they are all distinct problems. There are problems when these three types of governmental activity are brought into one agency; there are different but equivalent problems when they are left separate. Neither is a perfect solution.

One of the problems of keeping them separate, for instance, is how do you then get any "teeth" into the policy-making aspect if the administrative people say, "Well, it is our budget and we are going to administer it any way that we want, no matter what policy says".

If you put them all together, how do you handle the problem of just sheer bureaucratic size? And, if you are going to have one agency, how many things do you put into an environmental agency anyway? Certain functions clearly should go in; but what about the others—what do you do about the marginal departments that deal with matters of the environment, but only fifty percent of the time? What do you do with those? I don't suggest—and I don't think most people would suggest—that the Division of Highways belongs within an environmental agency; but it sure enough better not exist totally remote from such an agency nor from its policies if you intend to have a meaningful environmental program. How, administratively, is one to structure that kind of organization?

State government, itself, is a difficult concept today, because by and large our state governments over the last half century have been defunct; and yet in this environmental area particularly, it is pretty clear that local government on the town or county level isn't good enough any longer—if it ever was; it is too subject to political pressure, and it can't look at a broad enough scope. And I would strongly recommend that you not put all of your faith in the federal government to solve these problems. I happen to have spent some twelve years in the federal government, so I speak with some feeling. But there is one thing that the federal government will probably be in a good position to do, and that is to lay down general enforcement criteria. The federal government, however, is not good when it gets around to applying them to a local situation; that is something we had better keep on a more local level, although probably not at a village level; but again, how? What are the processes

that we need to accomplish this type of result?

So I guess what I am saying in all of this is that the kids, nowadays, all use the term "relevant"; we have got to be "relevant"; this is right. But, we have to remember that relevance is something that does not exist only to us in our own particular value system as we see it. I have relevance and ideas about relevance; so do you, each of you. So do a lot of other people.

Those of us in this room today probably would have little difficulty putting our various relevances together to come to a program. But, when you get out into the main stream of politics, which means our state, our towns, and our country (and also means whether the things we are talking about here today are merely going to be talk, or whether they will be translated into effective action) then we had better recognize that there are a lot of other relevances as well as ours. Some of them are different; some of them we find objectionable; some of them, however, are equally valid. Who knows, some of them might even be more valid; at least they are more valid to the people who hold them, and we had better recognize this as a fact. We had better broaden our visions and learn, perhaps, to do more careful groundwork when we suggest a program, and also, perhaps, to be a bit more tolerant—to be a bit more willing to recognize that the final outcome of almost any program of action, if it is to be a successful one, is likely to be a compromise rather than precisely what you or I or any one of us as individuals might think is the ideal solution. Because I can promise you that the absolutely ideal solution to anything is not likely to be found in the ideas (or prejudices) of any one of us, or even of any small group of us.

Thank you for your invitation to speak to you.

THE PROBLEM OF DEFINING "CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR"

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, the problem of defining "conscientious objector" and establishing relevant and usable criteria for the draft boards of our Selective Service System was highlighted by the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Muhammad Ali.

Nowhere are there valid rules or clear guidelines to be found for the men who administer our draft laws. I recently received a letter from the chairman of one of draft boards in my congressional district, giving his reasons for resigning this position after 20 years of service. He clearly and poignantly outlines how the recent Court decisions, coupled with congressional inaction, have caused him to believe that he cannot discharge his responsibilities justly in the determining of conscientious objector status. I recommend reading his letter to all of my colleagues. Text follows:

LOS ALAMOS, N. MEX.,
June 17, 1971.

HON. MANUEL LUJAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LUJAN: I recently submitted my resignation as chairman and member of New Mexico Selective Service Board no. 30, Los Alamos, New Mexico, to be effective June 30,

1971. Since the reasons for this resignation were prompted primarily by actions (or lack of action) by the United States Congress, I should like the New Mexico Senators and Representatives to know my reasons.

Before the Congressional election of 1970, I had correspondence with all of the New Mexico delegation to Congress expressing my concerns about the Selective Service law. Since that time administrative changes have been made in the operation of the Selective Service program. I feel that these have been improvements for the most part, but the one area where I feel the need for change most strongly has changed only because changes have been forced upon it by Supreme Court decision. I am referring to the problem of conscientious objection. I have watched this problem grow greatly in the past few years, yet I have seen little effort on the part of the Executive Department of our government or leaders in Congress to try to solve some of the problems which now exist.

It is my feeling that Supreme Court decisions in the past few years have interpreted this portion of the law in a manner which few, if any, members of Congress intended when the law was originally passed. In effect, it seems to me, the Court has passed some legislation. I am not a lawyer, and I do not know whether the Congress has the power to pass any legislation which might change the broad effects of these decisions. Perhaps the members of Congress do not wish to change them, even if they have the power. I do not object to the changes, provided that the will of the people and Congress is being followed.

But even assuming that these new interpretations are the will of Congress, I do not believe that the Congress has really looked at the conscientious objection problem in any complete way. Congress needs to consider how our American society has changed in its thinking in the years since conscientious objection was first written into the laws of Selective Service. Senator Edward Kennedy chaired a sub-committee of the Senate Armed Services Committee during the 91st Congress. The report of this sub-committee included a brief, but quite complete statement of the alternatives facing the nation on the sticky problem of conscientious objection. I do not know how much consideration the Senate Armed Services Committee of the 91st Congress gave to this portion of the report. Certainly during the present session news reports on Congressional deliberation on Selective Service indicate plenty of discussion on length of extension, number of men to be called up, and other problems, but nothing on conscientious objection. I feel that Congress has ignored the problem.

My objections to the present circumstances are two-fold. First I believe that the Supreme Court decisions have handed local Selective Service Boards the impossible task of deciding the "sincerity" of a registrant's claim. As I see it, a board member has three alternatives. He could reason as follows: "I cannot tell whether this registrant is sincere or not, but I will consider him to be such, unless it is proved otherwise". Under this reasoning nearly all of those requesting it would achieve a I-O classification. A member could take the opposite view and not accept a man's sincerity unless he proves he is. In this approach most would be denied their requests. Most members will honestly try to accomplish the impossible task of making a fair, considered judgment. So the most intelligent, widely read actors win their cases. I do not believe this is fair, and I can no longer take part in such a procedure.

The second part of my objection to the present procedure is the fact that local boards and those registrants who do achieve a I-O classification must go through very cumbersome and ineffective processes in getting the registrant into acceptable alternate service. Local boards do not have the infor-

mation or the ways and means to handle this operation. Once a boy is sent for induction into the armed services the Selective Service Board turns him over to the control of the military. But once a conscientious objector is called up, the local board must operate the machinery which finally gets him placed, and the boards are not equipped to do this.

I write to you, not to complain about you as an individual member of Congress, but to impress upon you my feeling that the handling of this problem is an example of the inefficient ways in which our national legislature operates in many areas. I am willing to leave it to our government to decide whether or not the United States needs to keep Selective Service. But if we are to have it, I believe it is up to Congress to make it as fair and efficient as possible.

I am not resigning in protest of our Indo-China policies, or the continuation of Selective Service. I am protesting the unwillingness of the Congress of the United States to look at this situation in the light of the responsibilities which have been placed on many volunteer citizens in this country who would like to do a good job in a situation that is not popular or easy under the best of circumstances. I have been a member of Selective Service Board No. 30 for nearly twenty years. Only in the last two or three years have I felt personally torn inside by the decisions I have had to assist in making when there were no real grounds or guidelines for making those decisions. I don't believe it needs to be this way.

If my thoughts are of any value, perhaps you can share them with your colleagues.
Sincerely yours,

EDWARD E. SPENCE.

**PRIMITIVE CULTISTS OF D.C. AND
NEW GUINEA—A WASTE OF TAX-
PAYER'S MONEY**

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, anyone with any degree of intelligence can, after reading Washington newspapers, reach the conclusion that the Federal Government is deliberately creating a hysterical situation that forces the people of this Nation to support more and more socialistic programs and increased Federal controls, especially in the economic sector where people of today expect a guaranteed annual income or, at most, an excessively high minimum wage standard.

Never has this deliberate action on the part of the Federal Government been more evident in the recent accounts of separate incidents regarding Federal expenditures here in the Nation's Capital. In separate accounts, the Washington Post, the liberal's "bible," reveals a waste of taxpayer money wherein the Federal Government is providing \$1.60 per hour for 1,400 schoolchildren to attend summer school here in the District—a wage scale equal to the minimum national scale and more than the minimum for agricultural workers, who only get \$1.30 per hour—and a Federal subsidy of crime insurance to be made available in the District August 1 through the Department of Housing and Urban Develop-

ment—only necessary because the people of the District cannot police themselves and tend to their own problems.

Small wonder that the American wage earner throws up his hands in disgust and feels he must appeal to the Federal Government for either higher minimum wages or a guaranteed annual income. That farmworker who gets only \$1.30 per hour pays taxes on that, and sees it thrown away as a bribe to get kids to go to summer school—and the children do not even want to do that, for only 400 of the expected 1,400 signed up for the Federal gift—is totally and completely disgusting. It is a sad state of affairs when the taxpayers of this country see their hard-earned money wasted by giving it to a bunch of kids in the Nation's Capital as an inducement to keep them off the streets because their parents cannot, or would not control them.

How I could be expected to explain this to the people of my district is beyond me. The situation in the Nation's Capital is somewhat similar to that reported in Port Moresby, New Guinea, where primitive New Guinea cultists wait patiently for their gods to deliver the white man's goods in great quantity, all the time refusing to work. The only difference is that for us the gods of New Guinea are the "moralists" of the "New American Revolution" and the primitive cultists are the people of the District. The people in the District have their money and do not want it; the people in New Guinea do not have it and are praying for it. They just do not know how lucky they really are—or how free they really are.

My people object most strongly to the use of their tax money for such purposes. We know that if the trend toward complete socialism is not stopped, it will not simply be the District population refusing a \$1.60 per hour dole to go to summer school because it is too much work; it will be the population of every town and city in this great land.

I insert related news articles at this point:

[From the Washington Post, July 7, 1971]

SCHOOL PROGRAM APPROVED

(By Eugene L. Meyer)

The D.C. City Council approved the summer "Earn and Learn" program for 1,400 model cities neighborhood youngsters yesterday, but expressed displeasure that only 400 had signed up so far to be paid \$1.60 per hour to go to summer school.

The approval vote was unanimous, but Council members who began by defending the controversial program became sharply critical of its administration by the time the vote was taken. "I'm terribly disappointed," said Vice Chairman Sterling Tucker, who at first enthusiastically supported the program. "My feeling is the planning is not what it could be. . . . I have real questions as to whether we're geared up at all.

"I will be extremely disappointed if we only have 400 or 500," Tucker said. "I would not look upon this program as a success at all."

Council member Henry S. Robinson, in moving for approval for the program, added: "I must strongly chastise the model cities officials and school system for going into this program without doing homework."

Charles Diggs, a school official in charge of the program, said that delays in getting necessary official approval had hurt recruiting efforts.

He said that because of the program's uncertainty "summer teachers have also disappeared. I'm not sure some of the summer administrators haven't also disappeared."

The program, under which youngsters will earn \$1.60 an hour for attending school for four hours a day for seven weeks, was supposed to begin last Monday. It is now tentatively set to start next Monday at Dunbar High School and Hamilton Junior High.

The city's school board approved the program in May. The \$544,000 cost is being paid by model cities money already allocated for the Shaw, Trinidad, Stanton Park and Ivy City areas.

The model cities commission approved the plan on June 15, disapproved it June 22 when youths said the money should be spent on jobs instead, then reapproved it June 25. Late last week, the matter was taken to the City Council, whose approval also was needed.

The program was conceived to fill in for a severe summer job shortage for youths between 14 and 21 living in the model neighborhoods.

[From the Washington Post, July 7, 1971]

CRIME INSURANCE DUE AUGUST 1

Insurance against crime will be available on Aug. 1 for businesses and private residences in the District of Columbia and Maryland, the Department of Housing and Urban Development announced yesterday.

The government-subsidized insurance, which will provide for a maximum coverage of \$15,000 for commercial policies, was voted by Congress last year to help residents of high-crime areas who have been priced out of private insurance coverage.

Rates for the insurance, not yet released, will be based on a formula reflecting FBI crime statistics for the area.

In addition to D.C. and Maryland, residents of California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island will also be eligible for the new insurance.

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 7, 1971]

SHOWERS OF RICHES AWAITED BY CULTISTS

PORT MORESBY, NEW GUINEA.—Thousands of primitive New Guinea cultists today removed a concrete survey marker from atop a mountain in a tribal ritual they hope will appease their gods and bring them the white man's goods in great quantity.

The marker, erected on Mt. Turu by U.S. Geodetic Survey men seven years ago, was carried several miles down the mountainside near Wewak Township, in the East Sepik District.

The cult, known as the Yangoru Cargo, is led by Matthias Yellwan and Daniel Hawena, who have promised their followers that this Sunday is the day the white man's riches will be delivered to them.

The belief in the arrival of superabundant riches stems from World War II when natives witnessed the unloading of vast amounts of American military supplies.

Thousands of villagers have deserted their work in the last three months in expectation that the ritual will provide everything they want—canned foods and luxury products. The territory's Australian administrators fear that many of the 30,000 cultists will wind up hungry because farmers deserted their fields and hired workers left their jobs to go to the mountain.

Australian patrol officers and Australian, Dutch, German and American missionaries have been trying to get the cultists to go back to work.

STOP OIL DRILLING OFF PACIFIC PALISADES

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles County grand jury has recently taken a position against any oil drilling or exploration within one-half mile of the mean high tideline. This decision is in direct response to the dangers of oil drilling in areas such as Pacific Palisades which have a propensity to slip without prompting from outside sources.

The Army Corps of Engineers is currently making a geological study of this area, and I must support the demands of the group known as No Oil Inc. of Pacific Palisades that oil companies not be allowed to perform any exploratory drilling in the area until the corps completes its study.

The following, then, are articles from the Los Angeles Times and the Santa Monica Outlook which describe the action taken by the grand jury of Los Angeles County in urging county officials to ban oil exploration in these potentially dangerous areas. I commend the grand jury for its action and also No Oil Inc. of Pacific Palisades for its efforts to stop exploration in their area.

[From the Santa Monica Evening Outlook, June 22, 1971]

AT PACIFIC PALISADES—OIL DRILLING HOLDUP ASKED

(By Tom Sullivan)

The Los Angeles County Grand Jury has called for a moratorium on oil exploration in Pacific Palisades until the Army Corps of Engineers completes its land stability investigation.

In letters sent to all Los Angeles councilmen and Planning Director Calvin Hamilton, the jury foreman, Leo Epstein, also called for enactment of pending legislation that would prohibit drilling for one-half mile inland from the mean high tideline, excluding existing M-3 industrial zoning.

Epstein said oil drilling along the Palisades' coastal bluffs could "seriously damage the ecological balance" of the coastline.

The 1970 Grand Jury also supported the efforts by No Oil, Inc. (NO) of the Palisades in its attempt to prevent Occidental Petroleum Corp. from exploring near the landslide-prone bluffs.

"Unrestricted drilling for oil can seriously disturb the ecological balance of our shoreline, can pose a danger . . . from lubrication of already unstable geological formations, and at the very least threatens oil spill pollution, an all-too-familiar tragedy," said Epstein's letter, dated last Thursday.

"Therefore, we respectfully urge that any new oil drilling in the city of Los Angeles be banned for a half-mile inland from the mean high tideline, excluding existing M-3 industrial zones," he wrote.

SEEKS HELP

The foreman also sent another letter last week to William D. Ruckelshaus, director of the federal Environmental Protection Agency in Washington, D.C.

In that letter, Epstein asked Ruckelshaus to help obtain a ban on all drilling in the Palisades until the corps of engineers completes its study.

The foreman said "severe damage" has already occurred from earth slippage in the

area, and further damage may result if oil exploration is allowed.

The corps of engineers is studying the land slippage problem in the Palisades as ordered by Congress in the 1966 Flood Control Act.

FEASIBILITY STUDY

It is charged with determining if it is scientifically and economically feasible to correct the problem, using engineering techniques.

Col. Robert J. Malley, district engineer for the corps, is heading the study of the Palisades.

Epstein sent a copy of the letter to the councilmen to Col. Malley. But the officer said he doesn't have the authority to order a moratorium on drilling in the area.

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 22, 1971]

GRAND JURY URGES BAN ON NEW INLAND OIL DRILLING NEAR SHORE

(By Ron Einstoss)

The Los Angeles County Grand Jury has urged that the city of Los Angeles ban new oil drilling for a half-mile inland from the mean high tideline, it was revealed Monday.

Jury foreman Leo Epstein made the request in a letter to city Planning Director Calvin Hamilton. Copies of the letter were sent to each member of the City Council.

"Unrestricted drilling for oil can seriously disturb the ecological balance of our shoreline, can pose a danger from subsidence and from lubrication of already unstable geological formations and at the very least threatens oil-spill pollution, and all too familiar tragedy," Epstein wrote.

The jurors also added their support to a moratorium on all drilling in the Pacific Palisades area until an Army Corps of Engineers' study now under way has been completed. It was also suggested that their recommendations be considered part of the master plan for land use to conserve coastal recreation and scenic areas.

Epstein directed another letter to William D. Ruckelshaus, head of the federal Environmental Protection Agency, in which the grand jury expressed its concern over oil drilling in populated areas.

The jurors asked that the federal government require an environmental impact study from any company which desires to drill for oil in the offshore, coastal or inland areas.

KILLING COPS AND THE REVOLUTIONARY MYSTIQUE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, police killings in New York City, Washington, D.C., and other urban areas of our Nation have proliferated to frightening proportions in the past year. This sad state of affairs represents a severe symptom of a grave sickness becoming more and more embedded in our society. It is time the people of this country and its leaders fully recognize the seriousness of the situation and start to deal with it in realistic terms.

Max Lerner in his May 26, 1971, article in the New York Post goes right to the core of the problem by describing the societal ailment in terms of a "revolutionary mystique" and then eloquently debunks the mystique by exposing it for

what it really is—an attempt on the part of the guilt ridden to clothe their foul deeds in a mantle of abstractions. Mr. Lerner quite correctly identifies the assailants as those opposed to the authority of police institutions as they exist in America, who indiscriminately mow down men who happen to be in blue coats, regardless of their color or creed.

I want to commend Max Lerner for his incisive article, printed in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

[From the New York Post, May 26, 1971]

KILLING COPS

(By Max Lerner)

New York is a city of hardened people, but when two cops were shot cold-bloodedly in a police car (they barely survived), and then two others were shot in the back and killed in Harlem, a wave of nausea swept the city. It suffered a crisis of confidence in itself—a crisis of belief in the city's capacity to deal with the berserk terrorists without going vigilante in the process.

Everyone is against killing cops—everyone, that is, except the cop killers, and everyone, except those who wouldn't do it themselves, but in whose hearts little fires are lit when they read that someone else has done it, because they feel cops are "fascist pigs." If you are going to speak out against killing cops, you must speak out also against these little fires, and the emotional climate in which they thrive.

Let us put an end to this mindless killing of cops, but put an end also to the ever-present granary of hatred and baiting of cops, which feed the flames that finally produce these killings. It is being said now in New York, and other cities where cops are being killed, that it is just "plain and simple murder." True, it is murder, but not quite so plain nor quite so simple.

An individual who kills someone he knows, out of a murder impulse, doesn't infect others. But someone who kills a cop doesn't kill anyone he knows, against whom he nourishes a grievance. He kills a category, the way Hitler's storm-troopers did, the way lynchers in the South used to, the way the terrorist kidnapers did just the other day in Turkey.

Whoever kills a category thinks he is a hero, and basks in his belief that he has somehow tapped a pipeline to history or justice. He sparks the same impulse in others, and he gets support from them, including many who would not themselves kill.

Police Commissioner Murphy, himself one of the best cops, says the killings are "undoubtedly the work of madmen." To call them madmen, bums, punks, is one way of stripping them of the mystique of "revolution" in which they try to clothe themselves.

It is important to strip these murderers of their revolutionary mystique. But I go farther: it is important to strip revolution itself of its mystique of being somehow above the standards of law, morality, and language that bind mere earthlings to the society and each other.

I am not speaking now of toughs and killers. There are presumably gentle people, who seem sensitive and tender, but who feel that if destructive deeds are done for "the revolution"—whether black or white—they are shriven of guilt and washed in the blood of the Leninist or Maoist lamb.

The epithets of "fascist pigs" and "racist pigs" may be uttered in hysteria, or in cold calculation that the collective violence which we call revolution cannot succeed unless it has first broken down the necessary sense of confidence between the police and the people. That is what the hardcore revolutionaries mean to break down. Don't let them.

Edward J. Kiernan, who heads the police union in New York, had a fit of hysteria of his own—and doubtless a fit of union electioneering as well—when he advised police they had a right as private citizens to equip themselves with shotguns. Riding shotgun on the beat is no answer, nor shooting first and asking questions later.

To follow this line would involve the police in what might easily become a race war, with black cops and lawful black civilians caught in the middle. It would give credibility to the terrorists by adding the charge of vigilantism to the charge of racism.

Nor is it a solution (as some well-meaning people advocate) to turn the control of the police over to the neighborhood, and have the blacks in Harlem run their own police system. The police killings would continue, only the black cops who died at the hands of the same terrorists would be killed as "Uncle Tom pigs" who had betrayed their race.

The best hope for both police and people is to use humanity and reason toward each other. Where cops are corrupt—and a number of them doubtless are—ferret them out, and discipline and punish them.

Where they are racist in their core attitudes, or just gun happy, weed them out. In all these cases they don't belong in their jobs. Don't hobble the rest with impossible restraints, and back them up in danger. Build professionalism, but with it build also a sense of human concern.

This is the credo neither of a "bleeding heart" nor a "do-gooder" (the quotes are Kiernan's) but of someone who believes that both the cops and the city deserve a better break.

THE CRIMINALITY OF UNPREPAREDNESS

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, the annual Independence Day observance held on the steps of the Truman Library in Independence, Mo., is an event which is always well attended. Each year a distinguished speaker is on the program.

This year we were privileged to have as our guest speaker on Saturday, July 3, Rear Adm. Heinz H. Loeffler, U.S.N.R. On this 14th annual observance, commenced by Mr. Truman in 1957, our speaker noted that the Truman Library had recently accepted for permanent display the 18-foot model of the battleship U.S.S. *Missouri*. This model will become a part of the historic memorabilia of an era which marked the entry of America into the age of atomic and nuclear power.

Admiral Loeffler in his speech lamented, however, that the little model would only be a symbol of an era since the day of the battleship passed with the signing of the surrender documents aboard the *Missouri* by Japanese and allied forces in September 1945.

The admiral quite rightly emphasized that America in the Pacific in 1945 had the mightiest naval force ever to sail the seas. With the signing of the surrender documents, there suddenly seemed to be no need for these ships and the trained crews that manned them. He said he is convinced Americans now look back in retrospect at that great as-

sembly of ships as a remembrance of the glory of our past without stopping to think that this magnificent fleet shortly after the war went into mothballs, there to languish and age. It is now completely outdated in the light of scientific advances which have happened during the postwar years.

The Reserve admiral in his remarks, then proceeded to call attention to the Soviet maritime expansion as an awesome challenge, not only in terms of naval power but also from a national policy viewpoint. In the words of Russian Fleet Admiral Gorskov:

The age-old dream of our people has become a reality. The pennants of Soviet ships now flutter in the most remote corners of the seas and oceans.

Our U.S. sea control forces have not really been challenged since World War II, but today we must confront the force of the Soviet naval power all over the globe wherever the objectives of the free world may demand our presence. The names of possible opponents in this international chess game of survival have changed, the admiral commented, but the basic requirements for survival remain the same.

I listened most attentively to the remarks of Admiral Loeffler. I am proud to acknowledge that I lead the applause when he said those who would have all the rest of us believe that any defensive action beyond our borders is equivalent to aggression are themselves misguided souls. These misguided persons think about as clearly as those poor confused human beings who first convince themselves, then try to sell their belief to others that the readiness of manpower and the manufacture of weapons prior to a physical attack on our shores is only due to the clever influence of the so-called military-industrial complex.

I regard it not only as a pleasant opportunity, but also as a clear obligation to share with my colleagues the challenge expressed by Rear Admiral Loeffler in his remarks on the steps of the Truman Library at Independence, Mo., on Saturday, July 3, as follows:

REMARKS BY REAR ADM. HEINZ H. LOEFFLER

Mr. Jesse, Congressman Randall, Dr. Brooks, honored guests, citizens of this historic community which has the meaningful and fine-sounding name of Independence. As a naval officer I am indeed honored to be the principal speaker at your annual observance of our Nation's freedom from the bondage of tyrannical foreign oppression.

Enshrined here at the Harry S. Truman Library are the historic memorabilia of an era which marked the progress of America into the age of atomic and nuclear power. As long as the free world exists this institution will be a focal point for historic research for all the generations to come.

I have noted that this date also is the day on which the 18-foot model of the battleship USS *Missouri* will be formally accepted for permanent display in the Truman Library. I hope it will remain here for our grandchildren and, in turn, their grandchildren to see and appreciate as part of America's national heritage and as a symbol of United States seapower as it was in the mid-twentieth century.

We must face the fact, however, that it will only be a symbol for all time, since the day of the battleship passed with the signing of the surrender documents aboard *Missouri* by Japanese and Allied Forces in 1945. The

model housed here, and perhaps the original ship, will in time have as great, or perhaps greater, historic significance as the United States Frigate *Constitution* in the sense that both ships marked the ending of eras of great importance in the development of America.

There are perhaps many persons in the audience today who contributed their pennies as school children so that *Constitution* could be preserved as a national memorial to the loyalty and bravery of those Americans of previous generations who sailed the world's ocean and seaways to develop the international commerce that has made America the great Nation that it now is. In so doing, many gave their lives to insure that the principle of freedom of the seas would be an enduring principle of our national policy. That the restoration of *Constitution* was made possible only through the penny collections of school children is perhaps an indicator of how forgetful a nation can become of its past history.

In respect to the Battleship *Missouri*, the same sense of apathy is beginning to show. So many things have happened, both for good and bad, since that historic September 1945 in Tokyo Bay, that Americans tend to become preoccupied with the day to day affairs and, thus, they relegate what happened on board *Missouri* and what has transpired since then to the back passages of the mind.

We tend to forget the wise words by George Santayana, "those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

And sometimes we forget the lessons learned in the days of Hitler and Stalin and the wisdom of Winston Churchill which can be paraphrased as follows:

"That the nation which will not fight far from home with stout allies by her side may be doomed in the end to fight alone within her own castle walls—without friends, at an hour when the enemy has achieved his greatest strength."

This is more difficult today than it was a few years ago. The specter of Stalin has been replaced by the less awesome masks of Khrushchev who talked of Goulash communism and of Breshnev, Kosygin and Podgorny who talk comfortably about cost accounting and even provide Russian consumers with Italian automobiles.

But to return to the events aboard *Missouri* and in Tokyo Bay on that historic date they will always remain in our memories. In that relatively small body of water, there was assembled the mightiest naval force ever to sail the seas. This great fleet had just been victorious against powerful and vindictive enemies.

Then, suddenly, with the signing of the surrender, there seemed to be no need for those magnificent ships and the highly trained crews that manned them. Nevertheless it is the picture of that great assembly of ships, in retrospect, a great many Americans have indelibly fixed in their minds. But this is a remembrance of things past as seen through the diffusion lens of elapsed time. While it is a magnificent view, as indeed the event itself was magnificent, it is now essentially a distorted picture which can only be brought into proper focus and perspective in the light of events that have since transpired.

The price of freedom is eternal vigilance and the surrender in Tokyo Bay was, in the historical sense, an end for us to a bitterly fought war. In the mass enthusiasm created by the event itself, we as a nation momentarily lost our sense of vigilance until we were abruptly awakened by the reality of what has come to be known as "the cold war"—the bloodless but implacable opposition of opposing political ideologies.

The magnificent fleet assembled in Tokyo Bay went into mothballs, there to languish and age and to become outdated in view of the technical and scientific advances which came heel and toe one upon another in the hectic post-war years when America went

back to the processes of scientific development which it had been partially denied during the war years.

Meantime, the cold war erupted into a variety of international crises and, as in Korea and now in Vietnam, progressed into actual shooting wars. And, all during this period American seapower steadily decreased while the opposing side demonstrated an ever-increasing awareness of man's destiny on the oceans and waterways of the world.

America, once unchallenged on the seas which are the effective highways of international commerce, now has serious competition which poses threats not only to America but to all the world.

Soviet maritime expansion has become an awesome challenge, not only in terms of naval power, but also from a national policy viewpoint.

Starting from practically nothing following the end of World War II, the Soviets have built naval and merchant fleets on the philosophical premise of human destiny on the seas that I have just mentioned. The subject of Soviet seapower actually has three distinct facets.

It breaks down first into the nature of their naval buildup in the context of military capabilities and force levels. Secondly, what does this naval buildup tell us about Soviet strategy and Soviet foreign policy? and, thirdly, in what direction is the United States navy moving in the face of this Soviet buildup?

The one area of the Soviet naval buildup that has received the most international public attention is the Soviet submarine fleet.

Beginning in the 1950's, the Soviets created an operational and technological base from which they have continued to modernize their various classes of submarines and to grow ever more effective and sophisticated in their operations. The Soviet submarine service has nuclear capability and is continuing to grow rapidly. Simultaneously, great emphasis has been placed on continued development of new surface craft.

The expansion of the Soviet fleet has been fast and broad-based. In the past 12 years they have delivered 10 cruisers, 75 destroyers and ocean escorts, 160 patrol craft and two large helicopter carriers. All the new cruisers are equipped with surface to air and surface to surface missiles with a 400-mile capability.

There is now no doubt that this Soviet naval buildup has significantly bolstered the combat capabilities of both Soviet strategic and general purpose undersea and surface forces.

The second question remains: What does this buildup mean for future Soviet strategy? In this age of thermonuclear intercontinental weapons, neither side can afford a position of obvious insufficiency. At the same time, there exists on both sides such a mutual horror of the consequences of a nuclear exchange as to make this an absolutely last resort.

With naval power leverage at different places and at different times we have been challenged by the phenomenal growth and development of this newly awakened giant with its newly acquired knowledge of the value of seapower.

First, there was the attempt to put Soviet missiles in Cuba, in 1962. Later, the presence of Soviet ships in Haiphong Harbor in North Vietnam added new and serious considerations to the purely military aspects of bombing or mining that port. Our political leadership felt that damage or destruction of Soviet shipping there would induce further escalation. And, the almost continuous presence of Soviet ships in the southeastern Mediterranean has restricted the military options of the Israelis against Egypt. There are other examples to demonstrate the strategic importance of this new life on the seas for the Soviets.

The position of the Soviets in relation to their new status as a major naval power is perhaps best summarized in the words of their Fleet Admiral Gorskov, who stated more than a year ago, "the age-old dream of our people has become a reality. The pennants of the Soviet ships now flutter in the most remote corners of the seas and oceans. Our Navy is a real force and possesses the ability to resolve successfully the task of defending the state interests of the Soviet Union and of the whole socialist camp." His statement demonstrates the keen understanding the Soviets have acquired of the many uses of seapower, both in peace and war.

The third question I posed is: What is the United States doing in the face of this Soviet buildup and in the face of today's social and political aspirations?

The obvious answer is that we must be ready to meet, and beat, the competition. While that is obvious it is also trite! This is a very big question which requires much more than a trite answer. In the Navy, we must make our contribution to deterrence in the face of a lower budget level. The same as our sister services. And, all the services are subject to factors such as the political climate, the needs and aspirations of our youth and the desires of our citizenry.

In addition to our Navy's strategic mission of deterrence, we have three additional significant missions, they are:

First. Readiness to project power into the Eurasian rimland. The tools used to project that power are our merchant marine; our carrier strike forces and our amphibious forces.

Second. Control of the seas to maintain freedom on the high seas; ability to control the seas is made up of a complex of naval weapons systems—submarine warfare aircraft and our strike aircraft operating from our attack carriers.

Third. Most important of the missions is that of overseas presence. If you look back over the last quarter-century, you can see that our projection forces were used in two significant wars—the Korean war and the present conflict in Vietnam. These are wars in which our sea control was never significantly challenged and our projection forces were therefore able to devote themselves completely to their task and we should not forget that 97% of all military supplies to Vietnam went in ships.

In effect, therefore, our sea control forces have not really been challenged since World War II.

In summary: We face the prospect of confronting the new and powerful force of Soviet naval power anywhere on the globe where the objectives of the free world demand our presence. To do this effectively, we must have a Navy which is varied, credible, versatile, and mobile. That is the challenge we must now meet!

The late President Eisenhower once stated that, "until war is eliminated from international relations, unpreparedness for it is well-nigh as criminal as war itself."

People sometimes forget that the security interests of the United States remain substantially unchanged, if indeed they are not immutable so long as the eastern colossi believe that power grows out of the barrel of a gun. As in 1917 and 1941 we cannot be disinterested when a hostile force threatens the balance of power. Germany and Japan were in no sense hereditary or foreordained enemies of the United States. It was rather that we could not tolerate the establishment of a hegemony in either Europe or Asia capable of marshalling the resources and manpower of these continents against the Western Hemisphere and the security of the United States itself.

The names of possible opponents in this international chessgame for survival have changed—but the basic precautions, indeed the basic requirements for survival remain the same. And still there are those in this

country, most of them utterly sincere, who feel that any defensive action beyond our borders is the equivalent of aggression, that readiness of manpower and manufacture of weapons prior to a physical attack on our shores is due to undue influence of the so-called military-industrial complex.

Perhaps the neo-isolationist sentiment is explicable in part because half of our population is under 25 years of age. With no memory of purge trials and death camps and who may regard the "totalitarian threat" as part of the fantasy world of the late night movies, not the bitter reality of daylight politics.

That new generation has grown up in the meantime, a generation which did not live through the shock and frustrations of the years immediately preceding World War II. They feel—many with great sincerity—that the country's leaders are warmongers—that we do not have enemies—that if we were to dismantle our military, all the world would be one great big brotherhood of peaceful men. In their youthful idealism they don't realize that human nature hasn't changed much since a Roman senator said 2000 years ago "Si vis pacem para bellum"—and a German poet said 200 years ago "es kann der Beste nicht im Frieden leben wenn es dem bösen Nachbarn nicht gefaellt."

In talking with you today, I realize that your fine city of independence is far from the seas I have been speaking of. However, the symbolic presence of the USS *Missouri* enshrined here has made you more aware than most communities of the role of seapower in the destiny of our Nation.

This may be only hindsight, but let's look at some historical facts in relation to President Eisenhower's statement on the criminality of unpreparedness. The USS *Missouri* and many of her sister ships, and our great aircraft carriers, had not been built when we lost a fleet at Pearl Harbor.

If we had *Missouri* and those other great ships on December 7, 1941, would the outcome have been different?

America learned on that fateful day the hard lesson of being unprepared.

I ask now: Has that lesson been forgotten?

Ladies and gentlemen I would like to end my presentation on a personal note—and I would like to particularly address the young people in this audience. I was 17 when I came to this country from Germany. I had \$50 in my pocket. I didn't know the country nor the language. With a reasonable amount of hard work and a great deal of good luck I was able to work myself up to become the president of a fair size corporation and a rear admiral in the United States Navy.

Where else in the world could this have happened?

So don't worry so much about the present or the future of this country, don't listen to the prophets of doom and destruction, to the critics of the system that has produced the greatest individual prosperity and personal liberty the world has ever seen but tell them that today you saw a man who is living proof that this is still—as it always has been—the land of unlimited opportunity.

Thank you very much.

MARK EVANS ADDRESSES SALT LAKE ADVERTISING CLUB

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on May 11 of this year the distinguished newsman and commentator, Mark Evans,

delivered an address before the Salt Lake Advertising Club in Salt Lake City, Utah.

In the contents of his speech he has touched on matters of importance to our country at this particular time, and because I believe that Members of Congress would enjoy reading the speech, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

SALT LAKE ADVERTISING CLUB—SILVER MEDAL AWARD

[Mark Evans, May 11, 1971]

Thank you very much, I think.

It is a thrill to be back here in the "Valley of the Mountains" and to look into the faces of people who have been near and dear to me throughout my life, and to especially see one who gave me the biggest break—Dave Romney and his lovely wife, my missionary companions, the leadership of the Church. It is a thrill to come back, I can assure you, particularly to pay tribute to Arch Madsen.

Anybody fresh out of Washington should have news, and I have some for you. This is a Commerce Department report. I know all of you businessmen are interested in what is going on in the world, particularly in the world of Commerce, and this report reads thusly:

The Commerce Department reports that sales and income figures show an easing up of the rate at which business is easing off which is taken as proof of the Government's contention that there is a slowing up of the slowdown. Now, let me clarify the terminology of the experts. It should be noted that a slowing up of the slowdown is not as good as an upturn of the downturn. But it's a good deal better than either a speedup of the slowdown or a deepening of the downturn, and it does suggest that the climate is about right for an adjustment to the readjustment.

Now, turning to unemployment. We find a definite decrease in the rate of increase which clearly shows there's a letting up of the let-down. Of course, if the slowdown should speed up, the decrease in the rate of increase of unemployment would turn into an increase in the rate of decrease. Are there any questions?

As usual, Washington people bring confusion. My favorite anecdote on that was told me by the late and great distinguished Senator from Illinois, who looked most of the time like an unmade bed, or as though he had just been electrocuted. I refer, of course, to the beloved sage of the Senate, Everett Dirksen.

He accosted me one time in the hallway of the Senate—we always exchanged stories—and said, "You know, Mark, when I go home to Illinois, I wear a very large button on my lapel. On that button I have inscribed the letters 'B A I K', and when somebody comes up to me and says, 'Everett, what does B A I K stand for?' I simply tell them, 'It stands for: "Boy, am I confused!"' And when some smart-aleck comes up to me and says, 'Everett, you don't spell confused with a "K"?' I simply tell them, 'You don't understand how confused I am.'"

Washington is either looking forward to elections or looking back on one. We are now looking forward to one. Politics are wonderful. They never seem to change. We have very ambitious men in Washington now who seek high office. Mr. Muskie has been told that he resembles Abraham Lincoln—he spends his weekends splitting rails. Mr. McGovern has definitely given up the Arab vote in North Dakota—he is recommending the sale of airplanes to the Arabs—the C5A and the F-111. Secretary Laird says there are no ground troops in Laos, and they have every right to be there. Civil Rights are always with us. We have a new slogan in Washing-

ton which reads, "Bigotry doesn't have a Chinaman's chance."

The latest story out of Washington is the story of a Jewish man by the name of Samuel Schwartz who had some business cards printed up. On one side it said, "I would rather do business with 1,000 Arabs than one Jew." On the other side, it said, "Sam Schwartz, Mortician."

There is a new face in Government in Washington—a new collar, I should say. He's a Roman Catholic priest and you might be interested in knowing how he was elected. He had a very important bumper sticker (in the world of communications they become very vital) which read: "Vote for me or go to Hell."

Watches have become big business in Washington as you well know. The Agnew watch has set a whole new pattern—it is now called "The gift bearing a Greek." Mr. Meany's watch tells time and a half. Mr. Humphrey's watch still doesn't run down. Barry Goldwater's watch runs backward. Ted Kennedy has one that is absolutely waterproof. Martha Mitchell has a new watch, too—it doesn't say what time it is, it tells you.

There is a new force in Government called "Ralph Naderism". Between Ralph Nader and St. Christopher almost everybody is afraid to drive an automobile any place nowadays. They tell me that after St. Christopher was downgraded, five million Catholics went out and had their brakes checked.

The President of the United States is still fair game. The one who left with the birds flew south and is still being talked about. One night before he left the White House he couldn't sleep. He reached over and, in the darkness of the night, swallowed what he thought was a sleeping pill. After it had gone down, he realized it wasn't the right flavor or size. Immediately, he turned on the light and, lo and behold, found he had swallowed a little pellet from a box marked "Department of Agriculture."

The Secretary of Agriculture had waited for eight years for that phone to ring. It rang in the middle of the night—at 3 o'clock in the morning—and a voice said, "What in the world are these little pellets you sent over to the White House, Orval?" Orval said, "I don't know what you are talking about, Mr. President." "Those little pellets that look like pills. I have swallowed one of them. What are they?" asked the President. Orval answered, "The only thing I can think of, Mr. President, is that they might be some pellets Mrs. Johnson wanted sent over for her African Violets."

Mr. Johnson said, "Great Caesar's Ghost, I've swallowed one of them. Are they poisonous?" "Oh no, Mr. President, we are very proud of them in the Department of Agriculture. Believe it or not, there's a ton and a half of fertilizer condensed down to that little pellet. My only suggestion is that you be careful of what you say for the next few days."

The Mayor of Washington asked me to chair the Bicentennial Commission to celebrate the 200th Anniversary of our country. I thought I had troubles running the President's Inaugural Ball, but, believe me, that was child's play! The Mayor said all I had to do was to "turn this City around." All I could think of was Will Rogers' famous story about when he suggested the ending of World War I: "All you have to do is heat the ocean until the submarines come to the top. Then, you shoot them out." Someone asked, "How do you heat the ocean?" Rogers answered: "I just gave you the idea. You work out the details."

I have a running love affair with Washington. It's a great city. I intend to make '76 (and I hope you don't mind this commercial) the most flagwaving, corny, square, Yankee Doodle year this country has ever known, and I hope it will make us forget 1971.

As I study our founding fathers, and this assignment gives me an opportunity to do this in considerable depth, I have observed that they had many problems we don't have today, and vice versa. Hegel put it pretty plainly when he philosophized that "we learn from history that we learn nothing from history." My offices used to be right across the street from the Archives of the United States, and, as you enter that great building which has all of the records of this Nation, there is inscribed on the left-hand side: "What is Past is Prologue." A Washington cab driver described that as meaning, "You ain't seen nothing yet."

Today's problems are not unique. Many youngsters in this country have a gross misconception. The "now" generation feels it has some kind of monopoly on problems. For their information, hunger followed the exodus from the Garden of Eden; wars began with Cain and racism wasn't far behind; drugs recall ancient history.

We are big on phraseology in our country and one of the big words today is "gap" and we hyphenate that with just about everything on which we can lay our tongues. I can assure you, and I wish my Dad was here to testify, there was a generation gap between him and me. No doubt his father could say the same thing, as well as his father's father. When wasn't there a communications gap?

I am reading a book now called, "Presidents and the Press." I have yet to find one who didn't have difficulty with a communications gap with the people who were criticizing him. Any married woman of seniority is an expert on the subject of a credibility gap. So what's new?

With three children behind me and a grandchild of which I am unbelievably proud, I have learned the art of attention getting. They learn it from infancy. It's almost born with them.

Last week I saw our Federal City full of infant tactics. Although full-grown, these malcontents were seeking attention in strange and devious ways. It was a convention of American cop-outs, a mixture of college hell week celebrants, draft-dodgers, pinkos and avowed Communists. The gap most obvious was what I call the "yap gap"—there was no lull in the conversations. I turned off one whose ranting I could no longer stomach by saying, "Remember Mr. Emerson's words when he said, 'Be careful of what you want, you might get it.'"

In today's world, replete with man's inhumanities, it seems we have almost reached the zenith of what we can do to destroy bridges, both fore and aft—bridges on which people will follow us and bridges which we, ourselves, must use. Men seem determined to destroy bridges.

How refreshing it is to come here for a few minutes and pay tribute to one whose life has been dedicated to building bridges, Arch Madsen, in whom there is no rancor. I have known him for over twenty years. He is a Rotarian who lives the very epitome of the slogan, "Service Above Self." He's a member of the Church who truly loves his fellowman. He's a professional broadcaster and a recognized statesman in our beleaguered industry. He is a man whose life and attitude make the word "gentleman" into two words—"gentle man." His God-given gift of enthusiasm is exceeded only by his sincerity and his integrity.

The oldest of eight children, at the age of seven he was stricken with a crippling disease, and inadequate medical facilities gave him every reason to be resentful. He had every reason to cop-out. He was an expert on poverty, but didn't know it; he didn't finish school because of illness—he got sick of it, though that really isn't true because, with seven behind him, Arch formed part of the production team early in the Madsen family.

It seems that his physical infirmities have only tempered the steel in his spine. He has

become one of the country's leading gap-closers—bridge-builders. At the outset, may I plead guilty to a monumental bias for this man. It is not inconceivable that the strength of his limbs was transplanted to his character thus providing the strong foundation of his avocation and his spiritual life. I have seen him face trying situations, both spiritually and in business, sometimes facing both simultaneously, and I have been inspired to see him come smiling through, choosing wise alternatives when he was stymied in his original purposes.

Arch reminds me a little bit of the man who came home from work and found his five-year-old son eager to play with him. The man was tired and wanted to get to the evening paper and relax. Recognizing that he had a challenge, he took the center section of the paper, spread it on the floor, drew a picture of the world on it, cut it up jig-saw-puzzle fashion, mixed the pieces up and said, "Son, I want you to put the world back together again."

The little boy went to work on it and the man went back to his paper. Within a few short moments, the boy came crashing onto his Dad's lap. Annoyed, the father said, "Son, I gave you a job to do; why didn't you finish it?" The little boy answered, "Look, Dad, it's all finished." And sure enough it was. The man asked, "How on earth did you do it so quickly?" Said the child, "It was simple, Dad. There was a picture of a man on the back, and I put the man together, and the world turned out all right."

May I recognize and congratulate the industry that singled out this man.

Our industry has suddenly been singled out as unsavory. Frankly, I don't think our industry has ever been fully recognized for the part it has played in America's growth in peace or in war. Strangely enough, advertising, abundant with panacea for every other industry, has now got gargantuan problems of its own. It is now high on the list of public enemies, a list made up by those cop-outs, drop-outs, the anti-establishment, anti-work, anti-soap, addicts and other unfortunates mixed with a hardcore group of anti-Americans, left-leaning pinkos and rightout Reds who professionally and ideologically seek an end to our democratic way of life—and make no mistake about it!

In my office in Washington, the Bicentennial office, not my business address, there is a great picture window. For two days I saw Washington under siege. That is why I am stirred up today. These misguided, degenerate souls, ironically enough, have been encouraged, endorsed, enthusiastically espoused and thoroughly understood by segments of our media whose very existence and economic life depend on the survival of the system as we know it. They oftentimes seem set on destroying it, and I must confess, after thirty years, I don't understand their attitudes.

Soapbox opportunities afforded by media have provided a magnet for dedicated liberals. Their missionary zeal covers all media from the classroom to the pulpit, from the cameras to the typewriters, from the microphones to the theatre. To earn a living and to have a forum is the best of all possible worlds. Their urging, their tolerance, their permissive attitude on leftist causes have now gained frightening proportions.

I wish every lethargic American in this room, and in this country, would have witnessed what I did at 6:00 AM on April 30th of this year in West Potomac Park in Washington. I could just barely see the Capitol Dome. I was in my car driving around the outskirts of that encampment and became lodged in traffic. I couldn't move and all six feet three inches of me was terror-stricken as I feared for my own life. In a baby blue Mark III Continental, believe me, I wasn't in happy circumstances surrounded by those odd balls. The stench of pot, the pollution of human souls, the unhappy countenances

are indescribable. And I am not talking about a handful of people, ladies and gentlemen, I am talking about a crowd of 40,000 people. It looked like Dante's "Inferno". I couldn't find a single normal looking human being in that whole mob. Unbelievable as it must seem, there were those in media who justified what was going on, and still do.

My emotion here today is a result of that experience. When will we stop our wishful thinking? When will we learn we cannot allow the inexperienced, the unwashed, the untried, to play catch with baseballs made of TNT?

Mr. Justice Holmes put it pretty well when he said, "Freedom of speech doesn't permit anyone to cry 'Fire' in a crowded theatre." There is, as never before, a need for bridges and courageous bridge builders. We need surveyors with a long view. We need engineers with integrity and dedication. We need statesmen among the people—statesmen are not relegated to politicians alone. "A statesman is one who builds the nation." We need people to realistically appraise the new world.

In the building in which I live in Washington, there is a wonderful old man who was a top-flight lawyer in Poland and is now a political refugee. He is a guard in the building. One day, looking up from an issue of the Washington Post, he shook his head and said, "Mr. Evans, I wonder if Mr. Jefferson had been alive today and knowing communism, if he wouldn't have made a couple of alterations in the Constitution of the United States."

In only one way can we build bridges in this travesty in which we find ourselves; only one way can we span this gap. There is only one language that these people understand. The advertising industry, and I am making a self-indictment, is a parroting industry. We echo the wishes of our sponsors—the ideas, wares and services we sell for him. The weight of making changes falls squarely on the American industry.

American business, American free enterprise, must cease their gutless attitude on issues detrimental to the future of business, the future of this Government. It is time to stand up and be counted!

Now, we can afford many things. I don't know whether we can afford the moon. I don't know whether we can afford Vietnam. I do know what we can't afford—we can no longer afford the luxury of lethargy. We can no longer, as they say in this year's campaign for the U.G.F., "sit on our apathy." The menace will not evaporate.

Media, cannibalistically devouring the hand that feeds it, must be informed with objectivity, with candor and with determination. Mr. Free Enterprise, say to the media chorus of leftism: "No more. Say all you like, print what you will, film what you may, but you do it no longer with our advertising dollars. In the name of this Republic, we demand fairness. The Mickey Mouse game must end."

Sound-thinking American consumers—you, Mrs. Housewife—who love liberty, must learn to say to short-sighted merchants who fear losing business, by not using unfriendly media, "Advertise how you choose, support whom you like, any media you prefer, but do so without my account. I'll buy elsewhere until I know my spending dollars are not supporting causes antipathetic to the way of life dear to most of us."

Now, fortunately, in "The Valley of the Mountains" I don't think you have the problems we have in some of our major cities such as Washington, for example. We must insist on fairness.

The results are becoming obvious hourly. Freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of speech are sacred, but they must be preserved for all ideologies; and when they try to stop you from going down the main streets of the Capitol of the United States, it seems to me they are infringing upon my right to assemble.

Surely we must realize that communication, transmitting press and speech, are overwhelmingly sympathetic to one philosophy, and the bridge of democracy is structurally weakened.

A dozen major advertisers in this nation—in New York, Washington and other major cities where this hanky-panky game is going on—could straighten out most media with concentrated action, with concerted action. Two papers, for example, in Washington are delivered daily to every member of Congress, to 114 Ambassadors and others, and within hours, the so-called American public opinion is flashed to every major capital in the world—and it is *not* your opinion.

The electronic media, reaching millions of viewers daily due to Government regulations regarding fairness, go through the motions and are less pointed in their opinion. Public broadcasters, such as Arch, don't have much to say about what comes along that news line.

As a thirty-year veteran of broadcasting, I know the game. A raised eyebrow, a choice of adjectives, verbs or adverbs, the placement of a story in the paper—all of these can alter the meaning completely. Doubt not that the overwhelming majority of electronic opinion-makers are of one persuasion. I can personally name many who have actually had policy-making positions with past administrations of one party and who can now only find fault with the current administration. This is normal.

I do not fault the bias, but I do fault the lack of balance. Lest you draw the wrong conclusion, let me reiterate: I freely acknowledge the valuable role of liberalism. Those who espouse it are sincerely seeking answers. Some work; some don't. I fault not liberalism. I fault the lack of equalization. A statesman is a politician who is held upright by pressure on all sides.

I fear Mr. Jefferson never dreamed media could one day compete with, and even exceed, the power of elected officials. Mr. Franklin wondered whether or not we could handle a democracy. We are now facing that test more than ever before in the history of this land.

Bulwar made it pretty simple when he said, "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." The great experiment is now 200 years old. Never before has there been a greater need for the principles on which the Republic was founded. Check and balances, the fourth estate, the fourth branch of Government—more powerful sometimes than elected officials—must be checked constantly. They, too, have motives.

There are those who query Government. They must, in turn, be subject to query. Mayor Stokes of Cleveland recently demanded full disclosure by the city's daily papers. A true accounting can be achieved only by those who financially support the media—my media, the one in which I work, and the one in which many of you work. Those advertising dollars pay the freight, and those who pay the freight must make certain that both sides of the story are told. It can be done. It must be done.

America's problems are many. They are multitudinous. It would only add to them if advertisers tried to dictate editorial policies. Those who pay the bill most righteously fight bias from either side on the front page. False headlines—we must battle them; we must urge balance. Publishers, boards of directors, network officials will get the message, plain and simple, of their sacred trust once revenues start shifting. If changes aren't brought about, wild elements such as those who invaded your nation's capitol will get bolder and bolder, and will get more and more violent. The politicians and media who urge them on will alter America's course drastically.

I do not fear liberalism. We need it. My fear is from apathetic moderates and con-

servatives. I do not fear a communist takeover as much as I fear a possible delayed action, a delayed reaction, a militant over-reaction. Urged by fear, it is not impossible that a strong charismatic leader with great television appeal and with a bundle of money, can come up with some over-simplified answers, and we could find the opposite of communism which we don't want, either. It's not much of a choice.

I think the strong silents, who finally fed up with nonsense and the system, will surely suffer. Need I remind you that a recent third party candidate registered a very sizeable vote in the last national election?

There are signs of hope, ladies and gentlemen. We, too, shall overcome! I don't think there is any lock on the meaning of that word or that sentence.

But, we won't do it by wishful thinking. We, as businessmen, must get off our capitalistic derrieres. We must continue to recognize bridge builders such as Arch Madsen. We must make our advertising dollars effective tools in seeking balance. We must learn from the baseball players that screaming at the umpires won't change the past decision, but they'll be more alert on the next one.

In a recent talk, Thomas Shepard made these hopeful comments:

"Our air is getting less fouled up all the time. In city after city, the water we drink is the safest in the world and many of our streams will soon look as wholesome as they are. The birthrate in the United States has been dropping continuously since 1955 and is now at the lowest point in history. The mercury in our oceans came mostly from deposits of nature. The 900 tons of mercury released each year by industries is nothing—it's like blaming a small boy with a water pistol for the Johnstown flood. We are not becoming a nation of drug addicts. We are becoming a nation of non-addicts.

"Seventy years ago, one in four hundred Americans was hooked on hard drugs. Today, it is one in three thousand. There isn't any black rebellion in America. The vast majority of blacks are staunch believers in the United States. Unemployment, the current out-of-work level, is 6% which is about par through our whole history. I am aware of the problems we face and the need to find solutions and put them into effect," said Mr. Shepard, "and I have nothing but praise for the many dedicated Americans who are devoting their lives to making this a better nation and a better world.

"The point I am trying to make in this: We are solving most of our problems. The conditions are getting better. They are not worse. American industry is spending three million dollars a year, and more, to clean up the environment, and additional billions to develop products that will keep it clean. The real danger today is not from the free enterprise establishment that has made ours the most prosperous, most powerful, most charitable nation on earth," he continued. "The danger today resides in the disaster lobby. Those dedicated crepe-hangers who, for personal gain or out of sheer ignorance, are undermining the American system and are threatening the lives and fortunes of the American people. There is an answer—and we will find it."

One of the most exciting moments of my life was spent at the Hilton Hotel not more than a month ago. Maybe two months. Gathered there was every branch of the Government—the President and the Vice President with their wives, right on down to the Court, the Congress of the United States, and most of the executive leaders all through the various departments. They had come together for just one reason—to pray. With bowed heads they stand, and this is the prayer offered by the Secretary of Labor. Think on it well because it is the theme of your own meeting:

"On this inspiring occasion and in this illustrious gathering, we would, this morning, reflect for a moment on the subject of bridges. The bridge is, indeed, wondrous—both as a structure and as a concept. As a structure, the bridge transcends trouble and shortens distance. It links separated points and spans dangerous chasms. It surmounts hazardous currents. All of this with serene and purposeful utility. As a concept, the bridge constitutes one of the great hopes and needs of our time.

"Ours is a world much in need of bridges—bridges of communications, of understanding, of goodwill; bridges anchored in compassion and buttressed by a fullness of spirit. How then shall we succeed better than in building bridges to span the gaps among nations and groups of men? Here, our Father, we need the insight and the direction that flow from an understanding of Your will. We pray that all men may achieve such understanding.

"Particularly we pray that You will inspire and guide our President, our public officials, the men of Congress, to enhance this role and skill as builders of bridges among men. And may we all understand the greatest bridge of all—the bridge between man and the source of strength and spirit he reflects—the bridge of Faith in Your guidance. Amen."

The words of a book just written by a man whom I hope you will have a chance to meet sometime, Aug Manning, were these: (I am going to paraphrase them.)

"We, and our forefathers, have built the greatest country in the history of the world. At Menlo Park we harnessed electricity and brightened the world; at Kitty Hawk we conquered gravity and made us all neighbors; from Cape Kennedy we walked on the moon; at Pittsburgh we conquered paralytic polio. We produced Lincolns and Jeffersons, Faulkners and Sandbergs; we have sheltered an Einstein, a Von Braun and a Fermi. We've split the atom and thrown our voice across the ocean; built the Golden Gate Bridge and Marina Towers."

Why do we beat our breasts and turn away from the challenge of this day? Are today's wars so much more horrifying than the war between the States? Is today's battle against pollution of our environment any more fearsome than the early settlers struggled with for sheer survival in this very valley?

You are living in the most exciting time ever known to man and you have within your power to make it the best of times—the Spring of Hope rather than the Winter of Despair.

Perhaps the secret that will help you, and all of us, to life our heads high once more lies in a four letter word—LOVE. Sometime in the past two decades, we have forgotten how to love our God, our country, our environment, our neighbors and ourselves; and the fruit of our forgetfulness is now being harvested by all of our children.

Now that our perspective and sense of proportion have changed, perhaps we can have another chance.

REFLECTIONS ON THE DEATH OF A YOUNG FARMER

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, Columnist James J. Kilpatrick recently published a set of thoughts entitled "Reflections on the Death of a Young Farmer." I have it printed here for my colleagues:

REFLECTIONS ON THE DEATH OF A YOUNG FARMER

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

SCRABBLE, VA.—Garfield Burke died on a Tuesday and was buried two days later in the little graveyard at Woodville. Meanwhile, on Wednesday, Mr. Griffith and his son Tommy came out to build the new deck, and this past weekend, once the sun got behind the mountains, it was possible to do some quiet sitting and thinking.

The death of a young husband and father—Garfield was 38—is always a matter of special wonderment and sorrow. The Rev. B. Gayle Titchnell, who delivered the eulogy, touched on the universal question that forever arises: Why this man? Until cancer felled him, he seemed in perfect health—strong and wiry, a clear-eyed farmer who could make hay for 12 hours and never seem to tire. In a small community such as ours, it seemed especially unfair for death to claim Garfield Burke. Mr. Titchnell said, as all preachers do, that we have to understand it was the Lord's will. Such understanding comes hard.

But life goes on. The Burkes have planted a big piece of the meadow in corn this year, and early on the morning after the funeral, Garfield's brother-in-law was up there with the big tractor, working the crop. From down on the deck, over the noisy rhythm of hammers and hand saws, we could hear the engine fighting our rocky soil. Later in the day, Garfield's father, our rural letter carrier, was back on the road delivering the mail.

It may be—I venture the idea tentatively—that country people develop a certain stoicism about death that city dwellers somehow miss. In the midst of our life, we are always in death. Most of the farming here is cattle farming, chiefly of Black Angus. The sullen beasts have their doom written in their dark and heavy heads: On some distant and inevitable Thursday, they know that tumbrels await for the auctioneer's call.

Country life is geared to living and dying, the yielding seed, the killing frost, the dead wood that finds a certain resurrection in bright flame and fertile ash. Birds and animals are a great part of our world—fish and insects too, for that matter—and we know, without ever really thinking of it, that chains of life are moving constantly around us. The chorus of frogs sounds a great amen.

We talk about these things, out on the new deck by night, with the trees in somnolent silhouette against an iridescent sky. This is a big year for fireflies; their soft lanterns are moving candles, points of light that dance with stars. But it is a big year for living creatures generally. Not since the summer of 1966 have we seen so many snakes—or so many chipmunks. Perhaps you can't have one without the other.

It has been a wet May and June. This is a country of granite and limestone—and every other rock known to man—and water runs off swiftly; but so much stays behind that our springs are gushing and the weeds are leaping. Our roadsides are a forest of day lilies, red as old barns; of blue chicory, massed honeysuckle, black-eyed susans, daisies that might have been lacquered in bone-white enamel. The dill is in full blossom; its slim stems shoot up like roman candles and explode in yellow diadems. We cut it for August picking; and we marvel.

The rains have been great for night hunters too. It is useless to turn out the hounds when the countryside is hot and dry, but every evening, by 11 o'clock or thereabouts, you can hear them now. These are small hounds, lean and purposeful; at first glance they all look alike, and they stream past like so many Little League players running to keep their legs in shape. Lorenzo, our boss-man collie, hates them absolutely. He complains as bitterly as the captain of a 747 besieged by Piper Cubs, but after a while he

gives up in brooding disgust, and the hunt goes on. It is like sleeping in the middle of an octet for French horns.

This is the life and the world that Garfield knew and we are sorry for his leaving it. Not much of high politics here; nothing of finance or industry, and very little of getting and spending. We are a long way, as they say, from where the action is; but we are very close, I think, to something else.

U.S.A. AND THE SOVIET MYTH:
CHAPTER 2

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, chapter 2, "Seeing Russia in Toto," of U.S.A. and the Soviet Myth, by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, presents a concise, historical background to Soviet Russian expansionism. With this background, Russia's involvement in Vietnam, the Middle East, and the Caribbean becomes more clear. Parts of this chapter follow:

SEEING "RUSSIA" IN TOTO

Winston Churchill: "Russia is 'a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma'."

"Russia" is no riddle. Nor is it a mystery or an enigma. The problem posed is purely subjective, not objective. It is in our minds, not in Eastern Europe and Asia. As a matter of fact, the most prodigious riddle in modern times is that so many, in so many unexpected places, hold this false Churchillian view of "Russia." This is the view that has been popularized, though Churchill with some certainty qualified it by adding "But perhaps there is a key. The key is Russian national interest." He failed to point out toward what?

Some, of course, use this riddish view as a convenient cover for their lethargic disposition toward the problem. The majority has come to believe in it after having been periodically jolted by Moscow's calculated zigzags. Others in effect perpetuate this obscurantist view with their conditioned notions about Russia. But the riddle is not Russia. It is, indeed, the amazing perseverance of our misconceived ideas about "Russia."

With the growing threat that hangs over us, it is about time that this and other truths about Russia are faced squarely and intelligently. No subject is fraught with as many basic misconceptions and errors as that of Russia. In the precincts of academic study, for example, what so often happens is that on the basis of these fundamental errors, misleading analyses are constructed. Invariably they lead to a number of false conclusions. Then, in time, the mere popularization of these conclusions only reinforces the original erroneous premises. The cycle repeats itself on higher levels of assembled information. In the meantime, the malformed perspectives spun about the subject become more entrenched than ever before. At no risk of exaggeration, this still is the general state of our so-called Russian studies in this country.

SOME ENIGMATIC NOTIONS ABOUT RUSSIA

Before we begin to see "Russia" in toto, it would profit us to glance at a few enigmatic notions commonly held about the Soviet Union; more examples will follow in later chapters: The first and foremost is that the USSR is Russia. One may perhaps excuse the average journalist for notoriously perpetuating this myth and all the consequent

errors it breeds, but it is clearly unpardonable for any responsible scholar or official to reveal his limitations by committing this basic error. For, in plain fact, Russia, the homeland of the Russian people, is no more coincident with the USSR than the United States is with North America.

A second ruling misconception has the Soviet Union as a "nation," with a Soviet people, a Soviet society, a Soviet economy, a Soviet political system and humans called "the Soviets." Here, too, the Soviet Union is no more a nation than was the British Empire. Whether many realize it or not, these monolithic terms have for some time been the stock of Moscow's terminology for export. They readily serve the semantic purpose of blurring the real, diverse and distinctive elements in the Soviet Union. The true meaning of a soviet, as a council of workers, is no longer even recognizable.

As we shall see in greater detail later, from these two paramount misconceptions many others evolve. For example, how often have you heard that the USSR is like the United States, "a country of many nationalities and ethnic groups," some 177 or more of them; or, that like the United States, the Soviet Union has its "national minorities, the Great Russians constituting the majority"; or that the USSR is a "federal union" like ours, Byelorussia being a counterpart of Massachusetts or, as George F. Kennan would have it, Ukraine a counterpart of Pennsylvania? These notions have as much real meaning as those harbored by many uncritical Americans only three decades ago that the Constitution of the USSR is actually like ours and that in many respects the USSR is a democracy like ours. They bear as much validity as the baseless assertions that "the Soviet Union was formed 50 years ago," that "Kiev, Kharkov, Baku are Russian cities," that "there are the Russian peoples," and that there even is a "Gross National Product of the Soviet Union," which again suggests the fiction of a Soviet nation.

Needless to say, the greatest part of anyone's education is devoted to an objective and accurate identification of things and events. If an address or lecture contained remarks to the effect that the United States was formed in 1776 or that Warsaw or Sofia is a Russian city, you would entertain prudent doubts about the interpretations and judgment of the speaker. It obviously follows with equal force of logic that if these misconceptions about the Soviet Union prevail, interpretations that follow can only be viewed with similar doubt. In fact, as the Nazi experience in the USSR well showed, policies and plans based on flagrant misconceptions invite only disaster. The moral is simple: we cannot afford to misidentify the sources of the enemy.

INSTITUTIONAL SINEWS OF THE U.S.S.R.

Let us then look into these roots, into the institutional sinews and background of the USSR. One of the most misleading illusions is that the Bolshevik Revolution represented a break with Russia's past and uniquely ushered in a new and chaste society. It is the height of unreality to believe that any such institutional hiatus is achievable in the existence of any social organism. An eminent Russian historian well points out in the preface to his authoritative work that "the roots of the Russian Revolution are deeply imbedded in the historical backwardness of Russia. . . ." In a holistic view of Russian development down to the present, these roots and their long stems can be essentially summed up in three overall and determinative phenomena. One is Russian imperialist expansionism and colonialism. The second is totalitarian despotism and tyranny. And the third is an institutionalized Messianism expressed in a variety of expedient ideologies.

There are, of course, other strains of a more constructive and salutary kind for the advance of civilization, but they certainly fall short of the weight and predominance of these three.

The history of Russia is in the largest degree the history of the Russian Empire. The former pales without the latter. Imperialist expansionism and colonialism have formed the chief sinew of parasitical Russian growth. Reading Russian history without a constant awareness of this is like reading American history without a penetrating sense of constitutional government.

Considering this first imposing feature of the Tsarist past and the pseudo-Communist present, probably no definition of it surpasses the one offered by Secretary of State Dean Acheson in 1951. He said: "Historically, the Russian state has had three great drives—to the west into Europe, to the south into the Middle East, and to the east into Asia. . . . Historically, also, the Russian state has displayed considerable caution in carrying out these drives. . . . The Politburo has acted in the same way. It has carried on and built on the imperialist tradition . . . the ruling power in Moscow has long been an imperial power and now rules a greatly extended empire. . . . It is clear that this process of encroachment and consolidation by which Russia has grown in the last 500 years from the duchy of Muscovy to a vast empire has got to be stopped." Compare this and its evidence with drive such as this: "From the days of Ivan the Great until our own time, a period of five centuries, the history of Moscow is one of steady, continuing expansion. Yet this expansion, in a way peculiar to Russia, is not an aggressive expansion."⁴

A glance at the political maps covering this imperialist expansion is sufficient for one to appreciate the old Russian saying, "Russia grows larger and larger." (See maps pp. 34-39.)

Tolstoy put it this way: "Russia is the Continent and Europe its Peninsula." A review of the record of Russian imperialist expansion reveals that there really is nothing new in the drives of present-day Moscow.⁵ As every alert student of Russian history knows, the three chief directions—west, south and east—have always been present. Moreover, the frequency of wars and aggressions, the "eternal peace" gestures followed by broken treaties, constant meddling in the affairs of other states, the tactic of alternation—first west, then east, again west, and then south—and the relentless conquest of nations form an unmistakable legacy for the heirs of the Tsars.

When it comes to diplomacy, duplicity, and divisive conspiracy, the institutional approach provides deeper insights into the present than any abstractionist reliance on the principles of Leninism. The progress of imperialist Russian expansionism over the centuries has been largely based on these factors. To mention only the zigzag operations of Alexander I, his double-cross of the Western allies for Napoleon in the Treaty of Tilsit was a perfect model for Stalin's double-cross of Hitler in 1939. Also, none of the countless violations of treaties by the Red Tsars could improve upon Alexander's violations of the Holy Alliance of 1814-15. Although pledged to police Europe in the maintenance of the status quo, he used the alliance as an umbrella for the instigation of Greek uprisings against Turkey. Alexander himself only transmitted to his heirs a tradition set by Ivan III, Peter, and Catherine.

To strike a note of irony here, let us see how Marx and Engels viewed the Russian menace in writings which are taboo in the Soviet Union. In an article on *The Foreign Policy of Russian Czarism* (1890) Engels observed, "Once again stupid Europe was made a fool of; Czarism preached legitimacy to the princes and reactionaries, to the liberal Philistines it preached the liberation of op-

Footnotes at end of article.

pressed peoples and enlightenment—and both believed it." How different is this today—peaceful coexistence for the West, arms for Asia and Africa; trade for the business interests, the inevitable "victory of socialism" for the masses and so forth? In an article on *Poland's European Mission* (1867) Marx strikes a familiar ring: "In the first place the policy of Russia is changeless, according to the admission of its official historian, the Muscovite Karamsin, but the polar star of its policy—world domination—is a fixed star." This has a familiar ring today when we're told about Moscow's fixed goal of world domination.

Above all, let us not confuse the terms "nation" and "state." It is sometimes amazing how the two terms are confused by our officials and journalists. Legally, the present Russian empire may be viewed as a state, but its political structure is thoroughly multi-national; and at that consisting of relatively few compact nations. As we saw, the Baltic countries were absorbed into this empire-state, but this in itself did not extinguish the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian nations. In fact, as suggested earlier, the criteria for what constitutes a nation, the integrating soul of a people—namely common territory, descent, language, tradition, customs, history, and religion—are more applicable in number to such non-Russian nations as Georgia, Armenia, Ukraine, and Turkestan than they are to most of the independent nations or states in Asia and Africa, or even to our own country where the language, in common with several other nations, is English. These non-Russian nations in the USSR have all these qualities that make up their individual national consciousness and their collective personalities, plus the indomitable will for national independence.

Without our institutional understanding of the Soviet Union, the usual population figures and classifications could be very misleading. This shows up in such inaccurate usages as "the national minorities" or "177 ethnic groups." First, since we are dealing in effect with manipulated estimates, there is real doubt that in the Soviet Union as a whole the Russians even constitute a majority. In fact, considering the dominant political position of Russia in the empire and the background to current statistics, there is every reason to believe that they are in the minority. I have held this position for over twenty years, and at this writing I should not be surprised that the 1970 USSR census did finally disclose what should have been admitted years ago. From a propaganda point of view, the minority "Russians" will stress that they don't manage this empire; instead, they use as window dressing Ukrainians and others.

Past estimates on the basis of the empire census of 1897 showed about sixty per cent of non-Russians. Lenin himself held that "in Czarist Russia the Russians constituted forty-three per cent of the total population, i.e., a minority, while the non-Russian nationalities constituted fifty-seven per cent." In the present period it is interesting to read in a standard textbook used in the USSR that "particularly rapid is the natural increase of population among the formerly oppressed nationalities . . . The census of 1926 showed that already the rate of natural increase among the formerly backward nationalities surpassed considerably the average birth rate of the USSR as a whole."⁶

There are many statistical tricks in padding figures for political purposes. Russians have been masters at such tricks. Counting a person as a Russian because he knows the Russian language or making election districts larger to reduce the quantitative influence of non-Russians is only one in the bag of tricks. However, as in the above case or in the careless disclosures of G. M. Chekalin in 1941, slips are made. With the aid of governmental demographers, the Displaced

Persons Commission took an interest in this subject and on the basis of reasonable extrapolations of the 1939 census, showed in 1951 that of an estimated total population of 202 million, over 54 per cent were non-Russians.⁷

It should be mentioned that soon after the release of this estimate in November 1951, the MVD head, Lavrenti P. Beria, vehemently denied its validity. Not only the overall percentages must have politically vexed the Kremlin then but also the breakdowns which refute the misleading notions of "177 ethnic groups." The non-Russian nations as represented by the non-Russian republics and certain cohesive groupings—with Turkestan combining the five Central Asiatic republics—alone comprise over 90 per cent of the total non-Russian population. This obviously leaves little for percentage distribution among the other-so-called ethnic groups, most of which are tribes with no national character. In the event of the collapse of the empire, the problems will not be insoluble as some, like Dr. Phillip C. Jessup, our pioneer representative to the U.N., suppose. Moreover, it is rather fuzzy thinking to regard any nation a "national minority" by virtue of its absorption and captivity in the empire.

A critical analysis of the 1959 census in the USSR further substantiates these observations. The original 208.8 million estimate was rather quickly revised to 212 million which also represents an underestimate. After the 1951 episode mentioned above, Moscow evidently could not afford to leave a detailed republic breakdown to other sources. What was not revealed along these lines in the 1939 census now appears. As anticipated at the time, the Russians were painted in the majority. From a political viewpoint it could scarcely have been otherwise. Conditions are different now.

About ten million Cossacks who are profoundly proud of their distinctive heritage are indiscriminately merged in the Russian figure. The countless who find it expedient to call themselves "Russians" are also covered by this nebulous figure. And what Frank Lorimer some time ago established in his book, *The Population of the Soviet Union*, the genocidal Russification process, is poignantly revealed by this census, particularly in Turkestan. In the Kazakh part of this Moslemic country the Russian colonialists now make up about 43 per cent of the population. Although simple sociologic explanations may be offered, in the '70s a different census, with the Russians in the minority, will doubtlessly be put to maximum propaganda effect, namely the multinational management of the empire.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Nicholas Berdyaev, *The Origin of Russian Communism*, London, 1948, p. 7.

² Petr B. Struve, *Sotsial'nai i ekonomicheskaya istoriya Rossii*, Paris, 1942, p. vii.

³ Dean Acheson, *The Mutual Security Program*, Committee on Foreign Affairs, 82nd Congress, 1st Session, 1951, pp. 11-12.

⁴ Louis J. Halle, *The Cold War As History*, London, 1967, p. 17.

⁵ See a condensed record of Russian imperialist expansion at the end of the chapter.

⁶ *Economic Geography of the USSR*, ed. by S. S. Balzak et al, New York, 1949, p. 174.

⁷ *U.S. Congressional Record*, Vol. XCVII, October 17, 1951, p. A6460.

A CLOSER LOOK AT PING PONG

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the now renowned ping pong diplomatic move

of Red China's should be understood for what it is, a major propaganda gesture which behooves us to take an objective, thorough look at its significance.

This point is very effectively made in an article by David Lawrence in the *Washington Star* of June 28 which I insert into the *RECORD* at this point:

A CLOSER LOOK AT PING PONG

(By David Lawrence)

Ever since the American table tennis team came back from Red China and it appeared that a friendly relationship was going to be established between the Peking regime and the United States, many people have been wondering what would happen to the Nationalist Republic on Formosa. Would it be abandoned by the United States? Would it have to give up its membership in the United Nations and its seat on the Security Council?

Oddly enough, the government at Taipei had little to say publicly until just a few days ago, when its ambassador to the United States, James C. H. Shen, made a frank speech to the National Press Club. He indicated clearly that there are a lot of phases of the problem which probably have not been thought of by Americans but which inevitably will become better and better known in the immediate future.

Ambassador Shen has lived and studied in the United States and speaks fluent English. He has had much experience in diplomacy, and understands world problems very well. He said at the outset of his talk:

"There are many in your country who are convinced that the free world can live on friendly terms with an aggressive Communist dictatorship such as that which is headed by Mao Tse-tung. Although we respect the sincerity of effort, we in Taiwan do not share your optimism.

"If we of the Republic of China seem to have little faith in often-voiced hope of building bridges to the Communist-occupied Chinese mainland, it is because we have a long and bitter experience with Mao Tse-tung and his cohorts. We have learned, at a great cost, the worthlessness of his promises. We have experienced the fanatical ruthlessness with which he pursues his goals. We know that even behind Chou En-lai's much-publicized smiles lurks the unaltered intent to trap the free world, and especially the United States, into letting down its guard. We know from their own boasts that their aim is the subjugation of the world. With such an opponent, truces are meaningless."

The ambassador went on to say that the Chinese Communist regime has not changed at all, and he called attention to the current campaign against the United States by newspapers which are owned and controlled by the Peking government.

He pointed out that, scarcely a month after "the ping pong overtures," the Peking press published an editorial "which touched an almost all-time low in savage hatred and contempt for the United States."

He said the editorial pictured the American People as turning against their government, and quoted its statement that they are "dealing heavier and heavier blows from within an important vigorous force in the world struggle against American imperialism."

Shen emphasized that this was published within a month after the United States had "made the friendliest gestures" to Peking since the Korean War and while the American press was full of talk about a thaw in Washington-Peking relations. He quoted from other newspapers in Red China, "all official organs of the Communist regime," and asserted that there is no sign of receding one inch from past policies, no matter what concessions the United States is willing to make. The ambassador made another significant point.

He declared, "In all the utterances of Mao-

Tse-tung and Chou En-lai, one thing is always noteworthy: In official pronouncements they make no attempt to speak to the United States government. If you read their statements closely, you will note that they are always speaking over the head of the U.S. government to what they describe as the rebellious masses of American people. Their words are not words of amity. They are the words of an unchanging enemy government which is thinking constantly about incitement of revolution in this country. Their terminology has not changed in the slightest, despite the repeated gestures of friendship from your government."

Shen said he is convinced that the United States will not desert his country and that Americans are "too intelligent and too knowledgeable not to realize that their self-interest lies with the Republic of China on Formosa and not with the Chinese Communists who oppose everything for which America stands."

He concluded with this appeal: "The future of Asia and of the whole free world depends on your decision. I know you will not fall us."

FARM SUBSIDY PROGRAM MUST BE CURBED

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the farm subsidy program has gotten completely out of hand.

This giveaway program, which I have fought since entering Congress, is not designed to aid the small, family farm. It is designed to help the large agribusinessmen who can afford to cultivate huge tracts of land.

We hear many complaints concerning the welfare recipient who collects a check to maintain herself and her children at a subsistence level, but we rarely receive complaints concerning the rich who continue to dip into the Federal Treasury to supplement their large income.

When the administrator of the farm subsidy program collects \$48,000 in Government checks from the program he administers—not for administering, but for farming—it is time to reevaluate our oversight procedures, as well as review the intent of the farm subsidy operation.

Actually, I favor a \$10,000 per farm limit. However, I recognize the fact that many oppose any action to alter the current regulations which allow corporations to collect hundreds of thousands of dollars. Thus, we may have to compromise and settle for a \$20,000 limit.

The taxpayers of this country are justifiably outraged over conditions which allow the wealthy to dip into the Federal Treasury to supplement their already bulging pockets.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I place in the RECORD an article that appeared in the July 5, 1971, Washington Post, which reveals just one of the many abuses of the farm subsidy program.

FARM SUBSIDY DIRECTOR QUALIFIES FOR \$48,000

Kenneth Frick, the Agriculture Department's administrator for farm commodity programs, this year will get a federal subsidy check for about \$48,000 from programs he administers.

Frick's farm partnership with his brother will receive \$95,000 in cotton subsidies and about \$25,000 in sugar beet payments. Although Frick's 40 per cent interest is being managed for him by a Bank of America trust while he is in the government, Frick said he will get the income.

The Frick partnership last year received \$195,000 in cotton subsidies. The new ceiling on farm payments would not permit the Frick brothers to receive more than \$110,000 in cotton subsidies this year. The partnership, therefore, gave up leased cotton allotments worth \$100,000, Frick said.

Frick said the partnership, unlike many other large growers, made no effort to reorganize its business interests in an effort to retain higher payments. He said the reason was his position as administrator of the subsidy programs.

AN ARTICLE ON THE EXERCISE OF PRIVATE CENSORSHIP

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in these days when the news media are waging such a valiant defense on the rights of free speech and free press in America, I thought the following article on the exercise of private censorship might provide a relevant lesson in this field:

THE MOST UNKINDEST CUT OF ALL

(By Goodman Ace)

In the olden, golden days of radio and early TV, comedy writers had one common, natural enemy—the network censors. They were out to get us, examining every line of dialogue with a fine-tooth microscope for jokes considered to be in "bad taste." Or for "indecent language"—such as "hell" and "damn," which were sheared from the script and made to read "heck" and "darn."

I'm trying to recall one such joke marked "bad taste." Oh yes. It was when we were writing the Perry Como program. Our Christmas show. One of the guests was Bishop Fulton Sheen. The scene was a Christmas tree laden with presents bearing the names of the recipients, who came and picked up their gifts.

Bishop Sheen, according to our script, was to come to Perry and ask if he might exchange his gift.

"Why?" asked Mr. Como. "What did you get?"

"A necktie," was the reply.

The Bishop enjoyed the line at rehearsals. But the censors marked it "bad taste." Clip, clip went the shears.

It happened every week and on all programs. The network censors found various reasons to delete comedy lines. And, at first, the writers took it all supinely, crushed and defeated, watching what they considered their best efforts go down the blue-penciled drain.

Finally, at secret meetings held from coast to coast, they resolved to fight this censorship by sneaking in lines so adroitly phrased that the censors would overlook them. When such a line showed up on a broadcast, all the gagmen honored the sneaky writer with a dinner at a delicatessen near the network, where he was toasted with a bottle of Cel-ray Tonic.

One writer who supplied the jokes for a program sponsored by Old Gold cigarettes wrote a sketch about the gold rush of '49 in which the comedian discovered a gold mine and came on stage shouting, "I've made a lucky strike." The network censors over-

looked the obvious conflict with the sponsor's interests, and the joke stayed in. And that night at the dinner Cel-ray flowed like champagne.

I was almost similarly honored when I wrote a program for Chesterfield cigarettes. In a sketch, I had one of the players say, "That was the straw that broke the camel's back." It went through all rehearsals, but on the day of the show the network shamus caught it and it was out. That night at the dinner I was given an E for effort and toasted with a glass of seltzer.

A craftier man than I was W. C. Fields. As a guest on the Lucky Strike program one Sunday night, Mr. Fields mentioned that he had a nephew named Chester.

It wasn't till the laugh had died down that the censor knew he had been had. That night at our dinner Mr. Fields was toasted in absentia with a glass of whatever he had been having plenty of.

But one writer and comedian on radio stood aloof from all this chicanery. He was Fred Allen, the most censor-bothered writer of the day. But he fought censorship in the open. Every week he met the censors with honest dissension, until one day he came up with such a delightful bit of sneakiness that he won the admiration of all downtrodden practitioners of the craft.

It was a simple and brilliantly diabolic plan. He wrote into each of his scripts at least three obviously objectionable lines that would attract the attention of the censor. And when the censor came up with six lines to be deleted, Mr. Allen offered to compromise. He would delete the objectionable three lines, which he wouldn't have used anyway, if the censor would allow the other three. Invariably it worked.

As the years went by, I became sanguine and more understanding of the problems of network censors. The Great Understanding. To achieve The Great Understanding takes a lot of understanding. And lots of Briscchi and aspirin. Oops! Make that Anacin, for the sake of an auld lang radio sponsor.

I have lost to the censors' shears not only an occasional brilliant line of dialogue but, once, an entire script. However, now I am able to murmur, "This too shall pass." And at night I slash my wrists. Not deeply. I only want to die a little.

So you will pardon the small, supercilious smile that curls my lips when I read that the networks themselves are now being censored by the White House. Network executives cry havoc, claiming the administration is interfering with their electronic journalism.

Now they know what the comedy writers went through all those years. How does it feel to be watched over by the eagle eye of Spiro T. Agnew, V.P.? Video Protector, that is.

FISCAL "HERESY"?

HON. JOHN ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of an incredible trend to spiral Federal spending up, up, and up, with what would appear to be total disregard to the mounting national debt, I am proud to bring to the attention of my colleagues an extraordinary example of good old-fashioned prudence.

In vivid contrast to the popular concept of "deficit spending," the administrators of Mount San Antonio College in my district in California have practiced remarkable fiscal responsibility with the dollars collected from their local property tax-

payers and have, in fact, economized so efficiently that the junior college district's 1971-72 budget shows a tax rate decrease. My colleagues, we might just do the same.

The following editorial which appeared in the Covina Sentinel is submitted so that my colleagues can thoughtfully consider the practical possibility that sound economizing could restructure the Nation's spending toward a sensible fiscal policy:

FISCAL "HERESY"

The old saying, "You get what you pay for," is illustrated well by Mt. San Antonio College.

Property taxpayers in the junior college district have been paying to support a quality program of higher education since the end of World War II and their money has been well spent.

So well spent, in fact, that the district's 1971-72 budget features, of all things, a tax rate decrease. That seems to be tantamount to fiscal heresy these days.

The ability of the district to maintain its operations, despite an anticipated student enrollment jump of six per cent and the inflationary spiral which has most government agencies gasping for financial breath, while slicing more than \$250,000 from its budget, can be traced largely to the old American philosophy of spending no more than necessary . . . and keeping expenses within the limit of income.

College administrators have been fortunate over the years in that district voters have responded consistently to requests for voluntary tax increases to fund vital construction projects. Had the voters refused these requests, the district today would be saddled with debt and spending a considerable amount of taxpayers' money for interest payments.

Instead, the communities within the MSAC District enjoy a modern, well-equipped and well-run junior college which ranks with the best in the nation. For all this, the public indebtedness is zero.

The administrators and trustees of MSAC deserve a pat on the back for maintaining sound fiscal policies through the years. They have shown that government can be operated on a sound financial footing and still provide service of high quality.

HIGHWAY SAFETY—ADOPTING THE "SLOW-MOVING VEHICLE (SMV)" EMBLEM IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill that would amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act so as to require the use of a distinctive emblem—SMV, slow-moving vehicle—in a prominent position on slow-moving vehicles.

I introduced similar legislation in the 91st Congress.

In Washington, D.C., as in other areas, there are a number of slow-moving vehicles using the streets and highways; that is, brush and water street cleaners, snow removal equipment, utility repair trucks, salt spreaders and street repair equipment, and other similar equipment. It can be anticipated that the subway

construction will increase the number of these types of vehicles and equipment using the city's streets and highways.

I am informed that studies conducted at Ohio State University have established that the SMV emblem has significantly reduced rear-end accidents because the oncoming traffic is alerted to the fact that they are overtaking a slow-moving vehicle ahead.

Adoption of such legislation by the Congress for the District of Columbia would, I am informed, bring the District highway safety laws into conformity with those in the adjoining States of Maryland and Virginia where the laws will go into effect in January 1972.

I might point out that this legislation is similar to that required on slow-moving vehicles in my own State of Minnesota. Our State law, as contained in Minnesota Statutes 169.522, requires the use of an iridescent triangular slow moving emblem on all animal-drawn vehicles, implements of husbandry, and other machinery, including all road construction machinery which are designed for operation at a speed of 25 miles per hour or less.

It is requested that the attached statement of the National Safety Council be inserted in the RECORD since it indicates the support of the Council for legislation such as that contained in my bill. It is my understanding that the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, the American Automobile Association, the American Society of Agricultural Engineers, and the Automotive Safety Foundation also endorse such legislation.

In the interest of traffic safety on the streets and highways of the District of Columbia, I introduce this legislation.

The statement follows:

NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL POLICY STATEMENT ON THE SLOW-MOVING VEHICLE EMBLEM

It is necessary for various vehicles with limited speed capability to utilize public streets and highways from time to time. This classification of vehicles includes farm tractors and other farm vehicles, road maintenance and construction equipment, and horse-drawn vehicles, designed for a speed no more than 25 miles per hour.

These slow-moving vehicles frequently cause conflict with faster moving traffic, and it is necessary for drivers of fast-moving vehicles to take extra precautions when overtaking slow-moving vehicles. However, the driver of a fast-moving vehicle must be able to perceive and recognize a slow-moving vehicle in time to take the necessary action to avoid a collision. There is need that the slow-moving vehicle be identified as such. This is partially met by various requirements in states that such vehicles display rear lights and/or flags.

However, these requirements are not standardized and do not necessarily identify the vehicle as of the slow-moving type. A standardized device is needed that not only increases the visibility of the vehicle but also identifies it as slow-moving. This need is met by the triangular reflectorized, fluorescent emblem developed through research by the Ohio State University and recommended by the American Society of Agricultural Engineers. The latter organization has also developed specifications for physical properties, dimensions, component materials, and use of the emblem (ASAE R276.)

The National Safety Council supports the promotion and use of the Slow-Moving Ve-

hicle Emblem and urges that every effort be made to encourage the use of this emblem on slow-moving vehicles and to educate the public to recognize it as identifying a slow-moving vehicle.

Approved by the Board of Directors, National Safety Council on April 13, 1966.

SOVIET MACK TRUCK DEAL AND ORGANIZED LABOR

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the announcement that the Mack Truck Co. of Allentown, Pa., plans to build a \$700 million truck factory in the Soviet Union using American capital and know-how is only surpassed by the approval of such anti-American action by the U.S. administration presently in power.

Reaction to these actions is only exceeded in amazement by the bewilderment at the announcement that the hierarchy of the United Auto Workers and the United Electrical Workers Union not only urged President Nixon to approve of the Soviet Mack truck deal, but felt that it would help American labor by providing "an important contribution to the national economy," and would "provide badly needed employment for thousands of American workers without in anyway affecting the interests of the United States."

One possible reason for this unprecedented support of American entanglement with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by two of the leading American unions can be found in an announcement that followed sharply on the heels of the union's support of the \$700 million Mack Truck deal—the United Auto Workers is in dire financial straits; it has even been forced to borrow money from the Teamsters Union.

Perhaps the UAW brass feel that, what with work going out of style with the advent of a guaranteed annual income, they can be more successful in organizing the Russian workers employed under the Soviet Mack truck plan.

I insert several related articles at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 1, 1971]

TWO UNIONS SUPPORT SOVIET-MACK TRUCK DEAL

(By Ed Townsend)

NEW YORK.—Vermont members of the United Electrical Workers Union (UE) in the machine-tool industry have been hard hit by a recession that has reduced the industry's operations to about half of its capacity.

Unemployment in the Springfield, Vt., area is a high 11.4 percent (nearly double the national level) or an estimated 15 percent or higher if those who have exhausted jobless-pay benefits are included. According to the UE, the unemployment office is one of the busiest spots in the area.

Many members of the United Automobile Workers Union (UAW) employed in the machine-tool industry elsewhere are jobless. The industry's first quarter of 1971 was its worst in years; three-month figures this year were 42 percent below the comparable months in

1970—and last year was not a good one for the industry.

Although there are some slight signs of a pickup, for the first time in the history the United States will not be the leading producer of machine tools this year, an executive officer of the National Machine Tool Builders Association said recently. West Germany is moving into the top spot, with Japan right behind. And the Soviet Union now is moving up strongly.

POLITICAL DECISIONS HIT

The industry and UE, UAW, and other unions complain that the situation which is costing the jobs of "tens of thousands of highly skilled American workers" must be blamed not only on the recession but also—many say much more—on "cold war" political decisions in Washington that have stopped U.S. producers from going after huge foreign orders.

Unless the political decisions are changed soon, they warn, "the American machine-tool industry runs the risk of being permanently relegated to an inferior position in the world with consequent permanent loss of jobs for workers."

Worries about this happening are behind the pressures being applied in Washington for approval of the recent agreement between the Soviet Union and Mack Trucks, Inc., for a truck plant to be built in Russia. The deal, subject to U.S. Government approval, contemplates the sales of upward of \$750 million of truck-production equipment (machine tools) to the Soviet Union, along with \$22 million of off-highway vehicles. Present U.S. policies would have to be relaxed to issue necessary export licenses for shipments to carry out the proposed contract.

Within hours after the announcement of the Soviet Union-Mack Truck agreement, UE's executive board met in New York to urge the President to approve the deal. The board said that "several thousand" workers, now unemployed, could be helped.

WOODCOCK URGES APPROVAL

Almost as quickly, in Detroit, UAW's president, Leonard Woodcock, called on the administration "to clear the way promptly for approval of the licenses." Mr. Woodcock said this would be "an important contribution to the national economy" and would "provide badly needed employment for thousands of American workers without in any way adversely affecting the interests of the United States."

Both unions say that lowering the trade bars would ease tensions between Russia and the United States. The administration recently relaxed restrictions on exports to Communist China in a move toward improved relations and better understanding.

The U.S. machine-tool industry, supported by the unions representing its employees, has been campaigning vigorously for a sanction to accept orders from the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries linked to Russia. On May 21, representatives of 15 leading American companies went to Moscow to explore the possibility of obtaining some of the lucrative orders which have been going to West Germany and Japan. According to industry spokesmen, the orders "could run into several billions of dollars," including the potentials in Hungary, Poland, and other countries.

On their return, company executives in the Vermont area told UE that Russian trade representatives indicated a readiness to place "very large" orders with them whenever they can be assured that the administration will grant shipping licenses. The Vermont group said that this business could boost production and employment in their depressed industry.

Other industry spokesmen said that, translated into jobs and payrolls, success in winning export licenses to take advantage of

business available in Russia and Eastern Europe could mean "recovery for many communities, such as those in Vermont, where machine tools are the predominant industry."

The U.S. Commerce Department helped arrange the Moscow sales trip and a representative went along to suggest, at least, that the Nixon administration favors easing the trade restrictions. Without the implied support, the delegation undoubtedly would have run into Russian reluctance to risk doing business with the Americans.

GOODS AVAILABLE ELSEWHERE

James A. Gray, executive vice-president of the National Machine Tool Builders Association, who went to Moscow earlier to arrange for the trip, said that "one thing that came in loud and clear in Moscow then was that there is a great reluctance on the part of the Russians to buy from American companies because of the difficulties of getting licenses."

The licensing policy is a part of an old cold-war theory that by keeping Russia and its allies from buying in the United States without approval in Washington, they can be kept weak and subject to U.S. political pressures.

Such a policy may still be necessary for some strategic military goods, but otherwise what the socialist countries need, they can buy—if not from the United States, then from other countries, including some of America's closest allies.

The Commerce Department reported recently that Eastern European countries, excluding the Soviet Union, bought \$3.9 billion worth of goods from the West, of which only \$144 million came from the United States. Such a figure is misleading in one respect: A substantial part of the purchases from outside the United States were from plants wholly or partially owned by U.S. companies unable to fill orders from plants in this country because of export restrictions.

Millions of dollars in machine-tool sales in other countries are for equipment made under licenses given or sold by U.S. companies to outside manufacturers.

Under such circumstances, the U.S. machine-tool industry contends, export licenses should be automatic. Russia and its allies are getting the equipment they need, regardless, so why not let U.S. producers get their business?

POLICY FACES REVIEW

When a UE delegation went to Washington to support this position, a State Department spokesman told the unionists that this country's imbalance in international trade would be helped considerably if the restrictions could be lifted, and that there is a growing feeling now that "licenses to ship the goods the Russians buy here should be granted more readily."

Other Commerce Department officials also expressed support for an amendment of regulations governing the granting of credit by the Export-Import Bank, to place trade with Eastern European countries on the same footing as that with other countries.

The Soviet Union-Mack Truck deal now has set the stage for a broad reassessment of the export-license policy. The Soviets are going to build a truck plant, regardless. They hope to buy equipment from the United States and benefit from the technological assistance that Mack Truck can supply. But, according to reports, they are hedging their bets through standby negotiations with automotive companies in Western Europe.

"We can make it harder for the Soviets, to our own disadvantage," says UAW's Mr. Woodcock, "but, even if there were reasons to do so, we could not stop them from building the plant. Cutting off one's nose to spite one's face is hardly a sound policy and denial of export licenses would be an exercise in futility."

The administration is studying the plans

for the truck plant and the specifications for equipment needed. There is strong backing for the desired sanction—and for opening the way to machine-tool business otherwise. This would be in line with President Nixon's desire to move from a period of international confrontation into one of negotiations. However, there is fierce opposition from within the Defense Department.

The military is reiterating its old argument: A country should not build up the capacity of a potential enemy to make war—and a plant with U.S. machine tools designed for peaceful production, to make trucks for Russian farms and industry, too easily could be transformed into a military support facility.

[From the Evening Star, July 6, 1971]

PRESIDENT MEETING INDUSTRY AND UNION ON STEEL CONTRACT

(By Norman Kempster)

President Nixon takes a long, although possibly reluctant, step toward the "jawbone" economic policies of his Democratic predecessors today by calling steel industry and union negotiators to the White House for a lecture on inflation.

This is the first time Nixon has summoned both management and labor for a meeting with him during negotiations for a national contract. The President has met separately with differing sides in earlier labor disputes.

The steel negotiators are scheduled to resume talks tomorrow on a contract to replace one that expires July 31. About 450,000 workers are covered by the pact.

WARNINGS PLANNED

Administration officials said Nixon planned to warn both sides that a big wage increase could further weaken the U.S. position in the world steel market and eventually result in lost jobs as well as lower profits. He would be relying on a new administration study of steel industry problems.

The President was expected to urge the United Steel Workers of America to make reasonable demands, and he is expected to urge the steel companies to hold the line on prices. He probably will not spell out specific guidelines for negotiators to follow.

The Steelworkers union is demanding a 31 percent pay boost over three years.

PROFITS DECREASE

Steel industry profits sagged last year to \$513.2 million, lowest since 1947, largely because of domestic price increases and booming imports.

Steelworkers union president I. W. Abel has said there can be no contract extension this year. The 1968 settlement was hammered out just days before the deadline, and the union worked more than four months without a contract in 1965.

Former Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson frequently called management or labor to the White House to warn against inflationary increases. The technique, called "jawboning," reached its peak in Kennedy's confrontation with steel companies in 1961 over a \$6 per ton price increase. The increase was rescinded.

POLICY ABANDONED

Nixon denounced jawboning and abandoned the wage-price guidelines on which it is based shortly after he took office. But he has used the technique on occasions in an effort to control inflation.

Advocates of a more activist government policy against inflation, such as Federal Reserve Chairman Arthur F. Burns, want Nixon to establish a national wage-price review board. This agency would have no enforcement powers, but it would be able to focus public attention on wage or price increases it considered excessive.

The day before announcement of Nixon's plan to meet with the steel negotiators, Treasury Secretary John B. Connally, the ad-

ministration's new chief economic spokesman, said the President had ruled out a wage-price review board.

TRUMP CARD

Nixon's intervention in steel bargaining is consistent with his earlier anti-inflation actions. The President's trump card in dealing with steel is the quota restrictions on the import of lower-priced foreign steel.

In January, he forced a partial rollback of a 12 percent price increase posted by Bethlehem Steel Co. after he threatened to relax the quotas.

After today's session, the President and Mrs. Nixon depart for Kansas City, Mo., for a briefing with Midwest newspaper and broadcast executives on the administration's domestic proposals. The Nixons then fly to their home in San Clemente, Calif., for a two-week stay.

UAW FINANCIAL WOES REVEALED BY WOODCOCK

MIAMI BEACH.—The United Auto Workers union is in "bad financial trouble" because of the 1970 strike against General Motors and the building of a family recreation and education center, UAW President Leonard Woodcock said yesterday.

But Woodcock said the 1.3 million-member UAW, second largest union in the nation, is taking steps to put its financial books in order.

Woodcock was in Miami Beach for the convention of the nation's largest union, the 2.1 million-member Teamsters union. He told delegates that James R. Hoffa is a "political prisoner" of the government who should be paroled from prison.

MATTER OF NAMES

"If Jimmy Hoffa's name was not Jimmy Hoffa, he would have been paroled last April as he should have been," Woodcock said. The former Teamster president is serving sentences totaling 13 years for jury tampering and mail fraud.

Hoffa has been in the federal penitentiary at Lewisburg, Pa., for the past four years, and has twice had parole bids denied. He resigned last month from all union posts.

Woodcock said the Justice Department, under the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, had "pursued Hoffa more than the average citizen" would have been.

In discussing his own problems, Woodcock said the UAW has called a special convention for Sept. 11 in Detroit to devise ways to balance its budget and retire a \$23 million debt stemming mostly from the Black Lake, Mich., family center that cost the union more than \$20 million to build. The center was conceived by the late UAW President Walter P. Reuther and dedicated to him after he died in a plane crash last year.

PAYMENTS SUSPENDED

Woodcock disclosed that the UAW has suspended, effective in April, its 5-cents-per-member monthly payments to the Alliance for Labor Action, a federation set up by the UAW and the Teamsters Union to rival the AFL-CIO.

He said the 115-day strike last fall against GM dissipated the union's \$121 million strike fund, with the UAW paying out \$15 million a week in strike benefits and \$5 million a week to pay health and welfare premiums for the strikers.

He said the strike eventually cost the UAW \$161 million, and the union will "never forget" the \$25 million loan made by the Teamsters, which now holds a mortgage on Black Lake.

Woodcock said the UAW has now built up a \$10 million strike fund, but has been unable to balance its budget or pay off the \$23 million debt, despite laying off more than 100 staff members last year.

Woodcock said his union's financial troubles also rule out any possibility of re-affiliation with the AFL-CIO soon because "we

can't afford" the per capita dues. Reuther pulled the union out of the AFL-CIO in 1968 in a dispute with its president, George Meany.

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) Morning Advocate, June 30, 1971]

WHEN READERS SPEAK TO THE EDITOR AND YOU

EDITOR, ADVOCATE: An issue most crucial to the life of Republic USA is the plan of Mack Trucks, Inc., to build the world's largest truck manufacturing plant in Russia. The people should make it clear to that company and the Nixon Administration that such a deal will not be tolerated. Mack Trucks should not wish to make profits from a deal which, ultimately, may mean the end of this Republic and the death of Freedom. The Russians are outbuilding us 3 to 1 in nuclear submarines; now we propose to cure another Red weakness. These trucks will be used to transport munitions to kill freedom-loving people who dare to stand up against Communist subversion and aggression and, worse, to kill U.S. fighting men. Communists have not changed their announced goal of burying us. This \$700 million truck plant would allow the use of capitalist industry and capitalist know-how to destroy all non-Communist institutions and our Republic.

H. L. HUNT.

DALLAS, TEX.

RAYMOND "HAP" DUMONT, FOUNDER OF NATIONAL BASEBALL CONGRESS, IN WICHITA, KANS.

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the great American past time of baseball has lost one of its great innovators. I have lost a good friend. Last Saturday in Wichita, Kans., Raymond "Hap" Dumont, founder and president of the National Baseball Congress, died suddenly at his desk near the stadium. We are saddened by this great loss; but Kansas, our Nation, and baseball are the beneficiaries of the legacy left by "Hap" Dumont.

He was the founder of the National Baseball Congress which for many years has sponsored a double elimination national semipro championship tournament in Wichita. Thirty-two teams from all over the Nation compete in this tournament.

Some 200 players have come up the rank from the semipro tournaments to perform in the major leagues.

"Hap" Dumont produced the first Kansas State tournament in 1931, and this Friday night the 41st annual tourney will open in Wichita's Lawrence Stadium. Similar tournaments will be held in the other 50 States to determine the entries for this year's national championship event that begins August 13.

"Hap" Dumont has been described as "baseball's man in motion." His contributions to the game are many. These innovations include the compressed air homeplate duster; a pop-up homeplate microphone; an electric timer to enforce the 20-second rule for pitcher's delivery; and grand-scale merchandising of baseball through the nonpro baseball network.

Bill Hodge, executive sports editor of the Wichita Eagle, eloquently eulogized Mr. Dumont on Sunday's sports page stating in part:

He was the only one of his kind when it came to promoting.

His death last Saturday afternoon while working alone in his office was a shock to his many friends, and yet it was the way many of them knew he someday, probably, would reach his end.

It truly could be said of Dumont that he loved his work and its rewards better than life itself. That is not to eulogize the man. It's just the way he was . . .

Ray Dumont was born in Wichita, Kans., on December 26, 1904. He was valedictorian of his high school graduating class. He had served as sports editor of the Hutchinson News and in 1929 returned to Wichita to work in the sports department of the Wichita Eagle. He later went to work for Goldsmith's Sporting Goods in Wichita, and it was in an effort to promote the sale of baseball equipment that led Mr. Dumont to inaugurate the successful State and National semipro organization.

Mrs. Shriver and I join with many Kansans today, as well as baseball lovers everywhere, in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Dumont; her children, Raymond Wesley Dumont, Ray Eden, and Mrs. Julius Govert, on the passing of "Hap" Dumont.

OUR COLLEAGUES ERR ON WAR SECRETS ISSUE

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, one of the best articles I have read concerning the purloined Pentagon papers was an editorial which appeared on the front page of the Detroit News on Sunday, June 27, 1971. The editorial was reprinted in full in the July 12 issue of U.S. News & World Report.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the editorial entitled "Our Colleagues Err on War Secrets Issue." I am pleased to call the article to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

OUR COLLEAGUES ERR ON WAR SECRETS ISSUE

The Detroit News does not agree with those of our press colleagues contending that national interest—and the cause of a free press—are served by the current battle over publication of secret Pentagon papers.

As the U.S. Supreme Court considers a case which could produce a new interpretation of the rights and responsibilities of the press in a democracy, this newspaper wants to emphasize that, though we will be affected and bound by the decision, the newspaper lawyers in the court are not speaking for The Detroit News.

We do not believe the New York Times and other involved newspapers acted responsibly and in the public interest when—without even trying to use established procedures for declassification of secret papers—they chose to publish an edited version of what it now

appears was an incomplete account of our involvement in the Vietnam war.

Despite our devotion to, and dependence upon, the basic rights guaranteed under the First Amendment, we do not accept the premise that the doctrine of a free press is an unrestricted license to print any secret document, the publication of which, in an individual editor's opinion, would be in the national interest.

Finally, we consider as unfactual the current contention by some newspapers that there never before has been any prepublication restriction on what newspapers decide to print.

Our brief includes several points:

First, carried to its logical conclusion, the Times theory would permit publication of any government secret—the design of a Polaris missile, contingency war plans, intelligence reports on enemy war preparations—provided only that the editor believed such publication would be in the national interest.

Such a conclusion, we believe, would result in a disastrous (for the press) collision between press freedom and the manifest democratic need for orderly government.

Granted, the bureaucratic tendency to cover mistakes with a "top secret" stamp is a problem. It always has been and newspapers have an obligation to fight it. But the solution does not lie in a grant to an individual—be he editor, scientist or public official—of power to substitute his personal definition of national interest as a basis for declassification.

To argue otherwise would be to accept the thesis of defenders of Dr. Klaus Fuchs that his betrayal of Anglo-American atomic secrets was justified by his sincere conviction that a better world would result from their delivery by him to the Soviet Union.

Newspapers which have published the Vietnam war papers protest that, in stopping them by court action, the Justice Department sought to establish a precedent of prior restraint upon newspaper publication.

Is that true? Forgetting the national defense field, is it not accepted that both state and federal judges use "prior restraint" to protect their own secrets? Would any of the judges to whom the Times appealed last week have listened for a minute to a contention that a newspaper which acquired a transcript of a grand jury investigation of organized crime had a right to publish it on the ground that Mafia operations constitute a national problem concerning which the public has a "right to know"?

We and the New York Times know the offending editor would be jailed for contempt of long-recognized prepublication restraints.

It is argued now that an informed public has a right to know right now what individual diplomats and military men recommended over the years of our Vietnam war escalation. But the Times itself has not always followed this theory, as it reported in the current Newsweek magazine by Columnist Stewart Alsop.

Alsop recalls the Cuban missile crisis and an article which he co-authored describing deliberations of National Security Council members. The Times then reacted with outrage to what Alsop calls his "attempt to present the American public a history—admittedly incomplete—of decision-making at the highest levels of government."

In an editorial captioned "Breach of Security," the Times fumed then that: "The secrecy of one of the highest organs of the United States has been seriously breached."

"What kind of advice can the President expect to get under such circumstances?" asked the Times. "How can there be any real freedom of discussion or dissent; how can anyone be expected to advance positions that may be politically unpopular or unprofitable? Does no one in Washington recall the McCarthy era and the McCarthy technique?"

What the Times asked then we'd repeat

today. If it was wrong for McCarthy retroactively to crucify diplomats for alleged wrong decisions and recommendations when China was falling to communism, is it proper to assail military and State Department men in 1971 for reports they wrote a decade ago when our Vietnam effort had general support?

As the Times (and The Detroit News) said during the McCarthy era the President will get no sincere recommendations if his subordinates suspect that they will be publicly pilloried for them a few years later, and in the context of different times.

And were the newspapers which published the documents motivated solely by a search for the whole truth? Current revelation as to the sources of the misappropriated documents raises questions.

First, the 40-odd volumes of secret papers went to the Times, which studied them for several weeks and then, without bothering to apply for declassification, began publication. When a Federal Court temporarily blocked further Times publication, the busy peddlers of the documents hurried them to other papers, each—like the Times—an advocate of immediate Vietnam withdrawal.

Simultaneously the papers were peddled to anti-war congressmen then preparing their effort to use the draft extension bill as a new vehicle to force adoption, without enemy reciprocation, of a firm withdrawal date for all U.S. forces in Indochina.

Manifestly the newspapers were used by the peace movement to get over a propaganda point. Obviously there is reason to wonder if they would have responded with such alacrity to an effort to publicize documentation supporting an opposite view of the Vietnam problem.

But, it is contended, publication did not harm national security, is that true?

Included in the published material were verbatim and dated translations of coded messages. Given the translation, cryptographers have a major tool for codebreaking. Granted, most of the codes have been changed but ability to decipher now our secret transmissions of the 1960's (which other nations have recorded) opens all our messages of that era to any country wishing to use them for diplomatic mischief.

Secretary of State William Rogers has noted other serious diplomatic problems:

What government is going to freely and frankly exchange views with us if it suspects the correspondence shortly will be published worldwide?

What head of state allied with Washington is going to be comfortable in the relationship when he reads the published recommendation of Assistant Secretary of State Roger Hilsman (now a leading resident of the dovetail) that military plotters who later murdered President Diem be given a free hand in disposing of the head of government with whom we had a fighting alliance?

Even if the papers publishing them did not so intend, the prospects are that the already obdurate Hanoi negotiators may feel that revelation of the alleged "immorality" of every U.S. president since Harry S. Truman will so stir American protest as to force President Nixon to surrender now. Certainly if a negotiated peace is in the American interest, none of the events of the last two weeks have helped our bargainers get one.

In summary, The Detroit News does not want the freedom of press so important to our existence stretched to justify this type of irresponsibility.

We do not defend the proposition that any government employee with access to classified material has a right to leak it for publication in the name of national interest.

We repeat that a contrary contention can lead only to a confrontation which the public will decide in a manner destructive to freedom of the press.

NATION'S ENERGY CRISIS

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, today's New York Times first page carries the second of three articles on the national energy crisis produced, at least in part, by the conflict between the need for more power and the desire of most Americans to save the environment. The series is authored by John Noble Wilford. I insert at this point in the RECORD:

NATION'S ENERGY CRISIS: NUCLEAR FUTURE LOOMS

(By John Noble Wilford)

Slowly, reluctantly and fearfully, the United States is moving toward a nuclear-powered future. It is not that people have learned to love the atom; it is because few can think of any other acceptable answer to the nation's energy crisis.

Nuclear power is technically difficult, initially expensive, a source of thermal pollution and the subject of acrimonious controversy and widespread anxiety about possible radiation hazards.

And yet to a growing number of technologists, economists and political leaders, it is the only way within the traditional economic system to meet the ever rising consumer demand for a steady supply of reasonably inexpensive power without ravaging the environment.

Thus the Nixon Administration has made nuclear power the keystone of its "clean energy" plan for the decade. And future Administrations, barring unforeseen discoveries, can be expected to follow the same general policy.

For nuclear power, despite its drawbacks, is without doubt more plentiful, ultimately cheaper and relatively less damaging to the environment than other fuels. The alternatives, in other words could be worse.

Coal, for example, is still plentiful; it might last for a few more centuries. But it cannot last forever. Most coal moreover, is too full of sulphur to meet present environment standards. Thus no new fossil fuel plants are allowed in the entire Los Angeles basin. And the extraction of coal exacts great environmental and human costs.

The cheapest way to extract coal is by strip mining, which now accounts for one-third of production. But strip mining is desolating tens of thousands of acres a year of some of the most beautiful mountain country in the nation, with little likelihood that the damage will ever be repaired. Only 58,000 of the 1.8 million stripmined acres have so far been restored, the Department of Interior reports.

But if strip mining is outlawed, as many conservationists are urging, then a greater reliance will have to be placed on deep mining, which is not only roughly three times as expensive but more hazardous as well. More than 80,000 miners have died in deep mine accidents since 1910. Safety precautions, while they might make the process humanly acceptable, would make it even more expensive and less economical.

Other sources of energy are equally problematic. Petroleum costs are rising as the search for new supplies grows more difficult and expensive, extending to the poles and farther out on the continental shelf. The price of fuel oil in Boston, for example, has doubled in a year's time. Before oil begins running out in a century or so, it may have to be rationed so that what is left is used only for transportation and the manufacture of plastics—not for burning up in the production of electricity or home heating.

RELIANCE ON FOREIGN SOURCES

Moreover, a continued reliance on petroleum and natural gas would mean a growing dependence on foreign sources. American demand for petroleum will reach 28 million barrels a day by 1985, the Humble Oil and Refining Company estimates, and only 11 million barrels are expected to be domestic.

More than 90 per cent of the fuel oil used on the Eastern Seaboard already comes from abroad, mostly from the Caribbean. This gives a number of foreign governments a major voice in the price and flow of American fuel.

Damming more rivers cannot fill the need for energy either. Hydroelectric power accounts for only 4 per cent of present energy production, and most of the suitable dam sites have been exploited. Even the Tennessee Valley Authority, originally a water power project, now derives less than 20 per cent of its power from hydroelectric facilities.

Harness the tides or tap steam inside the earth? These are considered interesting but limited alternatives. Convert sunlight directly to electricity? Engineers doubt this would ever be practical for large-scale energy generation.

At every turn, then, the complications confound as easy solution to the energy crisis and nuclear power seems more and more attractive.

AN ALCHEMIST'S DREAM

Nuclear reactors now produce 1.4 per cent of the nation's electricity. By 1980 the figure is expected to be 25 per cent, and by the turn of the century 50 per cent. Electricity then will crackle along high-voltage lines from "nuclear parks," clusters of reactors far from urban centers, and through submerged lines from reactor stations on platform anchored miles out in the Atlantic and Pacific waters.

Present nuclear reactors will seem old-fashioned. The more advanced types, called "breeders," will be a sort of alchemist's dream, making more fuel than they consume. Eventually, perhaps as early as the year 2000, there may be machines, based on the sun's energy-generating processes, that run on fuels almost as abundant as water itself.

But no energy-environment equation is ideal, not even the nuclear alternative. Nuclear power has its drawbacks, too.

Its technology has turned out to be more complex than expected. Development costs are high. Capital costs of a large nuclear plant have risen sharply in the last three years, from about \$120 for each kilowatt capacity to more than \$200.

Nuclear reactors produce even more waste heat than fossil-fuel generators. The problems of "thermal pollution," the heating of a stream or lake to the point that it can become inhospitable to fish, has disturbed environmentalists. And the safety of reactors is a matter of bitter controversy.

Since no one can forget nuclear energy's devastating debut at Hiroshima, people harbor deep-seated fears about anything atomic, fears over explosive accidents, insidious radiation leaks and the problem of how to dispose of radioactive fuel residue.

Public protests are holding up construction of several nuclear plants. The titles of some recent, widely discussed books reflect the gnawing concern: "Perils of the Peaceful Atom," "The Careless Atom" and "Population Control through Nuclear Pollution."

TOUGHER SAFETY RULES

Responding to recent attacks, the Atomic Energy Commission announced last month even stricter safety standards for nuclear reactors and reduced sharply the limit on the amount of radiation exposure that the public is permitted to receive from reactors—down to 1 per cent of the level permitted under current Federal radiation standards. Still, some critics raise questions

about long-term genetic effects from repeated exposure to these minuscule doses.

These drawbacks and fears have been largely responsible for the slow and reluctant acceptance of nuclear power—until now. Whatever their reservations, engineers and many environmentalists, economists and utility executives now can see no realistic alternative to the atom.

"Nuclear power certainly is the best answer to our needs right now and probably in the long run," says Byron Lee Jr., assistant to the president of the Commonwealth Edison Company of Chicago. By the end of the year, 25 per cent of the utility's generating capacity will come from nuclear power.

Although the initial capital investment is higher for a nuclear plant, Mr. Lee says, fuel costs over the estimated 30-year life of a plant are considerably lower. And because low-sulphur coal and oil are expensive in the Midwest, as in other regions, nuclear power is also considered "environmentally preferable."

The trend toward nuclear power is strong. Although only 21 commercial nuclear reactors are now in operation, supplying less than 1 per cent of the nation's energy needs, more power-generating capacity is now on order for atomic plants than for the conventional types. There are 54 under construction in this country, and orders for 42 more. Even a major Texas utility, in the heart of gas country, plans to go nuclear.

\$2 BILLION ASKED BY NIXON

The nuclear commitment was reinforced last month when President Nixon asked Congress to pledge \$2-billion in Federal funds over the next decade for development of a commercial "fast breeder" reactor. This is considered the next major step in nuclear technology.

Conservation of resources is the breeder's chief selling point.

Conventional nuclear reactors of the water-cooled type obtain energy from the splitting of fission, of the extremely scarce form of uranium, U-235. It makes up only seven-tenths of 1 percent of natural uranium, and is in danger of depletion in a few decades. The more abundant U-238 is the non-fissionable part of the fuel mix.

As the U-235 fissions, it releases energy, which boils water and creates the steam to drive turbines and produce electricity. Apart from the fuel and its unusual properties, the method is essentially the same as in ordinary fossil-fuel stream generators.

In the process, some neutrons that are released turn the U-238 into the fissionable plutonium, but in an inefficient manner. The breeder reactors will make the most of this transmutation of elements.

"A QUESTION OF RELIABILITY"

In the breeder, a fissionable fuel, either U-235 or plutonium 239, will be split for the heat-to-steam-to-electricity process. The surplus neutrons, allowed to travel at faster speeds, will react with the U-238 in such a way as to produce 14 atoms of plutonium for every 10 atoms consumed.

Like other nuclear technologies, the breeder has its highly vocal critics. A group of scientists, headed by Dr. Margaret Mead, the anthropologist, has filed a suit in Federal court in an effort to stir a national debate on the advisability of developing the breeder. They maintain that the A.E.C. has failed to make public enough information to judge the potential impact of breeder reactors on the environment.

To many scientists, however, the breeder is only an interim technology, a holding action until they can master the difficult art of controlling thermonuclear fusion. This is the release of tremendous energy through the fusing of light atoms, which is the basis of the hydrogen bomb and the nuclear reactions going on inside the sun.

Although President Nixon has asked for

\$2-million in addition to the \$30-million already budgeted for fusion, a number of scientists called the lower priority for this technology "a disgrace." They predict the Soviet Union may be the first to harness fusion.

As Dr. Richard F. Post of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Livermore, Calif., puts it: "We've got two really good horses to ride and we ought to ride them both." He predicts that fusion power will be controlled in the 1980's and be economically "in full swing" in 1990.

Most scientists are somewhat less optimistic. They doubt that fusion will be a practical source of energy until after the turn of the century. A few question whether it will ever be practical.

Fusion's promise seems to make the continued effort worthwhile. Fusion produces new worrisome radioactive wastes except tritium, which most specialists believe can be recycled through the system without significant hazard.

More advanced fusion techniques might lead to direct conversion from energy to electricity, thus bypassing the steam process and its waste-heat inefficiencies. A runaway chain reaction would be unlikely, since the fusion reaction stops if it cools ever so slightly.

Another important advantage is that the most likely fuel for fusion would be one or more forms of hydrogen, such as deuterium, which are derived from sea water. Thirty cubic kilometers of sea water could contain a deuterium energy equivalent to the current inventory of the earth's fossil fuels.

Not all current energy research involves nuclear technology.

A number of researchers are working on processes to remove polluting chemicals from fuels before combustion and on devices, such as improved electrostatic precipitators, to clean stack gases. Utilities are supporting research to improve transmission lines, since up to 20 per cent of the electricity generated is lost in transmission. This will become more critical as power plants are increasingly placed farther from urban centers.

Aircraft engine manufacturers are stepping up the development and sales of gas turbines, which are similar to jet engines, for generating electricity.

Though relatively small, gas turbine plants can be turned on and off quickly to handle a utility's periods of peak demand or as a back-up facility. They can burn a variety of liquid or gaseous fuels, from natural gas to kerosene, switching from one to another at a moment's notice.

One of the more promising lines of research is directed toward converting high-sulphur coal into sulphur-free, pipeline-quality gas—a synthetic form of natural gas.

The Department of Interior's Office of Coal Research is doubling its efforts in coal gasification, aiming toward the operation of a large demonstration plant by 1976. A smaller pilot plant is running in Chicago.

HEATING CRUSHED COAL

The gasification process involves heating crushed coal under very high pressures. Reactions between steam and the coal's carbon give off carbon monoxide and hydrogen. In a series of further reactions, sulphur is removed and the gases are converted to methane, which is what natural gas is.

Dr. Hoyte Hottel, proposed emeritus of chemical engineering at M.I.T., who is making a comparative study of new fuel sources for Research for the Future, Inc., is not optimistic about extracting oil from the plentiful shale deposits in the Western states.

"It requires heating up so much inert material to get a few gallons of oil," Dr. Hottel says. "I'm for leaving it alone until we've made more use of our other resources."

Many other technologies are expected to be investigated through a new National Science Foundation program called Research Applied to National Needs. The largest single

item in the program's \$81-million budget is energy resource research and analysis.

Through evolving combinations of research, nuclear and otherwise, the nation's engineers, scientists and energy managers hope to find the technological "fix" for the current crises. It is a traditionally American response, this faith that it all can be worked out through some more Yankee ingenuity.

There are those, however, who have some doubts. Even new technologies, they say, may not be sufficient unless Americans learn to curb their seemingly insatiable appetite for more and more energy.

PENTAGON PAPERS

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, the so-called top secret Pentagon Papers are perhaps more of a folly than the American people realize.

While the Justice Department presses for prosecution of those who leaked the documents to the New York Times and other newspapers, they appear to have done little about those who transmitted these secrets to Communist leaders in Hanoi, Peking and Moscow.

Last weekend Mr. Cyrus Eaton, a Cleveland industrialist and confidant of world Communist leaders, revealed that Communist heads of state "knew virtually every move the United States planned in Indochina before it happened."

In an exclusive interview with Mr. Irving Leibowitz, the distinguished editor of the Lorian Journal, Mr. Eaton said: "The only things that were really secret were to our allies and to the American people."

I call this interview to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress with the hope that our Government will be able to stop these leaks as quickly as possible.

I include the article as follows:

EXCLUSIVE: CYRUS S. EATON SAYS HANOI KNEW PENTAGON "SECRETS"

(By Irving Leibowitz)

Communist leaders in Hanoi, Peking and Moscow had "the most complete" information of secrets in the Pentagon Papers within hours, according to Cyrus S. Eaton, Cleveland industrialist and confidant of world Communist rulers.

He said Communist heads of state knew virtually every move the U.S. planned in Indochina before it happened—and that "the only things that were really secret were to our allies and to the American people."

Eaton, 87, visited Hanoi in December, 1969, for ten days as the guest of the North Vietnam government and was entertained by Premier Pham Van Dong and Ton Duc Thang, head of state. Eaton has many times been a guest in the Soviet Union of Premier Alexei N. Kosygin, President Nikolai V. Podgorny and Leonid L. Brezhnev, Communist Party general secretary.

"It's nearly a year and a half since I have been in Hanoi," Eaton said, "but I have been in touch with them constantly ever since directly, not only with the leaders in Hanoi, but also with their representatives in Paris and Moscow."

Reached by telephone at his farm in Nova Scotia, Eaton said that he was told of secret U.S. plans and policies before they happened. He also said that much, if not most, of the material in the Pentagon Papers covering the years of Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson were all familiar to Communist leaders in Hanoi, Peking and Moscow.

In Hanoi, Eaton said he had met "and saw quite a little of" Hoang Pung, an editor Eaton described as "the head of North Vietnam's intelligence network." Eaton said that he was told the contents of secret cables, documents, policies and meetings that took place in the U.S. embassy, the Saigon government and at the U.S. military and naval commands.

The North Vietnamese "had patriotic, reliable and resourceful spies" placed everywhere, Eaton said.

Pressed for specifics on what U.S. secrets he obtained from leaders in North Vietnam, Eaton recalled these events, some of which are covered in the period of the Pentagon Papers and some later during the administration of President Richard Nixon.

Nixon's early role: Eaton said that Hanoi rulers had pictures of Nixon when he was Vice President conferring with "commander in chief of the French Army in Indochina and Nixon's exact words to the French, urging them to continue fighting, not to get out, but that he would do his best to get the United States to come in not only with troops but with more money."

Diem coup: Eaton said the North Vietnamese knew the role the U.S. and Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge played in supporting the coup of Saigon generals Nov. 1, 1963 against President Ngo Dinh Diem of South Vietnam. "They had the most complete information on that," said Eaton.

Bombing North Vietnam: Eaton said the Hanoi government knew the U.S. planned to bomb North Vietnam before it happened.

Honolulu Conference: Eaton said the North Vietnamese knew that at a conference in Honolulu in 1963, the U.S. had discussed contingency plans to use nuclear weapons if the Red Chinese entered the war.

Cambodia and Laos: Eaton said the Communist leaders told him of secret U.S. plans to invade Cambodia and later Laos when he was in Hanoi in 1969. The invasion of Cambodia took place in May, 1970, and the invasion of Laos occurred in February, 1971. (The invasion of Cambodia was a surprise and shock to the U.S.)

Johnson escalation: Eaton said the North Vietnamese knew that Johnson was escalating the war at a time when he was telling the American people he would not send American boys to die in Asia.

Eaton many times has tried to play the role of "peacemaker" in the Vietnam War because of his friendship with world Communist leaders and his interests in the United States and its people. He said he has often told U.S. officials of the superior intelligence services of the Communist countries—and has been rebuffed.

Once, in 1965 when he was visiting Russia and talked with virtually every leader there, he tried to persuade American diplomats that the Soviet Union and Red China were committed to support North Vietnam against the United States.

Eaton said that U.S. Ambassador to Russia Foy Kohler tried to tell him (Eaton) that "there is nothing that goes on in Southeast Asia of any real interest in the Soviet Union."

Eaton said: "I almost had a fist fight with Kohler."

Eaton was not reluctant to talk publicly about the U.S. secrets since the Pentagon Papers are being published in newspapers across the country.

LEROI: THE KING OF NEWARK

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, so much money pours into antipoverty programs these days that control of federally funded projects has become a rich political plum at the local level. Big city poverty programs today provide much of the patronage, and hence the political clout, formerly supplied by the party machine. Nowhere does the fight for fiscal power rage more fiercely than in Newark, N.J.

Chief contender for control of the city's approximately \$6 million in antipoverty money is LeRoi Jones, sometime poet and playwright, full-time radical and rabble-rouser. Jones, who has a long history of association with Communist-front organizations and black extremist groups, was convicted of unlawful possession of weapons during the 1967 riots in Newark. He is now free on bail pending appeal of his 2½-year sentence, and he has emerged as a significant force in Newark politics.

His radical views have become the rallying point for those who believe that the city's black mayor, Kenneth Gibson, is not sufficiently militant. Jones wants all political power in the hands of Newark's black majority, and has publicly committed himself to driving whites from positions of authority. Mayor Gibson maintains that the city, which has been torn by racial tensions for years, cannot survive without the cooperation of black and white alike.

This voice of moderation has been increasingly drowned out by militant demands, and the influence of the mayor's year-old administration appears to be on the wane.

Jones' supporters recently defeated the mayor's candidates in an election of trustees of the United Community Corporation. The executive committee of the UCC largely controls the distribution of antipoverty funds. Jones has also extended his influence to include the presidency of the school board and key elements in the Newark Housing Authority. He is now concentrating on wresting control of the Federal Model Cities Agency, one of the last major Federal programs controlled by Mr. Gibson. If he succeeds, this self-appointed community leader will wield more of the power that counts—the power of the purse—than the duly elected mayor. The city of Newark, far from having profited from the grim lessons of the 1960's, will be firmly set on the disastrous course of racial strife.

That, of course, is exactly what LeRoi Jones wants. The whole progression of events might have been written by Jones as the scenario for one of his revolutionary plays. He knows that, in America at least, all political power need not "grow out of the barrel of a gun." An even more potent weapon is the taxpayer's money. What is in store for

Newark—and other cities like it—if fanatics like LeRoi Jones are permitted to pervert millions of tax dollars to their own sinister ends can be easily imagined. It is an outrage against common sense and common decency, as well as flagrant neglect of the Government's responsibility to oversee the expenditure of taxes, that such men should be allowed to gain power over public funds.

**CAPITAL INVESTMENT CRISIS
PLAGUES AMERICAN MANUFACTURERS**

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the capital investment crisis that has plagued American manufacturers and, in particular, the machine tool industry. There is a direct relationship between a high rate of capital investment in these industries and a healthy economic environment. If we are to build our productive capacity, and improve upon the ability of our products to compete favorably in world markets, then we must act now to provide a more favorable tax climate for capital investment.

It is my firm belief that the investment tax credit, taken as an integral part of our economic policy, will help achieve this goal. It will help promote long-term price stability. It will provide an increasing number of jobs in our expanding labor market. It will contribute to closing the gap between productivity increases and wage increases. It will contribute to the solution of our balance-of-payments problem by making our products more competitive in foreign markets. The implementation of an investment tax credit will be helpful in easing the Nation's transition to an expanding peacetime economy. The machine tool industry provides us with an example of why an investment tax credit is both necessary and desirable to safeguard American interests.

Since the repeal of the investment tax credit in 1969, the machine tool industry has suffered its most damaging depression since the middle 1930's. Major domestic orders for the first quarter of 1971 are running 63 percent below 1970. No significant upturn is in sight.

The employment situation for the machine tool industry is equally bleak—down 33 percent from last year. Perhaps even more grim is the fact that many of these employees were highly skilled laborers who have since sought out other jobs. Replacing them cannot and will not be accomplished overnight. Should a national emergency require full production capacity from the machine tool industry, months would be needed just to secure the necessary labor.

Until this year, the United States was first in machine tool production. Now, the United States is second to West Germany. At today's rate, Russia and Japan could also pass American machine tool

production this year, and the American position will continue to deteriorate unless we take action.

Many people continually point to the excess industrial capacity in the United States in support of the contention that no tax incentive to investment is needed today. These same people completely ignore the fact that too much of this excess capacity is high cost, obsolete, and must be replaced. A 1970 McGraw-Hill survey revealed that the United States has the highest percentage of overage obsolescent production facilities in relation to gross national product than any of the leading industrial nations. Perhaps even more sobering is the fact that, at the current rate, 1971 will see the smallest percentage increase in investment in American manufacturing facilities since 1953.

I do not mean to suggest that all of our country's economic problems are a result of insufficient tax incentives. However, I firmly believe that inadequate incentive for capital investment has been a contributing factor to many of these problems.

I do not advocate restrictive trade bills. This is not a remedy for the machine tool industry. Instead, U.S. firms need and seek the opportunities to have capital investment encouraged by the tax structure. Equally important is that such a tax incentive be made a permanent element in our tax code. This will contribute to long-term price stability and avoid many of the pitfalls inherent in using the investment tax credit as a "pump primer." Our objective should be the adoption of a tax policy which will facilitate the decisions of private industry regarding long-range investment practices. There can be no doubt that the "off-again-on-again" use of the investment tax credit makes sound, long-range investment decisions a near impossible task.

The accelerated depreciation guidelines offered by the administration will be a desirable step toward improving this situation. However, more needs to be done. The Governments of Japan, the United Kingdom, and West Germany offer such depreciation to their industries, and indications are that other countries may soon follow suit. Accordingly, I support and recommend to my colleagues the adoption of the 7-percent investment tax credit.

I believe the difference between the depreciation deduction and the investment tax credit deserves mention. The depreciation affects the earnings of a corporation by providing a reduction in the computation of the taxable income. On the other hand, the investment tax credit is a direct credit against the income tax. Therefore, it offers a much greater boost to industry income and provides corporations with the immediate capability for reinvestment in capital assets.

There can be no question that the investment tax credit would stimulate new investment in capital equipment. When the investment tax credit was in effect during the early 1960's, for example, domestic orders for the machine tool industry increased from 150,000 per year to

more than 500,000 in 1965. After the 1969 repeal of the credit, there was a serious drop from 550,000 domestic orders to 150,000 in a 1-year period.

In industries that require heavy outlays on capital goods, the investment tax credit would mean sizable additions to aftertax profits each year. The latest year for which official detailed figures are available—1965—serves to illustrate this point. The investment tax credit was responsible for an increase of more than 16 percent in aftertax profits to the airline companies which are still heavily committed to the purchase of new planes. Railroad companies, also committed to large capital expenditures, realized an increase over 12 percent in aftertax income. That these two industries, and many like them, could benefit from an investment tax credit is beyond question.

I believe that action on our part is now needed. I believe that the future of vitally important industries is involved. American labor and the number of jobs available in the 1970's are intricately involved in this picture and will be the greatest beneficiaries. The American public will reap the benefits of enactment of the investment tax credit.

PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, no issue, perhaps, is more frustrating and fraught with more human compassion than the plight of our American servicemen held prisoner in Southeast Asia. It has now been 7 years, 103 days, since the first American was taken prisoner by North Vietnam. He is still held captive.

The war in Indochina has probably divided our Nation to a greater degree than anything since the Civil War. Yet the problem of our prisoners of war and men missing in action is one on which we can all unite. Their barbaric treatment must stop. They must be released.

In 1969, our ambassador at the Paris peace talks said:

Let me remind you once again that we have proposed since the very first session of these Paris meetings that your side and ours enter into negotiations for the release of all prisoners of war on both sides. I call on your side to live up to the international standards for the treatment of those who are missing or held prisoner in Vietnam. This humanitarian issue should be dealt with separately from the political and military questions we face in the Paris meetings. We propose that our two sides enter promptly into discussions on all questions affecting prisoners of war held on both sides, including the question of their early release. The United States delegation stands ready to enter into such negotiations without delay.

We are still ready. We are still waiting. The Nixon administration has made every effort to negotiate their release. Our President has proposed a mutual withdrawal of all foreign troops from

Vietnam and a return of all prisoners of war. Still, our brave and helpless men remain. After more than 7 years, over 1,600 of our men are considered missing in action, with at least 400 of these estimated as being held captive by the Communist forces.

The magnitude of this unnecessary inhumanity to these men and their families increases with each passing day and month. We in Congress must continue to marshal United States and world opinion to expose the Communists for this inhumanity, and to effect the release of our men. Their families ask for no sympathy, but simply help for their husbands, their fathers, their sons, their brothers.

LEAK OF CLASSIFIED MATERIALS FLOW FROM GORED POLITICAL OXEN

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, John P. Roche, in his column in the AFL-CIO News of July 3, expresses an informed point of view concerning publication of the so-called Pentagon papers. The column follows:

LEAKS OF CLASSIFIED MATERIALS FLOW FROM GORED POLITICAL OXEN

(By John P. Roche)

By a strange coincidence, just about the time the New York Times was proofreading the Pentagon Papers the Senate Judiciary Committee approved the nomination of Otto Otepka as a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board. A number of right-wingers looked on this as a vindication of Otepka, who had been fired by those wicked liberals over at the State Dept. for bootlegging classified information to congressional committees.

However, recent events may lead the Senate Judiciary Committee, and Pres. Nixon, who nominated Otepka to the SACB, to rethink their stance. If Otepka deserves a slot on the SACB for the trivia he leaked, surely the person who conveyed the Pentagon Papers to the Times merits a spot on the Federal Communications Commission.

And, in fairness, the Times and other papers that have been oozing with virtuous editorials about freedom of information and the absurdity of the classification system should immediately support Otepka's nomination. If leaking classified materials is a blow for freedom, you really can't exclude the late Joe McCarthy's "loyal American underground" from the warrior band.

This thought is not advanced in any cynical spirit, but rather to make the point—that has been obscured in the rhetorical mist—that as usual in American politics one's views on leaking classified material tend to depend, in FDR's phrase, on "whose child has the measles." Let us therefore try to escape from an atmosphere dominated by editors reciting Milton, and government lawyers predicting the end of the bureaucratic world, and take a hard look at the real questions.

First, has the publication of these documents endangered "national security?" The answer: of course not. Anyone who has even a reasonably specialized knowledge of events in 1964 knows, and has known for years, that there were contingency plans being con-

sidered to deal with the worsening Vietnamese situation.

The documents have provided a lot of background. One can argue that their publication was imprudent, but that is an entirely different question.

Second, has the publication of these documents damaged the operation of the government? This is a tricky one, particularly since one of the worst tendencies in the State and Defense Departments was to overclassify just about everything.

I was convinced, for example, that certain men stamped their missives "Top Secret" just to attract attention, presumably figuring that nobody would bother to read a merely "Confidential" memo. Yet, at the same time, if one expects high government officials to lay their convictions, however unpopular they may be, on the line, there should be some guarantee that confidentiality will be maintained. One of the unfortunate by-products of Joe McCarthy's "loyal American underground" was that dissenters in the State Dept. kept their views to themselves.

Part of the historical bias built into the Pentagon Papers arose from the fact that such old hands as Dean Rusk and Lyndon Johnson profoundly distrusted the security system. Rusk was known to sit down and type up his "eyes only" memos to the President, and the latter openly took the view that to send any sensitive material to the State Dept. was to guarantee its publication in the next morning's paper.

Nobody ever sent the minutes of the Tuesday lunches—where crucial decisions were hammered out—anywhere except to the White House files. As mentioned here before, when Pres. Johnson wanted opinions, he sidestepped the system. In November 1967, for example, he canvassed a number of advisers on a radical deescalation of the war, but no word of it leaked out.

Publication of the documents will undoubtedly encourage bureaucrats to be more noncommittal in their memoranda and will probably stimulate Pres. Nixon to follow the Johnson-Rusk format (Nixon's "National Security Council System," which has papers flowing up, down, and sideways, is a sitting duck for an ambitious leaker.) But we can survive on that basis.

In short, given the paranoia that has been generated, I think the full Pentagon history should be turned over to a special congressional committee. I stand pat on my thesis that there is nothing to hide.

TRANSPORTATION IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, transportation progress for the Nation's Capital would be well served by the recognition and implementation of the principles recently set forth by the District of Columbia Republican Committee. This realistic statement represents a breadth of understanding of this region's real transportation problems and steps needed for the solutions. I commend this statement to my colleagues.

I include the statement:

STATEMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE ON NEED FOR A COMPLETE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

During April, May and June 1971, the fight to restore \$34.2 million for Metro subway construction continued unabated. Con-

gressman William H. Natcher continues to recommend that the District's overdue share of current Metro construction costs be refused, and for the third time this fiscal year, the House Appropriations Committee said "no" to Metro. There is no controversy in the Senate over the releasing of \$34.2 million. There is too much at stake for the opposing view-points to be adamant in their positions. We urge everybody involved in the long, drawnout fight over subway versus freeways to bend a little so that we can get on with the job.

We agree with the statement of the Chairman of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority that continued refusal of Congress to provide the District funds threatens to erode solid suburban support for the Metro, and otherwise destroy the program's delicate and complex financial program. Other local governments of the Washington area have, without exception been meeting their contractual fiscal obligations to the transit system, but not so the District.

Although work on the subway will continue, the refusal of Congress to release the District's contribution toward this fiscal year's construction will not only postpone operation of trains on the first six miles of the proposed 97 mile line beyond the planned start in late 1973, but will jeopardize the public sale of the multi-million revenue bonds, which in turn will threaten the subway program's entire financial structure. It is difficult for local governments to sell bonds for anything, including Metro construction. The Federal government's on-again, off-again payments could very well make the bonds impossible to sell. Bond buyers, after all, have a right to expect that the Metro in which they are investing will actually be built.

The Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee has said that subway money would be withheld until the District completely obeys the 1968 and 1970 Highway laws. In this he has succeeded only too well. He claims the Freeway program isn't proceeding properly, and that city and Federal officials have failed to comply in good faith with Congress's freeway building demands, and until the Freeway program does, there will be no money for the subway. It is clear he means just that.

We do not pass upon the merits of Congressman Natcher's claim, nor do we question his power to withhold subway funds, but we do question the wisdom of making construction of the subway dependent upon the building of more freeways when such a course may result in wrecking the Metro system.

In the event the Metro system is wrecked, the blame should not fall on Congressman Natcher alone. We feel that the blame should fall equally upon Congress which insists upon giving continued priority to freeways, and upon those in the District Government who continue to oppose freeways. Both sides are shortsighted. The truth is—we need not only a subway system now, but we also need more freeways now. Our goal should be to expedite progress on both.

Realistic studies of the transportation problem in the Nation's capital began in 1954, and have continued to date. These costly studies demonstrated a need for a balanced transportation system, with one part subway, one part bus, one part freeway, and one part parking. If the feud between Congressman Natcher and District and Federal officials is not brought to an immediate stop so both subways and freeways can be built, it will be necessary to embark on a new program of long and costly surveys and studies, as the prior findings will be out of date.

We certainly need a transportation network which will convert the Metropolitan area into one large economic community instead of the dozen small communities which now exist. We must also solve the transportation problem or else be faced with inner-city

blight and decay, with resultant unemployment, crime and increased welfare rolls.

We support a subway system which will perform its task of rushing suburban commuters to the inner city and inner city resident to jobs in the suburbs during morning and evening rush hours. We believe the Metro system now under construction will be a major factor in revitalizing the inner city. We also believe that a subway cannot do the entire job by itself. To revitalize the city and to increase the city's tax base, thereby creating new jobs and making possible needed improvements in school, recreation, health and welfare programs, we need a good freeway system, an adequate bus system, and an established, adequate parking program. Accordingly—

We also support the Congressional planned freeway system. We believe that the only way to lessen congestion on our streets is to channel motor traffic onto limited-access freeways. Freeways are needed to handle non-rush hour traffic and random passenger vehicles, as well as service vehicles which pick up and deliver goods. Both transportation consultants and Metro planners are agreed that even with a completed subway, nearly 40 percent of the public traveling to downtown at rush hours will be using automobiles, and that more than 80 percent of all trips in the Washington area during a twenty-four hour period will be made in automobiles. Consequently, an effective freeway system is essential to insure accessibility to and from downtown, and to provide traffic relief to the inner city. A subway system alone is not enough.

We also support an adequate bus system. A bus system is needed to provide transportation to those areas not served by subway, to provide crosstown transportation and to provide feeder service for the subway system. It will be necessary to merge the bus system with the subway system, to reshape the present bus system, as the subway system is phased in. This can be done effectively and efficiently only if the subway system and the bus system are under single ownership. We recommend that the Transit Authority be given the power to acquire ownership of D. C. Transit at a fair price. We believe the purchase should be made now, while the Transit System and its equipment are in good shape, and not later when it has become run down and too costly to salvage.

Public ownership of the bus lines in the District and in Maryland and Virginia, however distasteful, is now a fact of life. Taking over the bus system is not a political move and an economic plus. It is a transportation necessity to effectively move people. This fact has been recognized by the states of Maryland and Virginia, which have given the transportation authority the power to purchase the bus lines. There is no reason why we alone should drag our feet in doing the same.

We also support a strong program for public and private parking. The absence of an Authority or other control mechanism over parking has contributed heavily to traffic-snarled streets. An overall plan for parking is as important as freeways and rapid transit.

Finally, in our opinion the economy of the center city depends upon the movement of people and goods. To the extent that people and goods can move efficiently throughout the region and within the center city, orderly physical development can take place in an atmosphere of sound economic expansion. Mass transportation of people and goods in the National Capital region cannot be achieved without a balance among rapid rail transit, freeways, bus service and a planned parking program. A unified system of subway, busses, freeways and parking would not only reverse the present trend of merchants and businesses moving to the suburbs, but will help attract business to downtown Wash-

ington, thereby broadening our narrow tax base.

It is apparent that the time has come to stop talking, to stop making costly studies and for both Congress and the District to stop giving lip service to the need for a "balanced transportation system."

Let us procure that balanced transportation system by moving ahead with both the subway and freeway programs. The time has come to act.

THE BOOK MAN

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD an inspiring story by John Fetterman in a recent issue of the Louisville Courier-Journal and Times magazine about Everett Allen—"The Book Man."

Mr. Allen, who just turned 65, has made a life's work of bringing books to the people of the remote reaches of Kentucky's mountainous Perry, Knott, and Powell counties. In his special way, over the years since he first took the job in 1933, Mr. Allen has brought joy and learning to thousands of Kentuckians. During this time, Miss Lula Hale, director of Homeplace and its 12,000 book library since 1930, has supervised more than 2.5 million book loans through Everett Allen's bookmobile.

Mr. Speaker, John Fetterman has done a superb job of putting into words the kind of dedication that brings people to devote their lives to one of the greatest treasures we have—books. I hope that young people, such as Lexington's Vicki Jones, who runs an innercity bookmobile, continue to dedicate their efforts to this meaningful and rewarding pursuit.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD John Fetterman's article, "The Book Man." I regret that it is not possible also to reproduce his captivating photographs which mirror the joy in the faces of children discovering the magic and beauty of books.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal and Time magazine, June 27, 1971]

"THE BOOK MAN"

(By John Fetterman)

In an era of affluence and cultural progress, it appears incongruous that many Kentuckians are grateful if someone will lend a book to read. To satisfy that craving, many people—private and public—have labored over the years, often with little recognition.

Everett M. Allen, who recently turned 65, is one of the pioneers. Vicki Jones, who is only 23, is one of the new recruits. Allen retires from work this month after nearly four decades of hauling books to mountain people, sometimes over almost impassable roads. Miss Jones presides over a big, modern bookmobile which moves over smooth Lexington streets, and it serves hundreds of grateful people in the inner city.

Across the more remote parts of Perry, Knott and Powell Counties, schoolchildren, drop-outs and older people have learned to greet Allen as "the book man." Ever since 1933, when he was graduated from Berea College with a degree in chemistry, Allen has been a "book man." He took the job for

\$1 a day and has been at it ever since, except for a three-year hitch in the Air Force.

Why? "Well, I never thought seriously of doing anything else," he said. His 1960-model ¾-ton panel truck was bumping along the banks of Grapevine Creek in Perry County, en route to a remote one-room school. The truck was modified so that its sides opened up to reveal bookshelves. Down the center of the truck was a long bookcase which could be extended out the back door. The truck's odometer had just turned over the 90,000-mile mark. Like Allen, it was a veteran of the trade.

"I like people," Allen was saying. "But sometimes I just like to be alone. It's really hard to tell you why I've stuck to this. It gives you an inner feeling of satisfaction."

The reason for the "inner satisfaction" became apparent when Allen parked the red and white truck beside one-room Dunraven School and began to open the doors along the sides of the "bookmobile."

From inside came tiny voices shouting, "It's the book man!" And Allen was soon deluged by the 19 pupils who make up the school's eight grades. He addressed most of the children by their first names. The teacher there is Mrs. Mahala Ruth Napier and she was only slightly less excited than her pupils.

"It's the only visitor we've had in five months," she said, waving a hand toward the dusty truck.

All day, as he has done for four days of each week since 1933, Allen coaxed the truck along dirt roads, creek banks and up steep grades. Schools were not the only stops. He has learned that the people wait for books at their homes, at the cross-roads and at the tiny post offices.

On each Friday, Allen has spent the day repairing, cleaning and replacing the books, and getting his records up to date.

The bookmobile is a project of Homeplace, a mountain community project financed by the E. O. Robinson Mountain Fund. Miss Lula Hale, director of Homeplace since it was founded in 1930, says that more than 2.5 million "loans" have been made by the bookmobile. The project started in a modified station wagon and has worn out several vehicles over the decades.

"They say we've got the smallest library, the raggedest library and the best-loved library in the world," Miss Hale said. "An awful lot of people are reading because of us. We estimate that every book gets at least four readings before we get it back."

The some 700 books which the truck can carry are selected from the Homeplace library of around 12,000 volumes. Homeplace also has a second "bookmobile" making the rounds of other remote hollows and the concern around there was to find an adequate replacement for Allen. Allen himself mused over this as he ate his lunch while perched on a rock beside a mountain stream. He said he hoped a new book man would be found soon. "The folks will be missing their books."

Allen and Vicki Jones do not know each other, although both have felt the call of similar aspirations. Miss Jones presides in a comparatively plush, 28-foot, air-conditioned bookmobile in the "inner city" of Lexington. "So the children call it the "in-mobile," she said. She is a native of Orlando, Fla., a graduate of Clark College in Atlanta and has a master's degree in library science from the University of Kentucky.

The "in-mobile" is administered by the Lexington Public Library and is an extension of the outstanding bookmobile project of the Kentucky Department of Libraries, through which it is federally financed. The State program now boasts some 100 bookmobiles capable of handling up to 700 volumes each. In addition, there are five larger vehicles, such as the "inmobile," operating

in the larger cities. In a year, the bookmobiles circulate more than 5 million books, as well as comic books, magazines and records. The "in-mobile" can accommodate more than 3,000 titles on its neat shelves.

On a typical day, Miss Jones will check out between 80 and 100 volumes, and her customers are largely small fry, although she says she is having some success with her attempts to involve more adults.

The driver of the "in-mobile" is the Rev. James H. Carter, a Baptist minister. Once the vehicle is parked, he assumes the task of checking in books at the front door, while Miss Jones checks others out at the back door. Behind her, a portable radio is tuned to a rock station and the often-crowded interior of the bookmobile has a happy, almost-carnival air. Small hands tug the books from the shelves and few of the youngsters want help in selecting books. "They know what they like," Miss Jones said. But occasionally, with considerable diplomacy, she will persuade a young reader to make another selection, something nearer his reading and comprehension level.

The idea of taking books to Kentuckians in all walks of life is not new. In the state's earliest history, teachers and traveling ministers carried books and Bibles in their saddle bags. As early as 1916, the Berea College Library was sending books into remote homes and schools in its area via wagon. The big push for Kentucky's fleet of bookmobiles came in the early 1950s after considerable groundwork by individuals and corporations working through organizations called Friends of Kentucky Libraries and the Kentucky Bookmobile Project. In 1954, it was all put together with the purchase of more than 20 bookmobiles, an event of such importance that the new vehicles were paraded in Louisville during the state fair of that year.

Allen's long career, and Miss Jones' budding career, differ in some respects. To Allen, the years have meant taking worn and oft-repaired volumes up hundreds of hollows. His patrons eagerly took the novels, Bible stories and books on Appalachia. Miss Jones dispenses freely from a comprehensive section on black history, "how to" books on subjects ranging from home repair to hair styling, and reference works used to enhance the preparation of school homework.

There is no way to measure the long-term results of either project. But when one watches the gratitude and eagerness in the eyes of a mountaineer when he is handed a book, or the excitement in the face of an inner-city child when he literally sprints home to start reading his new book, the odds seem to indicate that the results will be favorable.

Or one could consider the other side of the coin: What would the results be if there were no books?

ADVANCES IN THE WAR ON HEROIN

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, one of the very beneficial aspects of the increased public awareness of the menace of drug abuse has been the increase in educational and informative articles and editorials appearing in the press. Because of the valuable role the media plays in keeping the public aware and informed, these articles can only serve to increase drug abuse. And the greater the knowledge about drug abuse, the less likely

the knowledge of the citizenry concerning that abuse will occur.

I was particularly pleased to read an article in the National Journal of July 3, 1971, by Mr. Dom Bonafede analyzing President Nixon's proposed drug by Mr. George Beveridge in the Sunday Star of July 4, 1971, addressing itself to Turkey's ban on opium cultivation.

You know that my Select Committee on Crime has been vitally concerned with both these issues, and I would like to share with my colleagues these two fine pieces of journalism.

I include these two articles:

[From the Washington Star, July 3, 1971]

BREAKTHROUGH ON HEROIN

Turkey's agreement to eliminate within a year her total production of opium poppies was hailed the other day by President Nixon as "the most significant breakthrough" yet achieved in a world-wide crusade to attack the problem of heroin at its source. He was quite right. The decision's importance, on several scores, can hardly be exaggerated.

The most pertinent fact is that more than half the heroin that filters into this country through illicit channels, and possibly as much as 80 percent, now originates as black-market opium in Turkey. The crackdown negotiated with Turkish Prime Minister Nihat Erim thus will turn off the primary faucet of current supply. And although the United States in return will cough up dollars and technical aid to help Turkey's farmers shift to other crops, Erim's move was nevertheless an extraordinary gesture of friendship. For while on the one hand opium production for legitimate pharmaceutical use has long been a legal activity in Turkey, that country ironically is not afflicted with a serious problem of opium-derivative addiction. Erim, in other words, was hardly responding to the same socio-political pressures which apply here.

As a good many experts are now noting, the Erim agreement is only a beginning. Turkey, despite its high volume of illicit exports, happens to be merely one of 12 opium-producing countries. Considering the lucrative illegal market for heroin in the United States, the international traffickers in narcotics are certain to tap these other sources. And indeed, the year-long period before Turkey's moratorium takes effect will give them time to re-group.

But those legitimate concerns do not in any manner diminish the very real consequences of the accord with Turkey. In its own right, a cessation of Turkish production not only will cut a primary source of opium but will disrupt an entire network of international criminal supply. For the first time, furthermore, the United States now has a precedent with which to try to induce the other 11 opium-producing nations of the world to follow Turkey's lead.

That psychological advantage must be exploited to the maximum now in negotiations with Mideast and Asian nations, where the principal threats of stepped-up illicit activity exist. Within our own shores, meanwhile, Congress should sharply accelerate research to find acceptable non-addictive synthetic substitutes for such opiates as morphine and codeine. With no legitimate market for these drugs, as Chairman Pepper of the Select Committee on Crime told the House the other day, the goal of a world-wide ban on the cultivation of opium will be much easier to attain.

[From the National Journal, July 3, 1971]
WHITE HOUSE REPORT/NIXON'S OFFENSIVE ON DRUGS TREADS ON ARRAY OF SPECIAL INTERESTS

(By Dom Bonafede)

The effectiveness of President Nixon's proposed drug offensive hinges on complex fac-

tors—bureaucratic jealousies, international relations, domestic political concerns, juridical and scientific concepts.

Recognizing the array of special interests involved, Mr. Nixon said in a June 17 message to Congress that the problem of drugs is "universal" and "must be faced on many fronts at the same time." He said that if the program were to be successful, it needed bipartisan support in Congress and the cooperation of foreign governments whose countries are the source of supply of illicit drugs or serve as way stations in global drug traffic.

In extraordinarily blunt language, the President demanded that federal agencies with jurisdiction over drugs "quit fighting each other and start fighting the drug problem."

Defining the problem: By his action, the President made the drug problem a top-priority issue. "America's public enemy number one is drug abuse," he said. "If we cannot destroy the drug menace in America, then it will surely in time destroy us. I am not prepared to accept this alternative."

Nevertheless, the Nixon plan—perhaps unavoidably—relies in part on mobilizing uncertain domestic political and international elements which conceivably could undermine it, if they were uncooperative.

Following long diplomatic negotiations, the Administration scored a breakthrough June 30 when Turkey, the largest source of illegal heroin in the U.S. market, announced a ban on the production of opium, effective in the fall of 1972.

But opium producers and merchants in Turkey are expected to try to circumvent the prohibition through clandestine operations—as they have done in the past when curbs on opium were more limited. Some U.S. officials also expect opium producers elsewhere, particularly in South Asia, to try to replace Turkey as the principal source for the U.S. market.

The scientific portion of the Administration's plan is mainly experimental, adding another unknown quantity to the President's initiatives.

All these factors could block achievement of the plan's ultimate objectives.

Dr. Jerome H. Jaffe, newly appointed special consultant to the President for narcotics and dangerous drugs, acknowledged: "The problem is so massive I'm not sure we fully appreciate the dimension of it."

The Nixon plan: Essentially, Mr. Nixon's plan calls for creation of a new authority, named the Special Action Office of Drug Abuse Prevention and located within the Executive Office of the President.

Jaffe, the agency director, would be accountable directly to the President and would supervise and be responsible for all federal drug-abuse programs involving prevention, education, treatment, rehabilitation, training and research. He would have almost unprecedented authority in selecting priorities, allocating budgets and evaluating programs, with the power to revise and implement them.

Jaffe would have jurisdiction over the whole gamut of federal drug-abuse programs, with the exception of law enforcement.

The Administration's program also would establish a mandatory seven-day detoxification process for American servicemen diagnosed as drug addicts prior to their return to the United States, and three weeks of expanded treatment in this country on a voluntary basis.

International aspects of the program stress bilateral and multilateral efforts to reduce opium production abroad and to control the shipment of contraband drugs into the United States.

Mr. Nixon asked Congress for \$155 million in new funds to underwrite his plan, bringing the total budget for drug abuse this year to an estimated \$370 million.

FORMULATING THE PLAN

Not unexpectedly, Mr. Nixon's declaration of war on drugs raised questions among Members of Congress, several of whom had introduced drug legislation, as to its timing—particularly since the severity of the problem has been common knowledge for several years.

The House Select Crime Committee, headed by Rep. Claude Pepper, D-Fla., and the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics, chaired by Sen. Harold E. Hughes, D-Iowa, have sounded repeated warnings of a U.S. drug epidemic.

Mr. Nixon made one move against drugs shortly after taking office. He introduced legislation in July 1969 for a comprehensive reform of federal drug enforcement laws, which Congress finally adopted in October 1970 (84 Stat 1236).

In his recent drug message, Mr. Nixon chided Congress for dragging its feet. "In the fifteen months between the submission of that legislation and its passage," he said, "much valuable time was lost."

Study groups: The White House set up two groups in 1970 to study the drug problem: an intergovernmental group headed by Egil Krogh Jr., deputy assistant to the President for domestic affairs, and Jeffrey Donfeld, a staff assistant; and an outside advisory group directed by Jaffe, who is an associate professor of psychiatry at the University of Chicago and director of the drug-abuse program of the Illinois department of mental health.

A third group, the President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization, headed by Roy L. Ash, president of Litton Industries, made a separate study.

Conflicting reports—all came up with different answers.

The Ash Council recommended on June 25 that a federal drug coordinating office be established within the HEW Department.

The government review unit favored drug treatment facilities at the local level under the National Institute of Mental Health.

The Jaffe group recommended a separate agency.

The Office of Management and Budget reviewed the recommendations early in 1971. And there were consultations among John D. Ehrlichman, assistant to the President for domestic affairs; OMB Director George P. Shultz; HEW Secretary Elliot I. Richardson, and Attorney General John N. Mitchell.

Resolution—The Administration bought the Jaffe approach.

"We felt we couldn't get control of policy unless we put it all together—everything but law enforcement," said Krogh. "There was strong feeling it should span everything, be accountable to the President and be in the President's office."

In Mid-May, Mr. Nixon directed implementation of the single-agency concept.

Two task forces were set up in OMB to draft the legislation and to design the organizational machinery: One, under OMB Assistant Director Richard P. Nathan, dealt with domestic matters; the other, headed by James R. Schlesinger, another assistant director of OMB, confronted the problems of foreign affairs.

Each task force was backed by a working group. Overseeing the project was a steering panel supervised by Arnold R. Weber, OMB associate director, and including Krogh, Nathan and Schlesinger.

During planning discussions for dealing with drug addiction among U.S. servicemen abroad, it was suggested that the law be changed to keep the addicts in the service for treatment beyond their normal terms. This suggestion, which some participants in the discussions equated with mandatory civil commitment, was abandoned.

On June 5, a Saturday, the policy groups had a final meeting to tie up the plan's loose ends. About five days later, it was endorsed

at a White House conference of Mr. Nixon and his chief domestic advisers, Ehrlichman and Shultz.

On June 17, the President submitted the plan to Congress.

Time factor: Nathan defended the timing of Mr. Nixon's proposal: "The President felt we had worked on it a long time and were ready for the next step."

He said the \$155 million in additional funds represented "the amount that can be effectively used, based on the problem and the kinds of resources needed."

Making an analogy with the U.S. space program, Jaffe said in an interview with *National Journal*, "All the resources in the world couldn't have gotten man to the moon one month earlier."

Nonetheless, Democratic National Chairman Lawrence F. O'Brien has characterized the Administration's program as "too little, too late."

He said that the White House was responding to public pressure with a "late-inning flurry of activity."

Rising concern—The President's message to Congress followed a series of events spotlighting the drug issue.

Drug abuse ranked third among national problems—after the Vietnam war and the economy—in a Gallup poll released in mid-June. The percentage of persons polled who listed drugs as the leading national problem had doubled since March, according to the poll, from six to 12 per cent.

Public reaction to reports of widespread drug addiction among U.S. servicemen in Southeast Asia led to speculation that the drug problem would force the government to speed its pullout of troops from the area.

Sen. Jacob K. Javits, R-N.Y., said that the American people "could get so fed up that the troops will be out of there faster than McGovern, Hatfield or anybody else ever dreamed of, regardless of the consequences." (Sens. George S. McGovern, D-S.D., and Mark Hatfield, R-Ore., are strong proponents of rigid withdrawal deadlines for American forces in Vietnam.)

"It is entirely possible that this is the kind of issue that can change the whole situation," Javits said.

Members of Congress were taking the initiative on the drug front and stealing the issue from the White House. At the time Mr. Nixon unveiled his program, 79 drug bills were pending in Congress.

A highly publicized report on the use of heroin worldwide, particularly among members of the U.S. armed forces in Southeast Asia, was released May 27 following a special study mission by Reps. Morgan F. Murphy, D-Ill., and Robert H. Steele, R-Conn.

The two House Members estimated that 10 to 15 per cent of all U.S. troops in South Vietnam are addicted to heroin, and that 200 GIs will die of addiction during 1971. (For background on the Murphy-Steele report, see No. 25, p. 1321.)

Three weeks later, the Defense Department confirmed that 10 per cent of U.S. servicemen in Vietnam are heroin users.

Visits to Vietnam—Krogh said, however, that the Administration's war on drugs resulted from an "incremental increase" of concern by the White House and "not as a response to Steele and Murphy."

He recalled that during a two-week trip to Vietnam in the summer of 1970 he learned to his "surprise and shock" of the prevalent use of heroin among American soldiers.

"The guys were then getting it under the misconception that it was cocaine," Krogh related. "Sellers were going around yelling, 'coke, coke, coke.'"

Ehrlichman saw the problem at first hand during a trip to Vietnam the following September.

During his stay in Vietnam, Ehrlichman met with President Thieu, alerted him to Washington's concern over the drug problem

there and requested his cooperation in dealing with it.

FOREIGN ASPECT

Heroin is made from morphine, a derivative of the opium poppy, which is not native to the United States and has never been cultivated here. Heroin has no legal or medical use in this country.

Yet, according to the National Institute of Mental Health, there are about 250,000 heroin addicts in the United States.

Pointing out that the United States is the world's largest illicit market for the drug, President Nixon has made the drug problem a major consideration in the nation's foreign policy.

In his June 17 message, Mr. Nixon said: "Heroin addiction is the most difficult to control and the most socially destructive form of addiction in America today. Heroin is a fact of life and a cause of death among an increasing number of citizens in America, and it is heroin addiction that must command priority in the struggle against drugs. "To wage an effective war against heroin addiction, we must have international cooperation."

Early steps: The Nixon Administration had already taken several steps in the area of foreign affairs:

Early in his Administration, Mr. Nixon created the State Department position of special assistant to the secretary for narcotic matters. Appointed to the position was a career officer, Harvey R. Wellman.

In August 1969, the United States signed a \$3-million drug-control agreement with Turkey, which supplies about 80 per cent of the heroin that reaches this country.

Later that year, the United States and Mexico waged a bilateral attack, called "operation cooperation," which was designed to interdict the flow of marijuana and other drugs from Mexico.

In February 1971, the United States signed the Convention of Psychotropic Substances, which restricts production, distribution and international commerce in hallucinogenic drugs such as LSD. The same month, the United States signed an agreement with France regarding the suppression of narcotics on a cooperative, bilateral basis.

Also, during the Nixon Administration, the budgets and personnel of the Customs Bureau and the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs—the chief U.S. law enforcement agencies concerned with illegal drug trafficking—have more than doubled.

Despite the international agreements and the beefing up of antidrug agencies, only an estimated 10 to 15 per cent of illegal drugs are intercepted on their way into the country.

Enforcement problems: In a statement to the United Nations Commission on Narcotics in September 1970, at Geneva, ENDD Director John E. Ingersoll said:

"The list of addicts is growing by several thousand each year, and, in 1969, the number of new addicts doubled from the preceding year. Every time one addict is cured, more take his place because of the ever-increasing amounts of heroin available . . . In New York City alone, persons are dying of drug-related causes at the rate of three per day."

Ingersoll concluded that "only a total ban on opium production would eliminate the scourge of opiate addiction."

Testifying before Pepper's crime committee on June 2, 1971, Ingersoll referred to his statement before the U.N. commission: "I wish I could say that other members of the commission agreed on this position. Unfortunately, that is not the case. . . ."

"The problem is complicated by deep-rooted politico-socio-economic factors which influence both the ability and the incentive to suppress production, and a geography which would preclude enforcement of such an edict in some of the most prolific growing areas."

Ingersoll said that in the remote north-

eastern part of Burma, which produces more illegal opium than any other area in the world (about 400 tons a year), the government is unable to control insurgent tribes who use opium as a cash crop to finance their causes.

A similar situation exists in northern Thailand and in some regions of Laos. Other countries, such as India, Yugoslavia, Japan and the Soviet Union, are opposed to international abolition on grounds that they are able to control production and restrict diversion to illegal channels.

Turkey: As the prime supplier of heroin to the United States, Turkey has been a special problem.

Recent Turkish governments have made modest attempts at curbing illegal opium production by encouraging crop substitutions, by tightening the surveillance of poppy fields and by restricting the number of provinces allowed to cultivate opium poppies.

The Turkish government's June 30 decree would ban all opium production there after 1972. The decree also limits plantings this fall to four provinces in western Turkey. Twenty-one provinces were producing opium crops legally as late as 1967.

Under current restrictions, about half of Turkey's opium production (an estimated 100 metric tons) has been diverted into the illegal market, which pays two to three times the legal rate—or approximately \$25 a kilogram—for crude opium.

Attitudes—Harvey Wellman, of the State Department, said in a speech before the American-Turkish Society at New York last Dec. 14:

"The United States and Turkey are poles apart in addressing the problem of drug abuse. . . . Turkey has no opium or heroin addiction problem. . . . In Turkey, cultivation of the opium poppy has been traditional from time immemorial. . . .

"It is hard for the Turkish government and people to appreciate the death and suffering which come from use of and addiction to heroin. It is hard for the American government and people to appreciate the difficulties of bringing Turkish opium production under effective control and preventing its diversion to illicit traffickers for processing into heroin and smuggling into the United States."

Compounding the problem is the fact that an estimated 85,000 Turkish farmers are engaged in poppy growing.

Wellman told *National Journal*, "The problem in Turkey is not money; it is effective collection of all opium produced. The Turkish government could market all the opium the country produces and put it into legal channels. But the illicit trafficker pays more than the legal market."

Last year, he said, governmental control of the "leakage" of opium into the illicit market was "disappointing."

Lawmakers' report—Murphy and Steele, in their May 27 report, offered a critical assessment of Turkey's efforts to control opium production:

"While there are indications that the prime minister intends to take action to control the growing of poppies, the study mission is of the opinion that there is no sense of immediacy on the part of the Turkish government. . . ."

In reference to the \$3-million drug loan to Turkey, Murphy and Steele reported: "All of the commodities programmed under this loan have not been received in Turkey. Bureaucracy and red tape have held up the clearing of the commodities through Turkish customs, with the result that much of the equipment sits around on the dock for substantial periods of time."

White House efforts—Turkey's recent restrictions on heroin production have come at the behest of the United States.

In return for Turkey's agreement to ban production after 1972, the United States agreed to compensate poppy farmers for their

losses, which will amount to \$3 million to \$5 million.

In addition, President Nixon indicated that Turkey will get more economic aid from this country. "I pledge to continue cooperation with Turkey in its efforts to increase the well-being of its people and to maintain its independence and security," Mr. Nixon said.

South Asia: A State Department officer said that opium originating in Burma, Thailand and Laos, and converted in Bangkok and Singapore, now accounts for 10 per cent of the heroin smuggled into the United States (double the percentage of two years ago), and almost all of the heroin used by U.S. servicemen in Vietnam.

Vietnam—Murphy and Steele said in their report that most of the heroin produced in Southeast Asia is for Americans. They said that uncontrolled production, corruption among officials and lax customs procedures play a major role in the area's illicit drug business.

"Strong action must be taken to stop heroin traffic in South Vietnam," their report said. "We are not optimistic that the government is either willing or able to take such action. One of the major reasons for pessimism is the internal political situation in South Vietnam, where differences between President Thieu and Vice President Ky inhibit effective action being taken."

Burma—Burma has tried to steer a narrow ideological line between the United States and the Soviet Union and cannot easily be pressured by Washington. As a result, this country has approached the problem of Burma as a heroin source through the U.N.'s multilateral techniques.

The State Department officer pointed out a fundamental difference between the drug problems with Turkey and Burma: "The problem in Turkey is leakage from legal production; the problem in Burma is illegal production."

He said that the illegal drug market in Burma is in large measure controlled by remnants of the Kuomintang, the former regular army of China before the Communist takeover.

Special mission: Mr. Nixon sent two of his top aides, Counselors Robert H. Finch and Donald Rumsfeld, on a special mission to 11 countries in April to "emphasize the President's personal concern about the drug problem." They were instructed to tell the leaders of the 11 nations that drug abuse was not solely a U.S. problem but affected all the world. (Finch and Rumsfeld visited England, Ireland, Morocco, Spain, Italy, Romania, Yugoslavia, Austria, West Germany, Switzerland and France.)

The two also were instructed to try to persuade the nations to support proposed amendments to the U.N. Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs. The convention is largely a vehicle by which the members attempt through international agreement to control the production and distribution of narcotic drugs. Its force rests mainly on voluntary compliance.

The United States supports two amendments to the convention: One would authorize the International Narcotics Board to make direct inquiries concerning opium production, rather than rely on voluntary reports; the second would authorize the board to embargo exportation and importation of drugs. (It can only recommend embargoes now.)

Commenting on the mission, Rumsfeld said, "We were instructed to say that the President has elevated the problem of drugs into the foreign policy area. That says a lot. It's a major change in U.S. attitude."

The reaction, Rumsfeld said, was "full recognition" of the President's interest and concern.

"There were differences in their conception of our problem. But regardless of how they view the problem, the very fact that the President elevated it as a foreign policy matter makes it important all by itself."

Internal dispute: There has been dispute within the Administration over just how far the government should go and how hard it should push other countries.

The positions ranged from a hard stand at the Treasury Department to a go-slow approach at the State Department.

A high-ranking Treasury official said the department's position was "pretty hard-nosed." He said that Treasury's approach "would include the threat to cut off economic aid and PL 480 funds" to those countries which decline to cooperate.

A State Department officer said: "We can't shift the blame to foreign suppliers; we have to look at the problem in its entirety—supply, demand, enforcement and so on. . . . You can talk about pressure, but it all depends on whether the country is directly affected (through drug abuse). There aren't many client countries who rely so much on us that our wishes constitute a demand on them."

"As for Turkey, I don't know whether we depend more on Turkey or Turkey on us. Remember, they have about 500,000 men under arms, about half of the land forces in NATO."

"It's a proud, sovereign country. You have to put it on a basis of cooperation, not coercion. You have to point out that it is in their interest as well as ours. You can't push even a good friend too hard or too far."

"There's another aspect of the question of aid: We give it because we think it is in our interest."

Paul L. Perito, chief counsel for Pepper's crime committee, says that compromise will fail.

"Unless we work toward the total eradication of opium production, we're not going to get anywhere," he said.

"The question is how great is our commitment. Pressure at the highest level is crucial."

In a compromise of sorts, the Administration has chosen to employ subtle pressure on those nations which figure in the production and shipment of narcotics.

Diplomats' meeting: In a move to demonstrate publicly that he intended to initiate "a worldwide escalation in our existing programs for the control of narcotics traffic," Mr. Nixon on June 14 summoned the Ambassadors to Turkey, France, Mexico, Luxembourg, Thailand, the Republic of Vietnam and the United Nations to a White House conference.

Mr. Nixon told the Ambassadors that the interdiction of narcotics is a matter of U.S. foreign policy. They were instructed to make clear to their host governments that what they do to suppress narcotics might well have a bearing on U.S. economic aid and military support.

"We want good relations with other countries, but we cannot buy good relations at the expense of temporizing on this problem," the President said in his message to Congress.

A Presidential assistant conceded that the Administration's maneuver constituted a sophisticated form of heat.

"The way it is publicly prescribed is crucial," he said. "What we wanted to avoid was having the threat put on the books in the form of legislation calling for punitive action. That would have been counterproductive."

"What we're really asking for is a cultural metamorphosis. Turks have been growing opium poppies for generations—like grapes in Bordeaux. As it was, the State Department was pulled along more than it liked."

BUREAUCRATIC INFIGHTING

Following a bipartisan leadership meeting on June 17 to discuss his drug program and the creation of the special action office, President Nixon said:

"I very much hesitate to bring some new responsibility into the White House. . . . But I consider this problem so urgent, I also

found that it was scattered so much throughout the government, with so much conflict, without coordination, that it had to be brought into the White House."

Jurisdiction: Although Mr. Nixon did not mention them by name, the Treasury Department's Customs Bureau and the Justice Department's BNDD have been locked in a jurisdictional dispute over drug law enforcement for more than a year, despite White House intervention to settle the issue.

The two agencies are considered the first line of defense in the war against drug abuse.

Because of the bureaucratic feud, the two agencies often failed to coordinate enforcement activities and to exchange information. Frequently, each pursued its own investigations without informing the other, duplicating efforts in some instances.

The dispute reached serious proportions late in 1969 when the two agencies competed bitterly for primacy in overseas enforcement of drug laws.

In February 1970, President Nixon himself moved to settle the conflict by issuing jurisdictional guidelines. In a Presidential memorandum, he said that BNDD should be the accredited agency representing the nation "in dealing with foreign law enforcement officials on narcotics questions. Customs should not represent the United States in this area, except when authorized by BNDD."

The guidelines further directed BNDD to control "all investigations involving violations of the laws of the United States relating to narcotics, marijuana and dangerous drugs, both within the United States and beyond its borders. . . . Customs was to remain mostly a port surveillance agency.

The guidelines said that future disagreements between the two agencies "shall be resolved in writing by the Attorney General."

Customs considered this a final affront, since BNDD is part of the Attorney General's department. (*For background on the dispute, see Vol. 2, No. 29, p. 1532.*)

Feud lingers: Almost a year and a half later, the differences remain unresolved.

This became clear during the fiscal 1972 budget hearings.

Customs—During testimony before a House appropriations subcommittee, Chairman Tom Steed, D-Okla., asked Treasury Secretary John B. Connally about the relationship between Customs and BNDD.

Connally replied that he had heard "considerable rumblings" that all was not going well; that the "restrictions placed upon the Customs people are far too restrictive, and that the cooperation anticipated is not quite being realized." The situation, he said, "impinges on much more than the overseas operations; it impinges on operations within the United States as well."

Customs Commissioner Myles J. Ambrose told Steed he did not think either agency "is happy with all facets" of the bureaucratic detente.

As an example, he said that the Customs agent in Hong Kong, an important transmission point for drug smugglers, may be unable to remain, because BNDD wants to increase its staff there.

Ambrose said that if his agent were recalled it would "cause very severe handicaps in our efforts to gain intelligence in this area. It would be seriously detrimental to the overall U.S. efforts to fight the narcotics problem."

Traditionally, Customs is a favored agency with Members of Congress, partly because it raises revenues. Last year, it collected \$3.3 billion.

This preferred position was clearly apparent in Steed's remarks to Ambrose:

"We feel, to put it bluntly, that you need elbow room to do your job. We are going to take a very dim view of any kind of administrative action that unduly handicaps your ability to do just that.

"I think you ought to know that this is a very strong feeling of this subcommittee and that we think the public interest is of such overriding importance, especially in the field of drugs and narcotics, that to handicap your ability to cope with it for any reason whatsoever is just not in the public interest.

"It may not serve the empire-building ego of some other bureaucratic activities, but that has not anything to do with what we think our responsibilities are and our relationship to the Bureau of Customs, because you are not only the guardians of our ramparts, you are the whole ball game insofar as the actual interdiction of unwanted contraband coming into the country, which is another way of saying that you not only come first, you are the whole ball game, and we intend for it to stay that way and to support you in seeing that you can do that."

Narcotics bureau—BNDD's Ingersoll, by contrast, took a thorough raking over from Rep. John J. Rooney, D-N.Y., chairman of another appropriations subcommittee.

The record includes the following exchange:

INGERSOLL. Although the number of arrests declined in 1970—

ROONEY. From what did they decline?
INGERSOLL. In 1970, the domestic arrests declined from 3,978 to 2,560. We project an increase to 3,250 by the end of 1971.

ROONEY. Quite a substantial decrease, is it not?

INGERSOLL. Yes, it was a decrease. As explained before—

ROONEY. I said quite a substantial decrease.

INGERSOLL. Yes, sir, a decrease of over 1,400 arrests.

ROONEY. Do you object to the word "substantial"?

INGERSOLL. No, sir.

ROONEY. Let me try it once again straight out. That is quite a substantial decrease, is it not?

INGERSOLL. Yes, sir, that is a substantial decrease in arrests.

Inhibitions—As part of a statement before the House Ways and Means Committee last July, Rep. Pepper noted the inhibitions on Customs in following up narcotics investigations beyond border points.

"As a practical matter," he said, "Customs is forced to turn over all such surveillance activities to BNDD even though that agency had nothing to do with the details of commencement of such investigation.

"Naturally, guidelines of this nature inevitably must cause uncertainty, rivalry and consequent inefficiency between the two agencies. Something must be done to iron out these difficulties. Because of the seriousness of the problem, we simply cannot afford petty jurisdictional bickering among bureaucrats."

Recently, Nathan acknowledged, "There are pretty important differences on how we should proceed on overseas enforcement procedures."

Connally said that unless the matter is settled on an interagency level, he will ask Congress to look into it.

OUTLOOK

Jaffe and other specialists concede that the treatment and rehabilitation of heroin addicts represents a dark area in the world of science and that no magic formula will solve the problem.

Dr. William Martin, of the Louisville narcotics treatment center, has called the current state of knowledge "primitive."

Jaffe contends that addicts are a heterogeneous group requiring different types of care and treatment.

During testimony before the Pepper crime committee in April, he said in reference to his work in Illinois: "Our program could be called a controlled comparison of several different approaches, somewhat competitive,

but friendly. . . . We believe to reach the majority of addicts it requires more than one approach or modality."

He favors locating treatment centers in communities where the patients live. However, he said, "no program, no matter how sound it might appear to be theoretically or how appealing it was emotionally, would be continued unless objective evaluation revealed it to be effective and to justify the expenditure of public funds."

Goals: In the course of an interview, Jaffe said he did not anticipate any trouble in obtaining federal funds to operate the Administration's new drug program.

He cautiously declined to project a time frame in which real achievements will be observable.

"It's not clear it can be done in the next couple of years," he said. "We can only go into this with a sense of optimism."

Jaffe said his office will have multiple goals but that one achievable objective is to provide treatment for anyone who wants it.

Jaffe's special action office is located in the New Executive Office Building. He will have a staff of about 30 at first. Once the operation is fully under way, however, his staff will exceed 100.

Legislation: In an unusual procedure, the President created the new special action office by executive order (Exec. Order 11599), and also offered legislation authorizing it (HR 9264).

Rep. Paul G. Rogers, D-Fla., chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment, which will handle the Administration's legislative proposal as well as other drug-related bills, said he intended to give the Nixon plan thorough hearings.

"I'm interested in seeing whether they plan to use existing materials or set up another layer of government facilities," he said.

Rogers has introduced a bill of his own which calls for use of community mental health facilities to treat addicts (HR 9059).

Rogers said he did not know why the White House established the new drug agency by executive order and also proposed legislation.

"Evidently, they felt they needed the legislation," he said. "But it does give it (the Administration program) some visibility, doesn't it?"

Pepper said he doubted that the Administration program could do much good because of the "relatively paltry sums" the President asked to fund it. "It is difficult for me to understand how this limited amount of federal money can possibly be truly responsive to our national drug addiction crisis."

Krogh has said that the President will request more money if he feels the program requires it.

THE DRUG CRISIS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is beset by a plague that gnaws away at our most precious resource, our youth, and affects all segments of our society. I am speaking of the spreading crisis of drug addiction. It knows no geographic boundary, it does not discriminate among its victims by age, sex, political views, social status, or economic position.

President Nixon, in his proposal to establish a special action office to coordinate the Federal effort to combat the

narcotics problem, has taken a valuable first step. I would like to help him make that a bigger step and strengthen his effort still further by expanding the protected jurisdiction of any such new agency.

I am a sponsor of H.R. 6732 to establish an office of drug abuse control in the Executive Office of the President. While encompassing many of the thoughts later expressed by the President in his proposal, this bill goes significantly further and is more comprehensive. It includes both research on and enforcement of narcotics control on both national and international levels. I feel strongly that this office should exercise control over the Justice Department's Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, the Treasury Department's Customs Bureau, and other related programs in the Departments of State and Housing and Urban Development, some of which are currently engaged in a duplication of efforts or which are working at cross purposes.

The new Executive drug control agency also should be given authority over Defense Department enforcement programs. No antinarcotics effort can ignore the increasingly critical drug abuse problems confronting our Armed Forces today. The proposed office must be able to compel all the Cabinet departments to adopt a coordinated approach, perhaps by exercising control of funding for their programs through the Office of Management and Budget.

The most compelling recent example of the narcotics addiction problem involves American troops stationed abroad. In Vietnam, the U.S. command is only beginning to realize the extent of its own unwitting contribution to the increasing use of drugs by our soldiers. Mr. Speaker, we must not ignore these 10-15 percent of our men who have fallen victim to the drug blight while in the Government service. We must mount a mass attack, a search-and-destroy mission, if you will, against the overseas drug addiction of American personnel, which hampers their assimilation back into civilian life and threatens to further aggravate the explosive crime problem at home already resulting from civilian drug addiction. This is why I advocate control over military drug rehabilitation programs by the proposed new Executive Office.

I often have criticized Defense Department policy in this area in the past, especially for its punitive discharges of servicemen who have become addicted to narcotics. Such handling does nothing to cure the addict, and only results in his transfer to civilian life with poor chance of ever receiving adequate treatment. The conditions in which our young men must live in Vietnam are often so bad that many of them are driven to drugs for relief. Thus it becomes our moral obligation to assist these men with all the resources at our disposal.

I have pressed the Department of Defense for summaries of the addiction problem at the various service installations around the world, and I am pleased that the Department has recently become more aware of the social and psychological problems of narcotics addiction in its own ranks. Secretary Laird

has recently announced establishment of detoxification treatment programs for returning soldiers and identification of addicts before they are returned to the United States. But an even greater commitment of resources is required after these initial efforts. I have urged the Department to provide funding for locally administered or private agencies which could treat veterans away from the military environment. Addicts in the services should be discharged for civil commitment to a civilian health facility, and should be supported by Department of Defense funds. In this way, returning soldiers will not overtax the already crowded Veterans' Administration hospitals, few of which have the laboratories, staff, or other facilities for drug rehabilitation.

I am supporting legislation to cope with the drug problem in its entirety—the importation of dangerous drugs from abroad, Government enforcement of narcotics laws, and educational programs aimed at increasing young people's knowledge of the grave threat the disease of addiction poses to them.

I have sponsored legislation which would deal directly with the source of so much of the illegal traffic in heroin and other drugs from Europe, Asia, Latin America and the Middle East. Ironically, the United States is the principal victim of this traffic, though we produce no opium or heroin. The House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe, which I chair, is concerned with a number of bills which help solve this crisis. One which I have sponsored, H.R. 8093, would direct the President to end military and economic assistance to those countries which have failed to cooperate in international efforts to stop the traffic in narcotics and other dangerous drugs. Strong measures like this may be the only way to force many of these nations to end their frequently open support of the cultivation of marijuana, poppies, and other sources which fuel the world's narcotics market. Of course, we should also encourage and support those countries which have made efforts to dry up their own clandestine drug industries. We should furnish technical and economic assistance to our ally, the Republic of Turkey, the source of 60 percent of the world's raw opium poppy, as it implements its decision to reverse agricultural practices going back hundreds of years by ending all opium poppy cultivation by June of 1972. Similar such measures elsewhere would rapidly dry up the world market and help put international pushers out of business.

In the United States itself, a different approach to the problem is required. Drug addiction has rapidly become the greatest single cause of death among young people between the ages of 18 and 35, and of the estimated half-million addicts in the Nation at least one-quarter are teenagers. In New York City and other major urban areas, small children can buy narcotics openly on street corners. A large percentage of robberies and muggings are caused by drug addicts desperate to pay for the next "fix" and support their \$50-\$100-a-day habits.

I have nothing but contempt for push-

ers and have always strongly urged prosecution to the fullest extent of the law for those who traffic in drugs. But in my view, the Federal Government has in the past been ineffective in its efforts at drug abuse control because of its failure to view the problem realistically. To deal with the thousands of drug addicts who give the international drug profiteers their market, we must treat drug dependency as an illness, not as a crime. It is self-defeating to punish, rather than cure, those who are the victims of drugs.

Reform is clearly needed in the Government's present antinarcotics efforts. Until the special action office proposed by the President, or some other form of executive agency in this area is formally established, we must keep up the pressure on our existing institutions to curtail the spread of narcotics. As the President has said:

The best way to end drug abuse is to prevent it.

We must use every opportunity. I have pressed the Food and Drug Administration to inquire into the justification for the amount of amphetamines and barbiturates produced in the United States. The narcotics crisis is in part the result of the drug culture created by manufacturers. The public has been conditioned to use drugs freely as a cure for all ills. We make 8 billion dosage units of "pep pills" a year, though current medical needs require about one-sixth of this amount. One of every two of these pills produced is currently being diverted into illegal channels. The uncontrolled production of these drugs, which are as dangerous as heroin, is a national disgrace.

The Government can only do a limited amount to regulate the use of drugs. We must, therefore, deal with the underlying conditions which contribute to their use, which force young people into the cycle of addiction from which they are helpless to free themselves. How can we hope to conquer narcotics addiction if we allow slum conditions—substandard housing and sanitary conditions, lack of recreational facilities, substandard public schools—to go unchecked? I have seen slum areas in New York and other cities where living conditions are so intolerable that one can readily sense the desperation which drives its young people into the arms of narcotics pushers. Drug addiction is often a direct result of other social problems, and it in turn feeds their continuation.

The Nation must begin immediately to tackle the many interrelated urban problems which can lead to addiction. Short of this, we can increase penalties for drug pushers to try to cut off the available supply. We also can beef up drug education programs in our schools and throughout society. I have advocated that training in all aspects of the drug menace become a requirement for the granting of a teaching license in New York State. Every teacher should know the techniques for coping with the uncertainties and ignorance that drive our young people toward the drug habit. By starting programs of this type nationwide, we can at least hope that the numbers of those innocently lured into

addiction solely because of the availability of narcotics can be reduced.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot emphasize strongly enough my firm support for the creation of an executive office on narcotics abuse. It is absolutely essential to coordinate all the efforts of the Federal departments, bureaus and agencies under one roof. I am glad the President has recognized the gravity of the problem and wants to do something about it. But I am hopeful that this House, with all the various bills before it, will want to go farther. We should create an office of drug abuse control which can act with independent and forceful authority to coordinate the Government's many separate programs into a unified crusade against the grave national problem of drug addiction and its causes.

TIME FOR THE TIMES

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1971

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in recent days with reference to the publication of the Pentagon papers and the responsibility of those who have released them as well as those who have published them.

The attached editorial from the Paris, Ill., Beacon-News of June 26, certainly has made clear that the important thing is that we are getting out of Vietnam. More study and more comment ought to be given that side of the Vietnam matter than finding fault with what has already taken place. Every poll that I have seen approves the President's getting out of Vietnam and that is what this editorial is all about.

It was written by an ex-Congressman, an old colleague of ours, Ed Jenison, who had so many years represented eastern Illinois in the Congress of the United States.

The editorial follows:

TIME FOR THE TIMES—

Now that a week or so has passed, clarity is beginning to replace confusion in the case of the New York Times and the famous or infamous Pentagon papers.

It wouldn't be a bad idea to attempt a calm appraisal at this point. Of course, the issue is before the courts, and perhaps laymen should hesitate to express an opinion even at this point.

But some facts are clear. The Pentagon, at somebody's direction, did undertake an exhaustive study in the mid-sixties on how and why the United States became drawn into a shooting war in Vietnam, and how and why a half a million young American men eventually found themselves on the fighting end of a gruesome conflict half a world away.

When the report came to light, rightly or wrongly, one fact emerged, at least. There was indeed, a difference between what Candidate Johnson had to say to the American people in his campaign for re-election in 1964, and the plans of President Johnson for what he deemed would be necessary in escalating the war effort in the immediate months ahead.

But why the furore in 1971? The New York Times, having come into possession of a study of those years labeled "top secret," saw fit to begin publishing voluminous ex-

tracts from even more voluminous volumes. And the fat was in the fire.

As a result, the Johnson administration is on the pan, but the Nixon administration, without any responsibility for the actions of that period, is forced into the position of protecting the national security by protesting an obvious violation.

The Times, and some other newspapers in its wake, continued to publish the material until halted, temporarily, by government intervention through court action.

But why the turmoil? It is a tempest in a tea pot. The matters under review were almost ancient history. The "revelations" to date were a matter of common knowledge to informed sources at the time and since. It could be true, as the government has suggested through court action, that some of the material, published in complete text in the case of some top secret communications, might reveal to an unfriendly power a clue to codes of transmission which might unlock other and unrelated but more important information vital to the security of the United States. But insofar as the information contained is concerned, there is little to indicate anything previously unknown has been revealed.

Perhaps one or two observations are worth making. In the first place any study so extensive it led to a 47 volume report could hardly remain confidential, much less "top secret," and tax payers might properly wonder why so many Pentagon hands were engaged in such a costly venture delving into the past when there were far more pressing present problems calling for solution.

But on the other side of the coin, the material was at least labeled "top secret." When it came into unauthorized hands, in this case the New York Times, from any source, the newspaper had a direct responsibility to take the proper course. And the proper course was not to rush the material into print.

Any experienced newspaper man, and any established newspaper, knows that security matters must be cleared through the proper government agency. The Times is as well informed on this fundamental procedure as any newspaper in the land. No more than a phone call would have been necessary to request consideration for declassifying the "top secret" material with the possible exception of isolated passages perhaps revealing the mechanics of military security. If such declassification had been rejected on request, the Times and all other newspapers would have had a proper case for public indignation in the cause of a free press. But the declassification might have come promptly, on proper request, and the day or few days delay would have had no harmful effect.

Instead, everybody is in the fog of uncertainty. The Nixon administration stands accused of "suppressing" important information when it is actually striving to protect national security. And such a posture, ironically, puts it in the role of "protecting" grave shortcomings of the Johnson administration.

But there is a vast difference between defending the procedures for national security and protecting or condoning past failures of a previous administration of opposite political faith. Violations of security are violations, whenever and wherever they occur. Unnecessary labeling of material, favorable or unfavorable, as "top secret" is a temptation difficult for bureaucrats to resist, but it can and should be overruled by an administration once alerted to the danger.

The present confusion is unfortunate, but it can be clarified, and material labeled "top secret" long ago and no longer in that category ought to be declassified and released for public appraisal. Any material still in fact "top secret" should be maintained in that category, and security should be strengthened to guarantee it is kept inviolate.

There must be no infringement on a free press but a free press must necessarily share responsibility with government when and if the security of freedom is in peril.

Let the dust settle. It is time for the Times and the rest of the press to recognize responsibility as well as principle. There is an orderly way to serve both. Unless the press, and government and the public recognize this, and practice it, there is a danger at hand far more serious than any or all of the material in a 47 volume "top secret" report.

And just this postscript: It would be tragic indeed if the furore over the past should hinder the problem of the present. How we got into the Vietnam situation is not so important at the moment as how we get out. One thing the partial disclosures have done is to contrast dramatically the policies of the Johnson and Nixon administrations. It is as simple as this—Johnson sent more U.S. troops in; Nixon pulled troops out and is continuing to do so. This is a hard and inescapable fact of political life. And no amount of smokescreen strategy of demanding a definite withdrawal date, with accompanying criticism of President Nixon for opposing it, is going to alter that basic truth.

The Number One task remains unchanged—to get U.S. forces out of Vietnam on an orderly basis with maximum protection to our own troops and maximum assurance for peace in the future. President Nixon has been pursuing that policy continuously. He is getting results. He deserves the continued support he has enjoyed to date from the American people who, in an overwhelming majority, hope and believe he will succeed.

TRIBUTE TO THE CARROLL COUNTY COURTHOUSE IN MARYLAND BAR JOURNAL

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, the July 1971 issue of the Maryland Bar Journal has a picture of the Carroll County Courthouse in Westminster, Md., on its cover with a tribute to the building prepared by Judge Edward O. Weant, Jr., of the Fifth Judicial Circuit.

I would like to share Judge Weant's remarks about the historic Carroll County Courthouse.

Carroll County was established January 19, 1837, and the cornerstone for its courthouse was laid June 13, 1838, on property contributed to the county for that purpose by Isaac Shriver who operated a tavern near the courthouse site. The architect for the courthouse was the first Burgess of Westminster, James M. Shellman; the contractor was Conrad Moul and the masonry work was done by Ephraim Swope and Thomas Durbin. The cost of the first construction was approximately \$18,000. The first change was the addition of the columned portico, steps, and cupola. The mechanics who built the cupola found it necessary to sue the county commissioners in order to be compensated for their efforts. In 1882 an expenditure of \$12,000 was authorized by the general assembly for repair and the addition of two one-story wings. In 1935 the wings were enlarged by adding a half story. The original building is still standing and forms the central unit of the existing structure.