

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INCREASED RURAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, on June 17 of this year I introduced H.R. 9245 to expand farm credit into rural areas to assist in rural development. The bill will modernize existing farm credit law; for example, the Federal land banks would be authorized to make loans in excess of the present 65-percent limitation on the farm's appraised value, to make real estate mortgage loans for nonfarm rural homes, and to provide financially related services to their members.

In a similar fashion production credit associations would be authorized to provide short and intermediate credit for repairs, maintenance, and improvement of nonfarm rural homes and to finance farm-related businesses. Furthermore, eligible cooperatives would be required to have only two-thirds of their membership composed of farmers and producers.

I believe that it is important to recognize that increased rural development assistance will benefit not only farmers but the entire Nation. It is well known that farmers' needs for capital continue to grow and there is nearly unanimous agreement among agriculture finance experts that agriculture capital and credit demands will double by the end of this decade. Directly linked to these needs are the urgent capital needs of other people who live in rural areas. It is my belief that the proposed legislation successfully accommodates the interests of both groups in a way which will assure a new prosperity for the rural areas of the Nation.

In this context I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues an editorial from the June issue of the American Agriculturist, by Mr. Gordon Conklin, editor. Mr. Conklin delineates the success of the Farm Credit System and expresses his opinion as to the need and importance of the 1971 Farm Credit legislation. His editorial follows:

NEW MODEL

Farmers are constantly updating their farming techniques . . . and the equipment they use in their businesses. The process requires ever-increasing amounts of capital, and this in turn creates the need to review the policies of lending institutions.

The Farm Credit Service has to rank as one of America's greatest success stories . . . launched with government "seed money," and growing to a financial giant that is a \$15-billion source of agricultural credit. Even more astonishing is the fact that Uncle Sam has been paid in full, and the FCS now runs its own ship without federal funds.

After a long study, a Commission on Agricultural Credit . . . chaired by Julian Thayer of Middlefield, Connecticut, recommended several changes that would provide the

FCS with greater flexibility in making loans, broaden the eligibility for its loans, and enlarge the scope of services which could be provided by the Service.

Some farmers will resist the proposal that the FCS enter into the rural non-farm loaning business . . . believing that the farm-orientation of the organization will thereby be diminished. It's my opinion, though, that the proposed changes will benefit farmers as well as rural non-farmers . . . updating the procedures and services of an organization that has done an outstanding job across the years.

WELL-DESERVED RECOGNITION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

HON. WILLIAM R. ROY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, today I voted in favor of H.R. 9092 which would establish a prevailing rate pay system for Government employees. This legislation affects the pay of about 700,000 Federal blue-collar workers. We in the Second District of Kansas are grateful for the fine work performed in our area by some 2,500 dedicated Federal employees. These people are an asset to Kansas in their work in many institutions, including Fort Riley, Fort Leavenworth, the Veterans' Administration hospitals in Wadsworth and Topeka, and the Federal penitentiary.

This legislation is quite similar to that passed by both Houses of the 91st Congress, only to be vetoed by the President on January 1, 1971. There is a need now, as there was then, for this legislation to provide equitable treatment for employees under the federal system.

One of the major benefits of the legislation is the institution of a five-step wage schedule instead of the present three, with automatic step increases. The addition of steps four and five should provide incentives for our Federal employees to remain in positions in which they have acquired expertise. Also, this should help Federal blue-collar employees keep pace economically in view of the spiraling cost-of-living increases we have been experiencing.

H.R. 9092 also establishes the Federal Prevailing Wage Advisory Committee which will replace the administratively established National Wage Policy Committee. The new Committee will consist of 11 members, five of whom will be representatives of Federal employees' unions; five will be representative of Federal agencies; one will be a member of the Civil Service Commission. The Chairman will be a Presidential appointee, with a 4-year term.

Another added benefit of this legislation is the establishment of a nationwide pay differential for nonovertime second- and third-shift work. At the present time, shift differentials are set according

to the prevailing practice in individual areas. Under H.R. 9092, a uniform 7½-percent pay differential is established for the second shift, and 10 percent for the third shift.

In addition, this legislation makes statutory the provision of "save pay" which has been used in practice, whereby an employee who is reduced in grade because his job is abolished or changed is paid at the former pay grade for 2 years to cushion the impact of the lower wage rate.

I am pleased that the House of Representatives approved this legislation. I hope that the Senate acts similarly and that the President signs the legislation into law. It is a deserving reward for our dedicated Federal employees.

DRAFT SHUTDOWN A CHANCE FOR CHANGE

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, with the military draft system shutdown as a result of congressional deadlock on draft extension legislation, now would be a good time to simply scrap the current system and replace it with something that might inspire our young people to serve rather than repel them as the current system does. That point has been eloquently made in a recent article by Newsday syndicated columnist Nick Thimmesch. I am pleased to say that Mr. Thimmesch recommends replacing the current draft system with the National Service System I proposed in my bill, H.R. 1000, and the text of his column, entitled "Draft Revision—Direction Unsure," follows:

DRAFT REVISION—DIRECTION UNSURE

(By Nick Thimmesch)

WASHINGTON.—With Congress still fussing over the draft bill, it's increasingly evident that the government's ability to conscript young men into the peacetime military is in serious trouble. The nation just can't solve the problem of meeting the military manpower needs of the world's greatest power in a society of young people who plain don't want to be drafted.

Draft reform, the proposed voluntary Army, and an amendment calling for a troop pullout from Vietnam within nine months if prisoners are released, combined to make the bill to extend the draft for two years, which the House and Senate passed, a nice object to wrangle over in joint-conference in the weeks ahead.

Perhaps the Republic would be better served if Congress considered proposals to create a National Service Corps which would give youth the choice between military duty or pitching in on the backlog of work on our great social problems.

Young people like to be formed into armies, and not always for war. An army of the post-pubescent swarmed over the Woodstock rock music festival several seasons ago,

and served notice that a new generation had arrived. Armies of youthful war protesters have become familiar sights in Washington. Battalion-size contingents have voluntarily helped in disasters—earthquakes, floods and forest fires.

So why couldn't America's would-be draftees be given the option of signing up for two years to work on projects to improve the environment; to serve in hospitals or health centers; to engage in antipoverty activities; to serve in VISTA, the Teacher Corps or the Peace Corps?

The choice for America's young men (perhaps young women, too?) would be either such national service or two years in the military. Actually, a program of this kind has already been proposed in Rep. Jonathan Bingham's (D-N.Y.), "National Service Act of 1970," with the support of nine congressmen, so it has some familiarity in Congress.

An immediate objection is that such a plan amounts to involuntary servitude forbidden by the 13th Amendment. But the Supreme Court has already ruled that the draft, for defense, does not contravene the involuntary servitude provision. So if the National Service Corps plan was administered by Selective Service, it probably could get by.

So why can't we have two armies, one for military purposes, and one for domestic service? Young men who prefer the military life, with its challenges, travel and discipline could go that route, and perhaps be rewarded for the extra effort with a year's free schooling after discharge. Those with an aversion to the military could slip into some sort of National Service uniform, submit to a looser discipline, but be put to the hard work of cleaning up the environment; helping the sick, aged and poor; or going abroad as Peace Corps volunteers.

With several million young people of this bent in pursuits outside the armed forces, our entire military might benefit. The military is presently loaded with youngsters who sought and received all manner of noncombat jobs, and are as much soldiers as, say, the Peoria, Illinois Women's Sodality. An Army, or Navy or Marine Corps, or even a Coast Guard has to be, after all, a military outfit, and the way matters are going now, the armed forces seem to be operated for the convenience of draftees and volunteers. These people would be much happier in a National Service Corps, and probably more useful, too.

The draft has been a national ordeal since President Franklin D. Roosevelt ordered it instituted for the first time on a peacetime basis in October of 1940. Millions fell into it in World War II, and since then, another 4,750,210 have been inducted. Though draft call-ups are very light now, millions of young men are potential draftees.

The draft, especially during the Vietnam era, has been unfair. Sen. Teddy Kennedy is mostly right when he says that the worst part of that war was fought by the poor because the more advantaged got college deferments. Disagreement over the draft is so great that a conservative like Barry Goldwater finds himself allied with liberals who push for a voluntary Army, and a professed war-hater like Rep. Pete McCloskey argues for the draft.

The United States, no matter what the condition of the world power balance, requires a good-sized, effective military. The United States presently has enormous domestic problems. Finally, we have millions of draft-age youth whose earnestness could be channeled into filling both these needs if we could find a selective service system which could route them either way—according to their wishes. We'd become a stronger, happier nation in the process.

U.S.S. "BREWTON"—DE-1086 LAUNCHED

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, having followed with increasing concern the steadily diminishing number of U.S. combatant ships and merchantmen during the past few years, it is most heartening to know that a new antisubmarine ship, the U.S.S. *Brewton*—DE-1086—was launched in New Orleans on July 24, 1971.

On that occasion the Navy's dynamic Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt, Jr., did not elaborate on the need for additional warships to bring our fleet up to minimum standards of safety. He has discussed this subject frequently and persuasively on previous occasions. Rather, Admiral Zumwalt talked on the trends in today's society, the need for spiritual motivation and a renewal of values to perpetuate this country's great heritage into the next century. Admiral Zumwalt's message is of immense importance to all of us and I place the full text of his remarks in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY ADM. E. R. ZUMWALT, JR.

As Chief of Naval Operations of the United States Navy, it is always a source of pleasure and satisfaction to me to witness the addition of a new warship to our Naval forces.

Today, however, I am also an active participant in this ceremony whereby the sleek and beautiful example of the art of the designer and skill of the ship builder is introduced for the first time to the waters—waters which will carry her from this day forward to make her mark in history as a unit of the United States Navy.

This alone is privilege and satisfaction enough for any man.

But in addition, I am favored today with two further sources of pride and honor.

First, my own wife, Mouza, is to christen this ship—giving it a name it will bear on and over the wide seas for decades into the future—perhaps into the next century, the beginning of a new millenia.

Secondly, the name this ship is to carry is one which has a unique place in my own heart and memory.

Lieutenant John C. Brewton, United States Naval Reserve, served under my command in Vietnam. He died on 11 January 1970 of wounds received from the enemy in action six weeks earlier while serving as Assistant Platoon Commander of a Navy Seal Team Detachment.

For his heroism in that final action, Lieutenant Brewton was posthumously awarded the Silver Star—our nation's third highest combat decoration.

His Task Force Commander, Captain J. R. Faulk, USN, is present in the audience today, as his Task Group Commander, Commander C. J. Wages, USN, now serving as my personal aide.

To us who knew him, nothing could be more fitting than to place John Brewton's name on a warship designed for anti-submarine warfare.

In tracking down and sinking a hostile submarine, the qualities so evident in John Brewton, the man, will be equally essential to USS *Brewton*, the ship. Anti-submarine warfare demands:

perseverance in the goals of the mission despite adversity or setbacks.

technical skill and proficiency to steady with confidence and certainty those led into battle and to lend security to those to be protected from danger.

endurance to stay in the contest until the issue is decided through victory or defeat.

determination to win through, whatever the odds, however long it may take.

most of all, courage to face death without flinching, even when the chill of its shadow is felt on the wind.

John Brewton displayed these qualities in full measure. Yes, Lieutenant Brewton was a very special young man to us—but he also was a very ordinary young American among those Navy men who served in Vietnam.

In 1945, Fleet Admiral Chester Nimitz, when speaking of the Iwo Jima campaign, said that it was a time when "Uncommon valor was a common virtue".

So it also was for our Navy men in the jungles and on the rivers of Vietnam.

Our young sailors and officers there had willingly chosen the road of danger and personal challenge in defense of freedom.

They did so because of their faith in America and their belief that freedom is indivisible—that it must be defended on far away shores if we are to avoid defending it on American soil.

The heroism in battle and courage in adversity or death shown by our Navy men in Vietnam serves as a constant inspiration to those who share this uniform—both in the U.S. Navy and that of our brothers-in-arms of the Vietnamese Navy.

We know that only so long as our Navy and our Nation can produce men of such caliber, such quality, and such devotion will America be secure against those who may in the future seek again to challenge our commitment to the cause of freedom.

Although all Americans wish it could be otherwise, our Naval forces, with those of our allies, must continue to stand ready to demonstrate that commitment in coming decades. This means that young Americans like John Brewton must continue to stand ready to pay, possibly with their "last full measure of devotion", the price of freedom.

But men of courage and spirit are not enough. They must have the tools with which to do the job. This ship we see before us today is one of the many tools our men must have if our country is to remain free. It is a warship, capable of dealing death and destruction when called for—but it is also a "Peace-Ship" which, by its existence in conjunction with the other necessary instruments of military power, can prevent war—and this is its primary reason for being.

But, men and weapons together are still not enough to ensure peace.

Our Armed Forces must also have the physical and moral support of their fellow countrymen if American courage, devotion and technology are to be fruitful.

There are trends in our society today which have tended to undermine and erode public confidence in our Armed Forces—indeed, in our nation's entire way of life.

America was once widely thought of as a land of affluence and plenty, with opportunity to succeed for all who wish to excel.

In recent years we have more searchingly turned our gaze inward, and now see with greater clarity the deficiencies of our society.

There is poverty—there is crime—there is inequality of opportunity—and we are rightly moving forward to bring the reality of America in line with the image we have long held of it.

But despite its flaws, our nation yet stands as the finest example of human organization and accomplishment in the history of man.

Our rise to pre-eminence among the nations of the world has not been without cost.

It can be said of America, as it was of Ancient Athens, that its "Grandeur was acquired by brave and valiant men, by men who knew their duty, . . . who . . . did not think it dishonorable for their country to . . . need . . . anything their valor could do for it, and so made it the most glorious present"—their lives.

And, as it was true of Athens, it is also true that those men and women who have died to make America the "last, best hope of earth" were not all in the uniformed service of the country.

The pioneers who pushed our boundaries westward across this continent and the seamen who extended our trading limits around the Horn to Asia and the Indies all shared in a dream of a greater America in the future—and they found no dishonor in courage, heroism or death in pursuit of that dream.

Our martyred Presidents, from Lincoln to John Kennedy also held in their hearts and frequently spoke of such a dream.

But there are voices abroad in America today which imply that this dream is dead—interred with the remains of those thousands of young Americans who, out of patriotism and love, made this country a present of their lives in Southeast Asia.

For three decades now, brutality, destruction and death have been pressed on our society and its people to a degree unprecedented in the last hundred years of our history. It is not a surprise to find our people growing weary and the voices of defeat rising in the wings. To some Americans, the "Generation of Peace" our President so fervently seeks seems beyond our grasp—the burden of that "long twilight struggle" foreseen by John Kennedy only a decade ago already seems to them to be intolerable—many of our institutions and symbols of authority are being questioned or undermined—it is advocated that we turn our back on the world beyond our shores—that we leave our partners to their fate, and turn our energy to a life of isolation, ease and physical comfort.

The suggestion is that we should turn our resources and attention to problems closer to home, even at the expense of our defensive military capability.

The debate rages now ever louder, and some predict that this is the course our people will choose to follow—that those same Americans who so swiftly responded to the call of greatness in the past have had enough of struggle and tension and will be persuaded to take the road of easy decision.

I do not believe it; nor would any man who knew John Brewton and thousands of young Americans just like him.

To turn our backs on the heritage of freedom and greatness handed down to this generation by those who for two centuries struggled and died to build it would imply an American poverty of spirit far in excess of any poverty of pocket book known in history.

If such a poverty of spirit exists, I have seen none of it reflected by those young Navy men who served so courageously in the rivers and jungles of Vietnam, nor do I see any of it now as our Navy men and women steadfastly go about their daily tasks on sea and shore around the globe.

Certainly, these young Americans have not abandoned their heritage, and I do not believe that their parents will be swayed to do so—however tiresome the burden may be. For, of all generations of Americans, we know that we live in an imperfect world—we are now inseparably part of it, and there can be no going back to earlier and less difficult days.

We also know that no thug ever attacked a well-armed man, while history is replete with the examples of the price ultimately paid by weakness.

The frontiers of our national interest are now spread across the seas—pressed outward by ancestors of energy, imagination, courage and venturesome spirit. Our way of life, our very existence as a nation, is now inextricably bound to the economic and security prospects of dozens of other nations.

We are tied to these remote lands by sea lines of communication—and the ability of our Navy to control these sea lines of communication in support of outposts increasingly to be manned by allies and partners is crucial to the future survival of America as we know it.

Let us abolish poverty—let us overcome crime in the streets—let us break down the barriers to equal opportunity—but let us always remember that we cannot do so in a vacuum.

The voices of defeatism and dissent are loud and powerful. But I am certain that the spirits of those thousands of Americans who have died for freedom in the last two hundred years join us in our prayer that this nation will see the shoals ahead and put about before it is too late.

The course ahead is shrouded in the mists of complexity, and there are no wise men who can perceive or would advocate simple answers to the difficulties we face.

But at least one thing is clear—USS BREWTON and the officers and men who will man her in coming decades will make their just contribution to the security of this land and all it represents—they will bear the burdens needed to perpetuate our heritage—and the challenges they will face together will be increasingly more difficult than those we all face today.

Finally, in readying themselves to meet the tests ahead, I can assure them that they could have no higher goal to pursue than to match the example of honor, courage and patriotism set for them by their ship's namesake.

May God bless them in their journey to the next century.

CBS CONTINUES DISTORTION AND FURTHER NATIONALIZED MEDIA THREAT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, CBS seems to have taken the refusal of this House to cite them for contempt of Congress for lying to the American people as a license to distort facts and continue to influence international policy and public attitudes with regard to our country.

Not content with shifting the blame from the decisionmakers in our foreign policy department, the responsible parties, to the military for the Vietnam fiasco, CBS has now turned to smearing the Union of South Africa with a patently distorted "documentary" and its movie counterpart, showing anti-American films at a Moscow film festival. Even the State Department refused to grant official support for this un-American protest.

The American people must be made aware of the continued efforts on the

part of those who control "the right to know" machinery in this country to defend ridiculous and absurd positions that have been taken by our foreign policy decisionmakers while publicizing supposed weaknesses of the American people.

Biased news reporting such as this and continued efforts on the part of the movie industry to tear down the very fabric of American life can only result in a public outcry for a nationalized communications system—the last and final step before this country deteriorates to absolute socialism and the horrors of George Orwell's not so implausible "1984."

What are CBS and Columbia International Pictures trying to prove?

I include news articles in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, July 20, 1971]

MOSCOW FILM FESTIVAL

Moscow.—The seventh Moscow Film Festival opened in the Kremlin yesterday with American movies in competition, despite U.S. State Department criticism of the event.

Members of the American delegation said about 20 films either produced or distributed by American companies will be shown. Among them will be "They Shoot Horses, Don't They?" and "The Great White Hope."

The State Department had endorsed the festival in past years, but this year the department advised American producers against participation because some of the documentaries on Vietnam might be anti-American.

"One of the objects is to show American films to as wide a Soviet audience as possible," said Marc Spiegel, head of the American delegation.

Films from 116 countries will be shown.

Soviet organizers have said that actress Jane Fonda will attend.

Other members of the U.S. delegation included Mario Jordan, executive vice president of Columbia International Pictures, and director Stanley J. Kramer, due to appear Friday.

[From the Evening Star, July 26, 1971]

ROUSING OVATION—U.S. FILMS HAILED AT SOVIET FESTIVAL

Moscow.—American movies today brought critical praise and enthusiastic ovations from Soviets at the 7th Moscow International Film Festival.

Pravda, the Communist party newspaper, hailed the Arthur Penn film "Little Big Man" for dashing "bourgeois myths" concerning treatment of American Indians.

Some 6,000 Soviet film fans gave a rousing ovation to Stanley J. Kramer last night when his film, "Bless the Beasts and the Children," was shown in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses.

Some 21 films made or distributed by American companies are being shown at the festival despite official State Department refusal to participate. The department withheld official support because of what it said is the likelihood that anti-American films would be shown at the festival.

The U.S. delegation leader, Marc Spiegel, said the American moviemakers decided to participate anyway on the ground that it is beneficial for as many Russians as possible to see U.S. movies.

Pravda film critic Georgy Kapralov, reviewing "Little Big Man," said that Penn "reveals implacably and with all the passion of an artist . . . one of the myths created by bourgeois historians.

"It is the myth of the salvation role of the bourgeoisie and its so-called cultural mission, as it allegedly introduced the blessings of

progress to once-backward peoples and tribes."

The film concerns massacres of Indian villagers by U.S. Army troops in the last century and the massacre of Custer's troops at the Little Big Horn.

[From Manchester Union Leader, July 26, 1971]

CBS AND SOUTH AFRICA

(Guest editorial from the National Review)

The South Africa Foundation is not pleased with CBS' documentary, *A Black View of South Africa*. John Chettle, Washington Director of the Foundation, has written a letter to the President of CBS complaining that, in a thirty-minute program, the CBS reporters managed to commit at least two dozen verifiable errors of fact, "not to mention quotations taken out of context, allegations impossible to substantiate and impossible to disprove, vague generalizations, instances of the particular referred to as if it were general, and other tricks of the aged art of special pleading."

Mr. Chettle then lists some of the more egregious errors, alongside his corrections. For example: "It is easier for an American newsman to get into Hanoi than into South Africa." (In fact, official State Department figures show that ten American newsmen have gone to Hanoi in the last five years, whereas over a hundred have visited South Africa.) "This is an illegal film . . . made in South Africa by black South Africans, violating laws, risking prison and even death." (Mr. Chettle wishes CBS had said what laws the photographers were violating. The only ones he can imagine as being applicable are those forbidding anyone to photograph a prison or a nuclear installation—"Outside these exceptions, anyone, whether white or black, may photograph anything and may freely remove the photographs or films from the country.") "It is daring indeed. The camera equipment was smuggled in, and so was the film." ("One can only regret that the makers of the film put themselves to so much unnecessary expense. All photographic equipment is freely available in South Africa.")

The other specific statements that Mr. Chettle cites as being either completely false or misleadingly over-simplified have to do with standards of living for blacks in South Africa, for example: that the minimum living cost for a family of four in most Bantu areas is \$10 a month more than the average man-wife team earns; that most Bantu housing was condemned as unfit for human habitation forty years ago; that black men are lured into continuing to work in the mines until they die of tuberculosis; that Indians are evicted from their houses on sugar estates if one working member of the family dies; that no precious minerals have been discovered in Bantu homelands.

All this, and much, much more, in a half-hour show.

ROCHESTER'S MAYOR STEPHEN
MAY ON GENERAL REVENUE
SHARING

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the debate continues in America over the best means to solve the growing revenue crisis which threatens to bankrupt many States and hundreds of local governments. The attention of the country is now focused on the Ways and Means Committee of the House as we anxiously await final action

on the various revenue sharing proposals under consideration.

Last month, the committee was fortunate to receive the testimony of the Honorable Stephen May, mayor of the city of Rochester. After making a compelling case for distributing a fairer share of Federal revenue to local governments, the mayor concluded with these words:

Our cities are victims of circumstances beyond their control, but they are not beyond the control of the U.S. Congress. We await positive, constructive action by your committee.

It is my earnest hope that we will heed the mayor's call.

A complete text of Mayor May's testimony follows:

STATEMENT BY MAYOR STEPHEN MAY, OF ROCHESTER, N.Y., TO THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE ON GENERAL REVENUE SHARING BILL, H.R. 4187, JUNE 16, 1971

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: The Congress of the United States has an unprecedented opportunity this year to enact landmark legislation which will be recorded as a dramatic turning point in this nation's history. Restoration of the American people's confidence in the ability of their elected leadership to utilize our nation's great resources to meet the challenges of our urban crisis must be the top priority on this country's agenda.

President Nixon deserves the commendation of all who are concerned about the quality of life in our financially pressed cities for his initiative in proposing a significant program of general federal revenue-sharing with state and local governments. Whether you approve his specific proposal or another form of unrestricted aid to cities is really unimportant. At least the President has pointed the way in the right direction, and his pioneering concept should not be sacrificed for narrow partisan gain.

Attached to this statement is a copy of a resolution adopted by a unanimous, bipartisan vote of the Rochester City Council, endorsing general revenue-sharing.

Pleas from every part of this country for more responsive government, for a sense of community and a national purpose, grow louder and more persistent each day. Those of us responsible for governing urban areas are lightning rods in this storm of protest, demand, expectation and complaint. We try to withstand the onslaught of citizen concern and frustration knowing full well that we have neither the financial resources nor the authority to be truly responsive. We know, from painful experience, that if government at all levels is not responsive then government at no level can be responsive. This is what general federal revenue-sharing is all about.

The most striking near-monopoly in this country today is the federal government's stranglehold on the flexible, dynamic and generally progressive federal income tax. With its overriding taxing and revenue-generating powers the federal government has been siphoning away the bulk of tax revenues while local governments confront the bulk of domestic problems.

States take a second crack at what are usually the same sources of wealth and frequently, in addition, some regressive tax revenues. The cities have what is left—usually the most regressive, archaic tax conceivable—the real property tax, plus whatever grants-in-aid the federal and state governments choose to bestow for specific purposes.

Over the past thirty years the nation has come to recognize that the national government bears the major responsibility for dealing with pervasive nation-wide problems

such as welfare, poverty and education by developing special-purpose programs partially funded and directed by the federal government. But we have been very slow to recognize the companion principle: that people of localities have ample power to hold their local administrations responsible for the spending of their money properly in providing basic public services—even when that money comes in the form of shared federal revenues.

For our aging cities, which increasingly house the poor, the old, the young and minority groups and already operate under heavy handicaps, failure to provide basic public services only lowers the quality of life and climaxes the mounting frustrations, hostility, anger and incivility which characterize America's urban scene. The stability and well-being of our city communities, precarious at best, hinges on the provision of essential public services such as sanitation, recreation facilities, police and fire protection, street maintenance, and housing code enforcement—services which receive little or no federal support.

Our people ask why the Congress is not listening to its Mayors. Our people ask if this nation's federal government is beyond the reach of those elected officials who are closest to the everyday problems of their communities. Is our national government becoming totally out of touch with the fundamental needs of day-to-day existence in our cities?

Local communities are a cornerstone of the strength and vitality of this nation, not mere creatures of another unit of government. Local governments were intended to be vital partners in the shared powers and responsibilities of government in our federal system. Why should cities have to beg for resources which are rightfully theirs as full-fledged partners in this system?

The richest society in the world cannot muster the money to deliver public services effectively—not because the cost is too high nor because the money isn't there—but mainly because the tax structure is arranged to leave vast amounts of wealth untapped or misallocated while overburdening the small taxpayer to the point of revolt. Surely there is something seriously wrong with the nation's allocation of its financial resources when the federal government, with a dynamic tax base which has tripled in the last 15 years, has been cutting taxes, and local governments, with a regressive sales and real estate tax base, have been raising them.

While state and local governments have been digging deeper and deeper in search of new revenues—inevitably regressive in nature—the federal income tax has been cut six times in the last 17 years: 1954, 1962, 1964, 1965, 1969 and 1971. Local government expenses, from 1950-69, jumped 350 percent while federal spending for domestic purposes increased only 200 percent. During the last ten years, expenditures at the state and local levels have increased 20 percent faster than their total tax revenues.

Lest local and state governments be accused of shirking their duties, or falling to make determined efforts to solve their own problems, I call to your attention the sincere and strenuous actions of governments in Rochester and New York State. They have striven mightily to muster the money to deliver vital public services while trimming budgets and cutting back on activities in order to remain solvent yet responsive to the people's needs.

Feeling the pinch of a sizeable budget deficit, the City of Rochester, through the diligent work of an economy task force, saved my city several million dollars. In addition to an across-the-board job freeze, we have reduced our work force by 450 and significantly curtailed library and recreation services. We have postponed the purchase of

all but the most urgently needed vehicles for our police and fire services. Other capital improvement programs are being delayed.

Many charges have been increased and others imposed for the first time. The City has raised fees for towing of illegally parked cars, for parking in our municipal garages and for permits for electricians, contractors and demolition companies. A fee is now charged for children studying ballet in our recreation program.

In an unprecedented—and unpopular—move the City has restored 18 previously tax-exempt properties to the tax rolls, and is vigorously pursuing further efforts in the same direction. Just last week the Rochester City Council, in an attempt to hold down disastrous increases in this year's property tax (which is already dangerously close to the State Constitutional limit), trimmed \$887,393 from the proposed City School Budget.

The New York State Legislature, in its recently adjourned session, raised the state sales tax from 3% to 4% and expanded its coverage to include meals under \$1.00. With Monroe County's own 3% sales tax, our residents now must live with a whopping and regressive 7% sales tax. New York State already has an income tax, an element which is conspicuously missing in its immediately neighboring states.

Our present tax structure forces our states, our communities and their respective officials to view with each other for limited resources and in devising attractive tax climates for businesses. This process sacrifices vital public services and perpetuates the regressive, archaic and inequitable property tax. This is a vicious cycle from which we all need to be rescued.

Especially severe hardships for my city's people result from the burdens forced by heavy reliance on the real estate tax—a tax which bears little relationship to a person's ability to pay and to the services it finances. Municipal officials are squeezed between taxpayer revolts from below and arbitrary revenue-sharing restrictions imposed from above. The result is a tragic loss of capacity to serve its residents.

Lack of support and trust of its own citizens at home and lack of support and trust from Congress and the federal government in Washington are converging on and crippling our cities. We look to you in Washington to restore local government to its rightful place in the federal system and to allocate sufficient and flexible enough funds to enable our cities to flourish, not merely survive.

It is clear that general revenue-sharing is an idea whose time has come. The Gallup poll indicates that 77% of the American people support the concept. They recognize—while the Congress has been slow to perceive—that state and local governments, which are closest to the people, are best able to provide essential services, and that those governments must have adequate resources to perform effectively.

It is up to the federal government, with its access to progressive, dynamic sources of revenue to provide the funds which will enable our cities to devote their efforts and resources to those programs and services which have been theirs historically and which are essentially local in nature—such as keeping streets safe and clean, collecting trash on a regular basis, providing recreational facilities, police and fire protection and housing code enforcement.

While I have no fixed views on the precise methods for distributing a fair share of federal revenues to local governments in a general revenue-sharing program, I feel that five criteria must be met:

1. The amount of new revenue available to cities must be large enough to have a significant impact on our ability to effectively deliver public services. An annual figure of

\$10 billion, as proposed by Governor Rockefeller, Senator Javits and others, comes closer to meeting our needs than does the \$5 billion President Nixon has recommended.

2. These funds must be made available for general municipal purposes as determined by the local government, with no strings attached. Certainly, we in local government are in the best position to determine how funds can be most effectively employed to improve our communities.

3. Provisions must specify that general revenue-sharing funds will be made available either directly to local governments or by means of a guaranteed state government pass-through which would thwart arbitrary tampering with funding levels by state officials insensitive to the needs of cities and local governments.

4. Safeguards must be enacted to protect local governments from unpredictable annual reductions in revenue-sharing funds except as economic growth or decline affects the economy as a whole and resulting federal revenues.

5. Strong provisions must be included for strict auditing of the expenditure of general revenue-sharing funds and to prevent their use for discriminatory purposes.

If we have ever needed a strong national policy which reaches straight into the pocket of every property taxpayer, it is now. As the mayor of a large city in deep financial trouble, I ask you to take the risks which go with general revenue-sharing because it is truly an investment in the renaissance of local government.

It is essential that a sound basis for sharing this nation's abundant wealth be devised. It is vital that you demonstrate an immediate, visible determination to share the riches which Washington gathers in from the far-flung communities of this nation. A commitment of federal funds to general revenue-sharing would begin to reverse the trend of national neglect of our cities and give desperately needed encouragement, trust and fortification to our embattled and dispirited municipal governments.

I ask your help in harnessing federal funds to local initiatives as part of a national undertaking to convert America's economic growth into the good life for all. General revenue-sharing is a means to fill a major gap in our fiscal federalism, to strengthen its structure by infusing funds and independence into city governments, and to increase our total government capacity to cope with the large social crisis of the 1970's.

Our cities are victims of circumstances beyond their control but they are not beyond the control of the United States Congress. We await positive, constructive action by your committee.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY UNANIMOUS BIPARTISAN VOTE OF THE ROCHESTER CITY COUNCIL ENDORSING GENERAL REVENUE SHARING

Whereas, the financial plight of our nation's cities is a continuing crisis resulting from a shrinking tax base while the cost of government continues to outstrip available revenue; and

Whereas, the City of Rochester faces another virtually insurmountable budget gap which will necessitate a burdensome tax increase and/or a significant reduction in vital City services; and

Whereas, Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller and other leaders have long urged a program of federal revenue-sharing and President Richard M. Nixon has asked Congress "to provide that the federal government regularly share some of its revenue with all cities . . . to be used by them for any purposes for which they can legally use their own resources"; and

Whereas, the 92nd Congress can set no

higher priority than enactment of a substantial program of federal-revenue sharing with local governments, if our cities are to survive and flourish;

Now be it Resolved,

that the City Council of the City of Rochester, New York hereby strongly endorses immediate implementation of a federal revenue-sharing program of significant magnitude to bring vitally needed money without stringent guidelines to Rochester and other local governments across the country.

And be it further Resolved

that copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Senators Jacob K. Javits and James Buckley and Congressmen Frank J. Horton and Barber Conable.

Adopted unanimously.

BLACK PROGRESS

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in considering the effectiveness of civil rights legislation, it is always encouraging to learn that our new laws have produced results consistent with our legislative intent.

A recent report produced through the cooperation of the Bureau of the Census and the Department of Labor has noted many areas of progress achieved during the last 10 years. This report and the results described were the subject of a perceptive editorial in today's Chicago Tribune entitled "Black Progress."

In connection with the oversight jurisdiction of Subcommittee 4 of the House Judiciary Committee upon which I am privileged to serve, the subcommittee is endeavoring to determine both the benefits and the shortcomings of existing civil rights laws. The Tribune editorial calls attention to both of these aspects—which, it seems to me, should be the main objective of our subcommittee's oversight function.

Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune editorial follows:

BLACK PROGRESS

Statistical reports make less dramatic news than civil rights confrontations and demonstrations, but one of the more significant analyses of figures was displayed prominently on our page one Monday. A new federal study reports that black people in the United States have made solid economic and educational gains in the last decade. The black advances may have been prodded in part by the civil rights activism of the 1960s, the report demonstrates that the American system does work.

Attacks often are made on the quality of education for blacks. These may be true, but nevertheless between 1965 and 1970 the number of blacks 18 to 24 years old enrolled in college nearly doubled. Much more progress still is needed, since one of every six college blacks is enrolled in an institution of higher learning compared with one of every three whites in the same age bracket. In 1970, 56 per cent of all blacks 25 to 29 years old had a high school diploma, compared with only 38 per cent in 1960.

Eradication of functional illiteracy among blacks had increasing success. By the end of

the 1960s, less than 1 per cent of blacks from 14 to 24 years of age had less than four years of school compared with 9 per cent of blacks 45 years and older.

Median family income for blacks rose approximately 50 per cent in the last decade to \$8,520. Even more significant, black family income increased at a faster rate than in white families. The ratio of black to white family income went from 53 to 64 per cent in the 1960s. Last year, 24 per cent of black families had incomes with purchasing power exceeding \$10,000 at 1969 prices, compared with only 9 per cent in 1960.

Blacks still remain behind whites in key economic and educational categories, but the gaps are becoming narrower. Another development cited in the report was the substantial migration from Southern states to Northern urban areas. When the nation's major cities—especially Chicago—solve their social, economic, and educational problems, the differences will become even smaller.

SEEKS MORE FOR DRUG PROGRAMS

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I offered an amendment to the Labor-HEW fiscal year 1972 appropriations bill, which added \$40 million to the budget for drug abuse control programs administered by the National Institute of Mental Health. Although the amendment was rejected, I would like to explain more fully why I offered it, by demonstrating the gross inadequacy of Federal funds for drug treatment programs.

I am inserting at the conclusion of my

remarks an analysis of the President's fiscal year 1972 budget request prepared by the Office of Management and Budget. It shows, for example, that the total Federal effort in drug treatment and rehabilitation, \$150 million, is barely comparable to the amount that the city and State of New York alone spend for their own programs.

I am also including an analysis of the drug abuse control funds of the National Institute of Mental Health, which administers the major portion of the Federal Government's treatment and rehabilitation programs, and a list of the grants made by the Institute.

I commend these analyses to the attention of those of my colleagues who are turning an increasingly critical eye on the role of the Federal Government in combating drug abuse:

U.S. OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

ESTIMATED OBLIGATIONS FOR FEDERAL DRUG ABUSE PROGRAMS BY CATEGORY, AGENCY AND LEGISLATIVE AUTHORIZATION

[Fiscal years; millions of dollars]¹

Category and agency	Authorization (see text for full titles)	1969	1970	1971	1972 required appropriation	Category and agency	Authorization (see text for full titles)	1969	1970	1971	1972 required appropriation
LAW ENFORCEMENT						EDUCATION AND TRAINING					
Justice:						HEW:					
BND	CDAPCA	16.8	25.8	39.3	60.7	NIMH	PHS	1.2	3.4	4.7	9.5
Other	NARA	.3	.4	.5	.7		CMHC			1.5	7.5
Treasury:						OE ²	DAEA	.2	3.7	6.6	6.0
Customs	Customs laws	3.1	12.4	18.3	41.5	Justice:					
IRS ³	26 U.S.C.				7.5	BND	CDAPCA	.4	1.3	2.9	4.5
						LEAA ⁴	OCCSSA	.2	1.3	2.6	2.6
Subtotal		20.2	38.6	58.1	110.4	Miscellaneous ⁵		.1	.5	.5	.5
						Subtotal		2.0	9.8	18.8	30.6
TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION						RESEARCH AND OTHER SUPPORT					
HEW:						HEW: NIMH	PHS	14.1	16.3	17.8	31.2
NIMH	CMHC	21.9	3.1	19.8	68.5		CMHC				2.0
	NARA		16.7	20.9	21.3	State: AID	CDAPCA	1.0	.7	1.4	1.5
SRS	VRA	1.0	1.6	1.8	2.8	USDA ⁶	FAA	.3	1.3	2.4	2.6
OEO	EOA	2.2	4.5	12.8	18.0	Special action office	7 U.S.C. 427				2.1
VA	38 U.S.C.	.6	4.8	5.0	22.5		Pending				3.0
HUD: Model cities	DCMDA	1.4	4.1	6.0	3.4	Subtotal		15.4	18.3	21.6	42.4
Justice:						Civilian program total		65.6	108.2	178.0	333.4
LEAA	OCCSSA	.4	5.6	10.9	11.0	Department of Defense					48.0
Bureau of Prisons	NARA	.5	1.1	2.3	2.5	Grand total					381.4
Subtotal		28.0	41.5	79.5	150.0						

¹ Some amounts remain estimates (back to 1969) because of formula grant programs, etc.

² Prior to 1972, funds not specifically dedicated to enforcing tax evasion laws against known or suspected drug traffickers.

³ As of July 1, appropriation in Conference Committee. (Estimates 13.0 will be result of committee action).

⁴ Includes model cities in 1971 (0.1-DCMDA and USDA in 1971 and 1972 (0.5 for 4-H club programs—7 U.S.C. 343).

⁵ Research for detection and eradication of narcotics.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

1. Authorizing legislation:

- BND: Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970. (CDAPCA)
- LEAA: Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended. (OCCSSA)
- Bureau of Prisons: Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966, (NARA) Title II.
- Other: NARA, Title III.

2. Authorization levels (in millions):

- BND (for functions under Title II of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act): 1972—\$66; 1973—76.²
 - LEAA: No specific authorizations.
 - Bureau of Prisons: No specific authorizations.
 - Other: No specific authorizations.
3. Estimated obligations (see attached table).
4. Difference between requested and appropriated, 1971. Bureau of Prisons requested \$3.0 million, received \$2.3 million.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

1. Authorizing legislation:

- Customs: 18 U.S.C. 545; 19 U.S.C. 482; 1461, 1467, 1496, 1581, and 1582; 21 U.S.C. 198a; 21 U.S.C. 966; 26 U.S.C. 7607. (Customs Laws)
 - Internal Revenue Service: Title 26 U.S. Code (26 U.S.C.)
2. Authorization levels: Unspecified.
3. Estimated obligations (see attached table).

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

1. Authorizing legislation:

- NIMH: Parts D and E of the Community Mental Health Centers Act, (CMHC) as amended by Title I of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970. Titles I and III of NARA. Sections 301, 302, 303, and 443 of the Public Health Service Act (PHS).
- Office of Education: Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970² (DAEA)
- Social and Rehabilitation Service: Sections 2, 3, and 4 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (VRA).

2.—AUTHORIZATION LEVELS

	1971	1972	1973
(a) NIMH:			
CMHC (Sec. 253) education	\$3	\$12	\$14
CMHC (Sec. 256)	20	30	35
CMHC ¹ (Sec. 261)	40	60	80
NARA	(?)	(?)	(?)
PHS	(?)	(?)	(?)
(b) Office of Education	10	20	28
(c) SRS	(?)	(?)	(?)

¹ Part E of CMHC authorizes funds for both drug abuse and alcoholism.

² No specific authorizations.

3. Estimated obligations (see table).

4. Differences between requested and appropriated. No difference between requested and appropriated. However, supplemental appropriations made as follows:

- NIMH: an additional \$6.5 million of which \$5 million was for special community projects and \$1.5 million for drug abuse education.

b. OE: an additional \$6 million for drug abuse education.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

1. Authorizing legislation.^a Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, Title II, Section 222(a) (9). (EOA)
2. Authorization level—1971, 1972, 1973—No specific authorizations.
3. Estimated obligations (see table).
4. Difference between requested and appropriation: 1971 request was \$3 million, \$15 million specified for drug abuse by Congress. 15% reduction by OEO Director.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

1. Authorizing legislation: Title 38 U.S.C., Chapter 17 (38 U.S.C.).
2. Authorization level: 1971-73—No specific authorizations.
3. Estimated obligations (see table).

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

1. Authorizing legislation: Model Cities; The Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966. (DCMDA).
2. Authorization level: 1971-73—No specific authorizations.
3. Estimated obligations (see table, because of nature of program these amounts are estimated outlays).

STATE DEPARTMENT

1. Authorizing legislation: AID; Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (FAA).
2. Authorization level: 1971-73—No specific authorizations.
3. Estimated obligations (see table).

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

1. Authorizing legislation: ARS; Marketing Act of 1946, (7 U.S.C. 427); Other: (4-H Clubs) Lever Act of 1914 as amended (7 U.S.C. 343).
2. Authorization levels: 1971-73—No specific authorizations.
3. Estimated obligations (see table).

NIMH APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1972

[In millions]

	1972 budget request	President's June 21 amendment increase	Total
1. Manpower training.....	\$2.9	\$4.0	\$6.9
2. State and community treatment, rehabilitation and education grants.....	27.0	50.4	77.4
3. Research.....	19.0	12.0	31.0
4. NARA civil commitment treatment.....	21.3	.6	21.9
5. Program support.....	2.5	0	2.5
Total.....	72.7	67.0	139.7

1. Manpower training has an *indefinite* authorization under Part D, Section 252 of the Community Mental Health Centers Act authorized by P.L. 90-574.
2. State and community rehabilitation, treatment and education are authorized by P.L. 90-574, 91-211 and 91-513.
 - (a) Section 252: indefinite authorization for treatment programs (Specialized training programs and materials, new types of treatment).
 - (b) Section 253: \$12 million authorized to establish drug abuse education projects.
 - (c) Section 256: \$30 million for public or non-profit private agencies for treatment and rehabilitation programs (grants made to public and non-profit agencies).
 - (d) Section 261: \$60 million for construction and staffing of treatment facilities. This amendment would add funds available for these sections.
3. Research has indefinite authorization under Public Health Service Act,

4. Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act (P.L. 89-793) authorizes civil commitment and provides *indefinite* authorization for contract arrangements with community agencies to treat committed addicts.

5. Program support (administrative costs).

FOOTNOTES

¹ Some activities of BNDD are not included within the functions authorized by Title II of the cited Act. These activities have no specific authorizations.

² Prior to 1971 legislative authority was Education Professions Development Act, Part D and Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title III.

³ Footnote in table.

⁴ Expired June 30, 1971.

Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Branch, Division of Narcotic Addiction and Drug Abuse, National Institute of Mental Health

ACTIVE GRANTS

Institution and location, starting date

PL 89-793, Section 402—\$10,988,000 through FY 1971

1. Connecticut Metal Health Center, New Haven, Conn., No. 5 H17 MH 16356-04-6-1-68.
2. University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., No. 5 H17 MH 16409-04-6-1-68.
3. University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., No. 5 H17 MH 16357-04-6-1-68.
4. Board of County Commissioners, Bernalillo County, Albuquerque, N. Mex., No. 5 H17 MH 16355-04-6-1-68.
5. West Philadelphia Corporation, Philadelphia, Pa., No. 5 H17 MH 16359-04-6-1-68.
6. Addiction Services Agency, \$3,114,000, New York, N. Y., No. 5 H17 MH 16353-03-5-1-69.

PL 90-574, Section 251—\$9,830,000

7. The Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, Md., No. 5 H19 MH 17830-02-8-1-69.
8. New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry, Newark, N.J., No. 5 H19 MH 17843-02-9-1-69.
9. Alcohol and Drug Dependence Division, Connecticut Department of Mental Health, Hartford, Conn., No. 5 H19 MH 17837-02-11-1-69.
10. Addiction Research and Treatment Corporation, Brooklyn, N.Y., \$2,252,000, No. 5 H19 MH 17836-02-11-1-69.
11. Boston University School of Medicine, Division of Psychiatry, Boston, Mass., No. 5 H19 MH 17844-02-1-1-70.
12. Missouri Division of Mental Health, Jefferson City, Mo., No. 5 H19 MH 17840-02-1-1-70.
13. New Jersey State Hospital, Marlboro, N.J., No. 5 H19 MH 17835-02-1-1-70.
14. Eagleville Hospital and Rehabilitation Center, Eagleville, Pa., No. 5 H19 MH 17831-02-2-1-70.
15. Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Department of Social Services, San Juan, P.R., No. 5 H19 MH 17829-02-4-1-70.
16. Bexar County Board of Mental, Health and Mental Retardation, San Antonio, Tex. No. 5 H19 MH 17841-02-5-1-70.

PL 91-211, staffing, part D—\$6,567,000

17. Health Council of the Detroit Model, Neighborhood, Inc., Detroit, Mich., No. 1 H19 MH 00434-01-10-1-70.
18. Government of the District of Columbia, Department of Human Resources, Narcotics Treatment Administration, Washington, D.C., No. 1 H19 MH 00466-01A1-12-1-70.
19. Committee on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse for Greater New Orleans, Inc., New Orleans, La., No. 1 H19 MH 00456-01-1-1-71.
20. Community Organization for Drug Abuse Control, Phoenix, Ariz. No. 1 H19 MH 00460-01A1-1-1-71.
21. Diagnostic and Rehabilitation Center,

Philadelphia, Pa. No. 1 H19 MH 00452-01-3-1-71.

22. Metropolitan Dade County Department of Hospitals, Division of Mental Health, Miami, Fla. No. 1 H19 MH 00378-01A1-4-1-71.

23. Craig House-Technoma Workshop, Pittsburgh, Pa. No. 1 H19 MH 00333-01A1-4-1-71.

24. Bedford Area Mental Health Clinics, Inc., New Bedford, Mass. No. 1 H19 MH 00497-01-7-1-71.*

25. Central Community Health Board of Hamilton County, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio. No. 1 H19 MH 00517 01-8-71.*

26. Greater Bridgeport Mental Health Council, Inc., Bridgeport, Conn. No. 1 H19 MH 00515-01-9-1-71.*

27. City of Detroit Department of Health, Detroit, Mich. No. 1 H19 MH 00536-01-9-1-71.

28. Westside Community Mental Health Center, San Francisco, Calif. No. 1 H19 MH 00453-01-9-1-71.*

29. Cumberland County Mental Health Authority, Fayetteville, N.C. No. 1 H19 MH 00462-01-10-1-71.*

PL 91-211 (Initiation and Development), \$150,000

30. University of Maryland, Baltimore, Md. No. 1 D20 MH 00565-01-7-1-71.*

31. Dede Wallace Center, Nashville, Tenn. No. 1 D20 MH 00555-01-9-1-71.*

32. Brevard County Mental Health Center, Inc., Rockledge, Fla., No. 1 D20 MH 00560-01-9-1-71.*

PL 91-513 (Section 256) \$5,000,000

33. Lancaster General Hospital, Lancaster, Pa., No. 1 H80 MH 00629-01-7-1-71.*

34. Addiction Prevention Treatment Foundation, Inc., New Haven, Conn., No. 1 H80 MH 00625-01-7-1-71.*

35. Muhlenberg Medical Center, Bethlehem, Pa., No. 1, H80 MH 00617-01-7-1-71.*

36. Community Organization for Drug Abuse Control, Phoenix, Ariz., No. 1 H80 MH 00616-01-7-1-71.*

37. Aquarius House, Muncie, Ind., No. 1 H80 MH 00611-01-7-1-71.*

38. Interseminarian, Inc., Boston, Mass., No. 1 H80 MH 00596-01-7-1-71.*

39. Metropolitan Development Council, Tacoma, Wash., No. 1 H80 MH 00576-01-7-1-71.*

40. Youth Projects, Inc., Fairfield, Calif., No. 1 H80 MH 00657-01-8-1-71.*

41. Community Mental Health Board, Clinton-Eaton-Ingham Counties, Lansing, Mich., No. 1 H80 MH 00610-01-8-1-71.*

42. S.O.D.A.T. (Services to Overcome Drug Abuse Among Teenagers), Grand Blanc, Mich., No. 1 H80 MH 00579-01-8-1-71.*

43. Kentucky Region Eight Mental Health/Mental Retardation Board, Inc., Louisville, Ky., No. 1 H80 MH 00639-01-9-1-71.*

44. The Mental Health Center of Norfolk and Chesapeake, Norfolk, Va., No. 1 H80 MH 00613-01-9-1-71.*

45. Tucson-Southern Counties Mental Health Services, Inc., Tucson, Ariz., No. 1 H80 MH 00636-01-10-1-71.*

46. Community Mental Health Center of Beaver County, Rochester, Pa., No. 1 H80 MH 00577-01-10-1-71.*

47. Narcotic Addicts Rehabilitation Center Organization, Atlantic City, N.J., No. 1 H80 MH 00516-01A1-10-1-71.*

48. Durham Community Mental Health Center, Durham, N.C., No. 1 H80 MH 00614-01-12-1-71.*

P.L. 91-513 (section 253) \$1,500,000 for drug abuse education for FY 1971. 13 grants and 7 contracts, 5 grants were made in New York for \$258,000 and 1 contract for \$140,000

*Planned.

AMERICA IN GREECE: SWAN SONG
OF AN EAGLE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. The action of the House Foreign Affairs Committee in approving an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act restricting aid to Greece has precipitated a number of spirited reactions.

As a supporter of my committee's action, I am pleased that we have taken an important step which shows clearly—and for the first time in my recollection—that we will not tolerate indefinitely American support of repressive dictatorships through a spurious and ever less believable appeal to "national security."

I am convinced that our national security is best served when we can bring strong democratic governments together for joint action toward peace. Supporting the Greek junta does not serve that goal.

Prof. George Anastaplo, of Rosary College, River Forest, Ill., has sent me the following article which clearly shows the danger of relying on the group of mutinous colonels who seized power in Greece in 1967 as a basis for American security in Europe and the Near East:

SWAN SONG OF AN EAGLE—AMERICA IN GREECE
(By George Anastaplo)

American foreign policy is obviously one of the greatest concerns of this time filled with urgencies. And over more than one part of the world the American eagle seems to have been circling of late on uncertainly fluttering wings, looking painfully unlike the embodiment of dignity and purpose we have heretofore envisioned as our national symbol. This is the metaphor chosen by George Anastaplo for the title of his article in this issue, "Swan Song of an Eagle: America in Greece."

Five issues ago Dr. Anastaplo analyzed for SWR the Greek situation as it existed at that time, in his "Greece Today and the Limits of American Power," an article which attracted notice both in America and abroad. Now, after a visit to Greece last fall which gave him an opportunity to get a very close view of further developments and even to put challenging questions to Prime Minister George Papadopoulos himself at a press conference, he has formulated his new observations for us in an essay which points out our national unwillingness—at least up to now—to learn from experience. A possible lesson is stated concisely in his conclusion: "We are not realistic about the enduring sources of our influence and self-confidence as a republican people if we 'pragmatically' exclude from our calculations in our relations abroad considerations of either political integrity or human dignity."

Dr. Anastaplo is chairman of the political science department at Rosary College, River Forest, Illinois. He is also lecturer in the liberal arts at the University of Chicago, and he holds an appointment as professor of politics and literature at the University of Dallas. His book, "The Constitutionalist: Notes on the First Amendment," is to be issued later this year by the Southern Methodist University Press.—from the "Editor's Notebook"

I.

A conspiracy of Greek colonels, in an army trained and equipped for a generation by the United States, began in the early hours of April 21, 1967, to put American foreign policy to a decisive test. A challenge was, in effect, issued that morning to the purpose and good faith of what we Americans have been doing the past quarter-century not only in Greece but all over the world. The remarkable failure of the United States to rise to this occasion in Greece has been irresponsible, revealing, and disquieting. Our failure to appreciate where our true interests lie and what our strength consists in suggests that we may not possess the prudence required if so great a power as ours is to be used responsibly.

Those who argue that the United States, dedicated to imperialism, is determined to ally itself with "reactionary" governments all over the world (whether from ideological sympathy or from considerations of military strategy) really offer us more comfort than the circumstances permit. For they at least infer a sense of purpose from what our government has been doing. It might even be some comfort, for instance, if we could be assured that the colonels who struck down the troubled constitutional government of Greece in April, 1967, acted in the direction, or at least with the connivance, of the United States. Instead, we seem to have been caught by surprise on that occasion, unable to respond prudently to what these men were or to what could be expected of them.

One can see in our confused and vacillating policy toward Greece since the colonels seized power critical features of the approach in handling foreign affairs which led to our debacle in Vietnam. On one side of the world, our approach led to unbecoming paralysis; on the other side, to wasteful adventure. We have exhibited in both places an inability to influence the armed minority whom we have furnished the weapons and respectability which they require to maintain themselves in power against the wishes and welfare of most of their countrymen and against the long-run interests of the United States. Critical in both Greece and Vietnam have been our remarkable inability to find out what is going on and our willingness to accept appraisals that permitted us to continue doing what we had been doing—in one case, nothing, in the other case, too much. Such reluctance to learn and thereafter to change course threatens our ultimate undoing as a great people.

It is no longer necessary to argue that our policy in Vietnam has been disastrous both abroad and at home, so much so that even the American politician who wanted in 1954 to take us into Indochina in support of the French is now constrained as President to attempt to withdraw us from there as unobtrusively as possible. In Vietnam we overstepped ourselves and did serious damage not only to others but to ourselves as well, so much so that we have (in excessive reaction to that misstep) refused to act where we can and should do so effectively. This, we have been told, is in conformity with the determination that the United States now expose abroad a "low profile." Thus, we are now moving to redeem our failure in Vietnam and to insure that we have "no more Vietnams."

But in Greece, we have since April, 1967, so conducted ourselves as to repudiate a success, and indeed perhaps the greatest success of our foreign policy since the Second World War. There the American eagle can be said to have soared, to have displayed itself in its majesty and sense of purpose. For it was in Greece, we have been reminded again and again, that the United States did help a beleaguered people save itself (virtually at the

last minute) from being taken behind the Iron Curtain. It was in Greece that a seriously troubled constitutional government was saved from imminent collapse and the economic and social conditions for its revival and maintenance were furnished. Indeed, we are told, it was what we did in Greece that provided the model and the inspiration for what we were to do immediately thereafter on a grand scale in Western Europe through the Marshall Plan. It was what we did in Greece that earned for us the gratitude and respect of virtually every major political leader of that country, so much so that we enjoyed there for a generation (with general approval of the Greek people) remarkable privileges for the military facilities and operations that we consider vital for the defense of the Eastern Mediterranean and of Europe.

It was what we did *not* do in Greece in April, 1967, when the colonels dared to rise that compelled some Greeks to begin to question the judgment of the United States in Greece. It was what we did not do during 1967 and 1968, as an oppressive, self-righteous, and incompetent regime (cynically invoking the American alliance) systematically purged from their posts most of the military, political, and financial leaders who had been closest to the United States, that led Greeks to question the good faith of the United States in Greece. It was what we did not do when opposition to the regime was expressed in its most authoritative form on September 30, 1969, that required Greeks to question the seriousness of the professed American concern for the restoration of constitutional government in their country. In short, it was what we have not done in Greece since April, 1967, that has raised far-reaching questions about the reliability of the United States as an ally in the cause of freedom under the rule of law, unless that freedom is so fortunate as to seem to be threatened from the extreme left.

II.

The army which was exploited by a handful of junior officers on the evening of April 20, 1967, had been trained in large part by the United States here and in Greece. Promotions and assignments of officers were usually made with American consultation. The relations between the Greek and American commands were intimate and warm: Greek officers regarded the Americans as saviors of their country, a bulwark against the inundation of Greece by "Slavic Communism" from across her northern borders. American officers admired in Greece an army which had fought well in 1940-41 (despite overwhelming odds) against both Italian and German invaders, which had been further tested in the Civil War of 1944-49, and which had contributed gallantly thereafter to the United Nations effort in Korea.

When the long-planned conspiracy struck in April, 1967, proclaiming that it was saving Greece from communism, it brought to power officers who had never distinguished themselves in any of the three campaigns which had shaped the contemporary Greek army: these officers had just barely received their commissions in 1940; they had, for the most part, sat out (and, in a few instances, may even have collaborated with) the Occupation of Greece by the Germans; and they had done far less in the anticommunist Civil War and in the Korean War than many of their colleagues whom they proceeded to arrest, dismiss, and exile in order to secure the power they had unlawfully seized.

American military experts had consistently assured Washington before April, 1967, that the equipment, training, and advice we had so generously provided the Greek army had helped shape it into one of the best in Europe, man for man. Since the seizure of

power in 1967, extensive purges have stripped the army of most of the senior officers who had distinguished themselves in battle and who had thereafter served in important NATO assignments. The better younger officers have been assigned to posts where they can be least dangerous to the usurpers.

Thus, the military apparatus that we helped put together has been dismantled. Nevertheless, one finds upon talking to our military experts both in Athens and at the Pentagon that their assessment is that the Greek army remains as good as it was. When were they wrong, now or then? Greek officers with whom one can talk confidentially insist that the American judgment is based on superficial considerations, on what is readily apparent to the visiting reviewing officer, rather than on the spirit of the army and on the quality of the officers who are now in the ascendancy. I was told on more than one occasion during my most recent visit to Greece (in September-October, 1969), that the army officers least respected by their colleagues have been the ones who have gone along with the colonels and who have been put in key positions; such officers are the only ones who can bear to associate themselves with the kind of men who have seized power on this occasion; such officers are the only ones whom the present rulers of Greece dare trust. The conspirators who now rule Greece remain obsessively alert to threats of conspiracy, so much so that the common good is readily sacrificed in their efforts to preserve themselves in power.

This is the evaluation one hears again and again of what has been happening as well in the towns and villages throughout the country: the elements in the community which had been held in contempt by the bulk of the residents—irrespective of their political sympathies—are the ones who are now collaborating with the colonels' tyranny. Often, they are the very men who collaborated with the Germans during the Occupation a generation ago: they are now able to reassert themselves, just as are the practitioners of torture who had been without "serious" employment since the Civil War. These collaborators take care to parade themselves as acting with the suzerainty, perhaps even at the instigation, of the United States: these are the people we have permitted ourselves to remain associated with in Greece, in order (as the Preamble to the North Atlantic Treaty of April 4, 1949, proclaims) "to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of [our] peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law."

One might have hoped that our sense of self-respect, to say nothing of our long-term interest in the Mediterranean, would keep us from continuing to be thus identified with the worst elements in an allied country, with the very elements which have now been charged with attempting to export military subversion of parliamentary institutions to Italy as well.

III.

When the colonels took over, we found ourselves confronted in Greece (for the first time since the Second World War) by a government we did not know. We *did* know that our sincere friends in Greece—royalists, liberals, conservatives—were immediately arrested by these colonels. We also knew that the communist threat of which so much was made by the colonels (and by the Greek-Americans whom they tricked) was unfounded, so much so that we are not surprised to find less and less made of that justification as the regime becomes more and more secure. But the American government hoped that the colonels were sincere in the assurances they offered that they would return the country to constitutional government as soon as possible.

American officials not only hoped that this was so, but also somehow believed it—and,

even worse, they acted on that belief. What they have said both publicly and privately, in both Athens and Washington, exposed them as believing that the colonels had extensive popular support and that their intentions were honorable. (One could see, upon discussing Greek affairs with American officials in 1967 and 1968, how the Vietnam debacle was permitted to happen.) It is indeed curious that our officials would not understand what was being revealed for all the world to see about the real intentions and the standing in their country of the colonels by the many court-martials of dissenting citizens, by the widespread and deliberate use of torture on suspected opponents, by the extensive purges of all the principal institutions of the country, by the incessant propaganda campaigns (reinforced by repeated raids on the treasury) disparaging the old way and extolling the new, and by the staging in September, 1968, of a "constitutional referendum" in which no effective opposition to the program espoused by the government was permitted.

Our friends in Greece—friends of all parties and of no party—pleaded with American officials to do something, at least to disassociate themselves from the regime, to counter the impressions deliberately given by the colonels to the Greek army that the takeover had been executed or was being maintained at the instigation of Americans. We have made halfhearted efforts from time to time to disassociate ourselves from the regime, but none that were really serious, and certainly none having the decisiveness and effect which would have characterized our actions for everyone in Greece to see if we had detected an incipient communist dictatorship in that country. We have insisted that we should not interfere with the domestic affairs of another country—a rather unfortunate time and place, considering our interference theretofore in Greek affairs, suddenly to become so principled in this respect. It should be noticed, moreover, that the principal "interference" called for by our friends in Greece has been that we make it absolutely clear to the Greek people that we are not supporting the colonels.

The most charitable explanation of why we did not act in 1967 and 1968 is that we allowed ourselves to be deceived. We allowed ourselves to believe, against the evidence that was there for all to see, that the colonels meant well and that, maybe, they would soon go away. We refused to exercise our judgment and thereby began to fritter away our influence. It did not seem to matter to us that the colonels, who had started by being apprehensive of what we might do to them, have come to regard us with contempt and that the Greek people, who had looked to us with hope, have come to regard us with increasing disappointment and hostility. Indeed, it is only a matter of time before the colonels also will be able to become openly hostile to the United States if only to win thereby some genuine support from a people who feel betrayed by us.

Our political analysts now have only one argument to fall back upon in justifying our continued acquiescence with the colonels, the assurances given them by the American military that the Greek army is still in excellent condition, that our military bases in Greece are still essential to the security of the United States, and that the colonels are able to guarantee those bases to us. Our loss of bases in Libya and the marked coolness toward us in Turkey merely intensify the admiration of the Pentagon for our Greek ally, an admiration that disregards the political component of any realistic military assessment. But it is likely that the people who now counsel us about being "pragmatic" with respect to Greece are of the same mentality (they may even be the same individuals) as those who counseled us ten, or even five, years ago to

be pragmatic (and consequently self-destructive) with respect to Turkey and Libya.

Do we really believe the colonels will stay forever? We act as if we do believe that. When the colonels do leave—after five years or a decade or even a generation of domestic strife and bitterness—what kind of regime do we anticipate will follow in Greece?

Do we care?

IV.

The American government did begin in 1969 to have second thoughts about Greece. It had finally become apparent, at least to our political experts, that things were not going well in Greece and that the colonels had not the slightest intention either of withdrawing from power or of restoring constitutional government. Indeed, the Greek government had even begun to be an embarrassment to its faithful American ally. Although we have taken half-hearted measures against the colonels from time to time, we have always refused to resort to those actions (culminating in an announced repudiation of our military association with Greece) which would probably have aroused the Greek army to bring down its usurpers.

We have never been more than half-hearted in disassociating ourselves from the colonels because we felt (after awhile) that we had finally come to know who they were. That is, we have had to find out what the colonels are like, unpalatable and unpromising as they have turned out to be, and so they have become familiar and hence "acceptable" to us as allies. In this attitude, consistent with our desire for a "low profile," we have been "pragmatic": we have insisted, that is, that it is better to "bear those ills we have than fly to others that we know not of." Even so, our insistence, since 1967, that we did not know whose government would follow if the colonels were obliged to decamp required a deliberate act of self-deception on our part; for it did not require much talent to figure out in 1967 or in 1968 or in 1969 who would have succeeded to power in Greece upon the departure of the colonels.

The United States has faced three problems with respect to any potential successor to the colonels: would he be friendly to the United States? would he be wanted by the Greek people? and would he serve if the opportunity offered itself? The potential successor one has heard most about in the three years since the colonels took over was Constantine Karamanlis, living since 1963 in self-imposed exile in Paris. The United States had to admit, with respect to Mr. Karamanlis, that there was no difficulty on the first count: Mr. Karamanlis, who had served successfully for almost eight years (between 1955 and 1963) as a conservative prime minister of Greece, was indeed a proven friend of the United States. So our officials had to fall back upon the insistence that nobody in Greece really wanted Mr. Karamanlis any more, or that, even if he was wanted, he would not be willing or able to return to Greece to take up anew the burdens of office.

Of course, all this was unpersuasive rationalization for an unimaginative, sadly irresponsible, and ultimately inexplicable doing-nothing policy. Consequently, no serious effort was made by our government to find out either what the Greek people and politicians wanted or what Mr. Karamanlis thought. I recall having to insist at length to our official experts both in Washington and in Athens, in 1967, in 1968, and in early 1969, that there could be no question that Mr. Karamanlis was the overwhelming favorite of the Greek people to replace the colonels immediately, that even the minority of sincere supporters of the colonels preferred him to them, and that he himself would be willing and able to return to Greece in the appropriate circumstances. What I knew, our officials could have known, simply by talking to people in Athens

and in the towns of Greece, in the villages, and in the countryside, as well as by talking to the most eminent Greeks living abroad.

But it was easier for our government, burdened with its troubles on the other side of the world and concerned about the instability of the Middle East, to rely upon the colonels' pronouncements and assurances, even going so far as to argue that if the Greeks really did not like the colonels' regime they would have expressed themselves in more acts of violence than had yet become evident. "Why should we resist in this way, and thereby risk our lives and liberty and jobs," Greeks have responded to such an argument from Americans, "when it is evident to us that the junta is ruling only because your government wants or at least permits it to do so?" Or, put in the American vernacular, "Why fight city hall?" No doubt, some criticisms can be made of the Greek people, and particularly of all their political leaders, of the past decade. But this is not the occasion, nor is it my role, to do so: there are Greeks enough to do this in due time. My legitimate concern and duty are with respect to the conduct of my government in Washington—and that conduct has been incredibly foolish both in its disregard of moral principle and in its strategic shortsightedness in going along with a regime far worse than the one which was overthrown.

And so there were two and a half years of self-deception, of false hopes, of repeated postponements of the decisions that should have been made by the United States. But then there came Mr. Karamanlis's Paris statement of September 30, 1969. The statement made absolutely clear: what had been apparent to everyone who had talked seriously with Mr. Karamanlis since the summer of 1967, that he thought the colonels a disaster for Greece both domestically and internationally and that he was willing to accept a political role in Greece upon their removal from office. The enthusiastic response to his statement in Greece, from people and politicians of all political persuasions, made absolutely clear what should have been long apparent to anyone who claims any ability to gauge the sentiment of a suppressed people—that the Greek people and their legitimate leaders are sick and tired of the colonels and eager to have Mr. Karamanlis contribute to the restoration of "democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law" to his troubled country.

v.

Mr. Karamanlis said in his September statement the things that needed to be said—not that they had not been said by others many times before, but their restatement by someone of his prestige, and in a way appropriate to someone known to be a moderate statesman, did impress the Greek people and should have impressed the United States.

Among the observations made by Mr. Karamanlis on this occasion were the following:

"It is now one year since the famous [constitutional] plebiscite [of September 29, 1968] and, instead of making progress, the cause of democracy in Greece has moved dangerously backwards. The government has become more tyrannical and now identifies itself with democracy in the most cynical possible manner. Arbitrary rule has now become entrenched and the despairing opposition of the people has reached new heights. . . .

"[The Government] has dismembered the armed forces of Greece by subjecting them to a process of Sovietization and by the dismissal of hundreds of high-ranking battle-experienced officers who might have hindered their objectives. . . .

"It has isolated the country politically and morally. Greece, nucleus of the European spirit, is now being pushed out of the family

of free nations. And to appreciate the full significance of this isolation, we must bear in mind the critical geopolitical position of our country and the fact that Greece will find herself excluded from the European groupings which are now taking shape, to the detriment not only of her economy but of her national security. . . .

"Worst of all, the government clings to its initial error and, instead of searching for a solution of the problem, seeks ways and means to ensure the indefinite continuation of the present regime. Until recently, it believed it could succeed by an electoral coup. Indeed, it went in search of collaborators for that purpose. Now it seeks the same objectives by terrorization of the Greek people and by hoodwinking international public opinion.

"And the government clings to its errors because it does not realize that if the reactions against it—both domestic and international—have so far been of a moderate nature, it is because of the expectations that were created by the repeated assurances it gave about the restoration of democracy. But the deception is now plain for all to see, and the government, under the pressure of the gathering storm, will be forced to make a choice:

"It would be far preferable if the choice were made in good time and in accordance with the interests of the nation. For if the delay is too long, there will no longer be a choice available. . . ."

Mr. Karamanlis can be said to have done what he could on this occasion. The question then became: what would the United States and the Greek army do in response to his call to the Greek government and to "those who, directly or indirectly, support it"?

The largely purged and carefully watched army would not move so long as its mentor across the Atlantic continued to associate publicly with and apparently support the Greek government; the lessons of a generation had been learned too well to be disregarded even on this critical occasion. Thus, it came down to what the United States would do, what signal it would give to the Greek people and especially to the Greek army, now that Mr. Karamanlis had issued, and in such unequivocal terms, his long-awaited statement in the name of political legitimacy in Greece. The United States then had the assurance and the lead some had argued it had had to wait for.

It was apparent to anyone who canvassed our embassy in Athens the morning of October 1, and the State Department and Pentagon shortly thereafter, that the United States would do nothing to take advantage of this new development.

We had become a paper eagle.

vi.

My most recent visit to Greece, to which I have already referred, was divided at midpoint by the issuance of the Karamanlis statement. Before it was issued, one encountered in Greece a sense of hopeless despair: the colonels were there to stay; their purges had been ruthless and effective; the United States was going along with them; the only way out seemed to be civil war, something that few Greeks can yet bear the thought of after the bloodletting of 1944-49. There had been since April, 1967, a generally deteriorating condition economically and socially. Education had already been severely damaged, as had been the arts. A generation of suppression and futile resistance seemed to lie ahead: at a time when Greece's European allies were living in peace and prosperity, the Greek people could expect nothing for years to come but the righteous posturings of self-serving dictators against a background of sporadic bombings by a few and of sullen resentment of the regime by many.

The Karamanlis statement (despite the absolute prohibition of it from the "free press" of Greece) immediately changed the atmosphere: hope welled up; opponents of

the regime (of all parties) were encouraged; even supporters of the regime could dare admit that they had had enough of being silenced and ordered around by a gang of armed opportunists and ruffians whom it was hard to take seriously and even harder to ignore. This newfound optimism rested upon two assumptions which I had no reason to share but which I did not have the heart to disparage in my October conversations with Greeks: it was felt by many of them that Mr. Karamanlis would not have moved if he had not had American encouragement and that the United States would not hear his call without responding sufficiently to help the Greeks dislodge the colonels.

The Greeks, however, did not realize, as did Mr. Karamanlis, that time was running out even for him, that if he did not act soon, he might not again be in a position to act at all. His statement seems to have been more an attempt to move the United States than a response in concert with American efforts. That is, he did what he did in the hope that others (in Greece and abroad) would do what they could do. There may have been an outside chance that army officers (despite their crippling legalism) might be spurred by his intervention to move on their own; or, failing that, that the United States would take advantage of the Karamanlis initiative by using its remaining prestige and considerable power in Greece to get things (and particularly the army) moving. My October soundings in the American government and in the Greek army revealed that no significant response could be expected from either quarter.

The circumstances of Greek life today are not such that a statement such as Mr. Karamanlis's can be alone sufficient to topple a military dictatorship or to arouse sustained public movements. His statement did have to be taken seriously, but primarily because of what might have happened in the army because of it, and that depended ultimately on what might have happened abroad.

vii.

A tiresome tyranny continues to dominate everyday life in Greece: some torture probably continues; mass arrests certainly continue; detention without trial continues; bloodless purges in all influential institutions continue; strict control of all forms of communication continues. The visitor who knows some Greek cannot help but notice a pervasive sense of oppression, unless he permits himself to be diverted (as many prominent Greek-Americans have been) by the flattery, the dubious history, and the privileges offered him by the Greek government. Greece is today, for the man of any sensitivity and alertness, depressing place to live or even to visit, much as I would expect to find Czechoslovakia to be these days. The known foreign critic of the colonels' regime can expect to find surveillance, harassment, and physical threats awaiting him in Greece. Thus, a foreign correspondent stationed in Athens insisted I call him at least once a day while I was there just to assure him that he need not initiate inquiries about me.

Such attentions were inspired in my own case by the half-dozen articles I had published in the United States since the colonels seized power. These attentions were intensified during my most recent visit to Greece by the questions I was obliged to put and the attitude I had found it difficult to conceal in Athens, especially at two press conferences called by the government during the week after the issuance of the Karamanlis statement. Since my inquiries and the responses to them illuminate the present situation in Greece, they bear reporting here.

The first press conference featured the prime minister, Colonel George Papadopoulos himself, on the morning of October 3, 1969, in the Senate Chamber of the Parliament Building. I was able, at the beginning of the conference, to put a question to the architect

of the conspiracy which now rules Greece, a question which drew explicitly upon the Karamanlis statement.

Mr. Karamanlis had urged, as he prepared to conclude the September 30 statement in which he had called upon the colonels to withdraw,

"The [Greek] government bears the responsibility for deciding, along with those who, directly or indirectly, support it. If, therefore, those who govern at present, captivated by power, fail to appreciate their duty, it will have to be pointed out to them by those officers who joined them in good faith. But beyond them, the whole of the country's armed forces must undertake the task. It is they who, having their origins among the mass of the people, bear the grave responsibility, on behalf of the nation, of protecting its freedom, security and independence."

My question was designed to explore the implications of this call. It was a question which exposed for the first time to public view (because of the mandatory radio and press display these press conferences receive) implications of Mr. Karamanlis's call and of the colonels' status, implications which no Greek journalist and no foreign correspondent permanently stationed in Greece could afford to probe into publicly. It was evident to me—and observed by several others who were present—that this was the inquiry which Mr. Papadopoulos least expected and was most disturbed by on this occasion. Our exchange, after I identified myself, went like this:

"A: We have been told many times that the April 21st revolution was made by Army officers who sincerely believed that they had to intervene when they did in order to rescue Greece from its deteriorating situation. My question addresses itself to the central problem of the legitimacy of the present regime and of its continuation in power.

"What do you, as Prime Minister and as Minister of Defense, advise those intelligent and sincere Army officers who should now honestly believe that your regime has been disastrous for Greece and who agree with Mr. Karamanlis that immediate intervention by the Army is again necessary in order to rescue Greece from its dangerously deteriorating situation?"

"P: Have you posed a hypothetical question?"

A: No, this is not hypothetical. This is not hypothetical because, as I understand Mr. Karamanlis's statement, he has called upon sincere, intelligent and honest Army officers to reevaluate the situation and to correct their mistakes.

"P: I am sorry but my reply will be somewhat strange. If I were certain of the cool-headedness of the intelligent and sincere officers of the Greek army, I would send the gentleman [asking the question] to these same officers to ask for their reply. But because I am not certain of the amount of cool-headedness which they can show in such a case, I will not ask the gentleman to find out for himself from these officers but I will ask him to wait for any developments and see what happens."

Conscientious army officers who studied the published transcript of this press conference, I have been told, found my question even more interesting and worthy of study because of the way the colonel was obliged to attempt to handle it.

The second press conference I attended that week featured the economics minister (Minister of Coordination), Colonel Nicholas Makarezos, on the morning of October 4, in an auditorium of the Grande Bretagne Hotel. We were told about the economic gains Greece had made since April, 1967, and about the prospects that the colonels had in store for their deserving country, all in response to Mr. Karamanlis's September 30 critique:

"[The government] has continued in an even more acute form the demagogic policies

of its predecessors, thereby undermining the economic future of the country, increasing without a care consumer expenditures at the expense of investment, widening the balance of payments gap (making good the deficiency by borrowing on the most onerous terms), and, finally, permitting an enormous increase in the country's foreign exchange debt, now estimated at 1,870 million dollars, of which 420 millions are in the form of short-term commercial credits. All this must give rise to the gravest anxiety for the future."

The audience on this occasion, which should have been (next to the two hundred officers who executed the conspiracy in April, 1967) the most enthusiastic of any the colonels could get together, has been described by the government as including "the Archbishop, members of the Cabinet, Governors and Directors of banks and public organizations, the Deans of the higher schools, State dignitaries and officials, representatives of the world of production, representatives of leagues and organizations of Athens, Piraeus, and various other regions of the country."

The most remarkable thing about this press conference was the obvious reluctance of even this captive audience (despite the vigorous promptings of a claque) to express enthusiasm of what Colonel Makarezos said.

I asked at one point whether there had been any restraints placed by the government upon imports into Greece. The colonel assured us there had not, that the Greek economy remained one of the freest in the world and that the policies and effects of the new government had not required and would not require the imposition of any such restrictions. When I got a microphone again, I thought it useful to return to my question in some such form as this:

"This seems to me the kind of regime in which, because of restrictions on the press and on political opposition, it is difficult to learn what is really happening. Thus, one must investigate in a roundabout way what a situation is if the truth about it is to be discovered. For example, with respect to the balance of payments issue which everyone recognizes is vital to the welfare of the Greek people, one must consider how any dangerously excessive balance of payments deficit would be corrected or concealed by your government: by increasing foreign investment in Greece (which would be, of course, a generally healthy development); by "borrowing abroad on the most onerous terms"; by secretly shifting funds from one account to another; or by restricting imports. I have come across indications that each of these four possible measures has been resorted to by your government. Have there not been, for instance, some governmental restrictions, informal if not formal, upon private importations during the past eighteen months?"

We were again assured by the colonel that there had been absolutely no restrictions imposed on imports and that the balance of payments situation was excellent. I confirmed, upon canvassing (at a press reception immediately afterwards) various of the correspondents present, what I had heard from the director of a bank and from several economists in Athens, that the government had indeed imposed various indirect (but not publicly admitted) restrictions on imports in its futile attempt to curb a serious balance of payments problem that had been aggravated by the colonels in their efforts to impress public opinion at home and abroad (with public works and massive propaganda expenditures) and to buy off Army officers and others (with substantial increases in economic privileges).

The correspondents with whom I talked are reluctant to publish anything about such developments, lest they be accused (if Greek) of "spreading rumors harmful to the economy" (which is now a serious criminal offense) or lest they be expelled (if foreigners) for "evident hostility to the regime." I

should add that I heard during my 1969 visit several detailed accounts of bribery and financial corruption of prominent people in or close to the colonels' families and government, something which I had not heard in 1967 or 1968. This official corruption promises to be far worse (because of the inability of honest men to deter it by the prospect of public exposure) than anything known under Greece's political governments since the Second World War.

It was during the press reception immediately following the Makarezos press conference that I had still another encounter with a government official (this one from the Office of the Prime Minister) which is revealing of the tone of the regime, especially as it suggests the kind of attitude a known critic of the regime, who is fortunate enough to enjoy considerable immunity because he is an American citizen by birth, is apt to encounter. The official (another former army officer) had been present at both the press conferences I attended that week. He descended upon me after I had finished talking with two foreign correspondents in the hotel lobby just outside the auditorium in which the Makarezos performance had been staged. Our exchange went something like this:

"A: We meet again. What's the matter this time?"

"B: I saw you passing out some more of your anti-government literature.

"A: I hope you don't believe I was trying to hide what I did in giving a foreign journalist a copy of the article I gave you last week.

"B: You are our guest here and yet you act as you do.

"A: Excuse me; I don't consider myself your guest, but rather a guest of the Greek people. But however that may be, I really don't see anything wrong in what I've just done.

"B: You should not do it so openly.

"A: You can say I'm a hopeless case. What do you expect me to do, take a strange man to my hotel room to slip him one of my articles?"

"B: You could have done it somewhere else.

"A: I do not know if I'll ever see him again. Besides, did not your Prime Minister tell us yesterday that the Greeks have liberty?"

"B: We do. Have you not been allowed to ask ministers unfriendly questions all week? You just asked some more of your unfriendly questions back in there!

"A: But your liberty does not extend out here to the lobby? Why do you bother to call it "liberty"?"

"B: Of course, it's liberty. You couldn't do it in America either what you have just done out here.

"A: Are you serious? I could not give a journalist in America an article critical of the regime?"

"B: That's right. I've been in America.

"A: And this is what you believe things to be like there?"

"B: I know them to be that way. I spent six months there.

"A: Where? In some prison?"

"B: What do you mean by that remark?"

"A: Where else can you have gotten the opinion you have about how we Americans behave? And now, you have imprisoned the Greeks and you call it "liberty."

"B: Why don't you leave us Greeks to run our own affairs?"

"A: Why must you pretend the Greeks are running their own affairs now?"

"B: You Americans should take care of your own business and stop interfering with ours.

"A: One difficulty is that your government asks us to interfere up to a point but to go no further: you want our military aid and our approval, but you do not want us to

examine what it is that we are being asked to aid and to approve.

"B: Whatever you say, you must know you are misbehaving.

"A: I certainly know I'm doing things you don't like."

One finds in the dictatorship of the colonels, as reflected in the three exchanges I have reconstructed, a curious mixture of the naive and the shameless. It is this characteristic of the regime, which parades itself at both Greek and a faithful American ally, which can be most disturbing to either an American or a Greek with pride in his country, even more so than the veiled threats encountered by the critic.

VIII.

Those of us who have been predicting serious damage to both the United States and Greece if we continue to support the colonels' regime and thereby help perpetuate it in power will, I am afraid, have an opportunity to test our prediction. It now seems likely that even the halfhearted rebukes the United States has leveled now and then at the colonels are going to be suspended (and that the military aid we have partially suspended is now going to be fully restored). Indeed, the United States further identified itself with the colonels' regime by making unsuccessful efforts in December, 1969, to dissuade member governments of the Council of Europe from "push[ing Greece] out of the family of free nations."

We can expect the dramatic Karamanlis intervention of September, 1969, soon to begin to lose momentum—and with it the hope of a peaceful solution to the continuing Greek crisis. We can expect to find serious-minded Greeks becoming even more bitter than they already are about the role of the United States in their country. This should be accompanied, among informed Greeks, by a sense of helplessness even deeper than before the issuance of the Karamanlis statement on which so many hopes had ridden. We can expect to find, thereafter, a sense of resignation among moderate Greeks and (for the first time) even some cooperation with the regime by some educated men who will come to feel that they must "get on with the business of living." Thus, within a couple of years we can expect to find that even Mr. Karamanlis will have become passé, as Greeks discern he has been exposed to be as helpless as they are to influence the Americans or to displace the colonels.

When the regime has thus found its position better secured—with Mr. Karamanlis (and other political figures) out of contention from abroad and with its thorough purges of domestic institutions completed—the colonels can then begin to try to repair the damage they will have done in their campaign to remain in power at all costs. Thus, for example, they can then consider devaluing the drachma, which has been much abused and artificially maintained by them in order to bolster their prestige among economic illiterates and Greek-Americans. Whether a recession develops in 1971 may depend on how lucky Greece and the colonels are, on what happens elsewhere in Europe and in the Middle East. Certainly, the colonels have recklessly created conditions for serious economic and social difficulties in Greece—if not for themselves, at least for their successors.

There is no prospect in Greece of a return to genuine parliamentary government so long as the colonels stay. They themselves must realize that they could not long survive, should martial law be lifted and should freedom of speech and of the press be restored, the public ridicule which the liberated Greek people would be capable of and which the colonels already invite. A public debate is something that none of them has

experience in or is capable of: without their guns and tanks they would be laughingstocks that no one would take seriously, except perhaps as objects of revenge. The prospect then is of a military tyranny which, in its vulnerability, could fall overnight due to the sudden pressure of chance events (related, for example, to Cyprus), but which is more likely to retain its conspiratorial grip for a generation.

Whether civil war, as distinguished from an escalation of bombings and sabotage and underground activity, will erupt in Greece, will depend on circumstances that are difficult to predict. But what can be predicted with some assurance (if the United States continues as it has) is that the political governments which follow the colonels five, ten, or twenty years from now will find it virtually necessary (if they are to survive popular attack and if they are to prevent a decisive move of Greek politics to the extreme left) to revise radically their alliance with the America which has been so successfully deceived and exploited by the colonels and to which the Greeks will (not without some justice) attribute their humiliating oppression.

Thus, the American policy makes political and military sense only if it should be assumed that Greece's friendship and strategic position are of use to us only for a few more years. Or, put another way, the United States must make the Gaullist NATO-policy of Andreas Papandreou look better and better to the suppressed Greek people every time we permit an American general to be photographed in comradesly association with the colonels.

IX.

Even more serious for America than the deterioration of a valuable alliance between the United States and Greece is what our behavior with respect to Greece may reveal about how we conduct our affairs all over the world.

If our political leaders, including our State Department experts, had a better idea of what they were doing, and were to insist upon their professional and constitutional prerogatives, our military people would be more likely to do their jobs properly. To some extent, the usurpation of political functions and judgments by military men may represent a sincere attempt on their part to take up the slack left by the incompetence, diffidence, or negligence of civilians. But our military are ill-equipped to make political judgments: in this they share the disabilities of the Greek colonels, who can seize and hold power but who do not really know what to do with it. Our military (if permitted to behave elsewhere as they have behaved, or as they seem to have behaved, in Greece) can succeed only in undermining our traditional respect for them, that public trust and accompanying honor which most fittingly reward and sustain men who devote their lives to the defense of their country.

Thus, we cannot be fair either to our military or to ourselves if we permit or require them to assume duties and make judgments for which they are not equipped. We are not realistic about the enduring sources of our influence and self-confidence as a republican people if we "pragmatically" exclude from our calculations in our relations abroad considerations of either political integrity or human dignity.

In continuing to associate as allies with the petty tyrants of Greece, we may be hopeful that we will be able to raise them to our level. Instead, we are much more likely to lower ourselves to theirs, at least in the eyes of decent men who know what is really going on in that long-suffering country.

Is this what our "low profile" is to mean abroad—that the American eagle must be ignominiously grounded?

AN ALLY LOST

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon said on July 15, 1971, 10:30 p.m., Washington time:

Premier Chou En Lai, on behalf of the Peoples Republic of China, has extended an invitation to President Nixon to visit China at an appropriate date before May, 1972. (I) accept the invitation with pleasure.

Radio Peking said on July 15, 1971, 10:45 p.m., Washington time:

People of the world, unite and defeat the U.S. aggressors and all their running dogs.

Many experienced China hands have aptly termed the President's announcement "total surrender." Our allies in Southeast Asia—and certainly all of the Chinese people—must regard it as a "sell out" or collaboration.

Our Nationalist Chinese allies, who are most immediately affected by the move, have—through authoritative statements in their press—termed the Nixon visit "foolish," "humiliating to President Nixon," and "shameful." The Chinese Ambassador to Washington, whom I called to deliver an apology on behalf of most of the people I represent, has expressed "shock" and "disbelief." These reactions are appropriate. The President's impending visit to Peking means a certain knife in the back for our long-time Taiwan allies. Nationalist China has declared that she will "go it alone" rather than submit to the infamy of a "two-China policy." The outlaw regime of rulers in Peking has also rejected any such "two-China policy." President Nixon's "normalization of relations" with the Chinese Communists therefore will be at the direct expense of our Nationalist allies, the legitimate government of the Chinese people.

But the implications of the visit for our other friends in Asia—and throughout the world—is just as significant. The Peking meeting indicates clearly that the United States has abandoned an anti-Communist policy in Asia—and probably everywhere else. The nations which have backed the American policy of stemming Communist aggression in the past must now see the handwriting on the wall. They can no longer maintain an isolated struggle against the Communist giant with any significant hope of success. The dominoes are beginning to wobble.

As I said after I called the White House staff to cancel my invitation to a cruise—along with several other Congressmen and White House staff members—aboard the Presidential yacht, *Sequoia*:

It is ironic that as Red China continues to export terrorism and totalitarianism and as she continues to actively assist in the killing of American and South Vietnamese defenders of freedom, the President of the United States announces that he will go to Peking—without his troops—to effect a "normalization of relations."

The President's announcement appears hypocritical—even to those who

might support his China move—when compared with his statement earlier this year that “an honorable relationship with Peking cannot be constructed at the expense of our Asian allies.” It is further ironic that as the U.S. Government initiates overtures to some of our most blood-thirsty and ruthless enemies, we continue to penalize nations, such as Rhodesia, which have consistently demonstrated their support of U.S. anti-Communist foreign policy.

There will certainly be some criticism of my stand in total and absolute opposition to the President, on the grounds that I am a Republican. However, it is my firm opinion that we should support principles, and people to the same extent that they support such principles.

The free world has lost an important battle. Not a battle marked by the clash of opposing armies but a battle of wills. As the ancient Sun Tzu pointed out, “To fight and conquer in all your battles is not supreme excellence: supreme excellence consists in breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting.”

It is impossible for me to support or condone this massive free world defeat.

SOUND THINKING OF OUR YOUTH

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, today our young people are often accused unjustly concerning their thoughts and actions. However, the great majority of them still think and act soundly.

It was a great satisfaction to me to hear the authors read recently the first three winning essays in the program of Rededication of the Freedom Shrine at the Swainsboro, Georgia High School Auditorium. Copies of the essays are furnished through the courtesy of Mr. M. D. Boatwright, Director, Swainsboro Area Vocational-Technical School.

The essays are as follows:

First place, “The Freedom Shrine,” by Sharon Davis, Exchange Club Essay Contest.

Second place, “What the Freedom Shrines Mean to Me,” by Chucky Moye—Mrs. Eloise Bailey's English IV Class.

Third place, “What the Freedom Documents Mean to Me,” By George L. Smith, III (Mrs. Eloise Bailey's English IV).

Also, Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to know that the young people have an active “Swainsboro Youth for Christ” movement.

Following is a report on their activities:

THE FREEDOM SHRINE

(By Sharon Davis)

Freedom Shrines are displayed in various places to be an emblem of freedom and democracy to all Americans. If there should be a poll taken of all the Americans who know about or even appreciate a Freedom Shrine, the number would be surprisingly small. When I thought seriously of what it means to me, my mind revolved back to the many famous documents in the lobby of my high school. If I were to casually wander into

this building and still very casually look and read over a few of the documents, my first impression would not be a spine-tingling mind-expanding experience. On the contrary I would not be affected at all. Some people would explain that these papers, exact copies of the ones in the Library of Congress, made America free. But these mere papers did not make our country, the home of our forefathers and children to come, a free land for all who wished to share its freedom. The men behind these documents, the love, time, and effort spent for these documents made this land your land and my land. If people do not appreciate, understand, or relate themselves to what the men behind the documents did for our nation, then the Freedom Shrine will never reserve a place as the proclamation of our freedom.

The mounted pieces of paper are but legal reminders of what was sacrificed for the freedom to live as we please. Over the years we have most certainly taken advantage of this freedom. Today's population has but a particle of responsibility compared to the time of the Revolutionary War and on up through the Depression. Not being burdened with these responsibilities, man has taken a no caring, self-only attitude which may bring upon his downfall. I am not saying that the average American citizen has completely lost all patriotism. Even I, as a teenager who knows nothing of what freedom really is feel a chill of pride and reverence as “The Star-Spangled Banner” is played, or the flag is raised, or a large group humbly pledges allegiance to the flag. To me, this is very much real and makes me proud to be an American.

As we trace back over the years in our United States history when America was formed and built, I have begun to realize what really took place to make this home of mine what it is today. Real live people with families, and houses, and jobs risked their lives to build my country. Real live people who had some of the same problems that I have today dedicated themselves to furnish me the freedom they never would know. Real live people who loved, lost, dreamed, fought, and died sacrificed to give me a life to live in freedom. And what have I done to show my gratitude for this unrepayable gift? Nothing at all but become more irresponsible and unworthy of this purchaseless gift. This freedom should be cherished as a true gift from God who made this all possible in the first place. The men who wrote the documents in the freedom Shrine had the future of the United States in mind when they signed them. They hoped and prayed with all their hearts that these efforts represented by these documents would live on forever and serve as an inspiration to future Americans to keep this country free. These efforts and accomplishments were to be remembered and honored as deeds of respect for the greatest country on the face of the earth.

Just seeing the Declaration of Independence does nothing to set afire my pride and patriotism in America. Only knowing what this sacred documents stands for makes it worth while without understanding what was endured, what was behind the flourish of pen and ink, what courage and suffering was inflicted, these documents are not really worth the paper used to print them on. Unless Americans understand how their priceless heritage was accomplished, a Freedom Shrine is useless.

It always seems that the same people who complain about the state of our nation never turn a hand to do something about changing it. They know nothing at all about establishing a democracy with the freedom of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and actually could care less. The average American could not tell you what the Treaty of Paris, the Monroe Doctrine, or the Nineteenth Amendment were all about, let alone what they contributed to our nation. To the

common American it is very hard to get excited about something which took place so many years before, especially if it has no direct effect on them. If there were to be a stop to the war in Vietnam, people would really get excited, because they can associate with it personally. Something so long ago seems irrelevant to them no matter how much it has helped them. They need to understand before they can attempt to appreciate. With this understanding The Freedom Shrine is indeed priceless, but without this knowledge of what this whole country is about, we may as well hand up blank sheets of paper—they would serve the same purpose.

WHAT THE FREEDOM SHRINE MEANS TO ME

(By Chucky Moye)

As I began to concentrate on writing this paper I realized that I had never thought about the Freedom Shrine, in fact, I did not even know it existed. So I decided that I would start from the bottom and learn a few basic facts about it. The Freedom Shrine is a group of twenty-eight documents, all of which played an important role in American history. As I read over a few of them, I realized that these were more than just pieces of paper; they were America. They made me feel proud to be an American, but they also made me see all the troubles we have faced and will always have to face. As I read each document I could see the history of America unfold in my mind. As I read the Declaration of Independence I could visualize the patriots fighting at Lexington and Concord and see the fiery look in the eyes of Patrick Henry. While reading the Gettysburg Address I could see a great man trying to mold together our divided country. Each document added something and seemed to bring back the past.

In a time when everyone seems to have forgotten the past, it was stirring. I realized what a great nation and heritage each American has. To me the Freedom Shrine means three things: the spirit of America, the trials of America and the glory of America.

The spirit of America is most evident in the Declaration of Independence. A British colony wanted to have a land of liberty and freedom for all, and they were willing to fight for it. Americans in 1776, and today, want the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This document beautifully shows hardworking men striving for what they believed certain God-given rights. They were successful and got their freedom and since then America has been the land of freedom. For freedom is truly the spirit of America and the one thing America is based upon.

The trials of America are best illustrated by the Gettysburg Address. At that time America was a country split in half undergoing a civil war. The war was ruining the country and making progress for America impossible. Then, after the Battle of Gettysburg, itself a turning point in the war, Abraham Lincoln made this great speech. He tried to unite Americans with a common bond and instill in them the spirit of America. He knew America was in a troubled time, but if everyone acted like an American, we would survive. After the war and reconstruction era, our Nation became stronger and more united because of it.

The glory of America is best shown by the Instruments of Surrender from World War II. America had not wanted to become involved in the war, but because of Pearl Harbor, found it necessary. We were not prepared for a war, but we had to become involved. Every able-bodied man and woman came to the aid of America. The men fought and the women and children ran the homes, farms, and factories. Every American did his share and as a result, we won the war. When things looked their darkest and other nations gave up, America turned the tide of the war. Never

has America been greater and her glory more evident.

The Freedom Shrine means to me a great nation, America, where everyone is free and the people are willing to fight for their freedom. A land where no one can tell me what I can or cannot do as long as I do not interfere with the well-being of another. A land that is the greatest nation and commands more respect than any other country on earth. America is truly the land of the free and the home of the brave, where every man is equal, distinguished only by his accomplishments. A land which is not perfect, but is way ahead of any other nation.

WHAT THE FREEDOM DOCUMENTS MEAN TO ME (By George L. Smith III)

In our rich and bountiful world, the United States of America stands out over every country as the world's paradise. Truly, freedom is the main idea that created this vast nation. Our great country was not created over night and although it is operating successfully, it still can use many, many changes to improve itself.

The Freedom Shrine, the Exchange Club's way of trying to instill a patriotic generation does encourage those who take the time to read it toward a nationalistic viewpoint. Each and every one of the documents on display speaks for itself in explaining what its purpose is and each document is individualistic, to the point, and gives Americans a sense of pride.

Take, for instance, The Declaration of Independence written in 1776. This document definitely shows the views that Americans had two centuries ago and the feeling that most Americans have today. This paper is an example of dignity and determination that true Americans feel and experience; to stand up for what one thinks is right.

Without men such as Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and George Washington, our country could not have gotten off the ground. These men encouraged freedom throughout the colonies, getting ideas started, and people organized for a great revolution.

The Exchange Club's Freedom Shrine has been set up all over the nation. Surely it has encouraged patriotism, which seems to be its purpose. To me, when I read it, Chill bumps crept up my spine tingling all over. I thought of the brilliant minds behind our country and their beliefs in equality which has surely created the greatest nation of all time.

I feel the Bill of Rights, written in 1791, is the most important document of all. It states in black and white the rights man has. Although they are twisted around a lot, when it gets down to the nitty-gritty, these several rights are what America stands on for its laws today. The Bill of Rights could be expressed by one other word: equality. These rights are what each American deserves, the men deserve it for defending the country, and the women for helping it grow.

The Star Spangled Banner is in itself a teacher. If one thinks of what he is singing when he sings the song, he would realize what men have done to defend this great symbol of ours, the stars and stripes. The song expresses a feeling that will also send a tingle up your spine. A great tune with great lyrics, the Star Spangled Banner definitely does have a place in the Freedom Shrine.

As did the Bills of Rights, the Emancipation Proclamation also expressed equality within its composition. Slaves, products of the cotton plantations and the match to the great fire, the Civil War, had been mistreated badly by most all of the slave owners. This in itself explains that it, the Emancipation Proclamation, shows the rights of equality one obtains when he enters the United States, no matter if his color, hair or clothes are different from the one's already here.

The Freedom Shrine is not just something that one goes to see how many rights or the measure of equality he has. I feel that it is also to show how great, vast, and different is the country we live in.

Sure, we have our problems, but the majority of us are happier than if we were under a Communist government.

To exhibit the United States' great power, the Exchange Club had the Monroe Doctrine put on display in the Freedom Shrine. The document states, "The United States will not permit any European nation to extend its holdings or use armed force on the two American continents." When President Monroe signed this document, he was not trying to bully the other continents, but demonstrating the determination of the United States to see that these new countries had a chance to choose what kind of government each one wanted. This goes to show that the United States is not here to take over the world, but to be fair in helping people to help themselves. Just as most of the other proud Americans in this country, I also believe this statement is very true.

Since the first Freedom Shrine document was written in 1620, our nation has come from just a few colonies here and there, to a stupendous, fabulous nation. These Freedom Shrine documents stand for years of hard work by many a person to shape a free nation. If it were not for these documents and the men behind them, then our country, the United States of America, would not be the great country it is today.

SWAINSBORO YOUTH FOR CHRIST

The young people of Swainsboro, Georgia are concerned about their positions in life and about the positions of the people about them. Because of this concern, a group of them met and decided to help anybody they could. The name of this group is Swainsboro Youth for Christ. It is composed of youth from five different churches in the town and has about twenty-five active members. The purpose of the team is to tell other youth about God and to influence them in a spiritual way. It has been a big success.

The Swainsboro Youth for Christ Team was started by a similar team from Wrens, Georgia who held a revival in various local churches. The revivals are constructed so that several young people give a testimony each night and only young people take an active part in the service. By leading the services in this way, more young people become involved and a better example is set.

During the past year the group has led revivals on weekends in various parts of the state and has helped in starting two other teams. The results of all these revivals have been great and both youth and adults are strengthened by them. At present the Youth Team is planning a weekend conference attended by youth from all the churches that revivals have been held in. Many guest speakers are being invited and everyone expects a fun, meaningful weekend.

The team is small, but it is growing and each member feels that he is doing something for God and is helping others.

HIGH REGARD TO BILL REISINGER

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Bill Reisinger has been a constituent of mine since the 10th District of Virginia was created, and I was elected to represent it in 1952. His mother's

family has been associated with the politics of northern Virginia from the time of the Continental Congress. His grandfather, Joel Grayson, served as superintendent of the House Document Room until his death in 1927, and quite probably served in that position longer than any other superintendent. His mother's sister, Mrs. F. Hosea Curtice, is today a respected elder stateswoman in the politics of west Fairfax County.

Over the years Bill has played an effective part in county politics, moving from precinct worker up through the ranks, and since the late fifties, has been increasingly associated with congressional and national activities of the Republican Party. His formal employment as a member of the staff of four Republican Members of the House has justly earned him the respect and high regard of many Members as well as staff personnel.

DRUG-ABUSE TREATMENT IN NEW HAVEN, CONN.

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, parents, school officials, and municipal leaders in New Haven, Conn., and surrounding towns have come to realize in the past few years the extent of drug-abuse problems, as well as the enormous commitment of planning and resources needed to attack those problems.

Extensive Federal funds have been committed to drug education, treatment, and prevention programs in the New Haven area, primarily because of the presence of the pioneering drug dependence unit of the Connecticut Mental Health Center, administered by Dr. Herbert Kleber, and also because of the activities of community groups and municipal leaders in assessing and attempting to correct growing drug abuse problems.

Recent testimony by the mayor of New Haven, the Honorable Bartholomew F. Guida, presented to the House Select Committee on Crime, focused on the background of the drug-abuse problem in New Haven and the steps which have been and are being taken to attack the problem. I would like to share this testimony, along with supporting materials, with my fellow Members of Congress so that other communities might benefit from New Haven's experience, and also to focus on the need for further Federal financial commitment to cities and States which are attacking the causes and developing the cures for drug abuse.

Following Mayor Guida's testimony, and a newspaper article summarizing that testimony, I am inserting a description of the mayor's task force on drug abuse, recently established to coordinate some of the efforts of ongoing education and treatment organizations, and to define further community and regional priorities for future action. An outline of this effort may also be of use to other communities which find themselves with

independently developing programs. Finally, I am inserting a second newspaper article which, sadly, chronicles the evidence that the Federal commitment to drug control has yet to stem this tide of drug abuse, crime, and violence and personal tragedy. Communities listed in this article have made valiant efforts to control their drug problems, and each could profitably use further financial support in their efforts. As Mayor Guida noted in his testimony:

No new legislation would appear to be necessary, rather increased appropriations.

I know that Members of this House are mindful that drug abuse affects the whole fabric of community life and that in many areas we have yet to begin a wholehearted attack. I hope that this chronicle of one area's drug problems and drug programs will be of help in other cities' efforts to salvage the fabric.

The material follows:

A CITYWIDE DRUG EFFORT IN NEW HAVEN

Until recently New Haven has had a fairly substantial number of programs and activities to combat drug abuse and no formal coordination between them. To deal with that problem, Mayor Bartholomew F. Guida, in early May, appointed a Mayor's Task Force on Drug Abuse.

The Task Force is composed of concerned citizens from various walks of life. It is charged with understanding the extent of the drug abuse problem in New Haven and the efforts now being made to deal with it. It shall suggest priorities among current programs and a total program of priorities for this area and shall mobilize all resources available to the community to fight the problems and causes of drug abuse.

To assist the Task Force two advisory committees have been formed. One is composed of various local officials, including the Development Administrator, the Model Cities Director, the Superintendent of Schools, the Health Director, the Community Action Agency, CPI, Director and the Chief of Police. The other committee is composed of the directors of the various programs. These committees are intended to assist the Task Force in anyway necessary and to provide guidance from their different perspectives.

The Task Force will act as a planning body, identifying the need and the resources available, defining the problem, and suggesting priorities for a plan of action.

It will meet the Mayor's charge through its approach to the drug abuse problem in terms of four areas: prevention, education, treatment, and enforcement.

For each of these areas a survey of what exists in terms of quality and quantity will be made, priorities for expansion and new programs will be suggested, and technical assistance to existing and potential programs may be provided.

The needs will be identified through the collection and compilation of data within New Haven and the surrounding area, such as the number of addicts, the rate of drug-related crimes, the costs of police protection, and the costs of and participation in prevention and treatment programs. Public hearings will be held to enable New Haven and area citizens to voice their views on the problem and make suggestions for solutions. Resources available to New Haven will be identified, including those programs and facilities now operating in the area, and the federal, state and private financial and technical assistance programs available that could have impact on activities in New Haven. Assistance in program development and in seeking funds may be provided to the various organizations operating or wishing to op-

erate programs which will serve New Haven residents. Coordination among the existing programs will be encouraged to maximize current efforts and to create the most effective city-wide effort possible. Programs and efforts serving city residents will be evaluated and recommendations for future activities made.

The Task Force's method of operation shall be to meet with experts in the field and those concerned. Such people have been and will be invited to its meetings to discuss not just their own program or activities as they relate to drugs, but also how they see the drug abuse problem as a whole.

The members of the Mayor's Task Force are all busy people who are donating time to what they feel to be an important problem. What has rapidly become apparent since the Task Force began meeting in the middle of May is that it needs a full time staff with experience in drug abuse programs to enable it to carry out its responsibilities.

Community Progress, Incorporated, the local Community Action Agency, has advanced funds to the city to enable us to hire an assistant to the Development Administrator for drug program coordination for two months, June and July. This individual is serving as Executive Secretary to the Mayor's Task Force, doing its staff work and providing assistance to programs operating in New Haven. We have found this already to be a necessary function of the city, one which could be carried out at an even greater scale, which we will not be able to continue without financial assistance.

We have determined that what we need are sufficient funds to employ a full-time experienced drug program coordinator, an assistant to him and a secretary. This would enable the city to deal with the problems of drug abuse with a reasonable level of activity.

The responsibilities of the drug coordinator shall be:

1. To provide whatever staff work is necessary for the Mayor's Task Force on Drugs.
2. To effect coordination between existing drug programs.
3. To coordinate New Haven's activities with those of the surrounding municipalities, thus working toward a regional approach to the problem.
4. To identify all available resources in the fight against drug abuse and mobilize as many of them as possible for New Haven.
5. To provide technical assistance to programs currently serving New Haven and to people and organizations interested in developing new programs.
6. To develop a comprehensive plan for the four aspects of drug control—education, prevention, enforcement, and treatment, in New Haven.

The responsibilities of the Assistant Drug Coordinator shall be to assist the drug coordinator in the six areas listed above. Experience has taught us, thus far, that more than one person is necessary to deal with the problem on an adequate scale.

The secretary shall be responsible for all clerical duties required by the Drug Coordinator, his assistant, and the Task Force. He or she shall attend all meeting of the Task Force and take and prepare minutes and do any bookkeeping necessary to the program.

The Drug Coordinator and his staff shall report to the Development Administrator of New Haven and be supervised by him.

TESTIMONY OF BARTHOLOMEW F. GUIDA, MAYOR OF NEW HAVEN, CONN., SUBMITTED TO THE HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME, JUNE 9, 1971

Chairman Pepper and Members of the Committee, I appreciate this opportunity to submit testimony to your committee about the problems of drug abuse confronting the City of New Haven. I am sure that it is similar to those problems faced in other cities throughout the country. It is extensive and frightening and continually increasing.

It affects every member of our community and, therefore, the vital life of our country.

THE EXTENT OF THE PROBLEM IN NEW HAVEN

Drug experts in New Haven have given us some idea of the characteristics of drug users and experimenters in our community. In common with most other cities, all types of drugs are used in New Haven. Among users and experimenters there is some distinction in the type of drug used by various age groups. For example, those preteen youngsters experimenting with drugs concentrate on glue sniffing, while early adolescents, twelve to fourteen years, involved in drugs, smoke marihuana and occasionally take LSD or heroin. The middle adolescents, fourteen to seventeen years, taking drugs, use marihuana, psychedelics, heroin, and amphetamines, while late adolescents, seventeen to twenty years in this category are into marihuana, psychedelics, heroin, amphetamines and barbiturates. Young adults, twenty to twenty-five years, who use drugs are into marihuana and heroin, and less often psychedelics, amphetamines, barbiturates, and cocaine. Adults, above twenty-five, who are users are into marihuana, heroin, barbiturates, and cocaine.

Surveys by our drug treatment specialists indicate that users and experimenters who live in different areas use different types of drugs. Inner-city users concentrate on marihuana, heroin, and cocaine, outer city users on marihuana, amphetamines, heroin, and less often, LSD. Marihuana, psychedelics, and less often, heroin and amphetamines are prevalent among suburban users. Black addicts use marihuana, heroin, and cocaine predominantly; Puerto Rican addicts marihuana, and heroin; and White addicts marihuana, psychedelics, amphetamines, heroin, and barbiturates. In terms of causes for drug use, users who suffer from socio-economic deprivation mainly use marihuana, heroin, and cocaine. Psychological disabilities among users lead mainly to marihuana, heroin, barbiturates, and amphetamines. Addicts who feel bored or alienated turn most often to marihuana, psychedelics, heroin, and amphetamines.

A thorough survey of drug use and addiction is now being made in the New Haven area. We estimate that there are now 1,200 to 1,500 heroin addicts and another 1,500 to 2,500 heroin experimenters. There are not even any good guesses on the use of other drugs in the area, but we do see the following trends:

1. Heroin use is increasing markedly in white suburban and outer city areas. The rate of increase in the inner city is slower, but the total numbers remain higher;
2. The use of LSD is leveling off to decreasing. There is a rise in the use of mescaline, but most of what is sold as mescaline is LSD or STP;
3. The use of amphetamines is leveling off to decreasing;
4. The use of marihuana is increasing in all strata of the population.

THE EFFORT IN NEW HAVEN

New Haven has a comparatively extensive drug effort, but one that goes nowhere near meeting our needs:

1. The Drug Dependence Unit of the Connecticut Mental Health Center, located in New Haven, is financed through a five-year grant, which began in July, 1968, from the National Institute of Mental Health. The Unit is a demonstration project which provides an almost full range of services to drug dependent individuals plus educational and preventative programs. The Unit sees individuals from 14 on up who have difficulty with narcotics, amphetamines, psychedelics, and barbiturates. To date over 1,000 patients have been seen by the program and on an average day there are over 350 patients in active treatment.

The Drug Dependence Unit has six major components:

A. *Methadone Maintenance Program.*—In this program methadone, a synthetic narcotic which blocks the effects of other narcotics such as heroin and eliminates drug craving, is dispensed to heroin addicts over 21 with a history of at least two years of addiction and who have previously failed at attempts to remain abstinent. In addition to receiving the drug, participants are involved in a variety of therapeutic vocational and educational endeavors with the ultimate goal being a productive as well as drug free life.

B. *Daytop, Inc.*—Daytop is a residential treatment community staffed entirely by ex-addicts who are Daytop graduates. It accepts patients from 16 on up who are drug dependent and has a capacity of over 50. The program utilizes certain aspects of "reality therapy", with drug dependent people being helped to understand and deal with their emotions, evasive behaviour and reasons for using drugs. Participants are expected to remain in the program for at least a year.

In addition to work at the facility, Daytop staff and residents are involved in numerous speaking engagements and four regional activities including a storefront in Milford, work with the NARA program at the Danbury Federal prison, work with drug addicts at the Connecticut State Prison in Somers and work with addicts at Cheshire Reformatory.

C. *Outpatient Clinic.*—The Outpatient Clinic is the initial induction facility for all patients to the Unit and is involved in direct treatment of adolescent and young adult drug abusers and provides consultation to a variety of youth serving institutions and agencies. Naloxone, a non-narcotic medication which when taken daily blocks the effects of heroin, is available to those who require it as part of the outpatient program. Participation in a wide variety of activity groups and graduation to leadership training towards employment within the program or with other agencies is based on the individual's readiness to begin helping others.

D. *NARCO, Inc.*—Narcotics Addiction Research and Community Opportunities, Inc. is a storefront operation concerned with the rehabilitation of drug dependent persons. It offers a variety of services, including screening and referral to treatment centers, legal aid, personal and family counseling, a pre-release program in which NARCO representatives visit Connecticut's penal institutions to help prepare inmates to function after their release, and an educational program.

NARCO is about to receive funds from the Connecticut Planning Committee on Criminal Administration to open a detoxification center. It also is involved with the Drug Dependence Unit's Epidemiology and Evaluation Unit in an NIMH grant for the evaluation of drug educational programs and an epidemiologic survey in various school systems. It has also recently opened a storefront in Waterbury.

E. *Drug Dependence Institute.*—The Drug Dependence Institute functions on a national basis and offers training in the prevention and treatment of drug addiction to advance knowledge and understanding of drug dependence. It also provides orientation and consultation services to school systems and agencies throughout the northeast.

F. *Epidemiology and Evaluation.*—This division is responsible for evaluating the Drug Dependence Unit's effectiveness in dealing with drug addiction, its ability to provide effective treatment for drug dependent persons, and its ability to reduce the level of drug dependence in the area served by the project. To accomplish this it monitors the activities of the Unit and examines the incidence and prevalence of addiction in the area.

2. Number Nine is a storefront crisis center, a "crash pad" and "hot line", which works with adolescents in various difficulties including those onto drugs. Its main work

has been with users of psychedelics and amphetamines.

3. Youth Crusaders, Inc. is a religious group modeled after Teen Challenge. It has no local facilities, but sends addicts to programs in New York and Philadelphia. It now operates on private contributions and volunteer services and has been trying unsuccessfully for two years to raise funds for a local residential center.

4. New Haven has several neighborhood-based programs and anticipates the development of new ones. Similar to most, Project Enough is a store-front operation which provides information and referral to addicts and potential addicts in the Fair Haven area. It is hoping to operate a program in a vacant

school in the area, which the city of New Haven is providing to the project free of charge, which will include group counseling, individual counseling, community education, and recreation to local residents. As yet, funds to operate the programs have not been available. The other neighborhood-based programs are not firmly established and have, therefore, not been included.

Besides these efforts, others exist in the city, especially through education about drug abuse in the schools and enforcement activities in the police department. These are not as clearly identifiable and will not be included specifically here. The funds involved during the current fiscal year in the programs mentioned above are:

	Federal	State	Local	Total
Drug Dependence Unit.....	\$574,000	\$146,000		\$720,000
Drug Dependence Institute ¹	317,174			317,174
NARCO ²		87,468		87,468
Project Enough (for 4 months).....			\$150	150
Number Nine.....			35,000	35,000
Youth Crusaders, Inc.....			6,000	6,000
Total.....	891,174	283,468	41,150	1,165,792

¹ Funds for DDI are separate than those received for the Drug Dependence Unit. \$139,025 is used for national training and \$178,149 for the New Haven area.

² These funds are received in addition to those through the Drug Dependence Unit.

Thus, a total of \$1,165,792 is being spent on these programs alone and it comes nowhere near meeting our needs. The Methadone Maintenance program which now handles 200 people at a cost of \$4.75 per person per day could easily be doubled. Daytop could use a second facility to handle another 50 people at a cost of \$9.50 per person per day. NARCO has been told it will lose about \$33,000 in funding from the State and needs that much plus \$50,000 to renovate its detoxification center. The use of Naloxone at the Out-Patient Clinic is now available to only 15 people; funds for seventy-five additional people at \$10.00 per person per day could be utilized immediately. The \$50,000 now being spent on out-patient services for acid and speed users could be tripled. Neighborhood centers to provide prevention and educational centers, alternatives and referrals are needed. In other words, a tremendous amount of money is needed right away for New Haven to barely begin to meet its needs.

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Legislation for treatment efforts is in place. The item lacking is funding. Other than possibly consolidating the programs in a single office in HEW, instead of the current situation in which they are in the Office of Education, the National Institute of Mental Health and the Office of Economic Opportunity, no new legislation would appear to be necessary, rather increased appropriations. More funds are also needed for the grants administered through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the Justice Department which provide money for drug abuse programs.

Enforcement efforts at the local level are not and cannot be sufficient to deal with the problems of the availability of drugs. We cannot stop the flow of drugs into our cities because the flow into this country is not under control. Greater enforcement efforts are needed along the country's borders. More customs officers and more stringent procedures for searching incoming goods and travellers could greatly decrease the amount of available drugs, especially heroin. In addition, the dispensation of drugs through doctors and pharmacies should be much more closely regulated. Each should be required to submit reports to the government on all drugs distributed through them. This could greatly reduce the abuse of amphetamines and narcotics.

It must be realized that any of these efforts

are stop-gap in nature. The need for drugs or any other outlet stems from problems in our society. These are problems which I would not presume to define but which cannot be dealt with through anything short of a national effort. What is it in this country or in human society that makes man turn to drugs or alcohol or any other escape mechanism?

I appreciate the opportunity to submit this testimony to you and hope that we can find a way for this country to deal with this serious problem.

[From the New Haven Register, June 6, 1971] ARRESTS OF DRUG VIOLATORS IN AREA HITS ALL-TIME HIGH

(By Richard E. Bastian)

The arrests of narcotics violators in the area has reached an all time high, and has led to the seizure of larger caches of marijuana and heroin by area police departments.

New Haven, Connecticut's third largest city, has led the state in the number of narcotics arrests for the past two years. West Haven ran third in 1970.

Several factors are given by police for the rise in the number of drug arrests. Included are:

A larger volume of drug traffic coming into the state leading to more persons becoming addicted;

A larger number of police personnel being assigned and specialized in narcotics work within individual departments;

More widespread activity by Regional Crime Squads, criminal intelligence units using undercover agents from surrounding towns. The New Haven area crime squad is made up of agents from that city and 14 surrounding communities. Similar units operate out of Waterbury, Hartford and Fairfield County.

Police officials generally agree that the number of drug users, both addicts and those only beginning to explore their effects, is considerably higher than the number actually caught. One policeman said it was "conservatively" 10 times higher.

The type of drug traffic differs between between the city and surrounding suburbs, according to a spokesman for the New Haven Regional Crime Squad.

"We're finding very little heroin in the suburbs . . . practically none," he said. The heroin user in the suburbs cannot find it there, he continued, and is forced to go to the city—either New Haven, Hartford or New

York. "The dealer wouldn't go to Wallingford," the detective added.

"Our problem in New York," he continued, "a major area for heroin traffic. It's only a train ride away."

In addition, the drug addict can take care of his habit at a lower price in New York and make a profit on whatever he brings back for sale in this area.

Marijuana and hashish are the most commonly used drugs in the suburbs, according to the regional crime squad investigator. There has been a small decline, he believes, in the use of Hallucinogenics such as LSD as a result of adverse publicity on its medical effects.

The rise in narcotics arrests has been a dramatic one in most areas. New Haven police recorded only seven arrests for narcotics violators in 1960. The figure rose to 508 in 1969 and then to 810 last year.

The number of arrests in New Haven continues to accelerate this year with 161 arrests recorded in the first quarter. The total jumped to 229 with 68 arrests during April. The figure is expected to exceed 1,000 by the end of 1971.

Hartford police made 265 arrests for narcotics violation in 1969 and 789 last year. The number of arrests in the state's largest city was 313 in the first three months of this year—nearly double the quarterly figure for New Haven.

Bridgeport, the state's second largest city, had 302 arrests in 1969, 431 in 1970, and 129 in the first quarter of this year.

Among the suburban communities in the state with a high number of narcotics arrests is West Haven. Police there have recorded 206 arrests to date—26 in the first 10 days of this month.

The 579 arrests by West Haven police in 1970 exceeded those made in Bridgeport by 148. Only Hartford and New Haven had more.

In contrast, Hamden has recorded only 33 narcotics arrests to date, 74 last year and 46 in the previous 12-month period.

Woodbridge, which also borders on New Haven, has had only one narcotics arrest this year. The same is true for Seymour, a short distance away.

Most suburban communities have experienced an increase in narcotics arrests, if only on a smaller scale with the larger urban centers.

The number more than doubled in Branford from 1969 to 1970 21 to 55. Police have recorded 24 arrests this year in the shoreline community.

The increase was greater in Orange where arrests zoomed from five in 1969 to 22 in 1970.

Only three area communities reported decreases in arrests last year from the number logged in 1969.

The borough of Naugatuck which had 65 arrests in 1969 reported only 12 in 1970. The intense activities by police in 1969 apparently dried up drug traffic the following year, a member of the local law enforcement agency noted. The number of arrests this year is up to 13.

The number of arrests also dropped during the same two-year period from 15 to six in Seymour and from nine to six in Shelton.

The narcotics arrests throughout the area are significant not only from a statistical point of view but also by the types of arrest. Most area detectives are focusing on persons selling drugs—as opposed to the simple possessor—in an effort to shut off the immediate source of drug traffic. The problem, however, is still one which goes beyond state and national boundaries.

While most of the arrests cited above are for possession of drugs a notable number, close to one third, are for the sale of narcotics.

State Police, in their annual report for 1970, listed 1,501 persons arrested in Connecticut for the sale of narcotics, compared to 4,200 for possession.

The growing number of arrests for the sale of narcotics has led police to larger caches of drugs.

Police in New Haven seized two plastic bags of pure heroin several weeks ago which had a street value of \$100,000. Another cache, worth \$25,000, was seized last week.

The street value of narcotics seized in the first four months of this year totaled \$252,311—considerably more than the \$207,551 value placed on all narcotics seized in the previous 12-month period.

One effect of the seizures has been to raise the price of heroin, according to Lt. Arthur Lee, head of the Gambling and Narcotics Division. The price on a bag of heroin has gone up from \$6 to \$10, he said, a serious problem for some addicts who need 15 bags a day to feed their habit. "It's hurting," he maintained.

Police are limited, though, in keeping drugs out of the city, Chief Biagio DeLieto observed. Drugs continue pouring into the city like water through a giant sieve. Police informers are a major asset in controlling the flow.

Controlling the flow from international sources is primarily a Federal responsibility, Chief DiLieto feels—not in any critical sense but from a practical and realistic viewpoint.

Getting to the source of drugs has been the key responsibility of the New Haven Regional Crime Squad, organized last year.

Most area police officials contacted had high praise for the unit.

"There's no question the regional crime squad has been of tremendous assistance to all area towns. They're fabulous," East Haven Police Chief Joseph Pascarella commented.

Another police chief attributed the increasing number of drug seizures directly to the undercover unit. State Police have assigned two men to each of the four crime squads.

One of the obvious advantages of the squad is the ability to use a detective from one town in another community 10 or 20 miles away where he is less likely to be recognized.

Another advantage is the ability to communicate between the various law enforcement agencies over town boundaries on illegal drug operations which recognize no jurisdictional borders.

Another aspect of handling the current problem of drug addiction—the judicial process—has come under some criticism from police sources. The criticism is related to the reduction in the charges against alleged drug violators.

The most outspoken critic of court procedures is Lt. Edmund Mosca second in command of the Old Saybrook Police Department.

The name of the game, he charged, is "plea bargaining." Under the rules a person charged with selling narcotics, a felony, will agree to plead guilty to possession of narcotics, a misdemeanor, if the court prosecutor will agree to drop the original charge, Mosca revealed.

The prosecutor's motive in seeking the lesser charge is to reduce the number of cases already on the crowded docket, he explained.

In some cases Mosca acknowledged there is insufficient evidence to support the more serious charge, or the offender is a first time loser, who can possibly benefit from leniency.

Ten of 16 charges made by Old Saybrook police on sale of narcotics were reduced to possession of drugs during 1969, Mosca noted. In 1970, the court reduced 24 of 29 sale charges to the lesser offense. Of the 29 cases, 22 involved a roundup of area residents by both local and state police.

Only two convictions were gained in 1969. The game was true in 1970.

Twenty charges are pending this year.

"It wasn't a case of our not having evidence," Mosca said. "We needed that to get the arrest warrants originally from the court."

Arrests by his department are hard won, consuming many hours of investigation the police lieutenant argued. Old Saybrook is only one of four communities, besides state police, with an organized police department in the wide area of Middlesex County.

Narcotics are not the only problem his small department faces, Mosca said. "We need a full-time narcotics unit in the lower Connecticut River valley, similar to the regional crime squad in the New Haven area."

NARCOTICS ARRESTS BY COMMUNITIES

Town or city	1969	1970
Ansonia.....	44	67
Branford.....	21	55
Cheshire.....	4	11
Clinton.....	9	10
Derby.....	6	14
East Haven ¹	17	50
Guilford.....	9	24
Hamden.....	46	74
Madison ²	3	16
Milford ²	12	64
Naugatuck.....	65	12
New Haven.....	508	810
North Haven ²	13	97
Old Saybrook.....	48	96
Orange.....	5	22
Seymour.....	15	6
Shelton ²	9	6
Southington.....	17	58
Wallingford.....	46	74
West Haven.....	212	579
Woodbridge.....	4	9

¹ Statistics based on Uniform Fiscal Year.

² Statistics incomplete for 1969

³ State Police statistics used.

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Register, June 28, 1971]

GUIDA ESTIMATES 4,000 IN CITY ON HEROIN (By Sam Negri)

Mayor Bartholomew F. Guida said today there are between 1,200 and 1,500 heroin addicts in New Haven and an additional 1,500 to 2,500 "heroin experimenters." In the current year \$1.1 million in federal, state and local money has gone into drug programs "and it comes no where near meeting our needs," the mayor declared.

Guida included these statistics in testimony sent to the House Select Committee on Crime. Rep. Claude Pepper, chairman of the committee, had written Guida soliciting his testimony.

The mayor submitted his testimony June 9 and made it public today.

He noted that in the current fiscal year the funds received for the operation of local drug programs have been: \$891,174 from the federal government; \$283,468 from the state and \$41,150 from the city government.

Of the total \$1.1 million, he said, the Drug Dependence Unit of the Connecticut Mental Health Center received \$720,000; the Drug Dependence Institute received \$317,174; NARCO, \$87,468; Project Enough (for four months), \$150; Number Nine, \$35,000 and Youth Crusaders Inc. \$6,000.

In addition to the figures on the number of heroin addicts and heroin experimenters, the mayor said there are "not even good guesses on the use of other drugs in the area, but we do see the following trends:

—"Heroin use is increasing markedly in white suburban and outer city areas. The rate of increase in the inner city is slower but the total numbers remain higher;

—"The use of LSD is leveling off to decreasing. There is a rise in the use of mescaline, but most of what is sold as mescaline is LSD or STP;

—"The use of amphetamines is leveling off to decreasing;

—"The use of marijuana is increasing in all strata of the population."

Guida said the federal government can be of assistance by providing more funds. Furthermore, he said, programs now adminis-

tered through the U.S. Office of Education, the National Institute of Mental Health and the Office of Economic Opportunity might be consolidated into a single office in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW).

"Enforcement efforts at the local level are not and cannot be sufficient to deal with the problems of availability of drugs," Guida said. "We cannot stop the flow of drugs into our cities because the flow into the country is not under control."

He added, "Greater enforcement efforts are needed along the country's borders. More customs officers and more stringent procedures for searching incoming goods and travelers could greatly decrease the amount of available drugs, especially heroin."

He also called for tighter regulation of drugs dispensed through pharmacies and doctors, but added:

"It must be realized that any of these efforts are stop-gap in nature. The need for drugs or any other outlet stems from problems in our society. These are problems which I would not presume to define but which cannot be dealt with through anything short of a national effort."

"SHOULD THE UNITED STATES STOP OR CHANGE GREEK AID?"

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., July 26, 1971.
Congressman JAMES G. FULTON,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FULTON: It was a pleasure and an honor for me to participate in the recent hearings of the subcommittee on Europe. Your questions, throughout, I thought were insightful, constructive and useful.

The enclosed is a written response which you requested during the hearing. I have provided a copy of it to the subcommittee for their records. My recommendation is not detailed, but its major thrust is in support of a balanced form of aid that distributes U.S. attention equally among political, social and military institutions.

Sincerely,

THEODORE A. COULOMBIS,
Associate Professor of International International Relations.

RESPONSE TO JAMES G. FULTON'S QUERY
(By Theodore A. Coulombis)

I would like to supply the following brief statement in response to Congressman Fulton's request that I amplify my remarks with respect to American aid toward Greece.

My promise is that the U.S. has—wittingly or unwittingly—provided the Greek military with "disproportionate time, attention, aid, training and the U.S. dollar compared to other political and social structures in Greece."

This premise is easy to demonstrate. Looking at indicators such as numbers of Greeks training in the U.S., one is impressed with the fact that the military received the lion's share of training. According to official U.S. statistics, the total number of Greek military personnel trained in the United States under the Military Assistance Program

(M.A.P.) between 1950 and 1969, amounted to 11,229. To this number one should add 1965 students trained under the M.A.P. program in overseas installations. (See *Military Assistance and Foreign Military Sales Facts*, OASD/ISA, Washington, D.C., March 1970). Considering the total number of the Greek officer corps, approximately 11,000, these training figures assume a staggering significance.

Another eloquent indicator is the following: U.S. military representation in Greece is considerably higher than its civilian counterpart. For instance, as of June 1970 there were approximately 3,300* military and DOD civilian personnel (excluding dependents) compared to about 210 civilian personnel outside the Department of Defense.

Further, while economic aid declined and tapered off in the early 1960's, military aid continued strong and is currently following an upward trend.

It appears, then, that the American modernizing influence has been disproportionately distributed in Greece, thus enlarging and modernizing the military structures (or institutions), while neglecting other crucial, civilian structures such as the parliament, the civilian bureaucracy political parties, trade unions, institutions of higher learning, the press, and other important pressure groups. The resultant hypertrophy of the military, its multi-functional technical and managerial training, and the relative atrophy of the remaining political structures, may have created some of the foundations of military dictatorship in Greece.

The implications for U.S. aid, in general, flow from the above analysis. Namely, in the future U.S. aid patterns toward Greece should conform to the principle of equitable distribution of aid among Greek social, political and military structures. If the military is singled out as the sole recipient of training and support, the chances are that the "balance" among Greek institutions and forces will be disturbed in favor of the military.

My recommendation would be, therefore, that U.S. aid should be given in a fashion that will allow the "checks and balances" among political, social and military structures to be perpetuated in a democratic environment. This principle can be applied regardless of the size of the aid package toward Greece.

In view of the previous imbalances, aid in the immediate future (in the form of technical assistance and funds) should be directed primarily to assist in the development of viable institutions in the area of politics and society (political parties, labor unions, professional associations and institutions of higher learning).

DEATH OF THOMAS MARTIN

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to hear of the death of my friend and former colleague in the House, Thomas Martin. Although I only had the opportunity to serve with him for 2 of his 16 years as a Congressman I developed the highest respect for Tom Martin.

* Symington Sub-committee hearing on Greece and Turkey (June 9, 1970) p. 1802. It should be kept in mind, however, that only about 90 of these personnel (serving with JUSMAG and the military attachés office) have a regular relationship and frequent contact with the Greek military establishment.

His friendly manner and sincere nature made it a pleasure and an honor to serve in the same body with him.

Tom Martin's life of distinguished public service did not begin in the House of Representatives, nor did it terminate here. He volunteered for military duty during World War I, was elected mayor of Iowa City for a 2-year term, from 1935 to 1937, and served in the U.S. Senate from 1955 until he retired in 1961.

I join my fellow Congressmen in expressing my regret over the loss of this able and dedicated gentleman. Mrs. O'Neill and the entire O'Neill family joins me in extending my heartfelt sympathy to the Martin family.

F-111—JUST AS I HAVE ALWAYS SAID

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the Armed Services Committee recently reported, and the House passed, H.R. 8687, the Military Procurement, Research Development, and Reserved Strength bill for fiscal year 1972.

That bill came to the floor with only one committee addition: \$112 million for continued production of the F-111 fighter-bomber. This solitary addition to the bill reflected the committee's agreement with an amendment that I had offered after extended testimony from Department of the Air Force witnesses during the hearings.

What I, and other supporters of this supremely capable aircraft have been saying all along is the subject of a story in the July 19, 1971, issue of the knowledgeable and respected *Armed Forces Journal*. This story, by Mr. George Weiss, is complete, factual, and once and for all tells the real story of the F-111.

Mr. Speaker, I insert this fine and objective story in the RECORD:

THE F-111: THE SWING-WING MAY SURPRISE YOU YET

(By George Weiss)

If the United States finds itself in a serious shooting war next year . . . or a decade from now . . . one of the first aircraft to be committed to battle will be "Little Orphan Annie," unloved by her relatives in Congress, eventually deserted for the international banking business by her illegitimate father, denied by her Navy foster brothers, but who finally found a home with friends of the family, the Air Force.

People have now taken to calling "Annie" by her given name, F-111, but some neighborhood critics still prefer her pre-natal name, TFX. Almost everyone remembers her nicknamed "Controversial." Perhaps they know her best by that name.

But the orphan, say the friends of the family, turned out to be a lady despite all the whispers behind her back and charges to her face that she would never amount to anything. Those who know her best, who fly with her and care for her ills, say they love her. She has won the approval of those who count the most—the men who will go with her into combat and trusting in her to see them home again.

She still has problems and faults and she

will have more. No one ever denies it. And since she is famous there are those who will pounce on her, without thinking, slashing at her old reputation. But, say the airmen, it hurts those who honestly believe she is to be a faithful companion through the years.

In many ways she didn't have a chance. Here are some of the reasons.

The Air Force wanted a long range fighter-bomber with primary emphasis on high speed, low altitude, nuclear and conventional bombing capability. The Navy needed a carrier based interceptor to climb to high altitudes, medium range, for fleet defense. Somehow the services were expected to adjust their needs and the resulting aircraft would be everything to everyone. It didn't happen.

The Navy finally saw an opportunity to pull out and the Air Force stuck with the problem going through several model designations, doggedly improving the aircraft.

If the Air Force erred in its approach to the situation it was in not having changed the type designation from tactical fighter to tactical bomber.

When the F-111 was little more than a gleam in the Air Force's eye, TAC discarded the aircraft designations of day-fighter and fighter-bomber, combining them into an all inclusive term—tactical fighter. All future TAC aircraft were expected to bomb and fight air-to-air with more or less equal agility. But the bomb load to be hung on the F-111 was equal to or greater than that of either B-66 or B-57 tactical bombers. The F-111 today is a tactical bomber with many of the characteristics of a fighter.

From the very outset it was obvious the F-111 would never become an air superiority fighter in the sense of being a "dog fighter." Weight alone precluded that option being available. However, shooting down aircraft is always a last ditch effort in trying to win air superiority. Tacticians go air-to-air when they have no other choice. What is preferred, and what the F-111 can do, is win air superiority in that vital role of airfield interdiction.

The Israeli Air Force most recently demonstrated this tactical concept in the Six Days War. The F-111 is a far superior weapon for airfield interdiction than any other fighter in the Defense Department, or the world for that matter, the Air Force maintains.

One field grade F-111 pilot interviewed by The Journal was asked how this aircraft would have added to the IAF plan for the destruction of the Egyptian Air Force at the onset of hostilities. "They could have made their first strike during the night instead of waiting for first light," he said. "They would not have needed as many aircraft to knock out the enemy fighter and bomber bases. The F-111 weapons system would have covered more area on each of the enemy bases—and the destruction would have been greater."

F-111 VS. FOXBAT

What will the F-111 do if it meets the Mach 3 "Foxbat" MiG-23? Well, according to the men who fly the F-111 they are going to be very surprised if the meeting takes place. It certainly won't be at extreme altitudes where the Foxbat performs best. If the Foxbat pilots want to "have a go" at the F-111 they will be forced to come down to the deck and the Russian fighter isn't going to last long at that arena, the fighter pilots maintain.

The Mach 2, MiG-21, a beautiful sports car version of an interceptor, could not handle the F-105 at low altitudes in North Vietnam. The F-105, like the F-111, was designed to stand the brutal punishment of high speeds and low altitudes. The MiG-21 pilots were forced to break off time after time while chasing the "Thud" around North Vietnamese hills and valleys—and the F-105s were still able to carry out their missions. There are a lot of "Thud drivers" in the F-

111 program who haven't forgotten that. They know the F-111 is several hundred miles an hour faster on the deck than the F-105 and no aircraft in the world can stay with it.

The anti-F-111 doom-sayers still predict the Foxbat will eat the fighter alive, but TAC pilots aren't getting grey hair anymore than the Israeli Air Force pilots who may face the MiG-23 with the F-4 Phantom. According to newspaper articles they too realize the Foxbat will have to come down to their altitude to fight. When the enemy pilots do they will be playing in a new ball game—and on the F-4 and F-111 pilots' home field.

F-111 PROGRAM COSTS

(In millions)

	Fighter	Bomber
Flyaway (airframes and engines).....	\$9.33	\$9.96
Production-flyaway plus support, spares.	11.8	13.94
Program-production plus construction, R. & D., operating costs, procurement costs.....	15.1	16.67

Note: Total F-111A/E/C/D/F program cost is currently estimated at \$6,675,000,000. Total FB-111 program cost is estimated at \$1,283,000,000.

But how about "look down-shoot down" capability? This is a possible new technique which would allow the Foxbat to fire missiles down from high altitude against fighters below.

Again the TAC pilots aren't too upset. The F-111, they say, has a few new "black boxes" to aid the two-man crew. The tall radar will notify them whenever the MiG-23, or any other enemy jet approaches. With sufficient warning in the cockpit, and the black boxes, the TAC crews believe they can manage the situation. Looking at it from another angle, the F-111 will be operating at night for the most part in the worst weather (an unavoidable fact in Europe) and at low altitudes. Those three facts alone offer considerable protection. Enemy ground based radar will be unable to continuously track individual fighters for proper interception by airborne units. They feel the enemy air threat won't cause them to worry on a full time basis.

The pilots of the F-111 can select the altitude they fly above the ground by simply setting an indicator on their terrain following radar. With that means they can stay below "enemy eyes" during each of the critical portions of their missions. The F-111 will maintain the desired altitude by scanning the terrain ahead and adjusting itself to surface elevation changes and obstacles. The most difficult part, pilots say, is to sit there at night pretending to relax, as the F-111 climbs an unseen hillside, goes over the top and into negative "g's" on the downside. In pitch dark situations the trust of the pilot for "Annie" must be absolute.

So far as has been determined no accidents have ever been attributed to terrain following in training or combat.

"You haven't lived," one F-111 pilot told The Journal, "until you go into the Grand Canyon after midnight in a rainstorm, and come out the other side."

But suppose, just suppose, the F-111 and the MiG-21 or even the MiG-23 meet? What then? In a straight-on, even-odds, no warning fight, the computer calculations point to the MiGs; but the TAC pilots still feel they have a few rabbits to pull from their hatful of tricks. The experts at Nellis AFB are working on some new maneuvers and tactics that should improve the odds. So if Annie walks the back alleys alone some dark night she will at least know there is more she can do in self defense than run and yell for help.

SAFETY COMPARISON

The F-111 continues to have the lowest accident rate of any Century series fighter. This table compares the F-111 with other type fighters at the 80,000 hour operation mark.

Major Type:	Accidents
F-100	77
F-101	42
F-102	48
F-104	59
F-105	42
F-106	33
F-4	39
F-111 (excludes two combat losses)	21

ACCIDENT RATE

Much of the continuing criticism of the F-111 hinges on the F-111's accidents. No matter what "Little Orphan Annie" does she attracts more attention than is deserved. But if you seriously examine her performance record in comparison with other fighters she comes off better than anyone expects.

Compared to the F-100 at 80,000 flight hours, the F-111 has had less than one-third as many accidents during those critical early states of development. The F-105 had twice as many accidents as the F-111 at the 80,000 hour point.

Both of these fighters were effective in Southeast Asia and carried more than their share of the combat load. Of course, both of them are single engine fighters. Comparing the F-111 with the popular F-4, another twin-engine, two-place jet, is more equitable. But the F-4 also had more accidents than the F-111 at the same stage of development.

No matter how you slice it, the F-111 comes out a safer fighter by far against all the century series jets.

From this one might forecast that, like the F-100, the F-111 will become more and more reliable as the pilots and maintenance experts get to know her better and understand her various quirks and internal problems.

STRUCTURAL PROBLEMS

But, say the critics, how about the structural failures that have "plagued" the aircraft? Of the 23 F-111s that have been destroyed in accidents only two are known to have involved a structural failure. There were losses in Southeast Asia in which the aircraft were not found. They will remain a mystery. However, no one in the F-111 business appears concerned that a structural failure was involved. The odds are they are correct.

The first F-111 structural failure in flight was traced to a bad weld which caused loss of flight control. The second failure was more serious and involved the left wing pivot fitting. As a result the fleet of 344 F-111 aircraft in operation were put into one of the toughest testing programs yet devised. As of 25 June 270 had been returned to duty with a clean bill of health. Only 10% of the aircraft tested were found to contain minor flaws which might not have ever been noticed in routine checks. As a result of the tests four wing carrythrough boxes and twelve wing pivot fittings were rejected.

The overall effect will be to increase the structural life of the F-111 and minimize future inspection requirements, a decided plus for the fighter.

The F-111 is now the most tested aircraft in the Air Force and the world. No other single aircraft has been subjected to the wide variety of reliability tests. Equipment and methods were invented to test the aircraft and some of these did produce ground failures as they were supposed to do. Because of these tests lives have been saved and the planes that passed are capable of withstanding stresses far higher than they are ever expected to encounter in normal operations or combat.

STRIKE ACCURACY

The F-111 went into combat in Southeast Asia when there were a limited number of targets available. All bombing was being conducted south of the 20th parallel. This did not allow the Air Force to fully explore the capabilities of the fighter to the extent desired.

Only 55 SEA combat sorties were flown by

the six plane force. There were also restrictions placed on the F-111s which grounded them for a considerable portion of their stay in Thailand.

In fact, only two weeks of actual combat experience was gained during the time the fighters were in Thailand.

The fighter was flown in single ship night missions and mostly (80%) in bad weather to attack known enemy positions. Flying at high speeds and low levels the pilots penetrated well defended positions, attacked their targets and departed without being threatened by enemy action in most cases.

The only defense the enemy seemed capable of mustering against the F-111 was barrage fire whenever they realized the fighter was operating in an area. The F-111 crews spotted AAA/SAM defense activity on only 42% of their missions. No F-111 was ever hit by enemy fire.

The terrain avoidance radar proved itself in training in the U.S. and in North Vietnam. SAMs failed to locate the F-111s in their low level penetrations just above the tree tops at night along the Annam mountain chain between Laos and North Vietnam.

Post-strike reconnaissance bomb damage assessments of their radar bombing attacks offered final proof to the Air Force that the F-111 could hit a target under combat conditions with results comparable to daylight attacks by other fighter-bombers.

Operating in daylight in the U.S. on training missions the F-111 established a bombing rate 50% better than the best previous bomb scores in the Air Force.

In one test, called Combat Bullseye, the F-111 was tested for accuracy in the delivery of aerial weapons against the F-105 and F-4. She was an easy winner.

One Air Force pilot, no longer flying the F-111, told the JOURNAL that after ten years bombing practice in the F-100 he topped his best previous score on his first practice mission in the F-111. He said his experience was not uncommon.

Pilots credit the F-111 itself as being responsible for the better bomb scores. The primary difference, they say, comes from the stability of the F-111 on bombing and strafing runs and the unusually smooth flight control system which, with the gun and bomb sight, makes a high degree of accuracy possible.

NATO COMMITMENT

Last September two F-111s left the U.S. non-stop for Upper Heyford, England, where they became a part of the 20th Tactical Fighter Wing. They did not employ air-to-air refueling on their trans-Atlantic flight. The wing has now converted from the F-100 to the F-111 which gives the fighter a NATO commitment.

The F-111 extends the combat radius of the wing to double that of old "Silver Dollar." The black underbellies of the new F-111s are mute testimony to their nuclear mission in Europe. Along with the aircraft came an entirely new all weather capability for the 20th. No longer will weather be a deciding factor for planning purposes. In fact, weather now enhances the capability, reliability and success potential of the wing.

Airmen maintaining the Upper Heyford F-111s in the NATO operational mission claim their job is easier than with the more familiar F-100s. While the Air Force stipulated that the F-111 should not exceed more than 35 man-hours maintenance for each hour flown, the twin-engine fighter is averaging well under 30 man-hours per hour, according to current experience.

NUCLEAR CAPABILITY

SAC also has operational aircraft. The force of 66 F-111 aircraft, armed with four SRAM missiles or nuclear gravity bombs, will soon be in place at both Pease AFB, N.H., and Plattsburg AFB, N.Y. With the FB-111s

already delivered to the Air Force and crews completing training at Carswell AFB, Texas, it is admitted by SAC that the medium range SAC bombers have long held a back-up operational mission. The instructor pilots have formed the aircrews for use in the event of an emergency.

The FB-111s, like the B-52 force, will soon be dispersed to satellite bases once their crews are declared combat ready.

SAC takes some pride in the fact that an FB-111 was declared a winner against the B52 in the last SAC bomb competition. Another FB-111 flew to England on a demonstration flight during the RAF bomber competition. The RAF did not invite it to participate.

Air Force Chief of Staff General John D. Ryan told the Senate Committee on Appropriations this spring that the FB-111 has "... better penetration, bombing and navigation capability than the B-52 ..." (and) adds a new dimension in versatility to the bomber force." He did not need to add that the shortcoming of the FB-111 was its limited range for strategic bombing and bomb carrying capability. As an interim SAC bomber it is satisfactory. The command has no intention to purchase more, including the new stretched version being offered by General Dynamics, The Journal was told by General Bruce K. Holloway, SAC Commander-in-Chief.

COST-EFFECTIVE

One Air Force officer involved in the F-111 program recently told The Journal, "The F-111 is going to look like a bargain in a few years." His reasons why were all operational.

Based on current experience with the F-111 and other aircraft in SEA it required 5.91 Phantom sorties or 5.04 "Thud" sorties to attain the target damage obtained by a single F-111.

The highly automated A-7 came out slightly better in comparison, 3.57 sorties as compared to the F-111.

The cost factor of operating fighters in a bombing role entails more than a single formation of jets. It includes electronic counter measures aircraft, ground based radars, tankers, air cap, flak suppression sorties and "Wild Weasel" anti-SAM missions. All must be coordinated and timed by a half dozen bases and units. The F-111 operated in SEA without such aerial support and will in the future.

Despite the cost and problems associated with the F-111 it still stands alone as the best aircraft yet developed for night and bad weather attack missions deep inside enemy territory. It is unique in its unrefueled range capabilities. No other fighter in the world can cross the Atlantic unrefueled which means that the F-111 alone can be rapidly deployed almost anywhere in the world without waiting for tanker support. Pacific missions would require island stops. Tankers would allow non-stop crossings.

It carries more bombs than any other fighter and surpasses all other known fighters for automatic navigation accuracy, weapons accuracy, maintainability and short or rough field operations. As a single ship attack aircraft it can operate as no other can without extensive air cover, tanker and electronic countermeasures support. In addition it has a 24-hour attack capability in bad weather, giving it an 80% advantage over other aircraft in the European theater.

Little Orphan Annie, the Texas turkey, is no lady, She's a Tiger.

F-111 AT A GLANCE

F-111A—This was the basic design which was to provide Tactical Air Command with an all weather tactical bombing capability. TF30-P3 engine. Total of 141 built.

FB-111—Basic design for Strategic Air Command. An interim bomber between the older model B-52s and the B-1. Provides both

nuclear and conventional capability with only minimum modification. TF30-P7 engines. Total of 76 built.

F-111E—Basic F-111A design with improved penetration aids and weapons management. TF30-P3 engine is stall free through supersonic envelope. Contract was for 94.

F-111F—Further improved with growth engine TF30-P100 for increased payload and maneuverability. Improved avionics include digital computers and advanced inertial navigation. Contract is for 70.

F-111D—Has major avionics modifications to add air-to-ground moving target attack capability. Has improved weapons delivery accuracy and payload. Contract was for 96.

A total of 526 F-111s will be built under existing contracts, including the 7 Navy F-111B models and 24 F-111C models for the Royal Australian Air Force.

DOW TESTIFIES BEFORE JOINT ATOMIC ENERGY COMMITTEE

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, on July 13, I testified before the Joint Atomic Energy Committee yesterday on the pending legislation, S. 2152, H.R. 9286, which speeds up the licensing process for atomic power plants. I feel that this is a crucial issue about which Members of Congress should become more aware. In the hope of increasing interest in this vital problem I am submitting for the RECORD my testimony on the bills S. 2152 and H.R. 9286:

TESTIMONY OF HON. JOHN G. DOW BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, TUESDAY, JULY 13, 1971

I very much appreciate this opportunity to testify before this distinguished Committee. Your responsibilities in the field of nuclear power has a direct effect on the area of New York I represent. There are three atomic plants under construction or in being for the Consolidated Edison Company of New York at a point that juts into my Congressional District. Anxiety of my constituents about the downwind damage in the event of a substantial accident at those plants causes me to pay some attention to the critics who have warned about the dangers of atomic plants.

Mr. Chairman, having delved into this a little I can say that there are some unresolved questions about the safety of nuclear power generation. The principal point of my testimony today will not be any resolution of this major issue but to say it is incumbent on the Congress to insist that the issue be satisfactorily solved and the correct answers arrived at before much more time has passed. There is far too much polarized opinion about nuclear safety to leave the subject any longer in its present state of unresolved equilibrium.

The proposed legislation would limit the mandatory hearings to the site authorization period, would offer optional hearings at the construction stage only if a significant question of health and public safety were raised, and would strictly rule out the present pattern of hearings immediately prior to the operational stage.

I realize that the AEC has an interest in the rapid construction and operation of nuclear plants in order to alleviate the present power crisis existing in this nation.

However, I feel that the AEC must examine the other side of the coin very carefully and thoroughly review all possible consequences of a rapid expansion of the nuclear power system.

Recently, considerable evidence has been brought to my attention which shows that the present type of nuclear reactor may be extremely harmful to human life. I am not an expert in this field and will not attempt to pass final judgment on these claims, but I have been convinced that the possibility of extreme danger from nuclear reactors is great enough to warrant a close investigation by the Congress before a further expansion of the nuclear power system is condoned and encouraged.

This problem must be solved by Congressional pressure on all of those concerned in order to arrive at the true facts. Heads must be knocked together and experts must be prodded and pressured until the true answers are apparent. Your distinguished Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is the one best hope to solve this problem.

For what it may be worth I would like to tell you of four areas where there is a major lack of agreement and where a resolution is critically needed.

1. RADIOACTIVITY OF NUCLEAR PLANTS

The radioactive threat posed by nuclear plants is an issue that produces an intolerable polarization of authority between the scientific and the non-scientific communities. Most of the controversy seems to center around what is a little or a lot of radioactivity; but there is more to be considered than this. Winds and clouds may sweep their concentrations and deposit them as heavy concentrations in small areas. Even the smallest amounts of radiation can be dangerous if they concentrate, as many radioactive chemicals do, in some plant or animal life. I have seen studies of how small levels of radioactive chemicals increase in concentration throughout the food chain to the point where they present grave dangers of cancer or accentuate existing ailments in the human species.

This problem is further heightened in the case of embryos and infants which seem to be the most susceptible to radiological exposure. It is submitted by scientists that effects of such exposure become apparent in a very short time in these cases. Some scientists also feel that the effects upon adults may be just as devastating as upon infants but they are not as rapidly apparent. This is the first area in which I think it is imperative that the Committee recognize the true gravity and resolve the dissension.

2. GENETIC DANGER

Secondly, but perhaps no less serious, is the genetic danger attributable to radioactive concentrations in the reproductive organs. Every exposure to radioactivity, however small, is ineradicable and degrades in some degree the living matter. It may never leave the chain of generations.

The uncertainty about long-term genetic effects has not been disposed of by any means.

3. ACCIDENTS AT NUCLEAR PLANTS

One of the dangers that even the most loyal believers in nuclear plants will admit is the possible accident within the plant. The plant's operation is basically one of damping down. When that fails for any reason and there is a loss of coolant, then temperatures instantly rise, fuel elements melt and the ultimate consequence is beyond guessing.

4. WASTEFULNESS OF FISSION PROCESS

The present performance of nuclear reactors by the fission process is said to be about 1% of potential, because it wastes an immense amount of plutonium 238. Should not this process be halted until some alternative process is developed that would realize on the potential? Fast breeders would supposedly be more efficient but they are admittedly more dangerous. In this connection the

fusion process deserves more attention and possibly promotion.

I am certain that your distinguished Committee could apply major force for the purpose of eliciting such answers from those competent to produce them. In some cases it would be necessary for the exaggerators and the belittlers of nuclear safety to battle it out until there is a meeting of the minds. Able as many of these authorities are, part of their differences are probably due to the fact that they are not always talking about the same thing. Even here there is a very likely failure of communication, and your Committee must insist upon the necessary clarifications.

Until Congress compels such classifications and disagreements to be cleared up, the current trend toward rapid expansion of the nuclear system will proceed unchecked. Now is the time for slow, deliberate thought, consultation and reconciliation between opposing sides. The uncertainty about the danger is too great to set it in concrete now. I therefore must oppose the pending bill, H.R. 9286, which streamlines the licensing procedures and reduces the amount of public participation in the creation of new nuclear reactors. The intervention of Congress on behalf of the public is necessary to create a process for seeking the truth about the dangers that may be associated with nuclear power.

On this basis I ask the Committee to reject the sections of this pending legislation which speed up the licensing procedures at a time when they should be slowed down instead.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Ernest J. Sternglass, an eminent physicist and professor of radiology at the University of Pittsburgh, prepared a special report on this subject which I would also like to share with my colleagues.

REPORT BY DR. ERNEST J. STERNGLASS, PROFESSOR OF RADIOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

I would like to address my remarks to the proposed changes in the licensing procedures of nuclear plants, which carry much more serious implications for the health and safety of the public than would appear on the surface.

Basically, the proposed new licensing procedures would eliminate hearings at the time a new plant is ready to go into operation, and they would restrict the depth and scope of the questions that could be raised by the public at the only remaining mandatory hearings prior to construction, greatly limiting the opportunity for the public and its legal and scientific advisers to raise issues and discover problems that may have escaped the scientists and engineers of the utility company, the manufacturers, and the AEC's licensing and regulatory staff.

Why is this such a potentially fateful and dangerous step to take? Are not the experts of the utilities, the nuclear industry, and the AEC, rather than a few laymen or outside scientists, in a much better position to know how best to design a plant so as to protect the health and safety of the public?

Why is it so vital that there should be the widest possible opportunity for specialists and scientists outside of the industry or the government to participate in the examination of the safety of nuclear reactors? Because time and again in the history of science the unexpected and upsetting discoveries have often been made by outsiders. We need only remember the most recent case of mercury, where it was a scientist outside the industry or the government who discovered that in the form of methyl mercury, and as a result of unanticipated biological concentration in the fish this element previously regarded as relatively harmless, was suddenly recognized to be thousands of times as toxic

than in the original form in which it was discharged from the plants. This has its perfect parallel in the unanticipated biological sensitivity of the embryo to nuclear fallout, where the complex indirect processes of the action of radiation, as in the case of the action of certain fission products such as Yttrium acting on the pituitary and the thyroid gland of the developing fetus, leading only to a slight retardation in the maturation process, nevertheless can apparently result in a major effect on the viability of the newborn's lungs, leading to the baby's death by asphyxiation.

Furthermore, the recognition of such unanticipated mechanisms often happen rapidly, and allowable releases of radioactivity and various safety features that seemed quite adequate, can and indeed have turned out to be thousands of times less safe within a year after construction has begun.

This was clearly not the fault of the engineers and physicists who had done their planning with the best available expert advice at the time. Nor was it the fault of the Commission, or the standard setting bodies, or of the leaders of the nuclear industry, the utilities or the government's scientific advisers. No one knew or ever dreamed that such things could happen. Even those of us who testified here before this same Committee in 1963 on the possibility of an increased sensitivity of the infant in the mother's womb to the development of leukemia from small amounts of radiation, could not and did not anticipate fully the seriousness of the biological consequences of low level radiation to the newborn. It was simply inconceivable that a well-studied phenomenon such as radiation should hold such a terrible surprise for mankind.

Yet within the last few years, and even the last few months, overwhelming evidence has accumulated that mankind faces a far greater hazard from small amounts of radioactivity in the air, the water and the food than anyone could ever have imagined when nuclear reactors were first designed.

We now know that in the county where the Dresden Reactor is located some 50 miles south-west of Chicago, Illinois, the rise and decline of radioactive gas discharges was not only accompanied by a corresponding rise and decline in infant deaths, but also a coincident rise and fall of premature births known to be associated with a much greater likelihood of death from respiratory disease and infections.

And we now know that in ways no one anticipated, even relatively small accidental release of radioactivity, whether from a reactor or from an underground weapons test, can lead to serious unanticipated consequences. For example, in the case of the "Baneberry" test in Nevada last December, infant mortality jumped as much as 30-50% in the nearby states of Idaho and Montana, in direct relation to the measured fallout in the air, on the ground and in the milk. Yet the amount of radiation released as a consequence of this test was only 1/10,000 to 1/1,000,000 (one ten-thousandth to one one-millionth) of what could be released in a major accident of a large nuclear reactor.

Clearly it is far better to hold in abeyance any possible benefit of nuclear energy than to risk its misuse by an inadequate examination of its full-effects on human health.

What then is the lesson that we must draw from this for the decisions that must now be made by the Congress of the United States?

1. That scientific discoveries in the areas of biology, embryology and radiation effects on the critical bio-chemical processes of living systems can happen so rapidly and unexpectedly that there must be mechanisms for review of reactor technology by public hearings until the very moment the reactor is to be turned on. In the three to five years that can elapse between the construction license hearing and the time the reactor is

completed, so much can happen in our understanding of biological hazards that what could have been regarded as adequate from the point of safety to the public when the reactor was built, is suddenly no longer acceptable for the protection of human life.

2. That often in the history of science, discoveries were made that were totally unexpected on the basis of everything known to the experts at the time, and that often, these discoveries were made not by the specialists in the field, but by outsiders who would never have been regarded as experts in that narrow speciality.

3. That only by the widest possible dissemination of facts to the entire public can such non-specialists even become aware of the existence of a problem, and that therefore any procedure that works to limit free access to any and all information dealing with the safety features of such a complex technology as exists in the nuclear field could be disastrous for society.

4. The very essence of the amazing progress of modern science and the technology based on it since its beginnings in the days of Galileo, Descartes and Newton three hundred years ago, has always been the continuous correction of errors and assumptions, made possible by the free publication of all data and even the most upsetting theories for anyone to see and criticize. Only through this often painful and slow process of continuous correction of past errors has science been able to advance, and only through such free access to data and knowledge has it been possible to utilize the collective wisdom to mankind's best minds for the benefit of society and to avoid or correct at least some of the inevitable mistakes.

5. But in the case of nuclear energy and the effects of nuclear radiation on animals and man the magnitude of the consequences of any errors are so vast and irreversible that above all in this field there must be nothing to limit the widest examination of all aspects, and the greatest possible opportunity to discover the unexpected, human mistake.

6. The proposed Bill H.R. 9286 should accordingly be changed so as to require mandatory public hearings also at the time the operating permit is to be granted, and that any matter relating to the public health and safety may be brought up at that time by those whose lives may be affected. Nothing should be done to weaken the basic spirit of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 which clearly called for the greatest possible participation of the public and the protection of its health and safety.

The very vastness of the power man has released in the atom demands the utmost in caution, lest it destroy him and his seed forever. And it is now the heavy task of this committee to make the judgment as to how best to protect the health and lives of this nation's future children, whose vulnerability is now recognized to be a thousand times greater than when the nuclear age began.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons that I am so vitally concerned with this problem of nuclear powerplants is that the three reactors located at Indian Point, N.Y., border on my congressional district and any radioactive pollution from them directly affects my constituents.

Dr. Sternglass has done a comprehensive study of the radiation resulting from the Indian Point powerplant and I would also like to submit this report for the RECORD.

LOW LEVEL RADIATION EFFECTS ON INFANTS AND CHILDREN IN THE NEW YORK METROPOLITAN AREA

(By E. J. Sternglass, Department of Radiology and Radiation Health, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.)

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, increasing evidence has accumulated that low-level radiation from

diagnostic X-rays,¹ nuclear fallout² and releases from nuclear power facilities,^{3,4} has produced unexpected severe effects on the developing embryo, the infant and young child.

In view of the proposed large increase in the amount of nuclear generating facilities to be installed near large metropolitan areas such as New York City, it seemed desirable to carry out a study of possible health effects on children in the greater New York Metropolitan area from the releases of nuclear facilities that have been operating in this region for the past ten to fifteen years.

The most important sources of radioactive effluent close to the New York Metropolitan Area have been the Indian Point Nuclear power station operated by the Consolidated Edison Company located in Westchester County along the Hudson River some 20 miles north of New York City, and the Gas Cooled Nuclear Reactor at the Brookhaven National Laboratory of the Atomic Energy Commission near Upton, Suffolk County, Long Island. It will be shown that both of these nuclear facilities appear to have had clearly detectable effects on infant mortality and leukemia rates in the surrounding counties, highly correlated with the known rises and declines of radioactive releases and the dose-rates from nuclear fallout as recorded at the Brookhaven National Laboratory.

The study was based on the available data for infant mortality and cancer mortality rates for all the counties of New York State within a radius of 100 miles of New York City as published in the Annual Vital Statistics Reports of the New York State Department of Health.⁵ Information on the releases from the Indian Point Unit Number 1 were obtained from a report of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare⁶ published in March 1970, as well as official AEC summaries of reactor releases.⁷ Figures on releases of liquid wastes from the Brookhaven National Laboratory as well as on external radiation doses produced by gaseous releases and fallout were obtained from a report by A. P. Hull,⁸ using the average weekly dose-rates at monitoring stations at the northeastern edge of the laboratory grounds and 4.8 miles away to the north.

The basic data taken from these sources is reproduced in the enclosed tables.

INFANT MORTALITY

In order to detect a possible effect of the releases on infant mortality it was decided to search both for changes with time before and after the releases began, and also to examine the pattern of infant mortality changes with distance away from the sources of radioactive gases and liquid effluent.

Since the Brookhaven Laboratories are located well to the east of New York City (approximately 50 miles from Manhattan and some 25 miles from Nassau County to the west) while the Indian Point plant is located some 20 miles to the north, between Rockland and Westchester Counties, they are far enough apart to separate the effects from these two sources. This is further facilitated by the fact that the Indian Point Plant did not begin to produce significant discharges until after 1963, while the Brookhaven releases began in 1951 and declined to very small values by 1964.

In order to account for such other factors as socio-economic, medical care, diet, drugs, pesticides, climate, air pollution, infectious diseases, fallout and various unknown factors that might influence the changes in infant mortality besides low-level radiation from plant releases, all mortality changes in the counties near the plants were compared with neighboring counties of similar socio-economic character having no large sources of radioactive effluent.

Thus, Westchester and Rockland may be compared most closely with Nassau County,

Long Island, since it has a similar total population of close to 1 million, similar suburban character, and closely similar fallout levels as well as similar socio-economic characteristics. Likewise, Suffolk County, where Brookhaven is located, can be compared most directly with neighboring Nassau, which also had the same infant mortality rates prior to the first nuclear detonations in 1944-45.

Furthermore, it is possible to use progressively more distant counties of New York State stretching in the form of a sector towards the north-west and north as control counties.

In order to correct for the fact that these counties further to the north have a more rural character than Westchester and Rockland, and therefore different socio-economic situations, medical care and air pollution, one can normalize the infant mortality rates in a suitable fashion and then examine the percent changes following the onset of emissions. Since a given small dose of radiation is expected to have closely the same relative effect on mortality changes regardless of the absolute rate, this technique allows one to detect changes in time as well as changes with distance from the source despite such differences as medical care and economic level.

The counties with smaller population can then be conveniently grouped into larger units with approximately the same distance from the point of release of the effluent.

RESULTS

The simplest and most direct test is to plot the pattern of mortality among infants born live and 0-1 year at death per 1000 live births for the two counties immediately surrounding the Indian Point Reactor and compare it with the time-history in Nassau County 20 to 50 miles away.

As can be seen from an inspection of a period of six years prior to the onset of large releases from the Indian Point Plant in 1964, the infant mortality rate for Nassau and Westchester were essentially the same within the statistical fluctuation of about 5% or ± 1.0 per 1000 births. There were rises apparently associated with the fallout from the large test-series in 1958 and 1961-62 prior to the onset of large releases of the Indian Point Plant in 1964 but the two counties showed exactly the same infant mortality rates of 19.1 in 1961, the year of lowest fallout in the air and diet just prior to the resumption of atmospheric testing by the U.S.S.R. in the fall of 1961, and by the U.S. in 1962.

However, after the releases began from the Indian Point Reactor, while Nassau infant mortality moved downward as did most areas of the U.S. following the end of nuclear testing,^{2,4} Westchester and Rockland moved upward and remained high for a period of 4 successive years. Not until after the emissions began to show a tendency to decline following the replacement of the original fuel-core in 1966 that had developed serious leaks⁶ did Westchester and Rockland infant mortality decline close to where Nassau had moved.

If one now plots the difference in infant mortality between the two counties nearest the reactor and compares it with the annual releases of liquid radioactive waste in the form of mixed fission products (beta and gamma emitters other than tritium) expressed as percent excess over the Nassau rate, one finds a direct linear relationship between excess mortality and the amount of activity as percent of permissible limit.

Applying a least-square fitting procedure to the data for the period 1963 to 1969 one obtains a correlation coefficient $C=0.835$. A still better fit is obtained for the 2 yr. average, or $C=0.974$. The t-test of statistical significance gives $t=9.96$ which for the present case of 5 degrees of freedom gives a probability of P of less than 0.01 that this correlation is a purely chance occurrence. Thus, the association between excess infant mortality near the reactor and the changing levels of

liquid waste discharges must be regarded as statistically highly significant. And since, as Fig. 4 shows, gaseous releases closely followed liquid releases in magnitude, not only areas bordering the Hudson River but also areas exposed to the gaseous releases would be expected to be affected.

As an independent check of this result, it is of interest to compare the changes of infant mortality for the two counties near the reactor with those counties more than 40 miles to the north and north-west, namely Columbia, Greene, Sullivan and Ulster, grouped together so as to provide a total population closer to that of Westchester and Rockland.

In order to allow such a comparison despite the more rural character of these control counties, their infant mortality rate was normalized to equal that for Westchester-Rockland in 1961, the year when Nassau showed the same infant mortality rate as the two counties next to Indian Point.

It is seen that as in the case of the comparison with Nassau County, the control group shows a very similar pattern prior to 1964, but as soon as the releases occurred, a gap between the nearby and the distant counties begins to appear amounting to about four standard deviation by 1966. The control counties show a rapid decline in infant mortality while the nearby counties show a rise followed by years of failure to decline.

Once again, one can examine the correlation between the excess in the infant mortality of the exposed counties as compared to the more distant control counties. As in the case of the use of Nassau as a control, there is a strong, positive correlation between excess mortality and the quantity of radioactive wastes discharged. The correlation coefficient is found to be 0.957 and $t=7.37$, which for the five degrees of freedom leads again to a small probability $P<0.01$ that this association is a pure chance occurrence. Furthermore, the amount of change per unit radioactive discharge is found to be closely the same using this group of controls as when Nassau County was used, within the accuracy of the data.

Using the same normalization procedure for the group of intermediate counties to the north of Westchester and Rockland, namely Dutchess, Orange and Putnam, it is now possible to test whether they show a pattern intermediate between the nearby and more distant counties during the period of peak emissions from the Indian Point Plant.

The result for the year of peak emission (1966) is shown where the three groups of counties have been plotted according to their average distances from the Indian Point Plant in Westchester County. Not only do the intermediate counties show the required intermediate position in the change of infant mortality, but the three groups show a dependence on distance consistent with an inverse first power law expected for long-lived gases diffusing from a stack.⁹

As a further test of the hypothesis that the infant mortality changes are associated with releases from the Indian Point Plant, one can make the same plot for Nassau and Suffolk counties to the south-east and again the pattern of declining mortality fits the hypothesis.

It is of interest to see whether despite its much poorer socio-economic pattern, air pollution problems and medical care, New York City shows a decline in infant mortality during the time that Westchester and Rockland showed a rise above the 1961 level. Using the same normalization procedure, the infant mortality for New York City is in fact found to decline after 1964, though not as rapidly as the more remote counties to the north and

east. Thus, the pattern of infant mortality changes following the onset of radioactivity releases from the Indian Point Plant is consistent with a causal effect of the releases on infant mortality, similar to the effects already noted for seven other nuclear reactors and fuel processing facilities.⁴

Taking either the control counties to the north or to the east as a reference, the excess infant mortality associated with a release of 43.7 curies per year of mixed fission products in liquid waste and 36.4 curies of noble and activation gases is 41%. For the year 1966, this represents an excess mortality of approximately 100 infants 0-1 year old in Westchester and Rockland Counties combined out of a total of 367 infants that died in their first year of life during 1966.

For New York City, assuming that the relative changes for 1966 can be attributed to the plant releases, the excess mortality would be approximately 26%. This would mean that out of the total of 3,686 infant deaths in 1966 some 750 probably died as a result of the operation of the Indian Point Plant. Thus, although New York City is more distant than Westchester and Rockland, due to its large population, the total number of additional deaths is some seven times larger than for the nearby counties.

EFFECTS OF LOW LEVEL FALLOUT

These results are so serious that it is essential to apply still further tests in an effort to see whether the observed association is likely to be of a causal nature. Thus, if low levels of radiation near a nuclear plant, typically well below the 500 mr per year allowable to any individual or of the order of a few millirads per year, can indeed produce such serious effects on the early embryo, then effects should be seen for the low level fallout radiation measured at Brookhaven over a period of many years.⁵

Assuming that Nassau County on Long Island just west of Suffolk County received essentially the same fallout levels as Brookhaven, it is possible to see whether the changing levels of annual fallout dose were in fact accompanied by corresponding changes in infant mortality in Nassau.

The data on infant mortality rates for Nassau are shown for the period following the first large H-bomb tests in the Pacific in 1954, together with the annual external gamma-radiation dose as measured at Brookhaven.⁶ (Table VII)

It is seen that as the radiation dose rose from about 6 mr/year in 1955 to 51.5 mr/year in 1959, infant mortality rose 17% from 18.1 to 21.2 per thousand live births. This first rise was followed by a second peak associated with the 1961-62 test-series, again followed within a year by a renewed peak in infant mortality.

Using the line connecting the points for 1955 before the rise and 1966 after the end of large-scale testing as a reference, it is possible to arrive at estimates for the yearly excess infant mortality and compare them with the measured external gamma dose.

From the result of this comparison, it is seen that the excess infant mortality in Nassau is indeed highly correlated with the changing levels of fallout radiation varying up and down as fallout levels rose and declined repeatedly. The correlation coefficient is found to be 0.797, with a t -value of 4.172, corresponding to $P<0.01$, making it a highly significant association.

The slope of the line is found to be $0.22 \pm 0.05\%$ per mr/year. Thus, this data suggests that a dose of as little as 1 millirad of fallout per year radiation from the ground or only about 1% of natural background radiation leads to almost a $\frac{1}{4}\%$ increase in infant mortality.

But a dose of 1 mr/yr is far below the presently maximum dose of 500 mr/yr permitted by existing AEC regulations for nuclear

plants. The infant mortality rises of 20-40% near nuclear facilities are not inconsistent with the doses that might be received, considering not only external radiation but also internal doses to critical organs of the sensitive embryo during the crucial first 12 weeks of organ development, which must be added to the measured external dose.

Actually, the recent work of Stewart and Kneal⁷ on the effect of diagnostic x-rays on the risk of childhood leukemia when given during intrauterine development leads to a comparable increase in risk. Using Stewart and Kneal's estimate of 1 rad to the late fetus resulting in 572 extra cases of leukemia and cancer per million population irradiated, and a normal incidence of 700 per million children born one arrives at a doubling dose of 1,200 mr. Furthermore, using Stewart and Kneal's result that the early embryo in the first trimester is some 15 times more sensitive than the late fetus¹⁰, one arrives at doubling doses as low as 80 mr for the first 3 months of development.

Thus, an annual dose of 76 mr corresponding to the maximum observed at Brookhaven from external fallout alone might result in 3 months doses as high as 25 mr to the early embryo, leading to an increase in leukemia incidence of about 30%, comparable to the magnitude of the observed increases in infant mortality from all causes.

LEUKEMIA IN NASSAU COUNTY

As a test of the hypothesis that such small levels of radiation can in fact lead to detectable rises in leukemia even when given over a period of months, one can examine the changes in leukemia in Nassau County.

Since the typical latency period for leukemia is some 3 to 5 years for the infant irradiated in utero or early postnatal life,¹ the comparison must be carried out with the radiation level existing 5 years earlier.

The leukemia data for Nassau County together with the measured external radiation dose 3-5 yrs. prior to the reported leukemia mortality, shows a striking parallel behavior for the two quantities. The correlation between the increase in leukemia relative to 1960 and the radiation levels after 1955 is strong and positive with a correlation coefficient of 0.819, $t=3.503$ corresponding to $P<0.02$.

The slope obtained by the least square fit is $0.49 \pm 0.13\%$ /mr/year, comparable with the slope relating the percent increase of infant mortality and fallout radiation.

From this result, one can calculate the doubling dose, or the dose for a 100% increase, of 204 ± 54 mr per year, equal to 51 ± 13 mr in any 3 months period. Considering that this represents only external dose, a total doubling dose of 80 mr to the early embryo as obtained from the study of diagnostic x-ray effects is therefore not unreasonable for fallout radiation as well.

One should therefore not be surprised to find similar changes in infant mortality that involve subtle genetic defects leading to slight immaturity at birth, which by itself tends to increase greatly the chance of death from respiratory or infectious diseases.¹¹ Such changes in immaturity or lowered weight at birth have in fact been observed in animal studies¹² and among children born in the U.S. since the early 1950's,¹ the time when large scale nuclear testing began, a trend that has only recently begun to reverse itself.

In fact, mortality for all age groups showed sharp upward changes beginning in the early 1950's as first pointed out by I. M. Moriyama.¹³

INFANT MORTALITY NEAR BROOKHAVEN NATIONAL LABORATORIES

These considerations therefore lead one to expect that the gaseous and liquid effluent from the Brookhaven reactor may also have led to detectable changes in infant mortality in Suffolk County.

Footnotes at end of article.

That this appears in fact to have been the case, where the infant mortality in Suffolk County is shown together with the reported liquid effluent produced and discharged at Brookhaven. The anomalous rise of infant mortality in Suffolk between 1953 and 1960 relative to Nassau is strongly associated with the reported activity produced at Brookhaven and the fraction released into the streams.⁸ Both before and after this period, Suffolk and Nassau showed the same infant mortality rates. And with the drastic reduction in releases that took place since the peak of activity in 1959, infant mortality in Suffolk County dropped from a high of 24.1 in 1960 to an all time low of 17.0 in 1969, an unprecedented drop of 30% in only 9 years.

CONCLUSION

In view of the present findings, the possibility, first advanced by I. M. Moriyama¹² exists that both infant mortality and chronic diseases for all ages having genetic components and involving subtle disturbances of the cell chemistry may have been more seriously affected by low level environmental radiation than had been expected on the basis of high-level radiation studies on laboratory animals.

It is therefore apparent that present limits on permissible environmental radiation may

have to be drastically lowered to take into account the possibility that the early embryo is far more radiation sensitive than the mature adult to subtle genetic and bio-chemical damage, perhaps by a factor of 100 to 1000 times.

FOOTNOTES

¹ A. Stewart and G. W. Kneale, *Lancet* 1, 1185 (June 6, 1970).

² E. J. Sternglass, Proc. 9th Hanford Radiobiology Symposium, AEC Symp. Series, Vol. 17 (Dec. 1969), p. 693.

³ E. J. Sternglass, "Infant Mortality and Nuclear Power Generation", Hearings of the Pennsylvania Senate Committee on Reactor Siting, Harrisburg, October 21, 1970.

⁴ E. J. Sternglass, "Effects of Low-Level Environmental Radiation on Infants and Children", Presented at a symposium on Biol. Conseq. of Envir. Rad., U. of Northern Illinois, March 20, 1971.

⁵ Annual Statistical Reports, N.Y. State Dept. of Health, Hollis S. Ingraham, Commissioner, Albany, N.Y. (available through 1967).

⁶ "Radioactive Waste Discharges to the Environment from Nuclear Power Facilities", U.S. Dept. H.E.W., P.H.S., Bureau of Radiol. Health, March 1970 (BRH-DER 70-2).

⁷ Testimony of Commissioner James T. Ramey, Hearings before the Pennsylvania

Senate Select Committee on Reactor Siting, October 1970.

⁸ Andrew P. Hull, "Background Radiation Levels at Brookhaven National Laboratory", Report submitted May 15, 1970 at the licensing hearings, Shoreham Nuclear Plant (AEC Docket No. 50-322).

⁹ M. J. May and I. F. Stuart, "Comparison of Calculated and Measured Long Term Doses from a Stack Effluent of Radioactive Gases" in "Environmental Surveillance in the Vicinity of Nuclear Facilities" (C. C. Thomas 1970), p. 234.

¹⁰ Table III of Ref. 1 gives sensitivity in the first trimester as (8.25-1.00)/(1.48-1.00) = 15 times relative to the last trimester. More recently, a possible question as to the exact dose in the trimester has occurred (Stewart and Kneale, *Lancet*, Dec. 5, 1970) to 1190, but the tenfold greater sensitivity of the early embryo has been well established in animal studies.

¹¹ H. C. Chase, "Trends in Prematurity in the United States, 1950-1967", *Am. J. Public Health*, Vol. 60, 1967 (Oct. 1970).

¹² J. I. Moskalev, et. al., "Proc. 9th Hanford Radiobiology Symposium", A.E.C. Symp. Series, Vol. 17 (Dec. 1969), p. 153.

¹³ I. M. Moriyama, "Trends in Mortality", *Public Health Reports* 75, No. 5 (May, 1960); also N.C.H.S., Monograph Ser. 3, No. 1 (1964).

TABLE I.—INFANT MORTALITY IN NEW YORK COUNTIES ADJACENT TO INDIAN POINT PLANT

Year and counties	Births	Deaths	Rates	Relative rates	Percent change ¹	Year and counties	Births	Deaths	Rates	Relative rates	Percent change ¹
1958:						1964:					
Rockland.....	2,736	66				Rockland.....	3,456	58			
Westchester.....	15,784	321				Westchester.....	15,366	340			
Total.....	18,520	387	21.0	109.9	+9.9	Total.....	18,822	398	21.1	110.5	+10.5
1959:						1965:					
Rockland.....	2,876	61				Rockland.....	3,554	79			
Westchester.....	15,726	340				Westchester.....	14,634	315			
Total.....	18,602	401	21.6	113.1	+13.1	Total.....	18,188	394	21.7	113.6	+13.6
1960:						1966:					
Rockland.....	3,044	75				Rockland.....	3,576	78			
Westchester.....	15,938	334				Westchester.....	13,652	295			
Total.....	18,982	409	21.5	112.6	+12.6	Total.....	17,268	373	21.6	113.1	+13.1
1961:						1967:					
Rockland.....	3,186	53				Rockland.....	3,492	67			
Westchester.....	16,024	314				Westchester.....	13,207	290			
Total.....	19,210	367	19.1	100	0	Total.....	16,699	357	21.4	112.0	+12.0
1962:						1968:					
Rockland.....	3,238	80				Rockland.....	3,391	60			
Westchester.....	15,622	337				Westchester.....	12,890	221			
Total.....	18,860	417	22.1	115.7	+15.7	Total.....	16,281	281	17.3	90.6	-9.4
1963:						1969:					
Rockland.....	3,340	77				Rockland.....	3,625	56			
Westchester.....	15,750	310				Westchester.....	13,292	236			
Total.....	19,090	387	20.3	106.3	+6.3	Total.....	16,917	292	17.3	90.6	-9.4

¹ Relative to 1961 value.

TABLE II.—INFANT MORTALITY IN NEW YORK COUNTIES 15-50 MILES NORTH OF INDIAN POINT PLANT

Year and County	Births	Deaths	Rates	Relative rates (percent)	Percent change ¹	Year and County	Births	Deaths	Rates	Relative rates (percent)	Percent change ¹
1958:						1961:					
Dutchess.....	3,674	77				Dutchess.....	3,912	109			
Orange.....	4,106	107				Orange.....	4,084	84			
Putnam.....	632	19				Putnam.....	770	18			
Total.....	8,412	203	24.1	100	0	Total.....	8,766	211	24.1	100	0
1959:						1962:					
Dutchess.....	3,736	98				Dutchess.....	3,998	93			
Orange.....	4,060	102				Orange.....	4,056	97			
Putnam.....	696	17				Putnam.....	724	24			
Total.....	8,492	217	25.6	106.2	+6.2	Total.....	8,778	214	24.4	101.3	+1.3
1960:						1963:					
Dutchess.....	3,912	106				Dutchess.....	4,014	77			
Orange.....	4,066	118				Orange.....	4,176	102			
Putnam.....	708	11				Putnam.....	806	19			
Total.....	8,686	235	27.1	112.8	+12.8	Total.....	8,996	198	22.0	91.3	-8.7

Year and County	Births	Deaths	Rates	Relative rates (percent)	Percent change ¹
1964:					
Dutchess.....	4,148	83			
Orange.....	4,244	113			
Putnam.....	818	13			
Total.....	9,210	209	22.7	94.2	-5.8
1965:					
Dutchess.....	3,988	82			
Orange.....	3,978	98			
Putnam.....	800	14			
Total.....	8,766	194	22.1	91.7	-8.3
1966:					
Dutchess.....	3,680	67			
Orange.....	3,680	73			
Putnam.....	796	21			
Total.....	8,156	161	19.7	81.7	-18.3

Year and County	Births	Deaths	Rates	Relative rates (percent)	Percent change ¹
1967:					
Dutchess.....	3,566	66			
Orange.....	3,693	71			
Putnam.....	746	13			
Total.....	8,005	150	18.7	77.6	-22.4
1968:					
Dutchess.....	3,580	72			
Putnam.....	3,682	91			
Orange.....	846	14			
Total.....	8,108	177	21.8	90.5	-9.5
1969:					
Dutchess.....	3,702	69			
Orange.....	3,906	69			
Putnam.....	987	22			
Total.....	8,595	158	18.4	76.3	-23.7

¹ Relative to 1961.

TABLE III.—INFANT MORTALITY IN NEW YORK COUNTIES 50-100 MILES NORTH AND NORTHWEST OF INDIAN POINT PLANT

Year and county	Births	Deaths	Rates	Relative rates	Percent change ¹
1958:					
Columbia.....	918	14			
Greene.....	568	14			
Sullivan.....	886	20			
Ulster.....	2,632	74			
Total.....	5,004	122	24.4	101.7	+1.7
1959:					
Columbia.....	870	19			
Greene.....	596	16			
Sullivan.....	892	20			
Ulster.....	2,670	57			
Total.....	5,028	112	22.3	92.1	-7.1
1960:					
Columbia.....	918	15			
Greene.....	612	19			
Sullivan.....	854	26			
Ulster.....	2,708	54			
Total.....	5,092	114	22.4	93.3	-6.7
1961:					
Columbia.....	928	23			
Greene.....	584	9			
Sullivan.....	896	33			
Ulster.....	2,720	58			
Total.....	5,128	123	24.0	100	0
1962:					
Columbia.....	924	21			
Greene.....	562	14			
Sullivan.....	824	31			
Ulster.....	2,574	74			
Total.....	4,884	140	28.7	119.6	+19.6
1963:					
Columbia.....	964	22			
Greene.....	568	13			
Sullivan.....	940	30			
Ulster.....	2,536	63			
Total.....	5,008	128	25.6	106.7	+6.7

Year and county	Births	Deaths	Rates	Relative rates	Percent change ¹
1964:					
Columbia.....	892	17			
Greene.....	600	16			
Sullivan.....	876	26			
Ulster.....	2,532	56			
Total.....	4,900	115	23.5	97.9	-2.1
1965:					
Columbia.....	844	12			
Greene.....	518	5			
Sullivan.....	852	18			
Ulster.....	2,468	63			
Total.....	4,682	98	20.9	87.1	-12.9
1966:					
Columbia.....	772	9			
Greene.....	512	7			
Sullivan.....	826	26			
Ulster.....	2,396	36			
Total.....	4,506	78	17.3	72.1	-27.9
1967:					
Columbia.....	792	19			
Greene.....	493	4			
Sullivan.....	745	22			
Ulster.....	2,214	41			
Total.....	4,253	86	20.2	84.2	-15.8
1968:					
Columbia.....	686	18			
Greene.....	466	12			
Sullivan.....	749	17			
Ulster.....	2,129	40			
Total.....	4,030	87	21.6	90.0	-10.0
1969:					
Columbia.....	807	11			
Greene.....	490	9			
Sullivan.....	802	23			
Ulster.....	2,254	37			
Total.....	4,353	80	18.4	76.7	-23.3

TABLE IV.—INFANT MORTALITY IN NEW YORK CITY 15 TO 50 MILES SOUTH OF INDIAN POINT PLANT

Year	Births	Deaths	Rates	Rel. rates ¹ (percent)	Percent change ¹
1958.....	159,256	4,279	26.9	104.7	+4.7
1959.....	159,498	4,273	26.8	104.3	+4.3
1960.....	157,706	4,142	26.3	102.3	+2.3
1961.....	160,396	4,119	25.7	100.0	0
1962.....	157,908	4,366	27.6	107.4	+7.4
1963.....	160,582	4,119	26.1	101.6	+1.6
1964.....	159,206	4,289	26.9	104.6	+4.6
1965.....	152,900	3,946	25.8	100.4	+0.4
1966.....	147,530	3,683	25.0	97.3	-2.7
1967.....	140,368	3,344	23.8	92.6	-7.4
1968.....	131,457	3,034	23.1	89.9	-10.1
1969.....	135,732	3,315	24.4	94.9	-5.1

¹ Relative to 1961 value.

TABLE V.—INFANT MORTALITY IN NASSAU COUNTY, LONG ISLAND, N.Y., 20 TO 50 MILES SOUTHEAST OF INDIAN POINT PLANT

Year	Births	Deaths	Rates	Rel. rates ¹ (percent)	Percent Change ¹
1958.....	26,088	516	19.8	103.7	+3.7
1959.....	25,406	540	21.3	111.5	+11.5
1960.....	25,298	480	19.0	99.5	-5
1961.....	24,544	470	19.1	100.0	0
1962.....	23,674	460	19.4	101.6	+1.6
1963.....	23,040	462	20.1	105.2	+5.2
1964.....	22,178	457	20.6	107.9	+7.9
1965.....	21,110	405	19.2	100.5	+0.5
1966.....	19,704	336	17.1	89.5	-10.5
1967.....	18,240	348	19.1	100.0	0
1968.....	17,547	306	17.4	91.1	-8.9
1969.....	17,526	289	16.5	86.4	-13.6

¹ Relative to 1961 value.

TABLE VI.—INFANT MORTALITY IN SUFFOLK COUNTY, LONG ISLAND, N.Y., 40 TO 140 MILES SOUTHEAST OF INDIAN POINT REACTOR

Year	Births	Deaths	Rates	Rel. rates ¹ (percent)	Change ¹	Change ²
1958	14,522	322	22.2	94.9	-5.1	+13.8
1959	15,718	331	21.1	90.2	-9.8	+8.2
1960	17,068	411	24.1	103.0	+3.0	+23.6
1961	17,906	419	23.4	100.0	0	+16.7
1962	18,304	383	20.9	89.9	-10.1	+6.7
1963	19,362	373	19.3	82.5	-17.5	-1.0
1964	19,860	377	19.0	81.2	-18.8	-2.6
1965	19,124	400	20.9	89.3	-10.7	+6.7
1966	18,626	311	16.7	71.4	-28.6	-1.7
1967	18,510	356	19.2	82.1	-17.9	-1.6
1968	18,275	319	17.5	74.8	-25.2	-11.4
1969	19,569	256	17.0	72.6	-27.4	-12.8

¹ Relative to 1961 value.² Relative to lowest rate attained previously, 19.5 in 1954.TABLE VIII.—EXTERNAL BACKGROUND RADIATION DOSE RATES AND WASTE DISCHARGES AT BROOKHAVEN NATIONAL LABORATORIES¹

Year	Total mr/wk. ²	Fallout mr/wk.	Dose/yr. mr/yr. ²	Dose/yr. BNL release mr/yr. ³	Liquid waste input to BNL filter bed mCi/yr.	Liquid waste released from BNL filter bed mCi/yr.	Year	Total mr/wk. ²	Fallout mr/wk.	Dose/yr. mr/yr. ²	Dose/yr. BNL release mr/yr. ³	Liquid waste input to BNL filter bed mCi/yr.	Liquid waste released from BNL filter bed mCi/yr.
1949	1.80	0.21	10.9				1960	1.88	0.29	15.1	3.6	542.9	177.8
1950	1.74	.15	7.8				1961	1.73	.14	7.3	7.3	384.4	219.1
1951	1.59	.00	0	5.2	160.5	21.5	1962	2.41	.82	42.8	5.2	128.9	135.9
1952	1.73	.03	1.5	3.6	116.6	27.9	1963	3.05	1.46	76.0	29.6	127.5	99.4
1953	1.73	.14	7.3	3.1	132.9	35.8	1964	2.65	1.06	55.2	28.6	89.0	76.4
1954	1.66	.07	3.7	5.2	182.1	48.5	1965	2.07	.48	25.0	15.6	66.8	41.8
1955	1.70	.11	5.7	13.5	223.8	75.0	1966	1.77	.18	9.4	12.0	85.1	37.2
1956	1.79	.20	10.4	7.8	170.0	55.0	1967	1.73	.14	7.3	4.7	81.2	47.9
1957	1.89	.30	15.6	10.4	300.8	105.1	1968	1.70	.11	5.7	2.6	21.5	16.2
1958	2.23	.64	33.2	20.8	325.1	106.0	1969	1.65	.06	3.1	0		
1959	2.58	.99	51.5	6.8	586.6	169.5							

¹ Based on data by A.P. Hull, reference 8.² Measured at 4.8 miles north of BNL perimeter.³ Difference between dose measured at northeast perimeter station and station 4.8 miles north.⁴ Year of lowest background rate at station 4.8 miles north of BNL perimeter, taken as normal background rate prior to major weapons testing and releases from BNL.⁵ From measurements at station 3.5 miles south of BNL perimeter.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

(1) Map of lower New York State showing the location of the Indian Point Plant in Westchester and the Brookhaven National Laboratory in Suffolk. Population figures are those for 1960.

(2) Infant mortality rates for Westchester and Rockland Counties compared with the rates for Nassau 1958-1969. Also shown is the liquid radioactive waste other than tritium released from the Indian Point Plant.

(3) Percent excess infant mortality for Westchester and Rockland Counties relative to Nassau vs. the annual amounts of liquid waste discharge from Indian Point, expressed in percent of permissible limit.

(4) Correlation between liquid and gaseous effluent in the form of noble and activation gases from the Indian Point Plant 1963-1968 as reported in the P.H.S. Publication BRH-70-2.

(5) Changes in infant mortality relative to 1961 Westchester and Rockland compared with four upstate control counties 40 to 80 miles north. Also shown are Indian Point liquid releases and Iodine-131 in N.Y. City milk in average monthly concentrations (pCi/liter). Liquid release as percent of permissible limit.

(6) Correlation between percent excess infant mortality for Westchester and Rockland relative to upstate control counties and liquid waste discharges from the Indian Point Reactor.

(7) Percent changes in infant mortality by 1966 relative to 1961 for counties at increasing distances from the Indian Point Plant moving north.

(8) Percent changes in infant mortality by 1966 relative to 1961 for counties at increasing distances from the Indian Point Plant moving south-east.

(9) Changes in infant mortality for West-

chester and Rockland compared with New York City relative to the 1961 rates.

(10) Percent changes of infant mortality for the year of peak releases from the Indian Point Plant by 1966 relative to 1961 for all New York Counties within a radius of 100 miles.

(11) Infant mortality in Nassau County during period of peak nuclear testing in the atmosphere compared with external radiation levels measured at Brookhaven. Also shown are annual doses from gaseous releases measured at the northeast perimeter of the Brookhaven Laboratory.

(12) Excess infant mortality in Nassau County relative to the 1955-66 base-line vs. the external gamma radiation dose measured at Brookhaven National Laboratory. The slope of the least-square fitted line corresponds to a 22% increase for a dose of only 100 mr per year.

(13) Leukemia rate per million population for Nassau County compared with the measured external gamma radiation rate from fallout 5 years earlier.

(14) Correlation between the percent increase in leukemia rates in Nassau County and the annual dose from external fallout radiation. The least-square fitted line corresponds to an increase of 49% for a dose of 100 mr per year.

(15) Infant mortality rates for Suffolk and Nassau counties, 1949-1969, compared with the releases of liquid radioactive waste from the Brookhaven National Laboratory in Suffolk County. Note that in 1949 and 1968, Nassau and Suffolk had the same rates of infant mortality. Note that throughout the period of nuclear testing and large releases from B.N.L. or from 1949 to 1962, infant mortality refused to decline, and that the sharp decline began only after 1965, when dietary levels of radioactivity had sharply declined all over the United States.

TABLE VII.—RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISCHARGES FROM INDIAN POINT UNIT NO. 1¹

Year	Gaseous waste Noble and active gases (curies)	Tritium in liquid waste (curies)	Liquid waste gross β and γ (curies)	Liquid waste-gross β and γ as percent of permissible limit	
				1-year average	2-year average
1963	0.0072	(?)	0.164	0.26	0.24
1964	13.2	(?)	13.0	22.0	11.13
1965	33.1	(?)	26.3	43.0	32.50
1966 ²	36.4	125	43.7	70.1	56.50
1967	23.4	297	28.0	41.55	35.80
1968	59.7	787	34.6	41.65	1.60
1969 ³	600	1,100	28.0	41.50	1.58

¹ Taken from U.S. Public Health Service Report BRH/DER 70-2 (March 1970) ref. 6.² Not reported.³ New fuel core installed.⁴ Based on radionuclide analysis.⁵ AEC Report, testimony of Commissioner J. T. Ramey (ref. 7).

ADDICTS FORCED TO FACE THEMSELVES

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, there appeared recently in the Lowell Sun, a series of articles on Anabasis House, a self-help drug rehabilitation program being conducted through SHARE, in Lowell, Mass.

The first report described the basic concept which its founder, Dr. Paul Struder, has attempted to implement at Anabasis House, and dealt with the difficulties of combating fear, misunderstanding, and ignorance of the whole drug problem as well as this particular undertaking. The third was a personal and eloquent response by the reporter, Eric Best, after more than a week's involvement with the program. The second article offers a particular meaningful picture of how people in need of help are confronting their own problems and learning to solve them at Anabasis House, and I am including it here for the thoughtful attention of my colleagues:

ADDICTS FORCED TO FACE THEMSELVES
(By Eric Best)

LOWELL.—Morning meetings, afternoon seminars and evening groups provide different vehicles for confrontation on a daily basis for addicts trying to "kick the habit" at Anabasis house. A part of the confrontation,

under leadership is designed to teach the residents to face themselves—their strengths, weaknesses, errors, and instabilities.

During morning meeting, "pull-ups" force people who have been thoughtless or careless the day before to admit their actions in front of the entire house population. If they have failed to help when they should have, failed to pick up after themselves, or failed to perform their duties as those duties are set down, they are "pulled up" by one of their peers and reprimanded in front of the group. The idea is that by facing themselves in this fashion they will be able to do the same when they leave the house, and not seek instead the protective euphoria of the drug experience.

The experience provides a substitute for what the 1970 government report on drug abuse said about aims for parents.

"... to rear his children so that they are neither deprived of affection nor spoiled. A parent should have a realistic set of expectations for them. He should give his children responsibilities according to their capabilities and not overprotect them from the difficulties they will encounter."

Afternoon seminars are often run by members of the house on a subject they know well, and are designed as a time not only for factual learning but as an opportunity for persons who have trouble facing a group to learn to deal with the anxiety of being the center of attention.

Dr. Paul Strudler now runs two seminars a week, employing various exercises in psychodrama and role playing to give the residents a format in which they can express feelings and thoughts which they would leave otherwise unexpressed, and perhaps altogether hidden.

"It's about time I got directly involved in the program I helped create," he says.

Response to his seminars is almost universally enthusiastic amongst the residents, who have admitted that his willingness to help them directly is just as significant as the quality of his ideas.

If one was to boil down the theory into a simple thought, the thought would be that in order to stay away from drugs one has to be stable enough and tough enough to handle reality as it comes. The need to face things and to be strong is typified by other halfway houses which have chosen such names as Challenge House, Reality House, Renaissance Project—all pointing to the fact that a drug user needs to change and his change will not come without sweat.

The Anabasis Philosophy, still being developed, is read by one of the residents at the beginning of every morning meeting.

"After time and space we have arrived here because there is no refuge from ourselves. We are together to share in the belief that there are no gains without pains, that to be strong we must struggle to meet the challenges... to stand tall and true in the face of our worst enemies that keep us ignorant and frightened and alone without love. Until we confront ourselves in the eyes of others we are running, afraid to be known, we can know neither ourselves nor any other.

"We believe that each of us can, with faith and love and trust for each other, triumph over our own enemies, within ourselves. In our struggle for development we shall reach forward to reach the apex of human dignity. Here we can appear clearly to ourselves—not as the giant of our dreams nor the dwarf of our fears, but as men, part of a whole with a share in its purpose.

"We will be dedicated to the belief that if you treat a man as he is, he will stay as he is. But if you treat him as he ought to be and could be, then he will become as he ought to be and could be.

"Now we are no longer alone as in death, but alive to ourselves and to others; sharing together the ultimate arrival of peace and tranquility."

It is not hard to find a resident who is bitter about the gulf in understanding that separates the outside public from the inner workings of the house.

One boy spent three months in the Deer Island jail and he says that did nothing for him.

"You spend so much time thinking about being in jail that you never have a chance to think about why you were on dope and how to get off. Here, that's what the point is—why I was in jail to begin with."

The boy is angry because he knows what he has to face every day. He also knows that he faces it because he has made errors that will take a lifetime of effort to correct. Now what he seeks is some understanding from the community of which he is a part, and he wants the community not to reject him out of hand.

Another girl is transparently afraid to return to the outside environment that brought her to where she is.

ACID AT LHS

"I flipped out on acid in Lowell High," she explains. "But I don't want to go back there because half the school is on drugs and it would be the same scene with the same people. I don't want anything to do with them now. Particularly the way they act towards someone who has been here. They think you're never anything but a drug addict."

"The most popular reason among these kids for being on drugs is the 'to belong to' reason, explains Louis Buccaroni. "Everyone is introduced to drugs by close friends, and so to get them off the same principles applies. We reverse the process and make them want to belong to a group of non-users as much as they wanted to belong to a group of users."

Buccaroni's point about users is echoed by a cynical comment in the Federal study. "There is little evidence to confirm the belief that pushers need to turn on a novice. His 'friends' do it for him."

VIEW ON THE PROGRAM

"It's the best there is available," says Vice Squad Inspector John Cullen, who is open in his skepticism about the degree to which the residents' behavior is controlled.

"They should treat the kids the way they did in CCC, make them work until they drop, throw water on them, then make them work some more," says a lieutenant on the force.

The same lieutenant has made the remark that addicts should be put on an island somewhere and left there with no access to drugs, the apparent theory being that deprivation solves addiction.

"My father came over here from Italy and things were tough on him for a long time," says another officer. "He made it and there's no reason why these kids can't either."

Out of the radically different conceptions of the program comes one reality, and that is that people do not really know what to think about drug addiction, except that they don't like the fact that it has arrived and they consider it an offensively untidy problem.

"Most people are so afraid of drug addiction that they pick up on rumors rather than asking what they can do," says Strudler. "Despite the severity of the problem and what people claim is their desire to see something done, we haven't had that much citizen participation."

LITTLE CITIZEN HELP

The lack of citizen participation which Strudler focuses on does not include the Kiwanis Volunteers who have provided a Board of Directors for SHARE, the doctors who have devoted time to develop the Methadone program at the three hospitals, or the persons who have donated furniture to make the house the bright and comfortable place to live in that it is.

But Sunday afternoons, the House is open to visitors and few people who have not sud-

denly found that their child is addicted have come through the house. People are also allowed in the house during the week.

Comments have been made to hospital personnel that the residents can often be seen sitting in front of the house, but few offers have been made of spots in the nearby countryside where the residents could gather for a picnic.

The summer, according to Buccaroni, is a difficult time for kids to hang on the program, because of the heat and the activity of summer the pull of the street life strengthens.

METHADONE ISSUE

Another complicating aspect of the program is the mystique which surrounds the use of methadone. Methadone is a drug which has a psychologically blocking effect on heroin, so that a patient treated with methadone, is able to function, does not have (physically), the craving for heroin, and knows that buying heroin will be effectively a waste of money.

Methadone is used to "detoxify" addicts; that is, bring them off heroin to a drug-free state. Or it can be used to "maintain" a heroin addict—that is, keep his body convinced that he is stable and able to function. Proponents of the drug say that since a heroin addict is essentially incurably sick, the drug is like insulin for a diabetic. Opponents to the use of the drug say that it is invaluable as a detoxification agent, but that it is wrong to string someone out on methadone and not deal with the cause of his heroin habit.

Residents at the House also say that methadone is harder to kick than heroin, because it is a longer-lasting drug which works itself more completely into a person's system.

"It's like keeping a cancer patient alive with drugs," says one. "You can control the pain but you don't cure the problem."

Strudler points out that although methadone maintenance is a drug dependent condition, it at least brings many individuals to a point where they can function, and solves their need to steal to support a heroin habit. "In that respect, it protects the community," he says.

Despite methadone's usefulness, the seven house residents presently on the drug are detoxifying. "The house is going to be completely drugfree," explains a girl.

Many people in law enforcement and in the courts are persuaded that the methadone program is being grossly misused by addicts, since some of them have devised ways to appear drug free by faking their urine tests. Furthermore, although methadone blocks heroin, it does not block the depressant effect of "downers" or the stimulating effects of speed and related drugs.

For a while during the past six months, it was not unusual for a resident of Anabasis to be maintained on methadone while he received therapy in the form of group meetings. But residents who have been there a long time, like one man for 10 months and another for seven months are opposed to addicts being maintained any longer than necessary.

The man on it for 10 months came off it four months ago and has remained drug free since that time. The other man is detoxifying now after 16 months of methadone maintenance and he admits that he feels painfully sick.

"I feel the worst I have felt in the last 16 months," he said last Monday. He doesn't know exactly when he will be drinking just orange juice at the hospital when he goes for his dosage, but he hopes it will be soon. He feels that he wants the last crutch removed, so that he can feel the satisfaction of making it on his own.

Others who have been on methadone find the cutoff of the maintenance drug too much to handle and they leave the house. Two members walked out last Monday, and those left behind speculated that it was their

methadone withdrawal that they couldn't tolerate.

Still, between the doctors at the hospital and those in the house who can watch the methadone patients, what is being sought is the best balance between the uncontrolled use of methadone and the clearly inhumane demand that every addict kick the drug cold.

NO CONTACT BY PARENTS

And what of the parents? For each of the residents of the house there is somewhere a set of parents, or one parent, and those who live locally are, for the most part, trying to confront themselves.

Buccaroni points out that most parents are not allowed any contact with their child if he is a new resident for at least 30 days.

"My feeling is that by the time a kid is put in here, his parents have had their chance and it is time that we have our chance without family troubles interfering," he says.

An encounter group program for parents has been started on Tuesday nights at Keith Academy, run by a volunteer from the Mental Health Program, Marcia Madden.

To attend one of the groups is to see a number of very devastated parents, facing the fact of their presence, a child somewhere of whom they have lost control and with whom they have lost touch.

Their group is slower to open up than the groups in which their children participate, but in the slow revelation of feelings, one cannot help but feel that these people would do anything asked of them to repair the torn fabric of their families.

They feel that not only were there aspects of their children that they did not understand, but that the same misunderstanding will have the same destructive effects on other families if the public does not become more aware of the drug threat.

"The house and the problem and the program is so misunderstood by so many people," says one woman whose daughter is an Anabasis resident. "If only they would take the time to find out what is really going on."

MEDICAL AID PROGRAMS AS PART OF ADVENTURISM IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, one of the witnesses at the recently concluded International Commission of Enquiry into U.S. Crimes in Indochina was Mrs. Claire Culhane, who served in Vietnam as an adviser to a Canadian Government hospital.

Mrs. Culhane's testimony deals with the role of medical aid programs in overall policy in Indochina. I am going to insert her testimony into the RECORD, but before I do so, I also want to have reprinted a brief portion of the Nuremberg Agreement which the United States entered into in 1945 to establish the International Military Tribunal to prosecute war criminals:

JURISDICTION AND GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Article 6. The Tribunal established by the Agreement referred to in Article 1 hereof for the trial and punishment of the major war criminals of the European Axis countries shall have the power to try and punish persons who, acting in the interests of the European Axis countries, whether as individuals or as members of organizations, committed any of the following crimes.

The following acts, or any of them, are crimes coming within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal for which there shall be individual responsibility:

(a) **CRIMES AGAINST PEACE:** namely, planning, preparation, initiation or waging of a war of aggression, or a war in violation of international treaties, agreements or assurances, or participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the foregoing;

(b) **WAR CRIMES:** namely, violations of the laws or customs of war. Such violations shall include, but not be limited to, murder, ill-treatment or deportation to slave labor or for any other purpose of civilian population of or in occupied territory, murder or ill-treatment of prisoners of war or persons on the seas, killing of hostages, plunder of public or private property, wanton destruction of cities, towns or villages, or devastation not justified by military necessity;

(c) **CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY:** namely, murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation, and other inhumane acts committed against any civilian population, before or during the war; or persecutions on political, racial or religious grounds in execution of or in connection with any crime within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal, whether or not in violation of the domestic law of the country where perpetrated.—See protocol [LXI] for correction of this paragraph.

Leaders, organizers, instigators and accomplices participating in the formulation or execution of a common plan or conspiracy to commit any of the foregoing crimes are responsible for all acts performed by any persons in execution of such plan.

In her testimony, Mrs. Culhane documents how U.S. officials in Southeast Asia are party to acts which blatantly violate the Nuremberg principles. It is unfortunate that this Nation's leaders have not been able to keep control over our actions in Indochina. It is especially tragic for the maimed, tortured, and suffering victims of this insanity.

Policymakers in this country today are guilty of violating every provision of the War Crimes Agreement. What Mrs. Culhane tells about is only a minute—but ghastly—segment. We cannot avoid these horrors any longer.

I now insert Mrs. Culhane's statement for the RECORD:

THE PART WHICH MEDICAL AID PROGRAMS PLAY IN THE U.S. POLICY IN INDOCHINA

(By Claire Culhane)

I am a Canadian citizen of the country bordering on the United States. Many of us realize that Canada is playing the role of the "Butcher's Helper." I propose to present the basis for this hateful designation.

I was sent by the Canadian Government in October 1967 as an Advisor to work as Administrative Assistant in the Canadian Anti-Tuberculosis Hospital in Quang Ngai, South Vietnam, which was located six miles from My Lai.

Every day that I was there I was horrified at the inhuman destruction of life and land about me. I can never forget the baby I had to lift out of a pool of its own blood. I heard the sounds of aerial bombing every night which left behind each morning a devastation beyond belief. In the midst of this agonizing carnage I recognized the Canadian-made planes flying above our Canadian-funded hospital. I know that the bombs were filled with Canadian-made explosives. I know that classified research into chemical and biological warfare was being carried out jointly with the United States in my country. I know that hundreds of millions of dollars worth of weaponry were being delivered annually from Canada, some of which were to find their final destination in

the corpses of tiny infants in the village where I worked.

In December 1946 the General Assembly of the United Nations unanimously passed a resolution (No. 95-1) affirming the principles of international laws. It recognizes the Charter of the Nuremberg Tribunal which includes a Code of Offenses against the peace and security of mankind. Principle VII of Section VIII of this Code states, in part:—

"... complicity in the commission of a crime against peace, a war crime or a crime against humanity... is a crime under International Law."

In April 1968 when I subsequently filed my report with the Canadian Department of External Aid documenting my findings during my period of service, I recommended an immediate parliamentary investigation in Canada's role in Vietnam. I stated, in part:—

"... the mere fact of my being in South Vietnam (within the given terms of reference) deprived me of my right to stand aside from some measure of responsibility for all the brutality and horror being inflicted upon innocent human beings... however, when I found myself being required to associate with those elements which were not only imposing the solution but employing the most cruel and savage methods to do so, I was left with no other choice but to detach myself from them."

I felt that my efforts should instead supplement the demands for an embargo on all arms sales to the USA which were being made by church and peace groups across the country. I also recommended that the only meaningful aid we could offer the Vietnamese people would be to send massive supplies of medical and surgical equipment directly through channels already utilized for those purposes. I also wished to be relieved of my deep sense of criminality for having worked within the infrastructure of a highly suspect US-aid program. This has since been confirmed in the report filed by A. D. Horne of the Washington Post (7/7/70) who asked Dr. John Hannah, Director of US-aid program: "How do you respond to complaints that the aid program is being used as a cover for CIA operations in Laos?" The doctor replied "Well, I just have to admit that that is true."

While making rounds in the wards of many hospitals in South Vietnam I gradually began to realize that there were some wounds and conditions which did not correspond to the usual categories of bomb splinters—artillery—cannon fire—napalm—grenades—mines—but had to be explained some other way. Such examples as: a peppering of the skin which did not always penetrate deeply into the organs and therefore could not have resulted from gunfire, was later explained to be from anti-personnel bombs calculated to penetrate only flesh but not metal or wood; or a girl with her breasts cleanly sliced off; or a baby with a hole in its back the size of a small orange; or a buffalo boy castrated; or the pattern of tracer bullets across a two year old's face extending from below the lobe of one ear across the cheeks, under the nostrils and across to the lobe of the other ear; an old man with literally no distinguishable features on his face, only the sockets where the eyes, nose and mouth once were; or a young girl with clear evidence of vaginal passage destruction by sharp and jagged objects; and of course the numerous crushed bodies run over by Armoured Patrol Cars. (During my first week in Quang Ngai two sisters brought in the remains of the body of their little brother just destroyed by such an accident); and the shrill hysteria of very young babies when approached by a Non-Vietnamese person whether in hospital or in the countryside became a consistent pattern.

In the words of Gunnar Myrdal, in his opening remarks:

"... it falls upon private individuals and organizations to establish the true facts of the grave war crimes against humanity committed by the U.S. in Indochina . . . to try to do this is a moral duty for every person, to keep silent about the horrible acts that have been committed and are continually being committed every day amounts to becoming a conspiracy hiding the crimes."

In presenting my testimony to this International Commission of Enquiry, I wish to underscore the fact that when my report was filed with the Canadian government as stated above, it was specifically urged that an immediate investigation be undertaken by a responsible Parliamentary committee since it was clearly apparent, by the very nature of the charges laid and the relative elements of time and distance in a country at war, that any delay could then be utilized to try and destroy the accuracy and urgency of the said report. It is therefore my considered opinion that the Canadian and American governments will have to jointly answer before the next international bar of justice for the crimes related herein.

It is therefore with the precise intention of bringing before this Commission the crimes against humanity as listed in the said report, that I submit my material to this body of opinion for their solemn consideration:

My material is divided as follows:

1. Conditions at the hospitals in South Vietnam

- (a) Canadian Anti-Tuberculosis Hospital
- (b) Quang Ngai Provincial Hospital
- (c) Da Nang Provincial Hospital
- (d) U.S. Military hospitals
- (e) Canadian Rehabilitation Hospital in Qui Nhon

2. Miscellaneous observations.

(a) Canadian antituberculosis hospital

There was a three month delay in opening this hospital following my arrival, mainly due to the lack of supplies and equipment, some of which had been declared "lost on arrival" but had been disposed of on the black market, and due to faulty and irresponsible construction and wiring resulting in a section of the ceiling caving in and narrowly missing bed-ridden patients.

On three occasions, in my presence, Dr. Michel Jutras, director, refused treatment to local people seeking minor surgery (e.g. superficial bullet wounds). On another occasion when the uncle of our hospital electrician was brought in, gravely burned and having just lost his wife and ten children all found dead in the tunnel behind him, as they hid from a bombing raid, the same Dr. Jutras ordered the patient removed from the half empty ward in our hospital to the overcrowded poorly equipped Provincial Hospital down the road.

The Canadian Hospital was occupied by the ARVN troops during the Tet Offensive of February 1968, and used as a military base. It became necessary to evacuate the patients (43) and send them home with ten days' supply of antibiotics, while the bombs were falling, since Dr. James Connolly (Milphap head at the Provincial Hospital) refused us permission to transfer them back to the old tuberculosis ward there, which was still empty.

On protesting later to the Canadian Ambassador in Saigon that we were not operating as a 100% independent Canadian humanitarian team as we were officially known, and should therefore be withdrawn officially under protest, the reply was made that I should be satisfied with a 50% ratio of humanitarianism and 50% political as that was what we were really there for. Our presence was evidently required to provide another facade for the so-called "pacification program."

Also, within this context is the construction of the \$570,000 housing unit in Ming

Manh suburb of Saigon under the publicly hailed "aid to refugees program". Only government and military officials can afford such rents, while on the grounds adjoining the Canadian hospital in Quang Ngai, 2,000 refugees continue to crowd around a single mud hole for their water supply.

(b) Quang Ngai Provincial Hospital

Located in a compound, approximately 700 patients filled about 400 beds, averaging two patients to a bed. Each patient usually was cared for by a member of the family. Plumbing, water and electricity services were totally inadequate as were medical and nursing care. Under the Saigon administration there are only about 100 Vietnamese doctors caring for the entire population. The government food allotment was 30 plasters per patient per day (less than 20 cents value in 1967) which was also the amount intended to feed the tuberculosis patients in the Canadian hospital. The standards fell far below those considered humane in the treatment and care of human beings.

Following are examples from the various wards:

In the Burns Ward I have seen patients so disfigured from napalm as to make it impossible to verify whether they were a man or a woman. I have seen skin and bone sizzling on a child's hand from phosphorus burn for 24 hours resisting any treatment. I have heard Dr. Van der Houf (Milphap Director) assure visiting journalists and doctors that the victims in the Burns Ward were mostly the result of gasoline explosions as he was sure they could confirm through the aid of the interpreter. However, on many occasions when a second question was placed asking "where did the gasoline come from?" the patient would point to the sky. It must also be noted at this point that the black market indiscriminately sold kerosene and gasoline in similar unmarked canisters so it was another cause for unnecessary painful and serious burns.

There were seldom enough daily supplies of vaseline gauze to wind around the limbs and bodies of these patients. Dressings were left unchanged indefinitely. One soon realized with great bitterness and frustration, that this type of nursing care was totally futile. We once nursed a small boy through three months, after which he was discharged although not totally healed. He had been brought into hospital originally by an American helicopter from his village several hundred miles distance. This was a common practice since USA transport dropped off wounded civilians wherever convenient to their own schedule. Since they were sometimes picked up after a military operation had destroyed their village, they were further victimized by being deposited many miles from their hamlet, unattended by a member of their family (an absolute essential to provide nursing care, food and the irreplaceable psychological sustenance.)

In this case, this particular child only partially healed of the excessive napalm burns was sent home (to a home which possibly no longer existed) to live and play in unsanitary conditions which could only result in reinfection of his open wounds, to become fatally infected within a short period of time.

It must then be concluded that even while trying to lavish the best possible care upon him during this three month stay in the hospital, it had to be carried out with the full knowledge that, unless the patient could be maintained in clean sterile conditions until the healing process was entirely completed, one was nursing a doomed child with little or no hope of surviving upon discharge. Even though this was the considered fate of every civilian in South Vietnam, the farce of caring for the sick under such circumstances could only be labeled as a futile exercise of macabre proportions.

In the Surgery Ward I have seen patients lifted off a soiled litter which had carried them many miles and many days, with the same caked blood and mud and splintered bone and protruding organs and entrails, and in this same condition placed on an operating table for surgery, without even the benefits of washing the operative site. The shortage of water supplies was not solved by the water tower constructed within sight and sound of the Surgery Ward. This tower had been constructed immediately prior to the 1966 tour of Senator Edward Kennedy when he came to investigate where US-AID funds were being spent. However, he left before the water tower was connected to the surgery ward, and so it was never completed and the lack of water continued. It obviously was not a matter of funds as that same season \$4,000 had been allotted to redecorate a villa where four doctors lived and for which they spent \$400 monthly rental (the rental for the Canadian house across the road was \$75.00 for the purpose of comparison.)

In the Soft Tissue Ward which Dr. Vennoma (former Director of Canadian Medical Services in South Vietnam) had volunteered to take charge of, contained an assortment of injuries. It was in this ward where one of the young Canadian male nurses used to perform grafting operations. The first one I witnessed was that of a young girl who was transferred from her bed to the end of the ward where there were less mosquitos, dirt and dogs. The donor area in the thigh was slightly anesthetized and the recipient area where three toes had been blown off was washed with hydrogen peroxide. The small islands of skin removed from the donor area were then transferred to the recipient area. The wound was bandaged and the girl returned to her bed. Supervision and further care were then just left to chance visits. The prognosis was entirely irrelevant.

It was in this ward as well where the victims of gas were brought in who demonstrated much difficulty in breathing and exhaled an overpowering stench from their very pores. Dr. Vennoma was to later describe this as a "type of gas used which makes one quite sick when one touches or inhales the breath from their lungs. After contact with them for more than three minutes one has to leave the room in order not to get ill." (In a letter sent to Dr. E. W. Pfeiffer in December 1967).

Children's Ward: Was the saddest and where the mortality rate was the highest. Amoebic dysentery, typhoid, pneumonia, malaria, took a nightly toll as they went into convulsions and died.

Maternity ward: During the Tet offensive of February 1968, three refugee families moved into this ward. They could not be removed during the labor and delivery period. When a Quaker friend, Margaret, and I requested that the American Red Cross people start providing shelter and food for the refugees who were encamping on the hospital grounds in large numbers, we were told it was impossible since it could not be done without the permission of the Vietnamese medical director, who had already left for Saigon for an indefinite period.

Medical ward: Dr. Paul Schmidt of the "Vietnam Project"¹ reported that one of his

¹ A two month volunteer service sponsored by the American Medical Association whereby doctors volunteered to go to Vietnam for two months. This was a self-defeating program in the sense that the few doctors who did manage to sustain a sincere motivation became deeply frustrated because of their inability to accomplish anything worth their efforts. Those others just didn't care because even if they did, in order to perform their duties with any measure of ethical concern, would mean being obliged to get to the basic causes, namely, lack of clean water, supplies, electricity, sewerage, equipment, and of course, the war.

patients, an 11 year old boy suffering from severe malnutrition and decreased blood count (Hemoglobin 4 gms. approximately 30% normal blood count) disappeared every weekend. It was finally discovered that he was walking 15 kms. every Friday to care for a baby sister left with neighbours after their parents had been killed, and then he returned every Monday to quietly get back into his bed.

Prisoners' cells—Two small cells on the hospital grounds were inspected by the Quaker friend, Margaret and myself on the 4th February, 1968. The French speaking guard who had held the same job since the days of the French occupation, revealed in the one cell a radiant young mother, proudly showing us her newborn baby as if the world was all aglow with the wonder of it all, and hardly an indication of her circumstances.

In the adjoining cell we were told by the guard was a girl whom he called "uno folle". She was approximately 16 years old with her hands manacled, her hair all disheveled, her face scratched, her blouse torn at both shoulders and having just flung the small bowl of rice crashing against the wall, turned on us shrieking "Moore" (meaning American). When I asked the guard how long was it since she had been violated, he shrugged, turned away and answered that he did not know.

(c) DaNang Provincial Hospital

During the period of evacuation after the Tet offensive, of the American civilian personnel from Quang Ngai, I assisted Dr. Patra Mosoly (of the Vietnam Project). We removed the sutures from the shaved scalp of a woman which were bursting from the purulent pressure at the tension points. The flaps of the scalp were laid back while the infected areas were washed with hydrogen peroxide. Instead of re-suturing the flaps of the scalp, they were just held firmly at the meeting edges while a fresh circular head bandage was applied.

Dr. Mosley, anxiously watching the time in order to meet an officer to play tennis at 12:30, was preparing to leave as I proceeded to straighten the bed clothes. At that point the condition of the patient's body beneath the bed covers was revealed as having an evident perforated intestinal wound, shattered upper femur, portion of foot severed and bleeding profusely, and altogether a desperate sight! Upon being called back and shown the woman's condition, Dr. Mosley laughingly replied: "Don't be silly, she won't live till morning anyway, she'll just smell a little sweeter when she dies."

(d) American Military Hospital

Nov. 8/67—Danang: Naval Military hospital where a D. D. Early, neurosurgeon, medical director, on learning that I was working with D. D. Vonnoma in a Tuberculosis Hospital, asked what Dr. Vonnoma thought of his experiments—he had been injecting tubercle bacilli into simians (monkeys) and found that they died within 24 hours and therefore had absolutely no resistance to the injection.

He wondered if there was any correlation between the monkeys and the Vietnamese who have a very low resistance to tuberculosis, one in seven have tuberculosis in Vietnam. He was serious.

(e) Canadian Rehabilitation Hospital—Qui Nhon

Upon my return to Canada I was contacted by Dr. Lotta Hitchmanova of the Unitarian Services, for background material on Vietnam as she was planning to go to Saigon to set up a children's home. I advised her that

Doctors trained in modern American methods were entirely dependent upon lab and xray reports before they could formulate their diagnosis. On one occasion an infant died of severe constipation which required only rectal stimulation to increase the peristalsis. The death certificate read: "Massive abdominal tumor cause of death."

this was not the time since she would have to work within the Saigonese structure which cared nothing for 95% of the population . . . that we did not go to Hitler Germany to set up hospitals but that we worked to end the war first and then helped survivors.

Apparently she went ahead anyway, and I was later to receive an inquiry from her office about a reply they had received from the Canadian team in Qui Nhon when asked to refer war wounded children. In the reply (copy of which will be forwarded to the Commission) the writer stated they were having a difficult chore in finding war casualty disabled children, much to his joy but not surprise! Such an observation reflects an ignorance and unconcern of the conditions in Qui Nhon as could be expected from a casual observer, but hardly from a dedicated worker. But such was the nature of the project . . . The proportion of amputees, injured and sickly children could not possibly vary in Qui Nhon to the rest of South Vietnam.

Further to Qui Nhon: In December 1970, it was reported that the American forces were attacked, vehicles burned, by angered civilians following the indiscriminate killing of several local students. This had happened on three occasions and finally the area was declared to be out of bounds for all American forces. When I inquired of the Canadian government what was the status of the Canadian medical team in an area where it was entirely dependent upon American logistics, under such circumstances, I received no reply to my question.

MISCELLANEOUS OBSERVATIONS

Oct. 14, 1967—Duc Pho: On the first Sunday in Quang Ngai, I drove to Duc Pho in our hospital jeep with Florent Lavole (Canadian male nurse) and Philip Griffiths (visiting professional photographer), not realizing that we were driving into an area which was in the mopping up stages. We witnessed the smoking remains of huts, charred military vehicles by the side of the road, destroyed bridges replaced by temporary pontoons. Not a single Vietnamese person to be seen anywhere at all. A G.I. in a passing convoy nervously shot across our path into a rice paddy, very narrowly missing us. We saw an archway built of gun casings near the military compound, which we were later told had caused the death of a ten year old Vietnamese boy as the casings fell into the courtyard. We also saw an American supply truck which had driven off a flooded bridge into the water, spilling out cartons of canned food. We were later told that the G.I.'s had had great sport "picking off the Vietnamese kids as they swam out to salvage the goods" (meaning shooting at them).

Dec. 1967—Da Nang: On a D-27 plane travelling back to Quang Ngai a G.I. sitting next to me on the bucket seats, commented that we must have just missed a load of prisoners, pointing to a thin piece of wire used to pierce through the two hands as they were placed against the prisoner's cheeks, he explained. As I looked questioningly at the door, he got up to show me how easily it opened.

Feb. 2, 1968—Quang Ngai: Early one morning I saw an ARVN taking a very young girl prisoner, wearing black pyjamas, with her hands manacled behind her back. He kept pushing her and when she stumbled to her feet and had great difficulty getting up, he would push her again. This went on right up the road, as far as the prison.

Returning from the hospital, at the cross roads near our house I saw the bodies of two dead Vietnamese, wearing black pyjamas. They were left lying in the road where they had been dragged. Many G.I.'s came by to take pictures of them.

Feb. 4, 1968—Quang Ngai: As the NLF had entered the prison and freed approximately half their numbers the first of the Offensive, waves of small American planes strafed the

prison yards for the entire day, literally pulverizing what was left of the occupants. The planes came right across the roof top of our house as the prison was just about ½ km. up the road, on the same side.

Feb 13/68—Saigon: With members of the Swiss medical team stationed with us in the Federal Hotel, where we became weary of stringent curfew hours, as well as revolted by the sights of enormous rats going through the refugee packed streets, we asked permission of the Minister of Health to work in the Saigon hospitals until it was decided whether we were to be sent back to our duty stations. The Canadian delegate brought back the official reply: "No thank you, everything is under control, as a matter of fact we have more doctors and nurses than patients right now."

Feb. 8/68—Da Nang: After hearing the report on the radio about an action at the bridge 2 km. from town the night before as being "10 enemy dead, no casualties" I was told by P/O Patrick Moriarty in charge of the medical station at MAGV CAB II that he had spent the night "wrapping up sixteen GI's who were killed last night—at the bridge."

Deprivations—how our mores have subjected and humiliated Vietnamese women.

Nov. 17/67—Da Nang: On invitation from Eloise Henkel, an American news correspondent, to meet her at the Press Club in Da Nang, we overheard an American Air Force officer, approximately 40 years old, university graduate, with three children of his own, referring to his sexual experiences in Vietnam. He remarked ". . . but it's the ten year olds that really tear me apart. . ."

Feb. 29/68—Quang Ngai: Our secretary, Nga the young girl who lived across the road, had previously worked in the US AID office, but had been discharged on the pretext that she had been stealing, though it was later admitted it was because she resisted the attentions of her employer. When she came to say goodbye to me at the airstrip, she whispered that she would not be going back to work at the hospital after I left. The reason she gave was because "when you were away in Saigon, I came to look for you one day, Dr. Jutras tried to make me go to his room. I did not go." This was later confirmed by Florent Lavole who admitted being present at the time. Typical comments heard over the months of visits by the various types and ranks of American military and civilian personnel to the Canadian House in Quang Ngai:

a) "I got ten points extra. I shot up a pregnant woman."

b) "But it doesn't matter if kids get killed, they'll only grow up to be VC . . . the only good Vietnamese is a dead Vietnamese . . . every dead Vietnamese is a VC."

c) Describing the portion of Highway No. 1 leading into Tansuhut Airport as a long white line seen from the plane, it was explained that it had been made by levelling rubber and sugar plantations, homes and hamlets, everything in sight, with enormous Roma bulldozers brought in from USA, and that it was just a beginning, since "we're going to make a parking lot of this country before we leave it."

d) "Only you can prevent forests."

e) "I'm going to leave as many big bellies behind as I can."

f) Nov./67—During nightly discussions with visiting GI and CIA members, I referred to their violating the Geneva Accord. Lt. Col. Grubach (spelling?) of JUSPAO, completing his 2nd year in Vietnam, commented: "I must get around to reading that one of these days."

g) Once when asking a GI why he was killing Vietnamese, he insisted that he was not killing any of them, that he only worked the computer, taking in the body count from the field.

h) "When pulling them out of a tunnel, pull them out by the arms and legs, then you

can count four instead of one for the body count."

Upon filing my report with the Canadian government as a former Advisor it has been my contention that the medical aid project which we have been funding directly to the Saigon administration over the years, has been neither intended nor effectually served the alleged purposes of "meeting the needs of the Vietnamese people." It has been on the contrary, serving the needs of the Pentagon policy to systematically and deliberately commit biocide in the whole of Indochina under the pretense of offering medical assistance.

In spite of the three year protest and exposé which I had been carrying out, trying to persuade the Canadian government to withdraw its involvement in S. Vietnam, in Feb. 1971 the Toronto Globe & Mail newspaper announced the construction of nine new medical centers in An Giang, province of Long Xuyen. This happens to be located right on the Cambodian border. Within the context of my report I submit this project can only be intended to facilitate the collection of information and the movement of troops and/or agents both during the present conflict, but more insidiously, for the period following the withdrawal of American forces.

The expose this very week, published in the New York Times, bears out the role which the Canadians in the I.C.C. have been playing. It revealed that the Canadian delegate to the I.C.C. officially, but secretly, carried messages from former Pres. Johnson to Hanoi, containing threats of further escalation. The shocking part is that the substance of these messages were kept from the public since the terms offered Hanoi were so inherently unfair. And so, in effect, Lester Pearson, then P.M. of Canada, with knowledge of the strategic plans, facilitated diplomatically the American escalation. It is within this context that the Canadian medical aid policy in S. Vietnam obviously functioned.

It is now undeniably corroborated that Canada has been providing the umbrella under which the most savage brutality has been carried out, depending upon the sympathy of good people everywhere to support the channels established for alleged medical aid, the real program to destroy the land and its peoples was better able to proceed.

It has been said that "the world is bleeding to death in Vietnam." To the extent that we have done even the smallest thing to prolong this agony, we are guilty.

In my professional opinion and based upon the above facts, the larger issue of war crimes constitutes the total sum of this report. It indicates that the basis was deliberately laid to prolong the war by creating an entirely false atmosphere of aiding and developing the Vietnamese people.

In my most precise and passionate opinion I consider the above facts a further proof of the crime against the very humanity of the peoples of Indochina.

(Report submitted to the Canadian government dated April 16/68, is filed herewith with the Commission.)

Two days after presenting this report in Oslo, personal conversation with one of the 7 American Vietnam Veterans, F. Barton Osborn, former CIA agent, described to me the methods of CIA work with "third friendly countries" within S. Vietnam.

"Stay-behind-operation"—during period of friendly control agents are trained for eventual friendly withdrawal; after loss of control of area agent reports to friendly forces from the then denied area.

"Sleeper operation"—same as above, except that agent is not activated until he is contacted according to previous instructions.

Hospitals can be used in this way as a unwitting unwitting support agent, i.e. courier, or means of access to denied area, or

communication with the agent. So, the 3rd country operation can either support the agent or be the agent.

The alarm about new construction in An Giang on Cambodian border by the Canadian government appears to bear some possible relationship to above method of work.

WINNING THE DRUG BATTLE

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, on July 9, 1971, the Honorable Eugene T. Rossides, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Enforcement, Tariff, and Trade Affairs, and Operations, outlined for the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the important role of the Department of the Treasury in President Nixon's anti-heroin action program. I find this statement to be both a valuable summary of the administration's program to meet the escalating narcotics problem in this country, and a fit commendation of the efforts of the Department of the Treasury.

As President Nixon's multifaceted program demonstrates, the effort to end narcotics supply and addiction can only be successful if a variety of Federal agencies, State programs and private organizations devote their full energies to this end. Yet, as can be seen in Assistant Secretary Rossides' statement, the Department of the Treasury carries important responsibilities within the overall program. I am happy to bring this statement to the attention of my colleagues.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE EUGENE T. ROSSIDES

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

On behalf of the Treasury Department I welcome this opportunity to appear before you today to discuss Treasury's role in President Nixon's antiheroin action program and to comment upon the overall antidrug abuse program of this Administration. The problem of drug abuse and particularly heroin abuse was not created over night, and it will not be cured over night. The drug problem of the 1950's became the drug crisis of the 1960's. It will take hard work and cooperative effort in the 1970's by many groups on the Federal, State and local levels to win this battle.

Early in his Administration the President moved on several fronts with a multidimensional action program:

First, he elevated the drug problem to the foreign policy level and has taken personal initiatives in soliciting the cooperation of other governments.

Second, he stressed the crucial role of education, research, and rehabilitation and provided for increased funds and emphasis in these essential areas.

Third, he recommended differentiation in the criminal penalty structure between heroin and marijuana; and flexible provisions for handling first offenders.

Fourth, he provided a substantial increase in budgetary support for Federal law enforcement in this area.

Fifth, he recognized the central role of the states and the need for close Federal-state

cooperation in a unified drive against drug abuse; and

Sixth, he stressed total community involvement—the private sector as well as governmental agencies—in this anti-drug abuse drive.

For the first time in history, we have seen not only the total involvement of the institution of the Presidency in the battle against drug abuse, but also the personal involvement of the President.

In my judgment this program has arrested the United States' incredible downward slide into drug abuse—although we have a long and steep climb ahead of us to return to the level from which we fell—and has alerted the international community to the global problem of drug abuse.

FOREIGN POLICY AND PRESIDENTIAL INITIATIVE

One of the serious errors of the past was the failure to appreciate drug abuse as a worldwide problem calling for an international response. Prior to this Administration, international activity by the United States was principally on the enforcement level.

President Nixon raised drug abuse to the foreign policy level at the beginning of his Administration and took personal initiatives to elicit the cooperation of other governments.

The result of this major change in the approach of the Executive Branch was to make the Department of State, as the primary representative for communicating to foreign governments the vital interest of the United States, responsible for doing everything necessary to advance our anti-drug abuse policy through diplomacy.

Secretary of State William P. Rogers has given high priority and personal leadership to the Department of State's effort in this area.

This role of the State Department in the Administration's war on drugs has had a unique and important impact. Through the use of diplomacy we have achieved a substantial advance in our objectives.

The Administration's diplomatic efforts have been worldwide. The President's words, in his address to the United Nations on its 25th Anniversary in October, 1970, sum up the problem:

"It is in the world interest that the narcotics traffic be curbed. Drugs pollute the minds and bodies of our young, bring misery, violence, and human and economic waste. This scourge of drugs can be eliminated through international cooperation."

An example of such cooperation is the effective partnership we have developed with the Government of Mexico. Operation Cooperation, the successor to Operation Intercept, has led to joint efforts by the two governments in the area of opium poppy and marijuana eradication and smuggling suppression.

Both Governments realize that a great deal more has to be done, particularly along our common border.

The French Government has pledged its cooperation and has increased substantially its enforcement efforts against heroin production and trafficking.

The most important and dramatic diplomatic news was the joint announcement on June 30, 1971, by Prime Minister Erim of Turkey and President Nixon that Turkey has decreed that within one year, in accordance with the law of Turkey, the opium poppy will no longer be planted in Turkey.

The Government of Turkey has pledged that, in the meantime, it would make a full effort to prevent the diversion of the crop now being harvested. The President has called the action of Prime Minister Erim important and courageous.

EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND REHABILITATION

The drug abuse problem is one of both supply and demand, and President Nixon's response has been guided accordingly. While

we are working to eliminate the supply at the sources, to stop the smuggling of illicit drugs into the United States, and to stop the distribution of illicit drugs internally, eliminating the demand for drugs among our youth is also central to success.

The key to eliminating the demand for drugs lies in education. The vast majority of youth, when given access to the facts, will reject drug abuse as against their own self-interest as well as against the interest of their nation.

President Nixon is convinced that much of our problem is attributable to the mass of misinformation and street-corner mythology which has filled the vacuum left by our failure in the past to deal with the young on a mature, reasoned and factual basis. In the past, our Government took the easy but ineffective route of "do as I say because I say so" rather than the more difficult route of clearly presenting the facts necessary for informed decision.

In his June 17, 1971 message, President Nixon stressed "reclamation of the drug user himself," and has requested Congressional approval of a total of \$105 million in addition to funds already contained in the FY 1972 budget to be used solely for the treatment and rehabilitation of drug-addicted individuals. He asked the Congress to provide an additional \$10 million in funds to increase and improve education and training in the field of dangerous drugs. This will increase the money available for education and training to more than \$24 million.

DIFFERENTIATION IN PENALTY STRUCTURE AND FLEXIBLE PROVISIONS FOR HANDLING FIRST OFFENDERS

Before enactment of the Controlled Dangerous Substances Act of 1970, Federal laws erroneously treated marijuana as a narcotic drug and compelled felony sentences upon conviction for any drug offenses for first offenders. The harsh and unrealistic effects of the Federal law generated credibility problems with our youth and posed enormous problems for Federal prosecutors and judges in dealing with first offenders.

President Nixon proposed a change in the penalty structure which for the first time provided a reasonable distinction between narcotic drugs and marijuana and provided the courts needed flexibility in dealing with the first offender. The courts were granted authority to clean the slate on the first offender by striking from the record mention of the first offense without adjudication of guilt. Both of these measures enhance credibility and acceptance of our drug laws, not only with youth, but also with those charged with its administration.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Drug law enforcement is a difficult and dangerous business. It demands the highest standards of professional competence of enforcement agents. President Nixon has increased substantially the budgets of the two Federal agencies primarily concerned with drug law enforcement—the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs of the Department of Justice and the Treasury's Bureau of Customs—and has initiated a major new Treasury enforcement program of tax investigations by the Internal Revenue Service of middle and upper echelon narcotics traffickers. I will discuss the Treasury programs later.

CENTRAL ROLE OF THE STATES AND FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATION

Federal-State cooperation is one of the essential elements for success in the struggle against drug abuse and this Administration is working closely with the States in this effort. Except for certain areas of special Federal interest, law enforcement and our educational system have been and must continue as essentially State and local responsibilities.

President Nixon has emphasized the Federal-State cooperation in his message to Con-

gress of July 14, 1969, on Control of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, again at the Governors' Conference on drugs at the White House held in December 1969, and as outlined in his more recent message to the Congress of June 17, 1971.

ACTION WITHIN THE PRIVATE SECTOR

The President has stressed that the private sector must provide community leadership in organizing drug abuse educational and other action programs. Religious organizations and community and civic groups such as Rotary, Kiwanis, Chamber of Commerce, and Jaycees are best equipped to get directly into the home where they can assist parents in handling the problem of drug abuse with intelligence and credibility.

TREASURY'S ROLE IN THE PRESIDENT'S ANTI-HEROIN ACTION PROGRAM

Treasury is playing a major role in the enforcement phase of the President's anti-heroin action program. Its Bureau of Customs, the nation's first line of defense against heroin smuggling, has achieved spectacular success; and the Internal Revenue Service is embarked on a major Presidential program designed to take the profit out of narcotics.

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

In his September 16, 1968, Anaheim, California, speech, the President stated:

"Let us recognize that the frontiers of the United States are the primary responsibility of the United States Bureau of Customs. I recommend that we triple the number of customs agents in this country from 331 to 1000."

The President has followed through on that pledge and more. In his July 14, 1969, Message to the Congress on the Control of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, he stated:

"The Department of the Treasury, through the Bureau of Customs, is charged with enforcing the nation's smuggling laws. I have directed the Secretary of the Treasury to initiate a major new effort to guard the nation's borders and ports against the growing volume of narcotics from abroad. There is a recognized need for more men and facilities in the Bureau of Customs to carry out this directive."

This directive was backed up with a substantial anti-narcotic supplemental budget request. The Congress responded with full bipartisan support in December of 1969 by passing an appropriation for 8.75 million dollars for 915 additional men and for equipment for Customs.

The hiring of these people, begun in January, 1970, and completed in June of that year, has produced remarkable results.

CUSTOMS SEIZURES

In a two-year period the number of seizures by Customs has more than doubled.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF CUSTOMS, DRUG SEIZURES BY FISCAL YEAR

	1969		1970		1971 ¹	
	Seizures	Pounds	Seizure	Pounds	Seizures	Pounds
Heroin.....	240	311	203	45.5	462	906
Cocaine.....	42	(2)	88	109.0	159	344
Opium.....	186	34	47	21.0	132	
Hashish.....	186	623	646	3,122.0	1,208	3,000
Marihuans.....	2,673	57,164	4,113	* 52.0	5,490	† 76
Dangerous drugs.....	630	† 4,763,361	1,080	12,271,000.0	1,348	6,000,000
Other.....	253	199	355		243	
Total (seizures).....	4,024		6,507		9,042	

¹ Preliminary figures (minimum amounts—there may be slight increases).

² Cocaine figures for 1969 included in the other column.

³ Tons.

⁴ 5-grain units.

CADPIN, from the initial letters of Customs Automated Data Processing of Intelligence, has been installed across the country. One hundred and sixty terminals, located at every important port of entry along the Mexican-U.S. border, at major international

Preliminary statistics show that narcotic and drug seizures by Customs in FY 71 were 9,042, an increase of 2,500 over the 1970 total of 6,507. In FY 69, 4,024 seizures were made.

Most dramatic is the increase in seizures of hard drugs. Customs' seizures of hard drugs in FY 1971 are over 1200 pounds, more than was seized in the whole preceding seven years! During the same period seizures of heroin alone, 906 pounds, in more than 460 seizures, exceeded the total amount seized for the preceding 10 fiscal years combined!

Cocaine seizures have also increased with 344 pounds seized this fiscal year as compared to 109 last year. In FY 69 separate statistics for cocaine were not even kept.

Hashish and marijuana seizures have also increased. During FY 71 there were about 1,208 seizures of hashish with more than 3,000 pounds seized. This is nearly twice the seizures in FY 70, but the pounds seized remains constant, 3,122 pounds of hashish being seized in FY 70. In FY 69 only 623 pounds of hashish were seized. In that same year, 57,164 pounds of marijuana were seized. During FY 71 this figure has grown to 76 tons in 5,490 seizures. Fifty-two tons were seized in FY 70.

Over 6,000,000 5-grain units of dangerous drugs such as amphetamines and barbiturates were seized during FY 71. This is about half the number seized last fiscal year, though the number of seizures increased to about 1,348 from 1,080. Attached is a chart setting forth Customs' drug seizures in detail for the past three fiscal years.

Major seizures of pure heroin have included:

1. 98 pounds (October, 1970—Miami)
2. 210 pounds (December, 1970—Miami)
3. 98 pounds (April, 1971—Newark)
4. 155 pounds (May, 1971—Miami)
5. 247.5 pounds (May, 1971—San Juan)

The men and women of the Bureau of Customs, under the dynamic leadership of Commissioner Myles J. Ambrose, deserve enormous credit for these outstanding accomplishments.

These results took dedication, imagination and total commitment of forces. Let me mention some of the things Customs has done with the resources provided by Congress for this drive:

In six months Customs added 915 trained personnel to its staff. These included an increment of inspectors who were able for the first time to give priority attention to checking for narcotics enforcement purposes persons, vehicles, cargo and mail entering the country. A substantial addition to our force of special agents enabled us to run down intelligence leads, investigate violations of the smuggling laws, and gather evidence for the convictions of those apprehended.

airports, and at various intelligence centers now have access to CADPIN's huge data bank. Merely by punching the keys of his terminal, the inspector on duty at a border crossing or an airport can obtain an almost instantaneous reply if a car or person is sus-

pected of smuggling, the car is stolen, or the person is the subject of an outstanding warrant.

Customs' communications system has been expanded and modernized, with better radios, repeater stations, and sector communications centers. Physical equipment, particularly cars, boats and planes, both fixed wing and helicopters, have been increased, giving Customs agents the tools with which to deal rapidly and responsively with smugglers and their syndicates.

Additional Customs stations have been opened. Two of these are in the remote Big Bend area of Texas, a favorite section of the border for smugglers.

New laboratories, to provide rapid identification of narcotic and dangerous substances, now speed the judicial processing of violators.

The use of dogs specially trained to locate marijuana in cars or in mail packages entering the country has been greatly increased, and they are now making substantial contributions in intercepting that substance as it enters the country.

EXPANDED CUSTOMS PROGRAM—1971

The President, in his program announced on June 17, 1971, recognized these accomplishments of Customs and proposed a budget amendment of \$18 million to maximize Customs demonstrated capabilities in intercepting the flow of drugs into the U.S. This amendment funded major additions to equipment and 1,000 additional personnel.

The Congress, with bipartisan support, authorized \$15 million and the Appropriations Subcommittee stated they would entertain a supplemental request after use of the \$15 million. The Congress acted swiftly, passing the appropriation bill on June 30.

The effects of these additional resources will be felt from the New York docks to the Florida airports, from the marinas of Southern California to sod airfields in the State of Washington, and along the lengths of the Mexican and Canadian borders. They will yield better enforcement at border crossings without increased delays.

The additional funds also provide for major equipment additions, principally aircraft and boats, with appropriate detection systems for both new craft and those in current inventory. The current intelligence indications of extensive smuggling by unscheduled planes and boats create this substantial need for detection, communication and interception resource. These will have particular impact along the Mexican border and against small craft making end-runs into Southern California, Florida and Texas.

CUSTOMS-TO-CUSTOMS COOPERATION

As one part of the anti-drug smuggling program, designed to disrupt the traffic in drugs between countries, Treasury established the policy of fostering and strengthening cooperation between and among the Customs Services of the various countries. The Bureau of Customs was directed to put the policy into effect.

The first Customs-to-Customs contacts, and the ones that have resulted in the most cooperation, have been with our neighbors to the North and South. In discussions with the Governments of Mexico and Canada we have improved cooperation in the attack on the drug traffic through Customs-to-Customs cooperation.

Applying the policy of increased Customs-to-Customs cooperation to a wider area, the Treasury Department obtained authorization and appropriations for U.S. Customs to become a full member of the Customs Cooperation Council. This is an organization of the Customs Services of more than sixty nations. Its purpose is to foster close working relationships between and among these services.

At its annual meeting in Vienna last month this Council adopted a resolution calling for

its member countries to exchange information on illicit traffic in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances. Previously, the Customs Services of many countries had paid little attention to the drug traffic.

The Bureau of Customs has an ongoing program, sponsored through AID, with the Vietnamese Customs Service. This has been helpful to the Government of Vietnam in its efforts to stem smuggling of heroin into that country. The Bureau is also preparing plans now for possible technical assistance to the Customs Services of other countries of Indochina, particularly Thailand and Laos.

As part of this ongoing program of full cooperation among the Customs Services, the Commissioner of Customs recently made an on-the-spot survey and talked with his counterparts in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and Hungary. In these contacts, the resolution for the exchange of information on the drug traffic adopted at Vienna was the stepping stone for talks on increased action against drug traffic by the Customs Services of each of these countries against the flow of opium and morphine base from Turkey to Western Europe.

PROPOSED CARGO THEFT LEGISLATION

On April 22, 1971, Secretary Connally transmitted to the Congress new legislation designed to increase the security and protection of imported merchandise and merchandise for export at ports of entry in the United States from loss or damage as a result of criminal and corrupt practices. This measure is currently pending in both the House and Senate. We hope that hearings will soon be held. This legislation is designed to provide security against cargo theft and will provide increased protection against the smuggling of narcotics through tighter control over a major area within which organized crime has been operating.

PROGRAM FOR TAX INVESTIGATIONS OF MAJOR NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS

Included in the June 17, 1971, Presidential Message, which announced the Administration's expanded effort to combat the menace of drug abuse, is a high priority program to conduct systematic tax investigations of middle and upper echelon narcotics traffickers. These are the people who are generally insulated from the daily operations of the drug traffic through a chain of intermediaries. This program will mount a nationally coordinated effort to disrupt the narcotics distribution system by intensive tax investigations of these key figures. By utilizing the civil and criminal tax laws, our objective is to prosecute violators and to drastically reduce the profits of this criminal activity by attacking the illegal revenues of the narcotics trade.

Reflecting the high priority given this program by the President, Congress has provided financial support for the program amounting to \$7.5 million in fiscal 1972 and authorization for 541 additional positions—200 Special Agents, 200 Revenue Agents and 141 support personnel.

Certain major features of this program should be noted:

(1) Treasury will not only coordinate its efforts with all other interested Federal agencies, but will actively seek the maximum cooperation of State and local agencies as well. This is a vital feature of this program.

(2) With the manpower provided, our goal is to have at least 400 full-scale IRS on-going investigations.

(3) In line with the high priority given this program by the President, the Internal Revenue Service is assigning, effective immediately, 100 experienced Special Agents and 100 experienced Revenue Agents, full time to this program.

We believe that this program will make a major additional contribution to the President's offensive against drug abuse.

INTERPOL

Interpol plays an important role in providing the mechanism for cooperation and the exchange of information among the law enforcement agencies of over 100 nations. The United States has been successful in sharpening Interpol's focus on the international narcotics traffic. At the 1969 and 1970 Interpol General Assemblies the drug traffic was the subject of a great deal of productive attention.

In closing I would like to express Treasury's appreciation for the bi-partisan support that the Congress has given the Treasury programs. The support and swift action of the appropriations sub-committees of the House and Senate in approving the amendment to the Treasury appropriation bill for FY 72 made the funds for the new increased programs promptly available to us. This was made possible under the leadership of Chairman Tom Steed and Congressman Howard W. Robison in the House and of Chairman Joseph M. Montoya and Senator J. Caleb Boggs in the Senate.

I assure you that all the personnel of Treasury will do their utmost to express that appreciation in the way I know that each member of the Congress wants it to be expressed—in the most effective possible attack on the illicit heroin traffic.

THERE CAN BE NO EDUCATION WITHOUT DISCIPLINE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the depths to which education in America has sunk is astounding. America's future is in jeopardy when students are permitted to curse their teachers and even threaten bodily harm without fear of legal consequences from the "new" judiciary.

Deterioration in education is further aggravated by teachers and professors who join with radical student elements in "protesting" student suspensions as discipline following campus disorders. Little wonder that students protest when they are actively supported in their disruptive actions by members of the faculty—who have not only failed to inculcate the basic education of discipline, but have also trained students in disrespect and dissension.

I include that related news articles and my bill H.R. 359, suspending Federal financial assistance to colleges failing to take corrective action when confronted with campus disorders and to teachers who engage in these demonstrations in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, July 28, 1971]

JUDGE FREES PUPIL, SCORES DISCIPLINE

Superior Court Judge James Washington criticized discipline in D.C. public schools yesterday as he acquitted a 16-year-old youth accused of threatening to harm his English teacher at Alice Deal Junior High School.

Declaring "every school teacher in D.C. has a problem," Judge Washington accused school administrators of not keeping order after hearing testimony of a 10-minute name-calling exchange between the pupil and teacher before 25 other pupils in an eighth-grade classroom.

"I hate to see this case come to court,"

the judge said. "The school administration should look after matters like this."

According to the teacher, Carolyn Awkard, the youth threatened to "hit me in the face" and voiced "a series of profanity" at her after she denied him permission to go to a restroom.

A pupil, Valdonia Crawford, 14, who testified as a witness, said the youth called the teacher "a bitch" and "a whore" and directed obscene language at her while the other pupils "snickered."

She also testified that the teacher called the youth "stupid, ignorant and that kind of words," telling him, "shut up, you're so stupid and stuff like that." Mrs. Awkard denied she had done so.

"I've never heard of conduct in a school like this," Judge Washington said. "I've never heard of a principal tolerating it."

All three witnesses also testified that the use of profanity in classrooms was not uncommon at the school.

The judge acquitted the pupil, a muscular youth nearly 6 feet tall, after ruling that Assistant D. C. Corporation Counsel Robert Sher failed to prove that a threat actually has been made.

Although Mrs. Awkard testified that she left the classroom after the youth threatened her, the judge said, ". . . the problem was whether she left because of the total confusion . . . or actual fear."

He said the case legally was less one of "threats" than "profane language, or hollering about that classroom."

Yet he lectured the youth and told him, "I would like to hold you guilty (so) you'll have nothing to gloat about."

"Your conduct at Deal shouldn't be tolerated by anyone," Judge Washington said. "I can't understand why any principal or anyone in charge in a school would permit anyone to talk to a teacher in profane language."

"In my day you would be knocked down and stomped on by the teacher and then when you got home you would be knocked down and stomped on by your parents."

Judge Washington emphasized that he did not question the "credibility" of the teacher.

Asserting that they labor under "the most trying of circumstances," the judge said, "The school teachers in the District of Columbia don't get half-paid for what they do."

The case originally was set for trial two weeks ago but was postponed until yesterday after the D.C. corporation counsel's office brought a contempt of court proceeding against the youth's attorney, Gall Higgins.

The office charges that Miss Higgins, a Public Defender Service attorney, improperly attempted to persuade the teacher not to testify. Miss Higgins denies the charge.

[From the Washington Post, July 28, 1971]

LINK TO PROTESTERS CITED IN DENIAL OF FACULTY PROMOTION

(By Eric Wentworth)

University of Maryland President Wilson H. Elkins has barred promotions for two College Park faculty members, one a prominent artist, after they joined in publicly protesting the suspensions of students following campus disorders last spring.

Protesting Elkins' decision, Prof. Jacob K. Goldhaber has threatened to resign as chairman of the mathematics department at College Park.

William W. Adams, associate professor of mathematics, and Mitchell Jamieson, associate professor of art, were among nine faculty members who signed a letter published May 11 in the student newspaper, *The Diamondback*.

Their letter criticized university authorities' action in summarily suspending students in connection with campus disturbances in early May.

"We intend," the nine wrote, "to treat any students in our courses who have been sus-

pending prior to hearings, or who have been unable to defend themselves at such hearings due to pending criminal trials, as students in good standing in our courses, and we urge all our colleagues to do the same."

Both Adams and Jamieson had previously been recommended for promotion to full professorships by their colleagues and by Chancellor Charles E. Bishop of the College Park campus. But Elkins, who has the last word in such matters, rejected the recommendations.

"The administration," Bishop wrote in a letter explaining Elkins' decision, "will not approve the appointment or promotion of any person who has announced that he will not comply with the university regulations which have been duly established by the board of regents."

"I didn't do anything wrong," Adams insisted in a telephone interview late yesterday. "However, if they thought I did do anything wrong, they should have brought it up in a way I could defend myself." Adams came to Maryland from Berkeley two years ago and in February, 1970, received an award for scientific achievement in mathematics from the Washington Academy of Sciences.

Jamieson, the artist, was reported to be out of town and unavailable for comment. Widely exhibited, he was a Navy combat artist in World War II and four years ago was sent to Vietnam by the Pentagon—a trip that inspired him to produce a series of drawings depicting the horrors of the conflict.

Bishop, reached by telephone, confirmed that he had recommended promotions for both men before the letter appeared in the *Diamondback*. Pressed on his position thereafter, the chancellor said he had not withdrawn the recommendations but obviously accepted Elkins' decision.

Bishop also confirmed that Prof. Goldhaber, in London for a sabbatical leave this coming year, had written a letter saying he would resign as department chairman unless Elkins' decision is reversed. The chancellor stressed that Goldhaber's resignation has not been accepted.

Bishop added that he has asked the executive board of the faculty assembly to advise him by Aug. 15 as to whether it believes any or all the letter's nine signers violated professional ethics. He said that to his knowledge none of the other seven were up for promotions that could have been denied.

Adams said he and his colleagues were considering possible further action themselves that could include calling a special meeting of the faculty assembly in the fall.

H.R. 359

A bill to require the suspension of Federal financial assistance to colleges and universities failing to take appropriate corrective measures forthwith when experiencing campus disorders; and to require the suspension of Federal financial assistance to teachers participating in such disorders

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Commissioner of Education shall forthwith suspend financial assistance (by way of grant, loan, or contract) under the provisions of law referred to in subsection (b) to any institution of higher education at which, by reason of violent demonstration, riots, seizure of institution property, or other disorders, there is a substantial disruption of the administration of the institution, or students, teachers, or officials are prevented from pursuing their studies or duties and the administrative officials of such institution fail to take appropriate corrective measures forthwith.

(b) The provisions of law referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (relating to financial assistance for

community service and continuing education programs).

(2) Part A of title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (relating to financial assistance for college library resources).

(3) Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (relating to financial assistance).

(4) Title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (relating to financial assistance for the improvement of undergraduate instruction).

(5) Title VIII of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (relating to networks for knowledge).

(6) Part B of title IX of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (relating to financial assistance for strengthening and improving education for public service).

(7) Title X of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (relating to financial assistance for improvement of graduate programs).

(8) The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (relating to grants and loans for construction of facilities for higher education).

(9) The Act of July 2, 1862 (commonly known as the Second Morrill Act).

(10) The Act of August 30, 1890 (commonly known as the Second Morrill Act).

(11) Section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935 (commonly known as the Bankhead-Jones Act).

(c) Financial assistance which has been suspended under subsection (a) may be resumed only after a waiting period of five months from the date of suspension, and upon the determination of the Commissioner that—

(1) the disorders which occasioned the suspension have terminated; and

(2) the institution has formulated and adopted a plan or program which, in the judgment of the Commissioner, provides reasonable assurance that such disorders, or similar disorders, will not recur.

SEC. 2. Where the Commissioner of Education determines any person on the teaching staff of an institution of higher education has participated in any violent demonstration, riot, seizure of institution property, or other disorder at that, or any other, institution of higher education, he shall forthwith terminate any Federal assistance for any fellowship held by such person or research grant he is receiving.

LEST WE FORGET

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in a land of progress and prosperity, it is often easy to assume an "out of sight, out of mind" attitude about matters which are not consistently brought to our attention. The fact exists that today more than 1,550 American servicemen are listed as prisoners or missing in Southeast Asia. The wives, children, and parents of these men haven't forgotten, and I would hope that my colleagues in Congress and our countrymen across America will not neglect the fact that all men are not free for as long as one of our number is enslaved. I insert the name of one of the missing:

Lt. Robert C. McMahan, U.S. Navy, 694966, Jacksonville, Ill. Married. 1965 graduate of Illinois College. Officially listed as missing in action February 14, 1968. As of today, Lt. McMahan has been missing in action in Southeast Asia for 1,259 days.

THE INDOCHINA WAR—IS IT
LEGAL?

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Erwin N. Griswold, Solicitor General of the United States and former dean of the Harvard School of Law, is one of the Nation's most distinguished legal scholars. He is a native Clevelander whom I have known all of my life and for whom I have the highest regard both personally and professionally.

During a panel discussion June 19 before the Florida Bar Association meeting in Miami, he contributed a most important and, in my opinion, conclusive opinion, conclusive opinion on the much-discussed subject of the legality of the present war in Indochina. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to make his address a part of the RECORD:

(Remarks of Erwin N. Griswold, Solicitor General of the United States in Panel Discussion Before the Florida Bar at the Doral Country Club, Miami, Fla., June 19, 1971)

THE INDOCHINA WAR—IS IT LEGAL?

The question we are discussing this morning is surely an important one, and is worthy of serious consideration. I welcome the participation here of Attorney General Quinn, of my home state, and of Professor Rutledge, of the Duke University Law School; and of course I am glad to have the support here of Senator Gurney, who has had to consider these questions in connection with his official duties. I cannot refrain from making the observation that both Attorney General Quinn and Senator Gurney were students of mine at the Harvard Law School.

One essential in the discussion of the question with which we are concerned is to mark it out, and to make clear what is not the subject of our consideration today. The over-all problem is inevitably engulfed in much emotion. As lawyers, though, we are trained to consider legal questions on their merits, and to separate out the emotional factors which are not relevant to the legal questions.

First, then, we must bear in mind that we are not here discussing the morality of the Vietnam war. That is obviously a difficult question, with respect to which most of us here probably have no special qualifications. Nor are we discussing the wisdom of the Vietnam war. We may have views as to whether we should ever have gone into Vietnam, or have gone into Vietnam as extensively as we did. That is a decision for which four Presidents share responsibility—President Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson, over a period of more than twenty years. I am sure that nothing would have pleased President Nixon more—politically, and personally—than to have been able to start his presidency without the great care and desperate concern of the Vietnam problem, which existed full-blown when his administration began.

Finally, we are not concerned here today with how or when to get out of Vietnam, or under what circumstances and conditions. As to that, I will only say that President Nixon has done more to taper off the war than any other person. When he became President, we had 550,000 Americans in Vietnam. Now we have 350,000, a reduction of close to 40%. And the reductions are continuing constantly.

Let there be any misunderstanding, let me make it plain that I do not minimize the importance of these problems. But they

have nothing to do with the legality of the Vietnam war, which is our topic for discussion here today.

A little clearing away should be done, too, on the legal side. We are not concerned here with any legal question of what we lawyers call "standing," as Attorney General Quinn and I were concerned when he filed an original suit in the Supreme Court of the United States on behalf of his client, and my state of citizenship, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. And to complete the picture of what we are not considering today, we are not concerned with any question of justiciability, that is, of whether the legal questions involved are suitable for consideration and determination by a court. We are not subject to any such limitation. We will make no adjudication, no final determination, except in our own minds, as citizens and lawyers, trained to consider legal questions.

Having thus observed what we are not considering today, I turn to the question we are considering—what might be called the "pure question" of the legality of the Vietnam war. When the question of legality is thus isolated—as it should be, I think, if we are going to base arguments on the legality of the war—there can be no doubt, I believe, that the war is "legal." This conclusion is based on four lines of legal reasoning, which I shall summarize in the remainder of my talk.

1. There is first the standard or test of history, which is of great importance when we are dealing with this sort of constitutional argument. For history shows us that military actions, often of substantial consequence, have been carried out by the President of the United States, on his own constitutional authority, throughout our history, and beginning in the earliest days of the Republic. Indeed, if the record is closely examined, one can count one hundred sixty-one separate instances in which this nation was engaged in hostilities against a foreign power, between 1798 and 1945, including the Civil War; and only six of these involved a formal declaration of war. Moreover, only twice in all our history has Congress authorized war by formal declaration prior to the commencement of actual hostilities. These were the War of 1812, and the Spanish-American War of 1898.

The notion of a war authorized by Congress in a fashion less dramatic than a formal declaration of war has been accepted since the earliest years of our national existence. There were the Barbary Pirates; there was Korea; and President Eisenhower sent a force to Lebanon in 1958. Coming closer to the place where we are now gathered, there were active affirmative military operations here in Florida against Spain in 1811, quite without any formal declaration by Congress. It would be tedious to go through all of these instances here. But they are numerous, and continued throughout our history. Some are better liked than others. There have been occupations of Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic. There was an occupation of Vera Cruz. General Pershing made his reputation not on the Mexican border, but in Mexico.

Congress has on more than one occasion authorized the President to use military force without making a declaration of war. An instance of this within the memory of most of us is the Formosa Resolution of 1955, by which Congress provided:

"That the President of the United States be and he hereby is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack, this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores."

Thus, by early and long continued practice, we have established the constitutional rule that military actions may be carried out without a declaration of war by Congress, that there are many intermediate situations short of formally declared war, and that the President does have wide powers to deal with international problems as they arise, including the disposition and use of the nation's military force. This is true generally, but it is particularly true when groundwork and backing for such actions have been laid by Congress.

2. Moving from the conclusion based on historical practice, we may consider next the provisions of the Constitution itself, simply as a legal instrument, allocating functions among the various organs of the government. Our Constitution, as is well known, sets up a system of checks and balances. But it also grants powers, for without those powers, there is no occasion to be concerned about checks and balances. There is no need to check a powerless President; and ours would be a sad governmental system indeed if we had a powerless President—or a powerless Congress, or a powerless Judiciary.

Specifically, the Constitution provides explicitly that "The Executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America." Obviously this means something; and it is not a merely passive grant. The grant of Executive power is broad and general. It is made more concrete by the further provision that "The President shall be Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States," and the provision that "he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed." Our President is not, and never has been thought to be, from the time of Washington on to the present, a mere automation, doing only what he is told; nor is he a mere moderator, standing by to carry out the directives of other officers and branches of the government. Of course, the President acts under the law. He is subject to numerous checks and balances. He can be widely controlled by Congress, through the appropriation power, and otherwise and like all other officers, he is subject to impeachment. But as President, he has great powers—great executive power because he is the Chief Executive—and we would not want to have it otherwise. Any political organism needs a spokesman, someone to lead, and marshal its forces, someone to meet emergencies, someone with the capacity to act, someone to speak, and in proper situations, to make decisions. That is what we mean by Executive power; and the Constitution expressly grants "The Executive power" to the President.

We have established so far, I think, the proposition that a formal declaration of war is not, and never has been, regarded as a prerequisite to the use of military force by the President of the United States. On the contrary, as I have indicated, there have been only six declarations of war in all our history—including the action of Congress at the time of the Civil War—and there have been well over a hundred commitments of military force, by nearly every President, with varying degrees of action by Congress, short of a declaration of war.

We come, then, to a consideration of the specific actions with respect to Vietnam, and Southeast Asia.

3. For present purposes, we can begin with the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, which was passed by both Houses of Congress, and approved by the President on August 10, 1964. It is printed at 78 Stat. 384, and has always been well known—never in any sense a secret document. Indeed, it was passed by Congress for the purpose of making it known in other quarters that the President had the backing and support of Congress.

What does the Tonkin Gulf Resolution say? After recitals, it contains two principal sections, which read as follows:

"That the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.

"Sec. 2. The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom."

It is true that early this year the Tonkin Gulf Resolution was "terminated" by Act of Congress, including Presidential approval. That, however, has nothing to do with its affect on the legality of actions taken while it was in force, nor on the propriety of actions taken to deal with the situation which arose while it was in force. As the State Department said, in a letter printed in a Senate Report, the Formosa and Tonkin Gulf Resolutions along with others were "a highly visible means of executive-legislative consultation . . . indicating congressional approval for the possible employment of United States military forces." S. Rep. No. 91-872, p. 20.

4. Perhaps even more important than the Tonkin Gulf Resolution is the fact that Congress has consistently backed and supported the actions of the President in all the intervening years. Early in 1965, President Johnson asked for and obtained a special appropriation of seven hundred million dollars, for the express purpose of carrying on military action in southeast Asia. This was granted by an Act of Congress approved on May 7, 1965. The vote in Congress was 408 to 7 in the House, and 88 to 3 in the Senate. This is an unusual appropriations act, in that it consists of a single item. Thus, there is no possibility that it passed through Congress by inadvertence, or that the support for it may have been coerced, as in the case of a rider. Here is the entire and complete effective text of that appropriation act:

The following is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the period ending June 30, 1965, namely:

"DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE-EMERGENCY FUND,
SOUTHEAST ASIA

"For transfer by the Secretary of Defense, upon determination by the President that such action is necessary in connection with military activities in southeast Asia, to any appropriation available to the Department of Defense for military functions, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred, \$700,000,000, to remain available until expended:
* * *

After this, there were many legislative acts by Congress, taken in full knowledge of the situation in Southeast Asia, and in support of the President's actions. On September 29, 1965, Congress passed the Defense Appropriations Act of 1966 which contained a separate Title worded "Emergency Fund, Southeast Asia." This appropriated \$1,700,000,000 to be used for—and I quote the language of the statute—"military activities in Southeast Asia."

In 1966, Congress passed the Military Construction Act of 1966 which contained a specific authorization that the funds appropriated could be used—and again I quote "for their stated purposes in connection with support of Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam . . ."

I will not consume further time by reading the language of all of the subsequent appropriation acts. It is enough, I think, to say that they were numerous, and made explicit reference to "the war in Vietnam," or in other terms of equivalent effect. All together, there have been at least 10 such subsequent appropriations acts.

In addition, during this period, Congress extended and amended the Selective Service Act, thus making available the manpower used in combat, as Congress well knew and fully understood. In addition, Congress authorized the President to call up the Reserves for use in the war, until June 1969.

Thus, as Judge Wyzanski said in his interesting opinion in the *Sisson* case (*United States v. Sisson*, 294 F. Supp. 511), the situation is one "in which there has been joint action by the President and Congress, even if the joint action has not taken the form of a declaration of war."

We are gathered here as lawyers. We are speaking about the legality of the Vietnam war. The hang-up on this question comes, it seems clear to me, from the assumption that there must be a declaration of war before military action is "legal." Of course, if you assume that to be true, then the conclusion will follow that the Vietnam war is not legal.

As I have indicated, however, there is no basis for such an assumption. Indeed, all of our history and practice has been to the contrary. And this has clearly been the history and practice over the past six years or more on this important question. The fact is that the President and Congress have consistently and continuously worked together on this matter, each supporting the other. The fact is, too, that President Nixon, under circumstances of great difficulty, has consistently taken steps to deescalate the war; and, with the full knowledge and support of Congress, he has already removed more than 200,000 of the troops who were, with the full knowledge and support of Congress, committed in Vietnam at the time he took office.

The problems of Vietnam are enormous, and extremely complicated and difficult—and important. But the essence of these problems is not one of legality. The President and Congress have worked together, and there can be no doubt, in my mind, about the legality of what has been done. It is only confusing in my view, and not at all constructive, or helpful in finding an ultimate solution, to approach the question in terms of legality. The problems of getting out of Vietnam are difficult, and complicated—and exceedingly important. They are worthy of the greatest thought, and the most thorough discussion. That thought and discussion will be aided, as I see it, if we do not mislead ourselves by excursions on questions of "legality" which are really without foundation. I have no doubt that the President and Congress will continue to work together in bringing this matter to a conclusion, and that their actions will continue to be "legal" as they have been in the past. Let us do everything we can to help them in that task.

NONRECOGNITION OF FOREIGN COUNTRY JUDGMENTS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing a bill I first submitted on February 25, 1970, which is designed to meet a special situation arising in the field of foreign country judgments. In effect, this bill will discourage foreign courts

from enforcing judgments against American citizens where the original legal action is based on inadequate jurisdiction.

Courts in the United States will not normally enforce money judgments rendered abroad by courts which do not have proper jurisdiction over the persons against whom the judgments were rendered. In this refusal, American courts use our common law conception of proper in personam jurisdiction, a conception which has been recognized by many other countries. A court should not be permitted to assess personal liability against a defendant unless the defendant has an opportunity to appear and present his case. In our system of justice, it has been the general rule that a suit must be brought where the defendant resides, because it is unfair to force the defendant to travel great distances and incur great expense in order to avoid a default judgment in what may be a frivolous suit. Thus, a judgment based merely on the nationality of the plaintiff, or the domicile of the plaintiff, or the presence of assets in a given country has no proper jurisdictional basis and will not be enforced in our courts. The propriety of this procedure has been recognized internationally by a protocol adopted by the Hague Conference on Private International Law.

A number of foreign countries, however, do use bases of jurisdiction which we consider improper, including members of the European Economic Community—Belgium, France, West Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands. Moreover, a Convention on Recognition of Judgments signed by member states of the EEC in Brussels on September 27, 1968, provides that judgments rendered against nonresidents of the community in one member country must be enforced in the other countries, even if they were rendered on a jurisdictionally improper basis. As a result, once the convention has been ratified, which appears likely by the end of 1971, domiciliaries of the United States with assets in the Common Market area can become the victims of forum-shopping, leading to enforcement in the Market area of a judgment rendered on a jurisdictionally improper basis.

Because of protests from non-EEC countries, the Common Market Convention of September 17, 1968, now includes a provision allowing member states individually to promise to third countries—like the United States—that against domiciliaries in that country, judgments from other EEC countries rendered without proper jurisdiction will not be enforced. Such a promise must be part of a treaty on recognition of judgments concluded with the third country. Whether any of the EEC countries cares to conclude such a treaty with the United States is not known. What is certain, however, is that we have a real interest in making such treaties worthwhile for EEC countries. The bill I am introducing today would help to create a healthy incentive for foreign countries to enter into such treaties with the United States.

The Nonrecognition of Foreign Country Judgments Act, would give our Government power to insure that there could be no recovery in a State or Federal court of the United States on a judg-

ment of any foreign country, first, which had obligated itself by treaty to enforce jurisdictionally improper foreign judgments and, second, which the President had by Executive order placed on a non-recognition list. The list would presumably contain those countries with whom we had not concluded treaties which would adequately protect American interests.

The Common Market Convention has endangered legitimate interests of the U.S. domiciliaries. For the protection of these interests, the U.S. Government should have power, if it deems it proper, to forbid the recognition in our courts of judgments rendered in a foreign country which has committed itself to the enforcement of jurisdictionally improper judgments. This bill would give our Government such power.

I insert the text of the bill at this point in the RECORD along with an article by Kurt H. Nadelmann, reprinted from the April 1969, issue of the Harvard Law Review, which provides further background on this problem:

THE COMMON MARKET JUDGMENTS CONVENTION AND A HAGUE CONFERENCE RECOMMENDATION: WHAT STEPS NEXT?

(Kurt H. Nadelmann*)

(A convention recently signed by the foreign ministers of the Common Market countries threatens to extend over a wide area the enforceability of judgments rendered at jurisdictionally improper fora. The history of this convention is intertwined with the efforts of the Hague Conference on Private International Law to restrict the effect of such judgments to assets in the country of rendition. Dr. Nadelmann examines the history of the Common Market Convention and of the Hague Conference Recommendation which attempts to deal with it. He concludes that the protection of Americans with assets abroad requires that the traditionally liberal recognition policies of the individual states be replaced by a more restrictive and particularized approach administered by the federal governmental.)

The Eleventh Session of the Hague Conference on Private International Law, held in October 1968, adopted a "Recommendation Relating to the Connection Between the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters and the Supplementary Protocol."¹ The reader of the Recommendation will find its contents as mysterious as its title. The central issue is a still unresolved clash between the six members of the European Economic Community and the "outside world" over the enforcement of foreign judgments—a question which may seriously affect the interests of Americans with assets abroad. This comment will provide the background of the present situation and suggest the course which the United States should now follow.

In late 1964, experts from the EEC published a draft Convention on Jurisdiction and Recognition of Judgments which they had prepared for the needs of the Community.² By the provisions of this draft, certain jurisdictional bases were not to be used in suits against domiciliaries of any of the member states. The forbidden bases were: the nationality of the plaintiff, available under the law of France and Luxembourg;³ the domicile of the plaintiff, available against nonresidents in Dutch law;⁴ and the presence of assets when used to obtain a judgment not limited to the value of the assets in the forum

state, available against nonresidents in German law.⁵ The draft allowed use of these bases of jurisdiction in suits against nondomiciliaries of the EEC. All judgments rendered in one state had to be enforced in the other states unless the jurisdictional basis asserted violated the provisions of the draft.⁶ If adopted, the draft would have extended over a wide area the enforceability of judgments rendered against nondomiciliaries at jurisdictionally improper fora.

The Extraordinary Session of the Hague Conference convened in April 1966 to complete work on a Convention on Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgments. A multilateral treaty of a special type was contemplated. All the basic provisions would be in the resulting Convention, but the Convention would become effective between two ratifying states only if they concluded a supplementary bilateral agreement to that effect. Such supplementary agreements, however, could not depart from the provisions of the Convention except in certain specified particulars.⁷ The idea was to preserve freedom of choice of treaty partners and still to unify the law of recognition.⁸

At the Extraordinary Session the Common Market states demanded that the Convention allow regional groups to conclude their own agreements without being bound by the provisions of the Convention. The other states desired safeguards from abuse of this freedom. In "Working Paper No. 30"⁹ the delegations from the United Kingdom and the United States proposed that the Convention include a provision on jurisdictionally improper fora. Judgments rendered without an adequate jurisdictional base were to be limited to the value of the assets in the country of rendition, and were not to be enforceable outside the forum state. Over this proposal a crisis developed. In a dramatic night session, it was finally agreed to refer the problem of jurisdictionally improper fora to a Special Commission. Meanwhile the Convention drafted at the Session¹⁰ would not be open for signature.¹¹

Before the Special Commission met in October 1966, the experts who had drafted the Common Market Convention had their own meeting. They did not change the basic scheme of their draft, but they added a new provision: article 59. This article allowed each of the six states individually to agree with nonmember states not to enforce against domiciliaries of such states judgments rendered at jurisdictionally improper fora. The new provision was brought to the attention of the Hague Conference Special Commission. At the meeting of the Special Commission the delegates drafted a Supplementary Protocol.¹² The Protocol lists jurisdictionally improper fora and provides that judgments rendered at such fora shall be denied extraterritorial recognition. Disagreement existed on whether the Supplementary Protocol should be mandatory for signers of the Hague Convention, but the Common Market group was able to obtain a majority in support of its view that the Protocol should not be binding. The delegate from the United States, joined by those from the United Kingdom and Sweden, formally reserved the right to reopen the question.¹³

Somewhat later, the Common Market experts made a change in new article 59 of their draft. Signatories could still promise other states that foreign judgments obtained at jurisdictionally improper fora would not be enforced, but the promise had to be part of a convention on recognition and enforcement of judgments.¹⁴ As amended, the Convention on Jurisdiction and Enforcement of Foreign Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters was signed in Brussels by the foreign ministers of the states forming the EEC on September 27, 1968,¹⁵ just ten days before the opening of the Eleventh Session of the Hague Conference. Through this

signing the Common Market Convention took precedence over the Supplementary Protocol where the two conflicted.¹⁶

At the Eleventh Session, the question of the relation between the Supplementary Protocol and the Hague Conference Convention, which had been placed on the agenda at the request of the United States, was assigned to the Fourth Committee, presided over by Judge André Panchaud of Switzerland, who has also chaired the meeting of the Special Commission. When the subject came up, the discussion quickly became bogged down in debate over a procedural point and the meeting was finally adjourned to give the delegations time for informal contacts.

Politically, the situation was confused and confusing. Under article 63 of the Common Market Convention new members of the EEC are obliged to accept the Convention as the basis for their own duty under the Treaty of Rome to facilitate enforcement of judgments rendered by other member states. When the Convention was signed in Brussels, the foreign ministers of every state except France proposed that negotiations be suggested to states which had sought membership in the Community so that their accession to the Convention might be prepared.¹⁷ The states involved—the United Kingdom, Denmark, Norway, and Ireland—thus were placed in a special dilemma over the Protocol issue. If the Protocol were binding, then they would not be able to use the Hague Convention if they subsequently became members of the Common Market. On the other hand, the Common Market scheme would require them to enforce judgments obtained in other EEC states even though the forum was jurisdictionally improper and enforcement would violate natural justice under their domestic law. Furthermore, the Protocol would protect them if they remained outside the Common Market.

An examination of the individual positions of the six Common Market states, moreover, furnishes an all but uniform picture. The case of Italy is particularly striking. Jurisdictionally improper fora are not used in Italy except on a retaliatory basis.¹⁸ Italy thus has an established policy, yet under the Constitution now signed Italian courts must enforce judgments rendered at an improper forum. A question of constitutionality may arise. As for Belgium, in a celebrated case the highest court of the land denied recognition to a French judgment rendered against a non-resident Englishman on the jurisdictional basis of the plaintiff's French nationality.¹⁹ And at the Extraordinary Session in 1966, the Belgian delegate sided with the "outside world" in the confrontation over "Working Paper No. 30."²⁰ French courts do not recognize foreign judgments rendered on the jurisdictional basis of presence of assets,²¹ and in the recently concluded treaty between France and Austria the defendant is given the right to appear in the Austrian court to limit the court's jurisdiction to assets in Austria when presence of assets is the basis for assumption of jurisdiction.²² Even the position of Germany, seeming promoter of the Common market scheme,²³ is equivocal. By the German treaties with Belgium and the Netherlands extraterritorial effect is given to German judgments rendered on the basis of mere presence of assets, but the condition is imposed that the defendant not have been domiciled in the other country; and German domiciliaries have the same protection from possible extraterritorial use of judgments obtained in Belgium or the Netherlands on a *forum arresti* basis.²⁴ Nothing in the attitude of Luxembourg suggests that it could have favored the scheme. But even assuming a perfect accord among the experts, the appearance in the Common Market Convention of article 59 is proof of second thoughts by at least

Footnotes at end of article.

some of the governments involved. The fact remains, however, that the pressure coming from the Convention's scheme has been maintained for the benefit of the individual states prepared to negotiate agreements under article 59.

Some of the Common Market states, it appears, are quite ready to proceed with negotiations under article 59. At the Hague Conference it became known that Germany and Norway have negotiated a convention and that the contents of the Supplementary Protocol are incorporated in the draft.²⁵ Britain and the Common Market countries would both profit from an article 59 agreement, and that procedure is facilitated by the existence of British treaties on recognition of judgments with France, Belgium, West Germany, Italy, and the Netherlands.²⁶ The special situations have been pointed out to show that the problems faced by states outside the EEC are not necessarily the same. Indeed, the Common Market Convention itself does not treat all other countries alike. A clause in the Convention maintains for Swiss nationals the protection which they have under the Franco-Swiss treaty of 1869.²⁷ Even if political considerations were not involved, a basis for concerted action by the outsiders thus would be difficult to find.

The situation at the session was such that, for one reason or another, many of the delegations did not look forward to a confrontation requiring them to vote for or against the binding character of the Supplementary Protocol. And for their own reasons the Common Market delegations let it be known that they were willing to vote for a strong recommendation in favor of use of the Supplementary Protocol by the member governments. The lines for a compromise were thus pretty well drawn. With the help of the President of the Conference Session and of the Committee Chairman, the text of a recommendation was prepared and submitted to the Conference as a joint proposal by the delegations of all six Common Market states, of the United States and the United Kingdom, and of Sweden and Switzerland. The Conference approved the Recommendation by a unanimous vote.

The Recommendation states that the Eleventh Session is "[c]onvinced that certain grounds of jurisdiction can only exceptionally justify the international recognition and enforcement of judgments and that this is particularly so where treaty relations exist regarding such recognition and enforcement," and makes three suggestions. The member states should sign and ratify the Convention and the Supplementary Protocol simultaneously. States coming to the conclusion that they cannot sign and ratify the Supplementary Protocol should take its provisions into account in any supplementary agreements that they conclude to bring the Convention into force. Any member state which is already bound by an existing convention not in accord with the principles of the Protocol should take all possible steps permitted within the existing treaty obligations to comply with those principles. For the Hague Conference the issue has been closed with the vote on the Recommendation. The Hague Conference Convention and the Supplementary Protocol, two separate documents, are open for signature. The fate of the instruments is in the hands of the members of the Conference.

However encouraging the unanimous vote on the Recommendation, the problem created by the Common Market Convention has not been removed. Once the Convention takes effect, United States domiciliaries and others with assets in the Common Market area, run the risk that forum shopping will be used and that a judgment obtained against them in one state on a jurisdictionally improper basis will be enforced automatically in the other states. Legitimate in-

terests can be seriously damaged. This threat cannot be ignored.

Traditionally, American courts have had a liberal policy on recognition of foreign judgments. This fact is well known around the Hague Conference. The Uniform Foreign Money-Judgments Recognition Act,²⁸ an expression of this policy, was among the materials used by the Hague Conference in preparing its own Convention. In some quarters abroad, the belief is held that the policy is not subject to change and is beyond the control of the national authorities. Unclear ideas about the distribution of powers between the states and the federal government are at the bottom of the assumption. Like any other country, the United States can protect the interests of its domiciliaries abroad. In a large number of foreign countries, the recognition of foreign judgments is made dependent upon existence of a treaty. Should this kind of a step be desirable, under the Constitution of the United States the Congress would have ample power to pass such a statute in aid of the President's treaty-making power. The same Act could, as in other nations, authorize the Executive to grant exceptions from the treaty requirement in stated situations. Judgments from countries which have a liberal recognition policy and do not apply a scheme like that of the Common Market Convention would not have to be affected. A better balance of interests would be achieved; pressures coming from the Common Market Convention scheme would be countered.

Solid practical reasons can be advanced in support of a change in policy. Non-recognition of American judgments abroad is the rule rather than the exception. To begin a short survey with the law in the Common Market states, American judgments are not enforceable in the Netherlands because its law requires existence of a treaty;²⁹ they are reexamined as to their merits in Belgium, where the law makes the grant of conclusive effect dependent upon existence of a treaty;³⁰ they are subject to a statutory reciprocity requirement in Germany—a test often difficult to satisfy in foreign courts not operating on the basis of *stare decisis*;³¹ and they are by statute subject to reexamination in Italy if rendered by default.³² In the Scandinavian countries, a treaty is needed for enforcement.³³ In the rest of Western Europe, as well as in Latin America, the situation does not differ substantially.³⁴ As for Canada, under the Code of Quebec, any defense which might have been set up to the original action may be pleaded against judgments rendered outside Canada;³⁵ and, in some other provinces, conclusive effect is withheld as well.³⁶

Redress cannot be obtained effectively by action of individual states of the union. Assuming the unproductive reciprocity requirement, unfair to the individual litigant,³⁷ were introduced by all or most states³⁸—it can, it would seem, be done without raising constitutional problems unless *Hilton v. Guyot*³⁹ is overruled—the scheme of the Common Market Convention would not be reached by such a step. More radical, individualized steps would have to be taken, which would be out of bounds for the states because they would interfere with the conduct of foreign relations by the national government.⁴⁰ Furthermore, concerted action by the states is not easy to achieve. Only a response coming from the entire nation has a good chance of being effective.

As a result of complaints from its businessmen, after a full study of the situation⁴¹ the United Kingdom in 1933 passed legislation authorizing treaty negotiations and giving the executive power to bar recognition proceedings for judgments from countries denying substantial reciprocity to judgments from the domestic courts.⁴² Except for the new complications, the scheme has worked extremely well.⁴³ The United States has been slower in a realistic appraisal of the situa-

tion. The Uniform Act of 1962 was prepared by the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws because codification of the domestic law on recognition can facilitate enforcement of domestic judgments in foreign countries having the reciprocity requirement,⁴⁴ and benefits were expected from the example set.⁴⁵ In light of the most recent events, a more dynamic approach has become necessary. Action in the form of federal legislation on recognition of foreign judgments seems to be called for.

The way for international developments, of course, remains open. Whether the Hague Convention and the Supplementary Protocol will be used and, in particular, whether Common Market states will use them, is one of the many unknown factors.

Moreover, a Common Market state ready to avail itself of article 59 of the Common Market Convention need not act through the Hague Conference Convention. Any bilateral treaty concluded with a third state may include the promise the foreign judgments rendered at a jurisdictionally improper forum will not be recognized. The question of interest to the United States is whether the United States is considered a potential treaty partner and by which of the states. Without inquiries this cannot be known. As far as the United States' own view is concerned, if an anti-treaty policy was followed in the past,⁴⁶ the participation of American delegations in the preparation of the Hague Convention and the Protocol would seem to suggest a change of mind.⁴⁷

The unanimous vote on the Recommendation at the recent session of the Hague Conference facilitates exploratory talks among the member governments. It is hoped that full advantage will be taken of the climate created. In the case of the Common Market states, mutual interest seems to suggest early contracts. If no arrangements have been made before the Common Market Convention takes effect, negotiations are likely to become more difficult. But the problem created by the Common Market scheme is not the only one requiring attention. Agreements with other nations are no less desirable. Their negotiation may establish a general pattern.

A major new activity on the part of the United States Government is called for. The work is likely to go on for some time. The type of project involved cannot be carried out effectively by services charged with the daily operation of government business. Proper arrangements must be made, and this is no minor aspect of the problem. But a number of approaches can be thought of, and a discussion at this place would serve no good purpose.

The recent events on the international level suggest all manner of comment. A "philosophical" approach may be the most constructive. Ever since, for still unclear reasons,⁴⁸ the jurisdictional basis of the nationality of the plaintiff was put into the Code Napoleon, the field of recognition of foreign judgments has been one of extraordinary events. Countermeasures were taken but some of these measures added to the difficulties and the whole field became frozen. The most recent episode, apparently the escalation of an idea not fully considered at the outset,⁴⁹ should perhaps not be overdramatized. A Protocol of obvious scholarly and practical value has been produced and the Recommendation stating that "certain grounds of jurisdiction can only exceptionally justify the international recognition and enforcement of judgments" is useful, too. If a common effort is made, conditions in a field long ready for a cleaning-up operation may well improve.

FOOTNOTES

* Research Scholar Emeritus, Harvard Law School.

The views here expressed are the author's and do not necessarily represent those of the

United States Government or of other members of the United States Delegation to the Eleventh Session of the Hague Conference.

¹ The Recommendation appears under B II in the Final Act of the Eleventh Session, reprinted in 16 AM. J. COMP. L. 602 (1968).

² Directorate on Harmonization of Laws, General Directorate on Competition, EEC Commission, Draft Convention Relating to the Jurisdiction of Courts, the Recognition and Enforcement of Decisions in Civil and Commercial Matters and the Enforcement of Public Documents, Documents No. 1437/IV/64, 1965 RABELS Z 594, I RIVISTA DI DIRITTO INTERNAZIONALE PRIVATO E PROCESSUALE 790 (1965), translated in 2 CCH COMM. MKT. REP. ¶ 6003 (1965); see Hay, *The Common Market Preliminary Draft Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments—Some Considerations of Policy and Interpretation*, 16 AM. J. COMP. L. 149 (1968).

³ C. Civ. art. 14 (1804) (France); C. Civ. art. 14 (1807) (Lux.). Dates of foreign codes herein are those of the earliest codes in which the provisions referred to appeared. Provisions have not been amended unless indicated.

⁴ C. Civ. Pro. art. 126(3) (1838).

⁵ ZPO § 23 (1877, as republished in 1950).

⁶ See Nadelmann, *Jurisdictionally Improper Fora in Treaties on Recognition of Judgments: The Common Market Draft*, 67 COLUM. L. REV. 995, 1000 (1967).

⁷ See Nadelmann & von Mehren, *The extraordinary Session of the Hague Conference on Private International Law*, 60 AM. J. INT'L L. 803, 804 (1966).

⁸ Some countries prefer the old-type bilateral convention, with the Hague Convention used as a model. See, e.g., Letter from the Department of Justice of Switzerland to the Permanent Bureau of the Hague Conference, May 3, 1968.

⁹ The text of "Working Paper No. 30" appears in Nadelmann, *The Outer World and the Common Market Exports' Draft Convention on Recognition of Judgments*, 5 COMM. MKT. L. REV. 409, 419-20 (1968).

¹⁰ Draft Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters, reprinted in 15 AM. J. COMP. L., 362 (1967).

¹¹ See Nadelmann & von Mehren, *supra* note 7, at 805. Publication of the Proceedings of the Session is in preparation.

¹² The text of the Protocol appears in 15 AM. J. COMP. 369 (1967).

¹³ The delegates from France and Germany abstained from the vote. See de Winter, *Excessive Jurisdiction in Private International Law*, 17 INT'L & COMP. L.Q. 706, 714 (1968); Kearney, *Progress Report—International Unification of Private Law*, 23 RECORD OF N.Y.C.B.A. 220, 230-32 (1968). The minutes will be in the Proceedings of the Extraordinary Session, which is in preparation.

¹⁴ Article 59 reads:

This Convention sets no obstacle to a commitment by a Contracting State toward a third State under the terms of a convention on recognition and enforcement of judgments not to recognize a decision, especially one rendered in another Contracting State, against a defendant domiciled or habitually resident in the territory of a third State if, in the case contemplated in Article 4, the decision could be based only on a jurisdictional basis listed in the second paragraph of Article 3 [the bases not allowed against domiciliaries of the Common Market].

Convention Concernant la Compétence Judiciaire et l'Exécution des Décisions en Matière Civile et Commerciale (ed. Conseil des Communautés Européennes, Bruxelles, undated) (official print) (unofficial translation) (emphasis added). An unofficial translation is given in 2 CCH COMM. MKT. REP. ¶ 6003 (1968).

¹⁵ See BULL. EUR. COMMUNITIES, Nov. 1968, at 22-23.

¹⁶ The Protocol applies "subject to the provisions of existing Conventions relating to the recognition and enforcement of judgments."

¹⁷ Information supplied to author by the Services of the EEC.

¹⁸ C. PRO CIV. art. 4(4) (1942); M. CAPPELLETTI & J. PERILLO, CIVIL PROCEDURE IN ITALY § 4.05(1) (H. Smit ed. 1965).

¹⁹ Marychurch et cie v Compagnie Maritime Française, [1904] Pasicrisie Belge I 293, 319, [1904] Belgique Judiciaire 1329, 1346, I REVUE DE DROIT INTERNATIONAL PRIVÉ 166 (1905) (Cass. 2e ch.).

²⁰ See de Winter, *supra* note 13, at 711, 714.

²¹ See P. HERZOG, CIVIL PROCEDURE IN FRANCE 580-90 (1967). See also von Mehren & Trautman, *Recognition of Foreign Adjudications: A Survey and a Suggested Approach*, 81 HARV. L. REV. 1601, 1613 (1968).

²² Convention of July 15, 1966, on Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments art. 11 (2), [1967] Bundesgesetzblatt No. 288 (AUST.), French text in 56 REVUE CRITIQUE DE DROITE INTERNATIONALE PRIVÉ 818 (1967).

²³ See Nadelmann, *supra* note 6, at 1000' n.37.

²⁴ *Id.* at 1015.

²⁵ Like other Scandinavian countries, Norway uses the presence of assets jurisdiction of the German type. C. Civ. Pro. § 32 (1915); P. AUGDAHL, NORSK CIVILPROSSESS 161 (3d ed. 1961); cf. R. GINSBURG & A. BRUZELIUS, CIVIL PROCEDURE IN SWEDEN 159 (1964); A. PHILIP, AMERICAN-DANISH PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW 25 (1957). Norway also does not allow recognition of foreign judgments in the absence of a treaty. C. Civ. Pro. § 167; P. AUGDAHL, *supra*, at 151. Both facts strengthen Norway's bargaining position.

²⁶ A. DICEY & J. MORRIS, THE CONFLICT OF LAWS 970 (8th ed. 1967). These treaties contain nothing to protect United Kingdom domiciliaries from the consequences of the scheme of the Common Market Convention, nor are Common Market residents protected from possible extraterritorial use of judgments obtained in the United Kingdom which should have local restriction. Scottish law allows attachment *ad fundandam jurisdictionem*, which can lead to an in personam judgment. See A. ANTON, PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW 106-07 (1967). Moreover, in England, as in the United States, in personam jurisdiction may be obtained by personal service on a transient—a basis of jurisdiction unknown in the civil law and today considered undesirable in the common law countries. See G. CHESHIRE, PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW 548 (7th ed. 1965); von Mehren & Trautman, *supra* note 21, at 1616; cf. UNIFORM FOREIGN MONEY-JUDGMENTS RECOGNITION ACT § 4(b) (6). Both means of obtaining jurisdiction are included in the list of "improper jurisdictional bases" in the Supplementary Protocol.

²⁷ Common Market Convention, *supra* notes 14 and 15, art. 58; see Treaty on Jurisdiction and Enforcement of Judgments in Civil Matters Between France and Switzerland, June 15, 1869, art. I, in JOURNAL DU DROIT INTERNATIONAL PRIVÉ, 2 Tables Générales 1874-1904, at 388 (1905).

²⁸ This act has been enacted in California, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts (with reciprocity requirement), Michigan, and Oklahoma.

²⁹ C. CIV. PRO. art. 431(1) (1838); see R. KOLLEWIJN, AMERICAN-DUTCH PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW 34 (2d ed. 1961). See generally Smit, *International Res Judicata in the Netherlands: A Comparative Analysis*, 16 BUFFALO LAW REV. 165 (1966).

³⁰ CODE JUDICIAIRE art. 570 (1967) (formerly Law on Jurisdiction of 1876, art. 10); see G. VAN HECKE, AMERICAN-BELGIAN PRIVATE

INTERNATIONAL LAW 39-40 (1968). The case law in Luxembourg is similar. See Pellus v. Detilloux, 19 Pasi-crisie Luxembourghoise 371 (Cour Supérieure (C.A.) Apr. 20, 1964). This is no longer the case in France. Nadelmann, *French Courts Recognize Foreign Money-Judgments: One Down and More To Go*, 13 AM. J. COMP. L. 72, 73 (1964).

³¹ ZPO § 328(1) (5) (1877, as republished in 1950); see Nadelmann, *Non-Recognition of American Money Judgments Abroad and What To Do About It*, 42 IOWA L. REV. 236, 252 (1957).

³² C. PRO. CIV. art. 780 (1942); see M. CAPPELLETTI & J. PERILLO, *supra* note 18, § 14.12.

³³ See P. AUGDAHL, *supra* note 25, at 161; H. EEK, THE SWEDISH CONFLICT OF LAW 86 (1965); A. PHILIP, *supra* note 25, at 28.

³⁴ See generally Nadelmann, *supra* note 30.

³⁵ C. CIV. PRO. art. 178 (1966); see J. CASTEL, PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW 271 (1960); W. JOHNSON, CONFLICT OF LAWS 765 (2d ed. 1962).

³⁶ See J. CASTEL, *supra* note 35, at 284; Nadelmann, *Enforcement of Foreign Judgments in Canada*, 38 CAN. B. REV. 68 (1960).

³⁷ The requirement is criticized in RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF CONFLICT OF LAWS § 98, comment e (Proposed Official Draft 1967); H. GOODRICH, CONFLICT OF LAWS 392 (4th ed. 1964); von Mehren & Trautman, *supra* note 21, at 1660-62.

³⁸ Reciprocity has been required by statute in Massachusetts since 1966, MASS. GEN. LAWS ANN. ch. 235, § 23A (Supp. 1969), and in New Hampshire since 1957, N.H. REV. STAT. ANN. § 524:11 (Supp. 1967) (limited to Canadian judgments).

³⁹ 159 U.S. 113 (1895).

⁴⁰ See *Zscherer v. Miller*, 389 U.S. 429 (1968), noted in *The Supreme Court*, 1967 Term, 82 HARV. L. REV. 63, 238-45 (1968), and 21 VAND. L. REV. 502 (1968); cf. Hill, *The Law-Making Power of the Federal Courts: Constitutional Preemption*, 67 COLUM. L. REV. 1024, 1056-57 (1967).

⁴¹ See FOREIGN JUDGMENTS (RECIPROCAL ENFORCEMENT) COMMITTEE REPORT, CMD. NO. 4213 (1932).

⁴² Foreign Judgments (Reciprocal Enforcement) Act, 23 & 24 GEO. 5, C. 13, § 9, at 151-52 (1933); see A. DICEY & J. MORRIS, *supra* note 26, at 970.

⁴³ See A. DICEY & J. MORRIS, *supra* note 26, at 970.

⁴⁴ See 9B UNIF. L. ANN. 64 (1966) (Commissioners' Prefatory Note).

⁴⁵ The Canadian Commissioners produced a similar act in 1964. See 1964 PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMISSIONERS ON UNIFORMITY OF LEGISLATION IN CANADA 107. The Swedish government has ordered an investigation of its law. See L. WELAMSON, VERKSTALLIGHET AV UTLÄNDSKA DOMAR 40 (1968) (Report to Department of Justice of Sweden).

⁴⁶ When the Secretary of State was first approached in 1874, he made a vague reference to problems created by the federal system. See Nadelmann, *Ignored State Interests: The Federal Government and International Efforts To Unify Rules of Private Law*, 102, U. PA. L. REV. 323 (1954).

⁴⁷ The change in approach has also become evident in the "neighboring" field of judicial assistance to foreign courts. See Amram, *United States Ratification of the Hague Convention on Service of Documents Abroad*, 61 AM. J. INT'L L. 1019 (1967).

⁴⁸ See H. GAUDEMET-TALLON, RECHERCHES SUR LES ORIGINES DE L'ARTICLE 14 DU CODE CIVIL (1964); Nadelmann, *Book Review*, 14 AM. J. COMP. L. 348 (1965).

⁴⁹ This view already expressed in Nadelmann, *supra* note 9, at 418, is supported by the fact that, at the Eleventh Session of the Hague Conference, nothing was said in support of the scheme.

A RED IS A RED: OTTAWA OR
HAVANA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on July 23, I called the attention of the House to the suspect role of Canada's new Red ambassador in the recent secret trip of Henry Kissinger to Peking to arrange President Nixon's proposed trip to Red China—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 27020.

Recent news articles have proven this. Current political attitudes would not allow our ambassadors to visit Havana—the other Red Chinese embassy within 100 miles of our border.

Circumstances dictated the creation of this new Communist embassy 60 miles to the North. Yet, for some unknown reason, our people have not accepted the fact that regardless of where our ambassadors go—Ottawa or Havana—they are still going to be talking to Communists—our sworn enemies who hate the American way of life.

I ask that related news articles be inserted at this point:

[From The New York Times, July 28, 1971]

U.S. AND CHINA ARE LIKELY TO DISCUSS
TRIP IN OTTAWA

(By Tad Szulc)

WASHINGTON.—Diplomatic discussions in preparation for President Nixon's forthcoming visit to Peking are expected to be conducted mainly through the Chinese Embassy in Canada, Nixon Administration officials said privately today.

They said the arrival in Ottawa last Friday of Ambassador Huang Hua, who is a specialist in American affairs, offered the best opportunity for such discussions.

But these officials pointed out that the President's representatives might on occasion use channels in other foreign capitals where contacts might be possible with less public notice.

Information on United States moves toward both the Chinese Communist and Nationalist Governments has been emerging only from conversations with Administration officials and informed foreign diplomats. Officials have been forbidden to discuss these matters in public since President Nixon announced only July 15 that he would go to Peking.

ANNOUNCEMENT PUT OFF

It is believed that no American official has met with Mr. Huang since his arrival in Ottawa and the impression here is that he would be given time to settle down before contacts are established.

The White House press secretary, Ronald L. Ziegler, said today that United States policy on Chinese representation in the United Nations would be announced, "when ready," by Secretary of State William P. Rogers. Both Mr. Ziegler and State Department spokesmen made it clear that the announcement was quite some time away.

Other officials attributed the delay in the announcement to the failure of the Chinese Nationalists to inform the United States on how they would react if Communist China is admitted to the United Nations in the fall.

It was understood that Mr. Rogers has held two unpublicized meetings with the Chinese Nationalist Ambassador, James C. H. Shen, since their first conference on July

19 after the Presidential announcement of the Peking trip.

Concerning the contacts with the Peking Government, officials said privately that it appeared likely that high-ranking Administration representatives would be "commuting" to Ottawa for meetings with Mr. Huang.

They indicated that it was unlikely that the contacts with Mr. Huang would be conducted by the United States Ambassador in Ottawa, Adolph W. Schmidt, who is not a professional diplomat.

[From New York Times, July 24, 1971]

PEKING'S FIRST ENVOY IN OTTAWA—
HUANG HUA

(By Frank Ching)

Huang Hua, who arrived in Ottawa yesterday to become the first Chinese Communist Ambassador to Canada, is one of Peking's most trusted diplomats.

Mr. Huang, who is 58 years old, has been working for the Communist cause for over 35 years, since the time he was a student leader in Peking in the nineteen-thirties. The graying, stocky ambassador comes to North America after having served in Africa for most of the last 10 years. He was ambassador to Ghana from 1960 to 1966 and made Accra Peking's major diplomatic base in West Africa.

Operating from Ghana, he was able to gain diplomatic recognition for his Government from three other African countries—Tanganyika, which later joined with Zanzibar to form Tanzania, which in turn recognized the Peking regime; the former French Congo, and Dahomey.

HAS DEALT WITH WESTERNERS

Early in 1966, Mr. Huang was appointed Ambassador to the United Arab Republic. Shortly after this, the Cultural Revolution erupted in China and Chinese ambassadors all over the world were recalled to Peking—but not Ambassador Huang. By leaving him at his post, Peking gave a clear sign of the confidence that the Chinese leadership had in him and of the importance of his work.

Mr. Huang, who speaks English fluently, is experienced in dealing with Westerners. He was educated in the American-supported Yenching University in Peking in the mid-1930's. When the Peking Executive Headquarters was set up in January, 1946, to oversee a Nationalist-Communist ceasefire agreement, Mr. Huang, as head of the Communist press section, became well acquainted with many Western newsmen.

And at Panmunjom, Korea, in 1953, he faced the Americans in tough negotiations over the setting up of a political conference after the Korean armistice.

When the Geneva conference on Indochina opened in April, 1954, Mr. Huang accompanied Premier Chou En-lai as his adviser and spokesman of the Chinese delegation.

American newsmen and others who knew him in his role as spokesman to the press during World War II found him very personable and agreeable. One American correspondent recalls that Mr. Huang always wanted to read dispatches "just to see what you are writing, not for censorship."

Mr. Huang showed a harsher personality at Panmunjom. Arthur H. Dean, who represented the United Nations Command and the United States, wrote later that Mr. Huang "habitually called me a capitalistic crook, rapist, thief, robber of widows, stealer of pennies from the eyes of the dead, mongrel of uncertain origin, and so on and so on."

As is often the case with Communist diplomats, little is known of Mr. Huang's personal life. He is believed to have been born in Kiangsu Province of a poor family. His real name was Wang Ju-mel, but, for reasons that have not been made clear, he assumed the name Huang Hua in the mid-thirties.

While at Yenching, he occupied an attic room in a dormitory, the cheapest student quarters available. When he was in his thirties he was known to have been married to a woman described as "the daughter of an old revolutionist," but no more is known about her. He has since remarried.

ARRESTED BY NATIONALISTS

Huang Hua—the name is pronounced hwong-hwa—was politically active as a student leader in Peking. He was arrested twice by the Nationalist authorities, once in late 1935 and again in March, 1936, for having taken part in student demonstrations.

He was imprisoned for two weeks after his second arrest. Several months after his release, Mr. Huang left for the Communist base in Yanan, in northwestern China, to become the interpreter of Edgar Snow, the American journalist. Mr. Snow's wife, Nym Wales, described Huang Hua at the time as being proud, self-possessed, discrete, and much admired for his courage.

Mr. Huang may well have to draw upon these qualities while serving in Ottawa. Presumably, his duties will include efforts to gain the admission of his Government to the United Nations and, possibly, improvement of relations with the United States.

The diplomat delayed his departure for Canada over a month, possibly to await the arrival of Henry A. Kissinger, President Nixon's foreign policy adviser. When Mr. Kissinger arrived in Peking July 9 for two days of secret talks, Mr. Huang was among those at the airport.

[From the Manchester Union Leader, July 27, 1971]

CHOU MAKING HIS DEMANDS

(By Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—Future U.S. policy toward the Chinese Nationalist government on Taiwan (Formosa) appears to be the crucial issue in the coming preparation talks for President Nixon's trip to Peking.

Although the President and his advisers aren't talking about it in public, the Chinese Communist leaders want him to make several changes in this policy before his trip to Peking early next year.

Premier Chou En-lai made this clear to Dr. Henry Kissinger, the President's chief foreign policy adviser, during their meeting in Peking. A Kissinger memorandum to the President highlighted Chou's "suggestion" in reporting that the Red Premier put the Taiwan issue ahead of all others, including the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam.

Kissinger was told that the President could "clear the air" for his trip by removing all units of the Seventh U.S. Fleet from the Formosa Straits and by cutting back on military aid to the Chinese Nationalist government.

It was Chou's position, Kissinger stressed, that the U.S. should end its naval protection of Taiwan as the first step toward a normalization of relations since the connections between the two countries had been disputed by this American military move.

When Kissinger indicated that this was a matter that had to be resolved by both the White House and Congress, Chou replied that the President surely must have the power and influence to make this change in U.S. policy.

Before agreeing to make the joint Peking-Washington announcement of the President's trip to China, Chou demanded and received Kissinger's assurances that the U.S. would support Peking's membership to the United Nations and the U.N. Security Council.

As to the position the U.S. takes toward Nationalist China in the U.N., Chou said it didn't make any difference to his government as long as the U.S. backed Peking's bid for membership as the representative to mainland China.

When Kissinger reported that public opin-

ion in the U.S. wouldn't permit a diplomatic break with the Chinese Nationalist government at this time, Chou indicated that this wasn't necessary or being requested now.

"What my government wants at this time is a public sign that the U.S. is going to begin phasing out its military help to Chiang Kai-shek," Chou is quoted as stating. Chou then pointed out that this could be done by withdrawing the Seventh Fleet and reducing U.S. military aid.

The key question—While Chou did not suggest the proposed changes in U.S. policy as a condition for Peking's invitation to the President, some of Nixon's advisers are concerned that they might become that during the coming preparation talks.

Whether President Nixon could make these changes in light of his pledges that the U.S. will honor all of its commitments to Nationalist China is a debatable question. Until the President learns more about Chou's suggestion, he is expected to do nothing that might cause the Chiang government to increase its opposition to his proposed trip to Peking.

Kissinger and Chou also agreed that further talks regarding the Nixon trip would be carried on at Peking's new embassy in Ottawa by Huang Hua, Communist China's first Ambassador to Canada, and Dr. Kissinger or one of his associates.

One of Peking's top diplomats, Huang is set to arrive in Canada later this month traveling via Europe. He took part in several of the talks that Chou had with Kissinger.

In their discussions on Vietnam, Kissinger reported that Chou informed him that his government was pleased with President Nixon's withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam. Chou expressed the hope that most of the withdrawal would be completed before the President arrived in Peking.

Note: When asked about China's own cultural revolution, Chou reported to Kissinger: "It is continuing, like the revolution in your country."

Heavy traffic—The roads to Peking could get crowded with Democratic Presidential hopefuls before President Nixon makes his trip to China.

At least three possible Democratic presidential hopefuls—Senator George McGovern (S.D.), Senator Edward Kennedy (Mass.), and former Senator Eugene McCarthy (Minn.)—are seeking permission from Peking to visit China during the coming year.

Senator McGovern would like to be the first to visit China. He sent an aide to the Chinese Communist Embassy in Canada recently to see if he could speed up approval of his request. Hsu Chung-fu, the Chinese charge d'affaires, promised that the Senator's application would be considered at the highest levels in Peking.

Senator Kennedy and McCarthy both hope to receive approval of their requests by fall. Both are on record for Peking's membership to the U.N. At least a half dozen members of the House also are seeking permission to travel to China.

As reported in the July 2 column, Chou told a group of Arab writers: "If U.S. politicians want to visit China there is a possibility, and we are watching. We may even extend invitations before the end of the year."

It was during his interview that Chou revealed that President Nixon had made several overtures to visit Peking and that his government was considering them. Chou also reported that there were changes going on inside the U.S., which were favorable to Peking. He cited antiwar demonstrations in the U.S., friendly speeches by members of Congress, and visits to China by U.S. newsmen and students.

Dr. Kissinger's report on his conversations with Chou confirmed earlier reports by these

Arab writers that Peking plans to use future negotiations with the U.S. to try to influence both American foreign and domestic policy.

THE INTERNATIONAL WASTEPAPER MARKET

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, as we contemplate the growing solid-waste problem in this country and begin to investigate the possibility of recycling many of the waste products we now simply destroy, it is easy to forget that for many countries of the world the wastes of our affluent society are valuable commodities. In a speech recently brought to my attention, Mr. Lloyd E. Williams, vice president of the Container Corporation of America, points out the growing international demand for wastepaper. Overseas shortages of wood pulp and secondary paper fibers are creating the potential for profitable export of our used paper products. Mr. Williams projects that even with a successful domestic recycling program, ample supplies of wastepaper will be available for export. I am happy to bring Mr. Williams' speech, and his innovative suggestions therein, to the attention of my colleagues:

EXPANDING THE INTERNATIONAL WASTEPAPER MARKET

(Remarks of Lloyd E. Williams)

I appreciate this opportunity to talk to you today about wastepaper markets. The export of wastepaper by the United States may be on the threshold of a fundamental change. The nature of this change depends a great deal upon how the interested people in this room guide the development of expanding international wastepaper markets.

Today, I want to review the current situation in exporting, and try to put the activities of dealers in the United States in perspective with the current situation found here and in the rest of the world. Hopefully, I can point out ways in which we can all work together to make it possible to expand our operations and increase our profitability.

Let me begin with the situation here in the U.S. As most of you know, the recycling rate of the U.S. paper and paperboard industry is currently slightly under the 20 percent level. Last year, the U.S. recycled about 10 million tons out of the 58 million tons of paper and paperboard produced and imported. The Pioneer Paper Stock Division of Container Corporation was involved in the collection of about one million tons of this wastepaper. The majority of paper collected by Pioneer is used in our own mills in the manufacture of paper and paperboard packaging.

My reason for giving you these figures is to provide you with the proper perspective on the relationship of my company to wastepaper.

Last year, my company's domestic paperboard mills used 715,000 tons of wastepaper as a raw material input, in manufacturing 1.4 million tons of paperboard. Thus, wastepaper represents 47 percent of Container's total raw material input. The recycling level at Container's overseas mills was considerably higher for pretty much the same reasons

that the overall recycling rates in several fibre-short countries are higher than in the United States.

The major use for the wastepaper fibres recycled by Container is in the manufacture of combination boxboards, which are used for cartons for soaps, cereals, crackers, and a myriad of other consumer products one sees while shopping in United States stores. It is also used in the manufacture of corrugating medium, fibre cans, tubes and cores, as well as posters, book covers, and other products. Wastepaper fibres are also used in several other product areas, but I won't go into detail about them now.

Now let's take a look at what has happened to the international export market in recent years.

From 1960 through 1970, most countries have shown a sizeable increase in imports of secondary fibres from the U.S. Total exports from the U.S. have gone from 153,000 short tons in 1960, to an all-time high of 408,000 short tons in 1970, with only a few areas where exports remained steady or fell off slightly. The major importers of U.S. stock have been Canada, Italy, Japan, Korea, Mexico, the Philippines and Venezuela. These seven countries account for 87 percent of total U.S. wastepaper exports.

Over the past ten years, the amount exported has fluctuated widely from year to year. The percentage increase between 1969 and 1970 for example, was a whopping 41 percent. There have been a number of factors which affect the movement of secondary fibres. The first of these, obviously, is U.S. domestic demand. If domestic demand is good, then domestic prices are strong. When domestic demand falls off, secondary fibre prices weaken and they become more attractive as an export item. Export demand is fairly constant, varying according to local situations within importing nations. But, U.S. price is the major factor that determines the extent of the United States' recycling industry's efforts to meet the demand.

Exports to Europe and the Far East are now mostly in the medium-priced, long-fibered brown grades, while Mexico and Latin America have shown great demand for these brown grades as well as pulp substitute grades.

The breakdown of goods exported to markets outside the U.S. is not detailed. But, based upon Container experience in 1969, 72 percent of the total amount exported was in the bulk grades, and 28 percent in specialty or pulp substitute grades. In 1970, bulk grades accounted for 65 percent, and pulp grades 35 percent. It is difficult to draw any real conclusions on these figures, because a great number of circumstances change the mix of tonnage shipments. For example, domestic demand for the grade in question will frequently determine whether or not tonnage can be exported. Short pulp supply usually means strong business or higher prices for pulp substitutes in the U.S. High prices, in turn, will frequently prohibit or at least limit the export stability of a given stock. For that matter, anything affecting prices upward will have a limiting effect upon the importer in fibre-short countries. Frequently, also, importing countries will control importation with the use of import duties, various licenses, import permits, requirements, examinations, etc.

Recently, I read an interesting article analyzing the problems of export marketing of wastepaper. The article stated that the movement of wastepaper out of the U.S. has been spasmodic in the past, and hindered by the actions of marginal dealers in the United States who are in and out of the market with great frequency. At times, special lower cargo rates have been available stateside, and frequently sailings were offered during periods when shipping business was depressed. How-

ever, as soon as shipping space became short again, the shippers chose goods with greater revenue and some paper stock was left standing on the exporting dock.

In spite of this, however, there are opportunities for increased exports of wastepaper due to overseas shortages of woodpulp and secondary fibres, as well as high pulp prices. The relatively high freight rates usually place wastepaper from the United States at a price disadvantage as compared to the importing mill's local supply of wastepaper and pulp.

Let me emphasize, although wastepaper from the United States delivered to a mill abroad usually costs two to three times that of the local supply, the demand in virgin fibre-short countries for additional pulp encourages the use of imported wastepaper to stretch the limited domestic supply.

And, this brings me around to my principal subject—the potentials for expanding the international wastepaper market. This is a very timely topic in light of the current activity here in the States with the general public and government influences on the environment, and, especially, recycling.

As I pointed out, the U.S. demand for wastepaper plays a significant role in determining the amount of paper, the quality, and the price of paper that can be exported from this country. So, let me take a few minutes to discuss what effect I think the current interest in recycling here in the U.S. will have and how it will affect wastepaper exports.

First, I do not think my country's interest in recycling has reached its peak, and I do believe that U.S. government and industry, and the general public, will continue to work for the social good of this country. This means that there will be continued interest in, and demand for, effective utilization of recycled fibres. However, this demand will not adversely affect export opportunities. Let me explain why.

The U.S. National Academy of Sciences is currently saying that the U.S. must double its paper recycling rate by 1985 or the environment will suffer considerably. For purposes of discussion, let us assume that this figure will be reached. To assume this, of course, we have to ignore the economics of this increase, including the capability of the industry to meet it and the capability of customers to absorb this amount.

Along with the doubled recycling rate, predictions are that the use of paper in the U.S. will double from 58 million tons to about 117 million tons. Therefore, if paper use doubles, the amount of paper disposed of will grow from 40 million tons to 80 million tons and continue to be 50 percent of municipal waste, assuming all other factors hold. On the other hand, if recycling into paper and board doubles to 40 percent, the tonnage use will not just double to 20 million, but will redouble to 40 million tons. However, the paper and board in solid waste will still increase to 60 million tons, and the percent of wastepaper in municipal solid waste will drop to only 43 percent from its present 50 percent level.

So, as you can see, there will still be plenty of paper around for export, no matter what happens to the current recycling movement in the United States.

One role members of B.I.R. can play in the U.S. domestic situation is to make certain that all concerned parties realize that importation of wastepaper from the U.S. represents an approach that turns America's solid waste management problem into another country's raw material resource solution. This is a salutary form of recycling that must be explored by governments and environmentalists. Though U.S. use of wastepaper be quadrupled, there would still be just as much of a disposal problem in the U.S. as there is now.

The demand for recycled wastepaper in international markets is considerable. It also

is predicted to grow rapidly in the coming years.

Since U.S. demand for recycled fibre does play an important role in overseas export potential, I think it is interesting to compare the per capita consumption of paper and paperboard in the U.S. against other countries, keeping in mind that the U.S. recycles at a 20 percent rate.

Current consumption of paper and paperboard worldwide is 72 pounds per person. The U.S. consumption figure in 1969 was 576 pounds, with all other countries consuming under 50 pounds per person per year.

This large difference indicates that the rest of the world can absorb a large amount of wastepaper, as the standard of living increases in the developing countries; when it is economically feasible, the possibility for exporting the wastepaper from the U.S. to these outlets is excellent.

Recent projections of the future requirements of the world for paper and paperboard indicate that there will be growing pressures for increased internal recycling or importation of wastepaper to supplement the limited fibre resources available in many countries. Undoubtedly, the wastepaper from the United States could play a large role in supporting these worldwide needs. When wood pulp prices increase and substitution of wastepaper becomes technically and practically feasible, it then will become economically attractive for major portions of the furnish to come from the large tonnage grades—old containers, news, and mixed papers.

An appreciable percentage of the world's increased requirements for paper and board in future years will have to be based on wastepaper to a greater degree than past and present usage of this resource.

However, don't let me give anyone the idea that all countries are just sitting there and waiting for the U.S. to ship them paper. Quite the contrary. Most countries can't afford to buy from the United States. And, frequently, there is a lack of incentive for capital money to be invested in wastepaper consuming mills in developing countries, or fibre-short countries, because the delivered price of wastepaper imports is too high.

Two main factors in the delivered price are the cost in the U.S. of preparing the fibres for export, and the total transportation cost from the point of preparation to the docks and over the water to the point of consumption. Transportation cost can add from 50 to 300 percent to the delivered cost of wastepaper, and constitutes a substantial impediment to export.

Increased volume and new techniques for transoceanic handling give hope for a closer correlation between freight and f.o.b. cost. Containerization in 10-25 ton units has been available for the past two years. There are roll-on and roll-off type vessels which take 40 tons in containers on lift trucks into holds, with unloading and discharge handled in the same convenient, expeditious manner.

Also, now becoming available is the transportation of containerized "lighters aboard ship." This is a revolutionary system for carrying cargo aboard ship in floating containers. These lighters dramatically increase the speed of handling cargoes, and cut voyage turn-around time in half. The entire vessel can be loaded to capacity in 24 hours, rather than the 10 days now required for conventional ships. These lighters can carry from 100 to 500 tons of paper stock and are, of course, on a per-ton comparison, loaded and unloaded much more quickly than with conventional ships.

Another area deserving investigation is bale density. This is important because freight rates are partially dependent upon density, with denser bales carrying a lower per-ton rate.

The possibilities for significantly increasing

the density of wastepaper bales, however, is dependent upon technological advancements. With current known technology, it is feasible, but not economical, to get bales with a density of greater than about 30 lbs./cu. ft. or a bulk volume of less than 67 cu. ft. per short ton of 2,000 lbs.

As pulp prices rise and foreign requirements for papermaking fibre grow, it is obvious that a considerable potential exists for increasing supplies of wastepaper from the U.S., if ocean freight can be reduced by negotiation, or if bale density can be improved economically. This may not be as easy as you might think.

Let me tell of an actual experience at Container Corporation's California paper stock operations. In order to reduce shipping costs through a high density bale, we developed and installed the largest and most powerful paper baler currently in use. However, much to our dismay, we discovered that when the bale was compressed to 35 pounds per cubic foot, the size of the metal bale band had to be increased to keep the bale from breaking open. Of course, the stronger and heavier banding cost more. This added expense equalized the anticipated ocean freight savings from the denser bale. So, an approach which we thought would save us money actually ended up not saving any at all. The outcome was that we reduced the bale density to 30 pounds per cubic foot, and then we had a viable shipping unit that did not require the stronger bands. So, as you can see, improved bale density may not be the complete answer, at least with current technology.

New techniques for collecting and processing of wastepaper suitable for mill consumption are being developed, but more are needed if we are to meet the demand for economical waste fibres, and if we are to contribute to the alleviation of solid waste in the U.S.

One of the fundamentals of economic pricing is a more stable export demand for long brown fibre and groundwood grades. It is crucial that importers and exporters work together to promote long term ordering so plans and investments can be made with the assurance that there will be a market for our output.

Recommendations for increasing exports of wastepaper invariably list the reduction in freight costs as the most important problem to be solved. Government could assist in this by paying a subsidy on exported wastepaper, equal to a portion the cost of disposal in municipal solid waste disposal systems, with no incremental charge to the taxpayer. The payments could be in the form of direct freight subsidy or some other form of government credits to accomplish the same purpose. This would provide a substantial inducement to export, since the average cost of collecting and disposing of municipal waste equates to more than one-half the cost of trans-Atlantic shipment. Other assistance government might render would include tax abatement or accelerated depreciation on new processing facilities installed for preparing wastepaper for export.

Thus, we see that the role of wastepaper in some of the developing countries, that do not have adequate supplies of papermaking fibres, can be an important one, and the United States appears to be the only major source they can call upon at the present time to furnish it.

The major industrial countries which can and do generate large supplies of wastepaper consume it and will continue to do so. In this situation, the position of the United States for exporting a large tonnage of wastepaper is unique. It appears that instead of concerning itself with the destructive disposal of wastepaper, the U.S. can rid itself of part of the problems and costs by selling a valuable recyclable resource to other countries who need and can use it. It won't solve the U.S.

balance of payments problem, but every small contribution helps.

We must educate all officials and all Americans that it is cheaper to provide economic incentives to get cellulose wastes out of the U.S. than it is to dispose of it. What the amount of the subsidy should be will have to be decided by a careful review of alternative disposal costs.

Economics, of course, is the key to expanded exports, but there are two other related items that at times are equally significant. Exporters here in the States must set and adhere to strict quality control to prevent substandard shipments. We must ship the quality ordered. And, likewise, the importer must have integrity to live up to his end of the bargain and accept what has been properly shipped to him and not create problems just because it is on open credit. This type of unprofessional conduct at either end of the shipping route leads to frustration and a reluctance to get more involved in exporting or importing.

I have touched on many points so far. Any single one might be worth several hours discussion, which undoubtedly will happen, as the international exporting of wastepaper continues to be explored. It is impossible to go into a great amount of detail in the short amount of time available to me today.

Let me summarize my comments on international marketing of wastepaper. Hopefully, my remarks can serve as a catalyst for more action, interest and results on all fronts.

The export demand for wastepaper has fluctuated wildly over the past years, because of changes in domestic demand and prices. The demand for wastepaper in fibre-short countries is great and can be expected to grow rapidly as these countries become more and more industrialized. The relatively low per capita consumption of paper and board in many countries makes the operation of small paper machines necessary as an economic alternative to importing new paper. Smaller machines are more adaptable to wastepaper furnish than virgin fiber and they require less capital investment. This is a pertinent argument in their favor, either in developing, tree-rich countries, or countries with no tree supply. In the majority of these emerging nations, the supply of local wastepaper is very minimal and therefore needs fortification by import.

The cost of delivered wastepaper must be reduced before the U.S. paper stock industry can meet the demand, increase its exports, and help alleviate America's solid waste management problems. Costs can be reduced through several courses of action—all of which B.I.R. members should work toward. These include encouragement of longer term ordering for sustained demand, reduced freight costs for wastepaper in U.S. shipment, subsidized cargo rates for overseas shipment, and development of more advanced equipment for handling wastepaper.

The current interest in the environment here in the U.S. and elsewhere will have slight effect upon exports of wastepaper, no matter what the optimistic predictions are. Keep in mind that even if we increase the amount exported by as much as one million tons, that still is only ten percent of the wastepaper presently being recycled in the United States and only 1/40 of what ends up in dumps. The perspective should be retained that exports of wastepaper have a limited role in the solution of the United States' solid waste disposal problem, unless more economic incentives are developed to favor such exports.

What is needed is for members of the B.I.R. in their respective countries, and for our respective governments, to come to grips with the real problem of economics. We must join forces on a worldwide basis to turn the waste management problem here in the U.S. into a trade advantage and a resource potential to countries that truly can use wastepaper.

FREE IRAN

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1971

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I brought to the attention of my colleagues an open letter to President Nixon from Mr. Hossin Habiby, chairman of Free Iran. In that letter, Mr. Habiby urged the President to reevaluate America's "position with the present illegal Government of Iran."

This letter seeks the same reevaluation, but this time from Congress. He bases his remarks upon the cornerstone of our Declaration of Independence—the inalienable rights of all people. I commend this letter to the personal attention of every Member and insert it in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, June 22, 1971]

FREE IRAN: AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: No one is more aware than you of the high esteem that Americans everywhere attach to the freedoms we believe are the inalienable rights of all peoples of the world.

Even today, the United States itself, is embroiled in bitter, undesirable action in Indo-China for the single purpose of upholding the all-important premise of freedom of speech, press, assembly and vote. And, it has given top diplomatic priority to an attempt to find a just settlement to the Arab-Israeli crisis.

As commendable as these actions are, they have, unfortunately, led to an almost complete neglect by the U.S. diplomatic corps in curbing Communist activity in Iran.

Through extortion and blackmail the Communists have obtained a foothold in Iran and this foothold, unchecked and unopposed, has spread from a cancerous beginning to an extremely critical and dangerous situation.

Communists have now infiltrated into the highest echelons of the Iranian government and they are unrelentingly forcing the Shah to yield to new concessions.

It will not be long before America will see the Shah in exile and the Communists in control although it is true that the same 28 million Iranians have little love for the Shah whose actions have been, in many instances, unwittingly aided by the very nations who oppose the Communists.

The Iranian Point Four Land Program, for example, has been a complete farce. In actuality, Shah Reza, father of the present Shah, confiscated—sometimes by force—almost half of Iran's arable land. At his death he was the largest land owner in the world. The present Shah sold this land back to its original owners under a 15-year mortgage program. The Shah then warehoused the mortgages to his favorite banks giving them permission to foreclose at the slightest default.

The late President Kennedy, while still a Senator, complained to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that millions of American taxpayer's dollars, earmarked to help impoverished people throughout the world, were being misused. As an example he pointed out that over \$16 million sent to Iran to promote the land reform program for Iranians actually showed up in the Shah's personal account in a New York bank. No explanation for the act was ever forthcoming from the Shah.

This corruption within the country and the ideological pressures from without pose serious problems for mankind but they almost pale by comparison to the activities

of the Shah's family in developing a world—yes—world—trade in the most fiendish form of drug addiction, that of heroin.

Under the Shah's direction a flourishing legalized heroin industry has been established in Iran. Poppy growing is legal as are the giant laboratories to convert the opium into the dreaded heroin. In just a short time Iran has become one of the largest drug producers in the world and unless immediate action is taken in Iran there is little hope of curbing this evil in Southeast Asia. It also follows that without these curbs the United States can expect the corruption of hundreds of thousands of persons within its own borders and millions throughout the world.

The United States has been a big factor in bringing Iran into the 20th century. The Shah is now showing his gratitude by allowing his family to traffic in heroin which flows into this country.

In spite of these activities, Iranian officials have had the temerity to invite Mrs. Nixon to attend ceremonies in October marking the 2500th year of the kingdom. It would be a heart-rending blow to freedom-loving people everywhere if the wife of the President of the United States patronized a monarchy that must rely on martial law to stay in power; that is deeply involved in heroin trafficking in the United States and is shamelessly exploiting 28 million Iranians by every available and under-handed means.

Peace in Vietnam is prayerfully desired. An Arab-Israeli settlement is wanted and necessary. But, please, Mr. Congressman, do not forsake the Iranians who suffer on both horns of a vicious dilemma—a capricious, cruel and unresponsive dictatorship and the imminent threat of a worse evil—total Communist takeover.

Iran is a vital "Bridge to Asia" and America's long-sought goals of freedom for the world may some day find this bridge instrumental in moving these ideals forward. Communist control would mean a tragic setback.

And do not forget the threat of world-wide corruption through the vicious method of heroin addiction, a vile industry now permitted to flourish in Iran.

Time is rapidly running out. Collectively your legislative body can be the lever that will move world policy toward a free Iran.

That is our hope.

HASSIN HABIBY,
Chairman, Free Iran.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
CHAMBER CHOIR

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to my colleagues' attention a report on the highly successful concert tour of the Soviet Union which the University of Michigan Chamber Choir has recently completed. As a Congressman from Michigan, I am personally very proud of this group and of the honor which they have earned for themselves, the university and the entire State of Michigan.

The chamber choir, under the direction of Prof. Thomas Hilbish, was the only university group in the United States to be selected to perform in the Soviet Union under the 1970-71 U.S.-U.S.S.R. cultural exchange agreement.

The group of 50 young musicians toured eight cities in a period of 7 weeks. During this time, the chamber choir per-

formed before capacity audiences in such cities as Moscow, Kiev, Odessa, and Leningrad. Throughout their trip, the choir was applauded, not only for their musical excellence, but also for the contributions that the individual members made in fostering a better understanding between our two countries. Between concerts in the various cities, the choir met informally with Russian musicians and students and the Michigan students proved themselves to be both popular and effective ambassadors of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate these students and their director for the honor they received in being chosen to participate in this cultural exchange program. But I also want to commend them on their achievement in performing so successfully as representatives of the United States.

FOOT IN THE DOOR

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, July 21, the House passed H.R. 4354 which would permit wider buses to operate on interstate highways. I opposed the bill since, in my judgement, this would set a precedent for pending legislation which would turn loose wider and longer trucks on our Nation's highways.

This point is very effectively made in an editorial in the Sunday, July 25, Chicago Heights Star:

FOOT IN THE DOOR

In Washington, the House of Representatives has approved a bill which would permit wider buses to operate on interstate highways.

On the face of it, the change might seem innocuous. The new width standard of 102 inches tops the present limitation by six inches, while the vehicles could be driven only on highways with lanes of at least 12 feet.

Along with critics of the bill, however, we are chiefly concerned with its "foot-in-the-door" capabilities. Not long ago, legislation which would have permitted wider and longer trucks was turned aside. Should wider buses be permitted, supporters of the truck legislation might well be expected to return—with stronger arguments than heretofore.

The degree of additional comfort achieved by widening the buses, meanwhile, is questionable. Each seat would acquire one more inch and the aisle would be widened by two inches.

Another argument for relaxing the rules is that many 102-inch buses now operate in large cities and on various highways other than interstate. Should the legislation win final approval, these vehicles could travel on federal highways leading to populous suburbs. But there is a considerable difference between high-speed interstate highways and other thoroughfares; if an error is to be made, we should prefer that it be made on the side of safety.

It is sufficiently hazardous and disconcerting to encounter oversized loads without adding to the standard size of buses and trucks.

NATIONAL MAGAZINE CITES ARCHITECTURE IN COLUMBUS, IND.

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent article in the August issue of American Home magazine in which Columbus, Ind., is once again recognized for its unique architectural program.

Entitled, "What's All This Top Architecture Doing Out on the Prairie?", the article takes a close look at not only the stunning buildings of this southeastern Indiana city, but at the people, too.

Since Columbus is my hometown, I can only echo the closing words of this outstanding study of the city: "Come to Columbus."

The article reads as follows:

WHAT'S ALL THIS TOP ARCHITECTURE DOING OUT ON THE PRAIRIE?

(By Jeanne Lamb O'Neill)

If I were showing America to a gang of visiting Ping-Pong players, I'd skip the Empire State Building, the Grand Canyon and even Disneyland. I'd make a beeline for Columbus, Indiana—a little town in the Midwest you've probably never heard of. But you will, you will. One of these days Columbus will be another Williamsburg, Va., in reverse—a museum of tomorrow instead of yesterday.

Located in southeastern Indiana, at the junction of the White, Flat Rock and Driftwood Rivers, Columbus, in its 8.3 square miles, has more eye-popping, trail-blazing buildings by big-name architects than any other town in America. What's more, in 8.3 square miles, it probably has more nice people.

Not so long ago, "nice" was a dirty word. Who wants to be nice? Let's be sophisticated, sexy, swinging, with-it. But suddenly, "nice" is what everybody is looking for. People are disillusioned with our zooming, fuming, dehumanizing cities. They're disenchanted with our junky, jumbled suburbs. They looking for a new way of living—the kids in their communes, the over-30's in "new cities" like Columbia, Md., and the oldesters in "leisure villages" and mobile-home communities. Well, come take a look at "The Athens of the Prairie." It may be the nicest town in the U.S.A.

Winston Churchill said—and Columbus residents often quote—"First we shape our buildings, then our buildings shape us." If it's true that good buildings are "catching," the people of Columbus can hardly escape the architectural fallout. They have no less than 36 standout landmarks in their town. What's more, their buildings aren't just for show. They're for people to live in, play in, study in, worship in and do business in.

Where else will you find two churches designed by father and son architectural greats? There's Eliel Saarinen's First Christian Church—called the world's kookiest and costliest back in 1942 and still an eye-brow-raiser and there's son Eero's hexagonal North Christian Church with its soaring 192-foot spire. But to many, the best-looking church in Columbus isn't either of these—its Harry Weese's magnificent First Baptist Church built in 1965.

In what other town can grammar-school kids romp through John M. Johansen's pastel-painted, carpet-lined "tubes" on their

way to class? Or ride on plastic pony-sculptures during recess at Edward Larabee Barnes's crazy saw-toothed schoolhouse? Or do their sums in an "inside-outside" school by Gunnar Birkerts or in Norman Fletcher's "umbrella school"? In Columbus, kids learn their I. M. Pei's before their ABC's and cut their teeth on a 20-foot Henry Moore "hip bone." Officially called the "Large Arch," Moore's jolly, green giant sculpture landed outside Pei's dazzling library last May. It's green because Englishman Moore didn't trust the Indiana elements to turn the bronze his shade of green. Already it's been "twanged" by just about everybody in town. (Hollow inside, it gives a swell twang.)

Then there's Kevin Roche's post office. It's—well—different. It doesn't look like any other post office you've ever seen. It does look like the only post office in America designed by a privately paid architect. "Isn't it dangerous?" whispers a middle-aged woman next to me—"I mean all that glass!"

People worried about "all that glass" at John Carl Warnecke's elementary school, too—the famous "glass pagoda" that Lady Bird Johnson visited on her "Crossroads U.S.A." tour. As it happens, not a window has been broken in 11 tempting years. (Better schools make better children?)

Obviously, local wags have a field day in Columbus. Boys and girls who go to school in the stern, all-gray junior high designed by Eliot Noyes giggle and call it "Southside Penitentiary." Explains vice principal Willis Hagan, "The architect said the kids will provide the color," and so they do as they chatter, snack and sometimes even study in the marvelous, wide-open spaces of the indoor "commons."

Though some of their parents grumble about the highfalutin architecture, they're the first ones to bundle Uncle Fred and Aunt Martha into the family car after Sunday dinner to show it all off. Says soft-but out-spoken Bob Marshall, in his editor's office at *The Republic*, "There are maybe 100, 200 people in town who don't like what's going on. But, you know, they'd complain about anything."

Is Columbus pretty? Yes, no—and maybe. "Athens of the Prairie" they call it, but the slogan is misleading. Columbus is no Athens. Even 36 gleaming temples do not an Athens make—not when they're surrounded by miles of dreary humdrum filling stations, supermarkets and pizza parlors. Of course, as general volunteer guide Scott Doup points out, we "ain't seen nothing yet." Many more wonders are on the way, including a \$13,000,000 Mitchell Giurgola "high school without walls," an immense engine plant by Roche, Dinkeloo and a colossal urban redevelopment project by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill to pretty up the downtown area. Someday Columbus may well be in Athens; right now, it's just a darned sight closer to it than any other town around.

Columbus is where, if you live in New York or San Francisco, you "can't get there from here." You have to take a plane to Indianapolis (45 minutes north of Columbus) or Louisville, Ky. (one hour south) or Cincinnati, Ohio (two hours east). And even your aunt in Cincinnati will think you mean Columbus, Ohio—"Oh, is there one in Indiana, too?" From whichever direction you approach the town, you can't miss it. The surrounding land is so flat you could spot a grasshopper on its knees.

As it happens, the main Columbus landmark, a fine old building designed by Isaac Hodgson 101 years ago, soars into the southern Indiana sky. It's the town's beloved county courthouse. The skinny needle of the North Christian Church across town is the "new architecture." That's the way things are in Columbus. The old and the new sit Saarinen-chic-by-dowager-jowl.

Strolling down the main thoroughfare, Washington Street, you'll see gewgawed and pastel-painted Victorian storefronts gazing blandly across at Saarinen's sleek, grassy Irwin Union Bank (called the "brassiere factory" because of the white, D-cup domes on top). The stores are part of the "model block" created by designer Alexander Girard, their old-fashioned bay windows and fancy dentils deliberately emphasized. Just down the street, behind the walls of the old St. Denis Hotel, are the Girard-designed offices of the Cummins Engine Company—probably the suavest corporation digs this side of Madison Avenue. The elegant, lofty rooms crackle with top executive brainpower and drip with Vasarelys and Rothkos, but the original handcarved staircase still stands, squeak and all.

Just off Washington Street, the courthouse overlooks a modern two-year-new motel. And I. M. Pei's 1968 Clea Rogers Memorial Library spreads its splendid wings right next door to the 1910 Irwin home and Italianate garden.

Nobody lives in the Irwin home now. Miss Elsie Sweeney, the last of the Irwin family to live there, moved out several years ago. Her nephew, J. Irwin Miller, lives out on Washington Street in the house Eero Saarinen built for him. Irwin Miller, in case you're stark-new in town, is Columbus. He's head of the town's biggest industry, Cummins Engine Company (diesels, you know—designed by the Irwins' family chauffeur, Clessie Cummins, in their garage and financed by the Irwin family). He's the multiest millionaire in town and for miles around. He has degrees from Yale and Oxford, a finger in national and international pies, a Stradivarius to fiddle on and a "downhome" way of dropping his g's. Most important, he's the how, why and wherefore of Columbus's architectural renaissance.

Miller's love of architecture is inherited. It was his family who convinced a dubious congregation back in 1942 to build Eliel Saarinen's \$725,000 church. Why not, said the doubters, spend the money in Christian works instead? Why not worship in less impressive surroundings? Because, came the Irwins' answer, "Great buildings dominate and influence the lives of all who live near them." Shades of Winston Churchill. Fore-shadows of Irwin Miller.

Twelve years later, Miller hired Eliel's son, Eero, a Yale classmate, to build the town's second shocker—the Irwin Union Bank. The year after that he set up the extraordinary Cummins Foundation and offered to pay the architect's fees for all new school buildings. And so they came to Columbus, all the greats in the business, to build the "great buildings" that Miller had envisioned.

So far, the foundation that Miller established has paid over \$2,000,000 in architect's fees for new public schools as well as churches and other buildings. But that doesn't include the name-design Cummins plants themselves—even the factories in Columbus are monuments. It doesn't include Ceraland, the 250-acre playland that Miller gave to his employees. Nor Otter Creek, the \$1,500,000 public golf club he gave to the whole town, complete with stunning Weese-designed clubhouse and Robert Trent Jones course.

No, there wouldn't be any "Athens" without Irwin Miller. But, happily, his enthusiasm has been contagious. Another big company in town, Hamilton Cosco, donated the lively new Weese-designed Lincoln Center. Members of the congregation raised the money for Weese's First Baptist Church. (Yes, there are more Weese designs in town than anything else.) And the popular Donner Park and Center were donated just for old-time's sake by Frederick Donner, a hometown boy who got rich on Pittsburgh steel.

Columbus, for all its progressive design, is still part of the Bible belt. Would you believe that there are 131 churches in town?

Or only one liquor store per 5,000 persons? That's the law in Bartholomew County. You can imagine the excitement when the new census paved the way for one more.

What is social life like in Columbus, anyway? "We do take a cocktail, you know," teases urbane Hank Abts, a Cummins vice president. And people in Columbus do wear hot pants, go to X-rated movies, drive to Indianapolis for shopping and theater and to Florida for winter tans. But Columbus is still, by any standard, a small town. It's still small enough to publish a list of everybody going in or out of the hospital. It's still small enough to write up one-year-olds' birthday parties. And it's small enough for the town's first citizen, Irwin Miller, to drive his own car to work, do without guards and gates around his showplace home and list his number in the telephone book.

"We have no Society—in quotes—here," says twinkly, brown-eyed Jean Prather, women's editor of *The Republic*. Echoing her, editor Bob Marshall reminisces, "We had a party-set once—back in 1910." That's when the children and grandchildren of the town's stern, shoulder-to-the-plow forefathers were sowing their wild oats. Today's party people are more likely to sow wild rice at their Saturday night "supper clubs" (not the smoke-filled variety but the kind where couples take turns outdoing each other in the kitchen). Almost everybody belongs to a supper club or gourmet club (Hawaii tonight, next month Little Italy) and, definitely, a bridge club. The wives have their sororities and garden clubs; the men, their lodges and breakfast clubs. Oh yes, there is a nightclub, the Village Inn, famed for live entertainment nightly and for Liza Minelli, who dropped by once and stayed a whole week.

Does Columbus sound pretty cornball to you? It is not, repeat not. It's just a little conservative. Hard-working, too. "Try to find someone to have a drink with," complains Marshall. "Everybody's still at his desk at 6:30." But you have to remember that there's no commuting time. Bob Storey is home from his downtown office in 8½ minutes flat. Actually, the whole town is Bob's office. He's a Cummins public relations man—a friendly, earnest Iowan with a disarming nut-brown gaze and a gorgeous read beard. The beard is in honor of Columbus's big Sesquicentennial Celebration this year (Bob's baby), but the beard will stay, if his wife will. When Bob first came to Columbus a dozen years ago, he says, it was "only 35 percent because of the job and 65 percent because of the town."

These days it's hard to tell which is which.

Although this is a quiet family town, times in Columbus are changing. That hippie outside the library with flowing blond hair and faded jeans puts out an underground newspaper called *The Different Drummer*. And industry has put lots of new people on Washington Street—from Texas and New York, Afghanistan and Latvia. "In the old days," says Jean Prather, "people didn't talk to new people for years. Not any more. Now I think we have a nice cosmopolitan mix." Cosmopolitan and nice. The Newcomers Club is as busy as any other group in town. And the Cosmopolitan Club, a fast-growing organization of foreign-born women, already has its pet Columbus projects.

Small wonder that Columbus is growing. Bright young management consultant Dick Fleming is one of the many to have seen the town's potential. Dick left Cummins' personnel department to try it on his own—right here in Columbus, because he likes Columbus. He's an expert on the town, not because he's a city councilman but because he has to sell Columbus every day to choosy, sophisticated executives all over the country. He's not having much trouble these days. With its growing industry, pioneering architecture and good schools, Columbus has a lot to attract ambitious men.

Everybody else in the world may be surprised at what's going on in Columbus, but nobody in Columbus is. Today's "Athens" didn't just spring up here by accident, any more than Columbus just sprang up here 150 years ago. The town's pioneers knew what they were doing and, more important, where they were going. "Why does everybody think it's so incredible that the town is ahead of its time? It's just an old Columbus tradition," says Randy Tucker, a Cummins executive and past school-board president. Jean Prather adds earnestly that the "seeds of progressiveness" have been there all the time.

Come to Columbus. They'd love to have you. But fair warning: It's the kind of town that makes you homesick—after you get back home.

Come to Columbus, by all means, but don't feel you have to rush. It's not one of America's treasures that you'd better see quickly before it's too late. The people of Columbus aren't going to change, and the buildings get better all the time.

THE RED PURGE OF OUR MILITARY CONTINUES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, continued evidence of the subordination of all racial considerations to the hypothetical, purely imaginary concept of "racial" balance and "improved race relations" appears in the continued reports of purges of Army officers who failed "to enforce adequately the regulations aimed to improve race relations or guarantee equal opportunity within the armed services" to the satisfaction of the Pentagon's civil rights division headed by a black who participates in activities sponsored by the National Urban League and NAACP.

It is a sad day for America when our military services are intimidated to discipline officers and remove them from command positions solely because they fail to conform to some imaginary concept of race relations held by organizations like the National Urban League and the NAACP—organizations which are but tools in the plot to destroy America's ability to defend itself.

This purge is designed to remove those people from command who put their country and its military above bureaucratic policy and political appeasement of malcontents.

This purge, covered up by the smoke-screen of "race relations," is a direct attack on dedicated military men because they are strict disciplinarians and anti-Communists. Race is the least of the considerations involved.

I insert a related news article in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Times, July 28, 1971]
PENTAGON SAID TO PENALIZE OFFICERS ON RACIAL POLICY

(By Thomas A. Johnson)

DETROIT, July 27.—Frank W. Render 2d, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, said today that 10 to 12 military officers, from general down to company grade, had been relieved of command, transferred or reprimanded for failure to enforce adequately the regulations aimed to improve race rela-

tions or guarantee equal opportunity within the armed services.

The official declined to name the officers involved, saying, "I don't believe it would serve any useful purpose to give their names—to embarrass them."

Mr. Render, a black who was appointed last August to head the Pentagon's civil rights division, made the statement in answer to a newsman's question concerning his office's enforcement powers.

The 35-year-old former human rights official from Syracuse said that the military services had taken actions against officers since December, 1970, in cases "where we could identify clearly that commanders had been negligent."

In Washington, a Pentagon spokesman, Jerry W. Friedhelm, refused to comment on the specifics of Mr. Render's remarks. He said, however, that a proper understanding of race relations was "a leadership requirement—if you can't understand race relations, you can't be a leader in today's Army."

He said he "wouldn't be surprised" if some officers had been relieved of their commands because of race issues, but he said he did not know how many such cases there had been.

Mr. Render participated here in a workshop on employment problems of youth, veterans, women and the working poor at the 61st annual conference of the National Urban League and was the principal speaker at a news conference this morning at the Pontchartrain Hotel.

The Department of the Navy announced at the conference that a destroyer escort, to be built this year at the Avondale shipyards, Westwego, La., would be named for Doris (Dorie) Miller, a black Navy Cross winner of World War II. The sailor, a ship's cook third-class, aided his wounded commanding officer and later manned a machine gun in the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941. He died in action two years later.

At the news conference, Mr. Render identified the officers who were disciplined only by saying they "wore stars, bars, oak leaves and birds on their shoulders." Such military insignia respectively identify generals, lieutenants and captains, majors and lieutenant colonels, and colonels. There was no indication as to whether Mr. Render was referring to any particular branches of the services.

There has been some speculation in Pentagon circles that Lieut. Gen. James H. Polk, former commander of United States troops in Germany, was retired prematurely earlier this year because of months of racial tension and major outbreaks of racial violence there.

Mr. Render led a 14-man race relations team on a three-week tour of American bases in Europe last fall and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People toured bases in Germany last January. In addition, three black Army officers and four black enlisted men in Germany formally requested last fall that the Department of Defense convene a court of inquiry to determine whether General Polk was guilty of "dereliction of duty" by failing to combat housing discrimination against black soldiers by Germany landlords.

This formal legal case was prepared by a black military judge, Capt. Curtis Smothers, who was subsequently transferred from his post in Frankfurt, Germany, to the Pentagon. The Secretary of the Army denied the request and stated that steps were being taken to end discrimination by landlords in Germany.

On March 25, Representative William Clay, Democrat of Missouri, entered a denunciation of General Polk into The Congressional Record. It was titled "Defense Department Retires General Polk—a racist in High Command." Mr. Clay, who is black, contended in the document that "General Polk could have eliminated many of the problems" of race in Germany "had he used the powers he had."

There was also some speculation in the Pentagon that the general's retirement might also have been caused by scandals within the command's post exchange system.

Meanwhile, a noted black historian warned some 5,000 delegates and visitors to the league conference in Cobo Hall against too-hasty coalitions between black and white groups.

Lerone Bennett, author of several books on black American history, who is a senior editor of Ebony magazine, said "Our most immediate task is not a coalition between blacks and whites but between blacks and blacks, not between the United Auto Workers and the Urban League but between the Urban League and the N.A.A.C.P.; not between black and white students but between black students and black administrators, black hustlers and black intellectuals, black fathers and black sons."

He declared that coalitions between blacks and whites of various interests had not worked for the best interests of blacks.

APOLLO 15 LUNAR MISSION, NASA, REVIEW AS RESULT OF RUSSIAN SOYUZ 11 ACCIDENT

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, D.C., July 20, 1971.

HON. JAMES G. FULTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: A review of the Apollo 15 lunar mission was initiated by NASA as a result of the Russian Soyuz 11 accident. This review was specifically directed to a reevaluation of the pressure garment suit wearing schedule during events that expose the command and lunar cabins to increased stress loads and therefore to a greater probability of a malfunction or cabin penetration leading to rapid cabin decompression. This letter reports the results of this review.

Among the events considered were launch, undocking, docking, Scientific Instrument Module (SIM) bay door jettison, propulsion burns, lunar landing and stay, lunar liftoff, LM jettison and earth reentry. Hardware items considered included hatches, valves (hatches and cabin), cabin penetrations, cabin leak rates for various hole sizes, and windows.

This review reconfirmed our high confidence in the capability of the hardware and that our operational procedures reduce to a minimum the possibility of damage to critical hardware through incorrect use. It reconfirmed that the hatches are fully qualified to pressures higher than they are normally exposed to, that they are relatively easy to operate, that the mechanical operation of handles or latches as well as the position of the pressure valve in the hatches can be observed visually, and that pressure integrity is easily and quickly verified while the astronauts are still suited.

Valves used in the hatches and in the cabin and other cabin pressure hull penetrations were reexamined as to qualification, failure rate and failure modes. Specifications and cabin leak rates for various size holes were reviewed. It was concluded that operating procedures for the valves are straightforward, that structurally the valve bodies are rugged and strongly fixed in position,

and that leak rates through the valves and other cabin penetrations, even with complete loss of O-rings, are low. The CM has the capability to maintain 3.5 psi for leak rates equivalent to a 1/4" hole for approximately 29 minutes and the LM even longer for an equivalent leak. Suit donning times for an emergency average about 11 minutes for the two crewmen in the LM to suit-up and approximately 19 minutes for the three crewmen in the CM to suit-up.

The cabin windows were also carefully reviewed. Although not of similar design, all CM and LM windows are of multiple pane construction. Thermal shock and pressure tests of both normal and damaged panes had been conducted as part of qualification tests. Each window is subjected to a thorough acceptance test, and pressure tested again after installation in the cabin. Based on the above, the windows are considered sound.

Even though there is an extremely low probability of loss of a complete CSM window during reentry, analysis shows that a suited crew would have a higher probability of survival in such a contingency. The rationale for the decision following Apollo 7 to reenter without suits was therefore reexamined. This rationale is based on the following: the reentry event, except for the splashdown phase, is fairly predictable and stress loads are well within the safety factor of the hardware. The stress loads imposed by the water impact, however, are not so predictable and vary, for example, with wind velocity and direction, wave heights, wave velocity, wave rising or falling and direction. Therefore, although the probability of a malfunction occurring at splashdown is also low, it is higher than a malfunction occurring during reentry into the earth's atmosphere. In the event that a malfunction on splashdown did occur and emergency egress were necessary, a suited crew would be handicapped. Removal of suits for egress would be especially difficult and time consuming in the Stable II (upside down) condition in the water, in which case egress through the upper hatch under water would be required.

Therefore, since (1) a malfunction at water impact is more probable than a malfunction at reentry, (2) wearing suits at water impact would decrease crew safety, and (3) time is not available for the astronauts to remove their suits between the period of high reentry stresses and splashdown, we have concluded that on Apollo 15 reentry and splashdown will be conducted with the crew unsuited as on previous missions.

In another area, however, the reexamination of operational modes has led to a change. Although the review confirmed the decision that the CSM/LM hatch was qualified to withstand the maximum pressure that could be reasonably expected to occur, the shock loads imposed during LM jettison on the CSM tunnel appear to warrant requiring the crew to be suited for this operation. Therefore, the LM jettison event will be added to the list of events during which the crew is required to be fully suited.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. FLETCHER,
Administrator.

PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. LLOYD, Mr. Speaker; today marks 7 years and 124 days since the first American soldier was taken captive by North Vietnamese forces. Presently more than 1,600 American men are listed as

missing in action or as prisoners of war. It is estimated that 400 of these men are being held captive by the North Vietnamese.

Families of these men continue to suffer the personal anguish and torment of loved ones—all of us share in the sorrow. Many of these families have lived with this uncertainty for years, and their plight has reached the hearts of all Americans who are concerned about the future of American servicemen held prisoner.

With each passing day, this unnecessary inhumanity to these men and their families grows greater. As Members of Congress, we must vow that American prisoners of war will not be forgotten and that their release will be pursued until every last prisoner has returned home to his family.

NATIONAL DEBT IS STAGGERING

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, our national debt is reaching the astronomical figure of \$400 billion.

How much is a billion? Here is one way to look at it. Since the birth of Christ, only about a billion minutes have elapsed.

And our debt is approaching \$400 billion.

To bring this figure into focus, Senator ELLENDER set his staff to work to come up with some figures.

The St. Cloud Times in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District, recently editorialized on this matter and I would like to share these thoughts by inserting the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I particularly commend the writer for his concluding remarks:

Nearly everything but money is in limited supply. This is why prices go higher and higher, and it takes more and more dollars to buy goods of tangible worth.

The editorial follows:

NATIONAL DEBT IS STAGGERING

The U.S. national debt stands at nearly \$400 billion. In an effort to make this figure somewhat comprehensive to ordinary citizens, the chairman of the senate appropriations committee of the U.S. senate, Senator Allen Ellender, set his staff and a bank of computers to work with some interesting results.

The senator found that, "If every member of the United States senate counted two, one-dollar bills every second of every minute of every hour of every day of every week, it would take approximately 64 years to count \$400 billion. If the senators worked the standard work year (eight hours per day for 260 yeardays a year) taking no coffee breaks, holidays or vacations, it would take them 267 years to accomplish the same count.

At its current capacity, it would take the Bureau of Printing and Engraving about 171 years to print 400 billion one-dollar bills. Four-hundred billion dollars in one-dollar

bills would fill about 3,456 railway boxcars, making a train almost 36 miles long.

The 400 billion one-dollar bills stacked on top of each other would reach about 27,095 miles, or 4.5 trips from New York to Los Angeles. Placed end to end, that many bills would make a path, 160 bills or 35 feet wide, to the moon.

Nearly everything but money is in limited supply. This is why prices go higher and higher, and it takes more and more dollars to buy goods of tangible worth. If inflation continues long enough and the senator's machines are equal to the task, they will someday learn how many trillions of dollars of debt are required to lay a pathway of dollar bills to the furthest star. By that time a loaf of bread will probably cost a few million dollars.

RAIL STRIKE DISASTROUS TO CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURE

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I personally appeared before the distinguished Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the Committee on Interstate Commerce and testified as to the disastrous effect of the current railroad dispute upon the people of California and of my 38th Congressional District.

Following, are my remarks before this subcommittee:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN VEYSEY

A great deal has already been said here today, by highly competent spokesmen, about the details of the proposed legislation before us. Clearly, the time is long overdue for this Congress to act decisively by passing permanent legislation to prevent the kind of economic disaster which this railroad strike is bringing to my state, my Congressional District, and to many other parts of the nation.

It has been determined by some that the selective strike does not constitute a national emergency and that, therefore, emergency legislative action is not justified. I can only point out that to the agricultural community in California's 38th Congressional District, and indeed, throughout the State of California, such an argument has absolutely no relevance. Our agricultural economy is suffering all of the adverse impact of a general strike. There is no rail service. Union Pacific and Southern Pacific strikes brought us to a standstill, and the apparently inevitable Santa Fe strike will choke us off completely.

In Imperial County, California, 75,000 tons of sugar beets are right now rotting in the ground because there are no rail cars to carry them to the refineries. The intense summertime heat in the Imperial Valley will destroy those beets within seven days. That represents more than a million and a quarter dollar loss to Imperial County farmers and a more than three million dollar loss to the agribusiness community. It also represents a lifetime's savings, and the entire future, to hundreds of farm families.

In Riverside County, the story is much the same for many citrus growers. Grapefruit, now worth \$1.00 each on Japanese markets, are falling to the ground by the tons. Ultimately, these crop losses will affect thousands of people, both in our district and out, who depend on agriculture for their survival.

Throughout California, this loss will be multiplied many times and the impact will most certainly be felt nationwide as the supply of fresh fruits and produce—lettuce, melons, tomatoes, and many other commodities—begins to dry up.

Further, this country cannot afford more ad hoc legislation. The solution to strike situations like this one, where the national economy and national interests are adversely affected, must be permanent machinery which protects the public interest while guaranteeing equal protection to the disputing parties.

I strongly support the intent and the provisions of HR 8385, authored by the distinguished Congressman from Michigan, James Harvey. It would deal constructively with this crisis, and with similar situations. It would give the President latitude, and specific options which would have prevented the losses we are now suffering. It would treat both management and labor fairly, while protecting the public interest. And it would eliminate the need and the demands for more ad hoc legislation. I am happy to be a co-sponsor of HR 8385.

I appeal to Congress to live up to its responsibilities and to enact a modern replacement for the falling mechanism of the Railway Labor Act. Otherwise, this legislative body may find itself in the business of running our nation's railroads on a day-to-day basis.

CFR 1970 MEMBERSHIP CHANGES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I had placed the 1969 membership list of the Council on Foreign Relations in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 12, 1971.

A more recent membership list—as of October 1, 1970—when compared with the membership list in the Annual Report of June 30, 1969, reveals that 41 resident members and 42 nonresident members were added, while the names of 38 resident members and 31 nonresident members, or a total of 69 names, were dropped from the list. Some of the resident members were transferred to nonresident members and vice versa.

So that our colleagues may have a more nearly current CFR membership, I insert a list of new members and membership changes:

NEW ADDITIONS TO CFR MEMBERSHIP LIST AS OF OCT. 1, 1970

RESIDENT MEMBERS

Abel, Elie, Armstrong, Willis C., Brisco, Milo M., Butcher, Willard C., Cahill, Jane P., Chace James, Dennison, Charles S., Frey, Donald N., Greenfield, James L., Haywood, Oliver G., Hellman, F. Warren, Henderson, Julia.

Josephson, William, Kassof, Allen H., Kristol, Irving, Larry, R. Heath, Lowenfeld, Andreas F., Luce, Charles F., Macomber, John D., Mulford, David C., Muse, Martha T., Nagorski, Zygmunt, Jr., Pierre, Andrew J., Reed, J. V., Jr.

Riesel, Victor, Riordian, James Q., Schwarz, Frederick A. O., Jr., Seitz, Frederick, Staples, Eugene S., Steadman, Richard C., Steel, Ronald, Stoessinger, John G., Stone, Robert J., Jr., Tavoulares, William P., Wallace, Martha R., Watts, John H., 3rd, Wells, Richard C., Wilcox, Wayne A., Wilkins, Roger W., Wyle, Frederic S., Zorthian, Barry.

NEW ADDITIONS TO CFR MEMBERSHIP LIST AS OF OCT. 1, 1970

NON-RESIDENT MEMBERS

Allison, Graham T., Apter, David E., Arnold, M. L., Asher, Robert E., Bartlett, Thomas Alva, Berry, Brig. Gen. Sidney B., Butterworth, W. Walton, Camps, Miriam, Cooper, Franklin S., Edwards, Robert H., Enders, Thomas O., Fried, Edward R.

Friedman, Irving S., Gerhardt, Maj. Gen. H. A., Goldman, Marshall L., Graham, Katharine, Gurganus, William R., Harris, Patricia Roberts, Hart, Parker T., Haynes, Brig. Gen. Fred, Holbrooke, Richard C., Houghton, Armory, Jr., Keniston, Kenneth, Laise, Carol C.

Lee, Vice Adm. John M., Lewis, John P., McGiffert, David E., McHenry, Donald F., Martin, Malcolm W., Morse, Arthur D., Olson, William C., Patterson, Hugh B., Jr., Ranis, Gustav, Rehm, John B.

Roberts, Walter Orr, Salzman, Herbert, Volcker, Paul A., Wahl, Nicholas, Ward, Robert E., Wehrle, Leroy S., Wilbur, Brayton, Jr., Wohlstetter, Roberta.

CFR MEMBERS IN 1969 DROPPED FROM MEMBERSHIP LIST OF OCT. 1, 1970

RESIDENT MEMBERS

Barnes, Joseph, Beal, Gerald F., Bennett, John C., Brinckerhoff, Charles M., Bufum, William B., Carlson, Ralph M., Chartener, William H., Cooper, Franklin S., Eberstadt, Ferdinand, Eder, Phanor J.

Gunther, John, Haider, Michael L., Harri-man, E. Roland, Houston, Frank K., Jay, Nelson Dean, Johnson, Edward F., Knoke, L. Warner, Lunt, Samuel D., McGraw, James H., Jr., May, A. Wilfred.

Merz, Charles, Nickerson, A. L., Pennoyer, Paul G., Roberston, Charles S., Robinson, Gerold T., Rosenman, Samuel I., Sachs, Howard, Sargent, Noel, Sarnoff, Brig. Gen. David, Schapiro, J. Salwyn.

Scherman, Harry, Schilthuis, Willem C., Shea, Andrew B., Simons, Hans, Spencer, Percy C., Stinebower, Leroy D., Tobby, John, Townsend, Oliver.

CFR MEMBERS IN 1969 DROPPED FROM MEMBERSHIP LIST OF OCTOBER 1, 1970

NON-RESIDENT MEMBERS

Blackie, William, Bristol, William M., Brown, William O., Chartener, William H., Dangerfield, Royden, Evans, Roger F., Ferguson, John H., Heflinger, Totton P., Hoyt, Edwin C., Jr., Kerr, Clark.

Leslie, Donald S., Lindblom, Charles E., Little, Herbert S., Mann, Thomas C., Marcus, Stanley, Matthews, William R., Millikan, Max F., Moran, William E., Jr., Prance, P. F. A., Reuther, Walter P.

Reitzel, William, Seymour, Forrest W., Sprague, Mansfield D., Strauss, Lewis L., Struble, Adm. A. D., Swithart, James W., Teller, Edward, Templeton, Richard H., Von Stirum, John, Warren, John Edwin, Wright, Theodore, P.

PRESIDENT NIXON IS KEEPING HIS WORD

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, last week the President of the United States withdrew an additional 4,100 soldiers from Vietnam.

On January 20, 1969, there were 532,500 Americans enduring the perils of an Asian war. Today, there are 229,200 Americans in Vietnam who are planning to come home.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon is keeping his word.

GOLDEN AND SILVER WEDDING JUBILEE CEREMONY

HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at a recent ceremony at St. Matthew's Cathedral in Washington, D.C., Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, addressed a group of golden and silver wedding jubilants.

I find his address at that occasion to be a most warm and heartening one and I would like to share the same with my colleagues today. It is my pleasure to enclose Cardinal O'Boyle's inspiring address.

PATRICK CARDINAL O'BOYLE GOLDEN AND SILVER WEDDING JUBILEE CEREMONY

My dear and esteemed Jubilarians and Friends all in Christ: In a few minutes you will renew your marriage vows. This is a joyous occasion, for we are here to celebrate your faithfulness to the love you pledged each other the day you were married. Before renewing your vows, you will perhaps enjoy recalling with me the day you were married.

The marriage ceremony began with a brief instruction, read to you by the priest. I will read it again now, to refresh your memory:

My dear friends: You are about to enter into a union which is most sacred and most serious. It is most sacred, because established by God Himself; most serious, because it will bind you together for life in a relationship so close and so intimate, that it will profoundly influence your whole future. That future, with its hopes and disappointments, its successes and its failures, its pleasures and its pains, its joys and its sorrows, is hidden from your eyes. You know that these elements are mingled in every life, and are to be expected in your own. And so not knowing what is before you, you take each other for better or for worse, for richer or for poorer, in sickness and in health, until death. Truly, then, these words are most serious. It is a beautiful tribute to your undoubted faith in each other, than recognizing their full import, you are nevertheless, so willing and ready to pronounce them. And because these words involve such solemn obligations, it is most fitting that you rest the security of your wedded life upon the great principle of self-sacrifice. And so you begin your married life by the voluntary and complete surrender of your individual lives in the interest of that deeper and wider life which you are to have in common. Henceforth you will belong entirely to each other; you will be one in mind, one in heart, and one in affections. And whatever sacrifices you may hereafter be required to make to preserve this common life, always make them generously. Sacrifice is usually difficult and irksome. Only love can make it easy; and perfect love can make it a joy. We are willing to give in proportion as we love. And when love is perfect the sacrifice is complete. God so loved the world that He gave His Only begotten Son; and the Son so loved us that He gave Himself for our salvation. "Greater love than this no man hath, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

No greater blessing can come to your married life than pure conjugal love, loyal and true to the end. May, then, this love with which you join your hands and hearts today, never fail, but grow deeper and stronger as the years go on. And if true love and the unselfish spirit of perfect sacrifice guide your action, you can expect the greatest measure of earthly happiness that may be allotted to man in this vale of tears. The rest is in the hands of God. Nor will God be wanting to your needs; He will pledge you the life-

long support of His graces in the Holy Sacrament which you are going to receive.

How true were the words of this instruction! Those of you who are celebrating your golden anniversary were married in 1921. You could not foresee the years of the depression, with its hardships. You could not foresee that many of your sons would be called to fight in a Second World War, from which some of them were never to return. Those of you who are celebrating your silver anniversaries were married just after that war ended. Materially, your lives have probably been easier. Yet during these years of material prosperity and spiritual confusion, you have had to nurture your love against many threats. And your children have come into the world in a time of spiritual dangers as worrisome for you as was the physical danger of their sons for our golden jubilarians.

Yet all of you have remained faithful. That is the wonderful thing. One out of four marriages in the United States ends in divorce today. In some places the figure is much higher—more than two of every three marriages in some large, West Coast communities end in divorce. And an increasing proportion of young people does not even bother getting married and divorced. Love that is faithful, that involves a spirit of sacrifice, means nothing to them. Instead they boast of their honesty; in their spiritual poverty they hope that by boasting of honesty they will find some virtue in faithlessness.

Your generous and faithful love appears all the brighter when you consider it against this dark background. Your lives should be, they will be an inspiration to the better part of our youth, to those who seek real community and who are willing to dedicate their lives to the service of life.

It used to be said in the past that the faithfulness of the priest and the religious to their lives of dedicated celibacy or virginity was a model for Catholic married couples. I believe that was true. But I also am celebrating a golden jubilee this year—fifty years as a priest—and I can tell you how necessary an inspiration your love as faithful Catholic married couples is for every faithful priest.

The two vocations—marriage and the priesthood—while different, are really very much alike. Both are sacraments of Christ, ways of dedicating one's life completely to others, for the building up of the Body of Christ. Marriage opens the way to the fruitfulness of natural and Christian parenthood. The priestly life opens the way to another parenthood, which is no less real, although some today would like to set aside the title "Father" as something inappropriate for the modern priest.

Love and dedication—these make sacrifice into joy. If only there were more genuine love, more faithfulness, there would be less uncertainty about the value of our lives as husbands and wives, as priests and religious. If there were more appreciation for the generosity of faithful love, there would be fewer defections and divorces. And if there were a sounder appreciation of the responsibilities of our great vocations, I think there would be fewer voices demanding that a single person be permitted to become both husband and natural father, priest and spiritual father, all in one. Either vocation is as much as a man can bear, with the help of God's grace.

Unfortunately, there are some who betray their commitments. There are married couples who give up trying to love one another; there are priests who quit trying to serve Christ and the Church. Betrayal of commitments means forgetfulness of the great goods and goals to which our vocations mean dedication. Parents seek their own happiness in new liaisons, regardless of the effect this has on the children of broken homes. And some priests and religious seek their self-fulfillment in new occupations,

regardless of the spiritual devastation they leave behind. Self-fulfillment. That is the pet phrase of today—or in other words, what's in it for me? Not faithfulness and sacrifice, for the sake of salvation and spiritual life, but the so-called self-fulfillment.

Dedication means openness to life, readiness to help the next generation to be born physically and spiritually. It is sad to see how widespread is becoming the betrayal of commitments in our society. Physicians whose dedication is to preserving and helping life, are being called upon to turn their skills to the service of death. Already professional abortionists, merchants of death, murderers of unborn children, are openly assuming a respectable place in society and in the medical profession.

Less than two weeks ago, one of our local newspapers, after reporting some of the wretched conditions at Forest Haven, Washington's major public institution for the mentally retarded, suggested editorially (*Washington Post*, May 31, 1971) that killing such persons would be "the conscious termination of nonlives in the name of mercy." While the editorial noted that "not many people are ready to accept or take responsibility for" such a policy, it also said that such persons, namely, the retarded, "have no life to lead."

This editorial took for granted as established the practice of abortion. It marked the further step, as a society that has accepted murder of the unborn under the euphemism "termination of pregnancy" is now being readied to accept the murder of the mentally retarded under the euphemism "termination of nonlives." I wonder how many of us will live to the day when we will be counted among the "nonlives" and our lives will be terminated for us as a step of progressive, liberal, social policy in a society that has forgotten the meaning of faithfulness loyal and true to the end.

Of course, some who collaborate in this bloody business do so out of noble and generous motives. A physician who is co-owner of a local abortion clinic, which charges \$200 per killing, was reported last week (*Washington Post*, June 7, 1971, page C 2) to have estimated costs at \$80 per killing. Asked if there were not a resultant profit in the neighborhood of \$100 per abortion, the physician was quoted as saying: "I'm not sure, we haven't figured it out. It should be about that, but I don't want to talk about it. Doctors should be above commercial matters like this."

What dedication! A man so wrapped up in his humanitarian endeavor that he does not take time to subtract \$80 from \$200 to determine just what his profit is. Such men are carried by their noble and generous natures far above any crass, commercial consideration! Such men undoubtedly will be low-bidders, if the time comes for the termination of the "nonlives" of the retarded people living at Forest Haven.

Some will say that concern about killing the innocent is a peculiarly Catholic concern. That is not so. We know that Protestant theologians, such as Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Dr. Paul Ramsey of Princeton University, Dr. George H. Williams of Harvard Divinity School, and Dr. James F. Gustafson of Yale Divinity School, agree with the common Christian tradition, represented in Reformation times by John Calvin and by the Lutheran theologian, Johann Osiander, in firmly rejecting abortion. Similarly, orthodox Jews are firm in their defense of innocent life: one of their leading Rabbis has recently compared abortion to the slaughter of the Jews in the Nazi concentration camps.

Yet if it were true that only Catholics opposed abortion and defended the lives of the innocent, that should make us no less firm in our position. For human life should be held sacred as a matter of social justice,

and we should be ready to bear witness to this sacredness, just as we must be ready to bear witness to the requirements of social justice in other areas, including the area of racial equality.

In a society like ours, I repeat, the example of your faithful love, loyal and true over the years, shines out even more brightly than did the youthful and intense love which brought you to the dedication of your wedding day. Every one of us falls short of the perfect ideal of our vocation sometimes, but God is not wanting to our needs, including the need for mercy and forgiveness. None of you has made the great betrayal, the final renunciation of the pledge of love whose anniversary you are celebrating again this year.

And so, with thanksgiving for God's goodness in the years past and with confidence in His continued help to the end, you may now again consecrate your love for one another, pledging it anew for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health, until death. May God bless you with more years of love and joy in one another, and at last with an eternity of happiness together with Him in heaven!

ADDED EMPLOYMENT AND ADDED INCOME

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to make my position known concerning the consideration of two bills before the House today which are similar in content to legislation vetoed earlier by the President.

Specifically these bills are H.R. 9092 reported by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which I am a member, and H.R. 9922 reported by the Committee on Public Works.

The first bill under consideration, H.R. 9092, would establish principles for setting the pay of about 700,000 Federal blue-collar workers, mainly employees of the Departments of Defense and Interior and the General Services and Veterans' Administrations.

I notice that the administration is once again opposed to the bill which was vetoed in similar form on January 1 of this year. I am tempted to exclaim "here we go again!" as the Congress is called upon for lack of administration initiative and concern to bring order out of the chaotic situation which prevails in the Federal Government's procedures for fixing the rates of pay of these employees under the so-called prevailing wage system.

My concern that such a system be established was conveyed directly to the President in a meeting I attended in March with other members of the congressional black caucus.

I pointed out that the veto of this legislation had taken place 9 days before the Treasury Department announced a liberation of depreciation guidelines to stimulate the depressed economy. This amounted to a \$2.7 billion windfall to big business.

The President cited inflation as his

principal reason for vetoing the pay rate adjustment bill. I asked then and I continue to ask today why it is inflationary to give Federal blue-collar workers \$115 million more a year to spend to boost a sagging economy and not inflationary to give businessmen \$2.7 billion more to spend.

In addition to establishing pay principles, H.R. 9092 would accomplish the following reforms:

Establish an 11-member Federal Prevailing Wage Advisory Committee to replace the current administratively established committee, with a full-time chairman not in the Federal service.

Provide "save pay" for 2 years for prevailing rate employees who are reduced in grade.

Provide a five-step wage schedule instead of the present three, with automatic step increases.

Provide a 7½-percent nationwide pay differential for nonovertime second shift work and 10 percent for the third shift.

Bring employees of nonappropriated fund activities of the Armed Forces, the Veterans' Canteen Service, and the District of Columbia under the system.

The estimated annual costs of the bill in the first full year are \$115 million, and \$181 million for each of the 4 years after the first year.

H.R. 9092 was reported favorably by a committee vote of 21 to 3. Last year, a substantially similar bill passed this House by a vote of 231 to 90. I intend to vote with what I believe will be the majority again this year and do justice to our Federal blue-collar workers.

The second bill before us today is H.R. 9922, the Public Works and Economic Development Act and Appalachian Regional Development Act Extensions. I urge acceptance of this measure.

I note that the new bill contains no accelerated public works title but rather transfers the programs and much of the money in this title in the original bill to a new and expanded public works and economic development title.

I also note that the administration has finally joined the AFL-CIO in supporting this measure. I regard this measure as an old bill in new clothing and if that is what it takes to win support and a measure of face-saving for the administration then I do not particularly mind.

However, I will point out that this is a ready example of what I objected to last March as the administration's tactics—an evident willingness to exploit the needs of the disadvantaged in a cynical if not callous manner by vetoing one day and proposing virtually the same the next day when it suits some tactical or political advantage.

H.R. 9922 seeks to employ thousands of men and women who are unemployed, though they actively seek work, in public works projects. Many of these people are those which the administration abstractly refers to as "statistical quirks" and "acceptable percentage of unemployed" in its specious statements concerning the state of the economy.

I, for one, will not attempt to be so brash nor, I believe, will the House become a party to the myopic affliction

which seems to infect the administration's domestic economists.

I urge Members of the House to join with me in sending on to the Senate H.R. 9092 and H.R. 9922 so that we might fulfill the leadership void necessitated by the vicissitudinous nature of the present administration.

TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION OF GI DRUG ADDICTS

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to join Mr. MURPHY of New York in the introduction of his bill to implement a program for treating and rehabilitating members and veterans of the Armed Forces who are drug addicts.

We are dealing with a very serious problem, and, for a legislator, a very difficult one to solve. It is, however, a matter on which we all must take a stand and act rapidly before addiction in Vietnam becomes an overwhelmingly grave issue. I personally have given this problem a great deal of careful consideration in recent months, and after weighing all the factors I have come to embrace a number of guiding principles concerning GI drug addiction.

There are indications that heroin addiction in Vietnam has reached epidemic proportions. It is our responsibility as the representative body of this Nation to do a great deal of soul searching as to why hard drugs have become so popular, and seemingly so necessary, in Vietnam. Then we must proceed to offer understanding and humanitarian solutions to this devastating problem.

The opportunities for drug addiction in Indochina are endless. The Far East triangle of Laos, Thailand, and Burma, produces over 60 percent of the illegal opium in the world, growing between 1,000 and 1,300 tons per year. There exists such a damaging climate for our soldiers in Vietnam that it is estimated that over 50 percent of our troops take some type of illegal drug, and, as the Murphy-Steele heroin study mission estimates, from 10 to 25 percent use heroin.

We must, I believe, face up to the fact that in Vietnam, the social condition—the war, the massive black market for drugs—is a disproportionate factor in creating this serious drug situation. The Murphy-Steele report points out that most of the soldiers in South Vietnam become addicted only after being in that country; few enter Vietnam already addicted. Clearly, Vietnam seems to catalyze the chances for an individual becoming hooked on heroin.

The legislation I am supporting today is directed toward individual GIs who become addicts while in service, but it is clear that other legislation must be proposed which seeks to alter the pattern in Vietnam, which is the real source of the problem. It is also clear that by assisting the individual, a potentially serious situation is being avoided in the

United States as great numbers of Vietnam veterans return home addicted.

The bill being introduced today represents my conclusions after a period of study and includes provisions which I believe will be most useful at the present time.

First, the armed services should periodically perform detection and evaluation tests to determine who is an addict, and then proceed to start the addict on an initiatory detoxification program.

Second, the addict should be transferred to a civilian facility as quickly as possible. I feel that this is efficacious for the reasons that: first, there are psychological rejections and fears attached to the Armed Forces in the minds of many addicts. Second, surveys have shown conclusively that addicts respond to treatment far better if near to their homes, family, and friends; and third, civilian programs are already well established and claim an improving degree of scientific expertise, as opposed to the novitiate status of the military in this matter. I might add that there are those who might claim that civilian commitment would seem to be an "easy out" for those soldiers who do not wish to remain in the military. One simply needs to become an addict and thereby escape the armed services, they would maintain. I can only emphatically state that the horrors of heroin addiction would provide such a deterrent as to obviate an "easy out" of the armed services.

Third, the GI addict should receive a physical disability discharge. I believe that we must treat the GI drug dependent as a sick person, as one who is physically unfit for service because of his disease. I believe that this philosophy should be applied retroactively, as well, in order to encompass all Vietnam veterans previously discharged dishonorably because of addiction to narcotics. Such veterans ought to be given the same opportunities for treatment at VA hospitals and the same chances to procure a decent job as any other veteran.

Further, I believe that we should show the utmost concern for the civil liberties of the GI narcotics addict. Mandatory commitment is a procedure I endorse reluctantly. But after conversations with psychiatrists and physicians, I am convinced that such commitment would protect the addict against the bleak future of criminal prosecution. The crime cycle becomes an especially terrible problem for society and the returning veteran, who in Vietnam uses 90 percent pure heroin and pays only about \$1 for 150 mg., while on the streets of New York City he can obtain only 5 to 8 percent pure heroin for much higher costs. Since the returning veteran must buy much higher quantities of heroin at greatly higher prices, he is forced into a life of crime at home in order to support his habit.

Another factor favoring mandatory commitment is that many addicts fear the idea of coming on their own to a rehabilitation center. I believe that if the Government and military humanely seek out addicts to offer them assistance, without punishment, such assistance will for the most part be accepted.

Finally, if we are to be truly concerned with the welfare of the addict as well as with the welfare of society, we must dedicate ourselves to provide an adequate number of facilities for treatment. It is only sensible and morally right that the creation of more rehabilitation facilities precede any plans for mass commitment of GI drug addicts. For this reason I am supporting legislation, ably offered by Mr. PEYSER, of New York, to authorize the Federal Government to provide 50 percent of all funds necessary for the States to provide treatment centers for addicts.

The above comments represent the principles I believe we must follow in order to care most properly for the GI who falls prey to the disease of drug addiction. The legislation submitted here is but a part of an overall effort which must be undertaken, and I offer my continuing support in that effort.

POISONING OF WILDLIFE ON OUR PUBLIC LANDS IS A DISGRACE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the poisoning of wildlife on our public lands is a national disgrace.

When the Department of Interior appropriations bill came before the House of Representatives, I attempted to restrict the Federal Government's participation in the poisoning program. However, we were unsuccessful.

Tomorrow I plan to reintroduce H.R. 9668 in order to ban the use of poisons on public lands unless it is specifically authorized by the Secretary of Interior in conjunction with the administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

In the August issue of the Reader's Digest, the need for this legislation is brought out clearly and succinctly. For the benefit of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent to place this article entitled "The Poisoning of the West" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

THE POISONING OF THE WEST

(By Jack Olsen)

Condensed from "Slaughter the Animals, Poison the Earth."

Just after dawn on a recent November morning west of Fort Stockton, Texas, a surveyor, looking for a boundary marker, tugged at a mysterious gray pipe protruding from the chalky soil. There was a sharp report, and something tore into the fleshy part of his hand. A doctor in Fort Stockton administered first aid, but an hour later the surveyor was dead. Investigation showed that the pipe was a "coyote getter," a deadly device set to shoot cyanide into the mouth of any animal that pulled at its aromatic wick.

A few miles east of Craig, Colo., hunting guide Bill Miles came upon several dozen sheep carcasses. By asking around, he discovered that the sheep had been laced with sodium fluoroacetate, or "1080," one of the most dangerous poisons known to man. The carcasses were to be used by government trappers to kill predators said to be harassing sheep. Noticing that a stream which fed Craig's water supply ran near the poisoned meat, Miles protested. Twice in two weeks he saw snow cover the carcasses, then melt into

the watershed. He began taking pictures, and shortly thereafter local sheepmen told him to mind his own business or suffer the consequences. When he continued photographing, three of his hunting dogs died on his doorstep, poisoned.

Straddling the border of Colorado and Utah is Dinosaur National Monument. Like all national parks, it is administered strictly in accordance with nature, and the poisoning of animals within its borders is considered the ultimate offense against park law and order. In the spring of 1970, a group of cowhands were searching for strays in the park. Suddenly, in quick succession, two of their dogs stiffened and died. The dogs were four miles inside the park, but Dinosaur officials weren't surprised. Said one: "We've plenty of other evidence that the poisoners come right across our borders."

These three incidents, multiplied *ad nauseam*, characterize the programs of wildlife extermination in full swing throughout the entire Western half of the United States. Mounted by sheepmen and government trappers to protect the sheep industry from predators, especially coyotes, the programs have already brought whole animal species to the edge of extinction, and they threaten still others. They also threaten *Homo sapiens*, that poor creature who lately has begun driving six miles out of his way to buy phosphate-free laundry soap, all the while turning his back on a practice that is directly and specifically contaminating millions of acres of his country (and which is funded, ultimately, with dollars from his own pocket).

The poisons being used include the cyanide in coyote getters, arsenic, the thallium in bait carcasses, the strychnine encased in sugar-pill coatings, and 1080, a single ounce of which is toxic enough to send 200 adult humans, or 20,000 coyotes, into writhing, convulsive death.

FLICKERING OUT

At one time the West was protected by its very limitlessness. No longer. To add to the efficiency of miracle poisons like 1080, the poisoners work from planes, trail bikes, snowmobiles and pickup trucks—vehicles that carry them to every corner of the range in a few easy hours. "The whole sheep range out there, why, that whole country's plastered with poison," says Paul Maxwell, former trapper and now president of the National Council of Public Land Users. Adds an equally perturbed Wyoming trapper, "Private poisoning is strictly forbidden on public land, but many sheepmen who use the national forest for grazing go in with sacks and sacks of strychnine pellets and throw 'em around like seed. They kill everything in the area before they bring their sheep in."

The results of such "efficiency" are increasingly clear. There are broad areas of California where the coyote has been completely eliminated. A trapper in southwest Texas was asked when he saw his last wild badger. He shrugged his shoulders and said, "I can't even remember." Black bears and foxes are gone in some areas. The kit fox, a master controller of rodents, has vanished from thousands of square miles of the prairie. The black-footed ferret, never common, is about to flicker out as a species. One of the very few surviving California condors fell to 1080-treated grain. Even the mountain lion, officially listed as an endangered species, is specifically and mercilessly being killed.

Says retired government trapper Charles Orlosky, who lives high in a remote area of the Rocky Mountains: "Even here the poisoners are at work. They've wiped out weasel, marten, mink, fox, badger. And it's not true that 1080 is dangerous only to canine species, as the poisoners claim. I've found all kinds of birds feeding on 1080 stations. Last winter was the first time in years that we didn't have a pair of eagles feeding up here. They just disappeared."

POLITICAL PIGEONHOLE

Such observations are backed up by the government's own figures. Each year, to supplement the frenzied poisoning by ranchers, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service fields many of its own "trappers," who distribute tons of 1080-baited meat and bang coyote getters into the earth by the tens of thousands. In 1963—to cite the last year for which such figures are available to "the general public"—these professional poisoners reported a kill of 90,000 coyotes, 300 mountain lions, 21,000 bobcats and lynx, 2,800 "red wolves," 800 bears, 24,000 foxes, 7,000 badgers, 19,000 skunks, 10,000 raccoons, 1,200 beavers, 7,600 opossums and 6,700 porcupines. These figures do not include many animals—and birds—who ate poison and staggered away to die untabulated.

Despite repeated warnings about the dangers of such widespread slaughter—from scientists, conservationists, even some ranchers—hardly a legislative body has paid the slightest attention. This includes the U.S. Congress, where a session is not complete without the introduction of anti-poisoning legislation, a few chuckles and a prompt pigeonholing of the matter.

Arnold Rieder, a former Montana state senator who is now a member of that state's Fish and Game Commission, tells why: "The wool-growers are the best-organized livestock group of all. To a great degree they control the stockgrowers' associations, and that means control of the Western-state capitals and the delegations that are sent to Washington. Invariably, sheepmen get their way."

Consider what happened in Montana while Rieder was still a senator. To prove that neither government nor private poisoners had the slightest intention of following the few anti-poisoning rules written into law, Rieder introduced legislation that superficially seemed absurd. It simply required the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to obey its own poisoning regulations. Immediately, a bulletin went out from the Montana Wool Growers Association to all members: "Senator Rieder of Jefferson County has introduced Senate Bill 196, which places an unnecessary restriction on the use of poison for the control of predatory animals. We need the support of your senator to kill the bill. Would you please wire him immediately. . . ." Rieder's bill lost. With the Wool Growers Association working against him, he was defeated in the next election.

DELIBERATE DISTORTION

To prove the need for its "trappers," the Fish and Wildlife Service calls on sheepmen for "statistics" on stock losses caused by predators. Not surprisingly, the figures come in by the mile. Sheepmen compile horrifying lists of losses, anticipated losses, possible losses. The Fish and Wildlife Service feeds the statistics into its computers and works up programs accordingly. The result is a galloping Parkinsonism that would drive a privately financed organization out of business within months. Every year the reported stock losses rise, the Wildlife Service poisoning budget climbs proportionately, and the population of wild animals sinks to a new low.

The situation brings to mind a statement made by Charles Orlosky a few years ago: "When I was trapping for the government, the Service decided once to prove how many bears and coyotes were taking sheep. They sent out instructions to take out the stomachs of some of the animals we trapped, tie them up, soak them in formaldehyde and send them to headquarters. Our instructions were to put some wool in the stomachs before we sealed them up. In that way there wouldn't be any doubt about what bears and coyotes ate. It wasn't surprising that all the reports came out showing that a high per-

centage of bears and coyotes were sheep killers."

The end result of such deliberate distortion is fiscal irresponsibility on an imposing scale. In Colorado, for example, the annual Wildlife Service kill dropped from 10,200 wild animals in 1967 to 8,200 in 1970—but even while there were fewer creatures to kill, the poisoning budget rose by \$30,000. In 18 national forests in California, the value of sheep lost in one year—1962—was \$3,500; in that same year, the cost of federal predator-control programs was a whopping \$90,000.

CHECKS AND BALANCES

What is to be done about the drenching of the West with poison? Those closest to the problem—men like crusading Colorado naturalist Alfred Etter and politician-conservationist Arnold Rieder—agree that the first step must be to eliminate certain myths central to the poisoning establishment's rationale.

One such myth is voiced typically by an official of the Fish and Wildlife Service. "Look," he says, "we know what the stock loss was before we began poisoning. If we eliminate poisons like 1080, the loss would be more than 20 percent of the herd, maybe 35 or even 50 percent. Coyotes would run the country and put sheepmen out of business." In reply, Etter points out that coyotes did not "run the country" in all the centuries before the invention of cyanide guns and 1080.

A second, and perhaps most crucial, myth is that predator control actually controls predators. The poisoners say it does. Etter says that the poisoners keep themselves in business by aggravating the very problems they are hired to solve, that there would actually be far less destructive predation if nature were freer to operate within its own system of checks and balances. "Where we have starved the coyote," he says, "where we have poisoned indiscriminately, killing the coyote's food supply, there we have uniformly encountered increasing reports of predation."

The most perfunctory investigation of sheep-country losses seems to substantiate Etter's conclusion. Consider, for example, two northwestern Colorado counties, Rio Blanco and Moffet, where it is likely that more predators have been put to death than in any area of similar size in the world. What has been the result? A local sheepman named Hugh Seely speaks at a public meeting: "The thing that disturbs me about this control problem is that our losses the last few years have been greater than ever."

Etter explains: "The coyote is normally an animal with a highly developed territorial imperative. By keeping the coyote population harassed and in a constant state of flux, we disrupt his territorial habits and make him, in effect, into a different animal. This different animal—desperate, itinerant—may become a sheep killer. But if he had been left undisturbed, we would probably never have heard from him. The same thing applies to other predators."

FINAL DARKNESS

On the whole concerned Westerners are pessimistic about bringing scientific rhyme and reason into the predator-control programs. "We're in a stranglehold," says Paul Maxwell of the National Council of Public Land Users. "If we talk a legislator into speaking out, the stockmen's lobbies climb all over him in the next election and get him out of there. If we take a complaint to a governor or a commissioner of agriculture, we find him trembling in his socks about the sheepmen, and then he yesses us to death and does nothing."

If there is a logical point of attack, it would seem to be at the poisoning programs on government land. American land in the public domain is more than four times the size of the state of Texas, and every acre of it belongs as much to each citizen as it does to

the stockman who runs his thousands of close-cropping, plant-destroying sheep on them.

If these lands are not to be transformed into American Saharas, concerned citizens—especially Westerners—must begin to demand answers to certain basic questions: Is it in the national interest to bring whole species to the brink of extinction? Is the sheep industry as it is presently organized worth it? Or is there perhaps a way to retain both sheep and wildlife?

Unless there are massive changes, the day must come when the last sickened coyote will lift his voice to the skies, and there will be no answer. We animals of the earth are a single family, and the death of one only hurries the others toward the final patch of darkness.

JACKSONIANS RIDING WITH ALFRED WORDEN

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, once again all America as well as the rest of the world are gazing with wonder at our closest neighbor in space, knowing that within a few days three Americans will be probing its surface for its long-kept secrets. While this space spectacular is a source of pride to every American, to the people of Jackson, Mich., hometown of astronaut Alfred M. Worden, it is a landmark occasion—the American dream of hometown boy-makes-good come true.

I join in saluting these space pioneers and share the pride of the people of Jackson, whom I am privileged to represent in the Congress. I ask that the editorial appearing in the Sunday Citizen Patriot of Jackson, of July 25, 1971, be included in the RECORD.

The article follows:

JACKSONIANS RIDING WITH ALFRED WORDEN

The moon launch scheduled for Monday morning holds special significance for Jackson residents. One of our own will be up there.

Whether or not you agree that space exploration is a wise expenditure of tax dollars, you would have to agree that the planning, knowledge, courage and skill that have gone into America's space program have been a source of pride to all of us.

Many people right here in Jackson are personal acquaintances of Alfred M. Worden. They knew him as a boy and as a young man growing into adulthood. They loved his piano playing. They graduated with him in the 1950 class of Jackson High School.

Now he's due to circle the moon in a few days. He'll be only 69 miles above the planet while his fellow astronauts walk and drive on its surface. The thought is enough to excite even the most ho hum person.

Maj. Worden's journey with David R. Scott and James B. Irwin is made even more dramatic by an awareness that the last two major space explorations were marred by failures which ended the lives of three Russian cosmonauts and almost killed three Americans.

As routine as space flights have become, compared to the tension that accompanied each one during the 60s, the oxygen tank explosion on Apollo 13 and the apparent loss of pressure in the latest Russian flight showed again that all systems must work perfectly in space.

For 12 days, Scott, Worden and Irwin will be in space, continuing the investigations that began almost 15 years ago and intensified when President John F. Kennedy pledged America to an effort that would get an American on the moon in the decade of the 60s.

That goal was achieved. On July 20, 1969, astronaut Neil A. Armstrong placed his foot on the moon and called it a "giant step" for mankind. Now, a little more than two years later, Jackson's Alfred Worden will help Irwin and Scott become the seventh and eighth Americans to walk on the lunar surface.

We wish all three Godspeed, a good blastoff, a smooth journey, a successful landing, an exciting moonwalk and a delicious trip back home. For "Sonny" Worden, we have a special request: When you are circling the moon, look back at us on earth and blow a kiss toward Jackson.

PUBLIC WORKS CHIEFS PULL TOGETHER IN CONGRESS

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to incorporate in the RECORD an article in the July 22 issue of Engineering News-Record on the legislative role of the Committee on Public Works and its distinguished chairman, the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK.

It is of particular note, Mr. Speaker, that the author of this article, Mr. William Hickman, an experienced Washington reporter, emphasizes the high degree of cooperation this committee has established with its opposite number in the other body. This cooperative spirit will, I am certain, contribute importantly to the effectiveness of the Committee on Public Works in the broad legislative areas over which it has jurisdiction.

The article follows:

PUBLIC WORKS CHIEFS PULL TOGETHER IN CONGRESS

"Jennings and John make a damned effective team," says an admiring congressman of the Senate and House public works chairmen. Sen. Jennings Randolph (D-W. Va.) and Rep. John Blatnik (D-Minn.) head committees that have prime responsibility for authorizing billions of construction dollars annually (see below).

Blatnik moved into his post only in January and the committee staff remains almost unchanged. Also, the two refrain from discussing long-range objectives, preferring to discuss only legislation before them. The fruits of the new partnership are not yet obvious. But it's apparent that Randolph's approach is more compatible with the new House chairman than with his predecessor, former Rep. George Fallon (D-Md.). When the two really start to pull together it can have great impact.

Often major legislation languishes or appears in a watered down form because the two committees cannot agree on key provisions. Also, consideration of authorization bills often drags into the fiscal year so the effect of increased spending levels is dulled while programs operate at the previous year's level (ENR 7/15 p. 17). Last year, passage of the biennial highway act didn't come until almost Christmas while states waited to learn their authorizations for fiscal 1972, which began this month (ENR 12/24/70 p. 9).

NEW THRUST

Chairmen generally exercise almost authoritarian control over their committees and are largely responsible for disposition of measures. The fairly new Randolph-Blatnik team first showed its muscle this summer when the two men jammed through the \$2-billion accelerated public works bill by overwhelming margins, even though the Senate committee did not hold any hearings and House hearings were only perfunctory.

While President Nixon vetoed the program, and Congress upheld his action (see p. 9), the point was made: Congressional Democrats are willing to spend money to fight unemployment, though the Administration is not. And that is expected to become a major issue in next year's elections.

Randolph and Blatnik are both veterans of tough political battles with 51 years in Congress between them. Randolph has headed his powerful committee for six years, while Blatnik just succeeded to his post this year. He took over from Fallon, defeated last November in large measure because of the efforts of environmentalists and antihighway forces in the Baltimore area who considered him unresponsive.

That's a trap Blatnik's not likely to fall into, though he was recently accused of being soft on fighting disposal of iron ore tailings back home. He argues that he was one of the earliest proponents of pollution control legislation and is still a staunch supporter. Randolph, too, was an early leader in the pollution fight.

Now that nearly everyone on Capitol Hill is on that bandwagon, it's more significant to look at how the public works chairmen feel about a broader application of highway user revenues. Fallon was unyielding in his view that the Highway Trust Fund be used only for highway purposes.

Congressional courtesy, which continues even after a member leaves the Hill, prevents Randolph and Blatnik from criticizing Fallon. But it's obvious that they find more in common than either did with the former Representative. This can not only speed legislation, but make it more progressive.

"The trust fund is not sacrosanct," says Blatnik. "We're building an adequate system of Interstate highways. When that's finished I'd be open to a variety of revenue sharing proposals that would help build a balanced system—rapid rail service, bus-only lanes, secondary roads."

Randolph's thinking has been moving in the same direction. "You have to be ready for changing conditions," he says. "Society doesn't remain static. I'm as open to new ideas as I was in 1932."

Over the years Randolph has insisted that airports and mass transit should get substantial funding on their own, because projected highway spending cannot even meet needs in that program. However, his committee's draft of the 1970 highway act included trust fund financing of bus facilities plus any type of transit construction that would reduce the need for new roads in major urban areas. The latter feature died on the Senate floor.

While Blatnik is leaning toward unified funding of surface transportation Randolph's long interest in aviation inclines him toward a total transportation trust fund. There is room for compromise.

SOCIAL ORIENTATION

It's ironic that the chairmen get along so well. Randolph, 69, was elected to the House in 1932 as a red hot New Dealer, but has gradually, become more conservative. His staff members call him a centrist. Defeated after serving 14 years, he reappeared in the Senate in 1958.

Blatnik, 60, is a founder of the liberal Democratic Study Group on the Hill and is placed in the left wing among colleagues. His party affiliation is actually Democrat-Farm-Labor, the Minnesota coalition that

has produced such figures as Hubert Humphrey, Eugene McCarthy and former Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman.

Both chairmen are large, friendly men with quick smiles. Their politics might best be summed up as populism with the expected strong dose of agrarian influence. Heavy government spending for people-oriented programs bothers neither one. In fact, they may consider programs more in terms of creating jobs and supplying an economic transfusion than the products produced.

But Blatnik tends to view programs in more personal terms than Randolph, who is taken by nationwide public works efforts. Blatnik's interest in equal rights no doubt exceeds the senator's, for instance. And he's concerned with problems of broad social implication. Blatnik would like to see government foster new communities to cope with urban congestion. "It costs less to bring jobs to people than people to jobs," he observes. "If you give people economic opportunities, they will stay in sparsely settled regions."

Colleagues say Randolph's greatest strength is as a strategist and a solid member of the Senate's so called Inner Club, a handful of members whose influence far exceeds their number. Reportedly his clout is such that he recently called Robert Byrd, deputy Senate leader and a fellow West Virginia Democrat, and took him to task for slow legislative progress this year.

Blatnik is in a less solid position with the House majority leadership. He entered Congress in 1947 along with John F. Kennedy, Richard Nixon and Carl Albert (D-Okla.), now Speaker of the House, but his rigidly liberal views have tended to curb his influence. Though Blatnik says his basic philosophy hasn't changed, his power has grown to where it is probably equal to most other chairmen. And that should bring the new team through on major new public works legislation.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1971

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week, as we have for the past 12 years, we pause in our regular deliberations and lawmaking to remember the nations of the world which are referred to as the "Captive Nations," those who lack the rights of liberty, choice, and self-determination.

These nations are those held under the Communist yoke, whose people have neither the internal liberties which we take for granted in the free world, nor the right to emigrate.

Unfortunately, it is too easy to point to examples as there are so many. We need look only to the Baltic nations, Eastern Europe, and Asia.

The Soviets are all too ready to point to the charter of the United Nations to try to prove violations on the part of the free nations, but they refuse to recognize the mote in their own eye.

As far back as the 86th Congress, this body passed a resolution which called upon the conscience of the world to recognize these gross inequities that exist; to demand an end to hypocrisy; to insist

that all men—not just Americans—are endowed with certain inalienable rights.

It is time these rights were guaranteed to all people. May that day be soon.

PERIPHERAL CANAL PROPOSAL DAMAGING TO DELTA AND SAN FRANCISCO BAY

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the Catholic Voice recently printed an article by Walter Kelly concerning the possible effects of the Peripheral Canal on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and the densely populated Los Angeles area.

I strongly oppose the construction of the canal and my many reasons for so doing are described in the article.

The project's effect on the ecology of the area will be nothing less than disastrous. There has been ample testimony from experts supporting that conclusion.

In addition, the area for which this water is intended does not need the quantities proposed. What the Los Angeles area needs instead, as I have often stated, is more air. I do not see a constructive purpose, unless it is to enhance the wealth of developers, in making it possible to increase an already swollen, overburdened, cumbersome, and smog-filled area with more people. In this regard, I am in complete agreement with the statement at the end of Walter Kelly's article, the whole of which I wish included in the RECORD:

WILL PERIPHERAL CANAL RUIN DELTA?

(By Walter Kelly)

The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, one of California's most important marshland wildlife preserves and a center for fishing and agriculture, may be in for a lot of environmental damage if the State Department of Water resources goes ahead with plans to send massive amounts of water from that area downstate.

A maze of rivers, sloughs and marsh interspersed with fertile fields, the Delta, much of which is at or near sea level, stretches in an enormous "V" from the northern end of San Francisco Bay to Sacramento on the North and below Stockton to the South.

Fresh water from the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers is vital to both the agriculture of the area and the complex ecosystem which makes the Delta a home for migrating ducks, geese and game fish.

The river water serves as a barrier to the more salty waters of San Francisco Bay which, conservationists claim, would be inimicable to varieties of aquatic life.

Conservation groups, including the Sierra Club, have joined political representatives of Contra Costa County, U.S. Congressman Jerome Waldie and State Senator John Nejedly, to oppose Water Resources Department plans to build a 42-mile long viaduct called the Peripheral Canal, most of it through East Contra Costa County.

The Canal, one of the last links in the 600 mile State Water System, would have the capacity to transport 80 percent of the water in the Sacramento River around the western side of the Delta to pumping stations at Tracy, southwest of Stockton.

From Tracy the water would be sent down-

state to irrigate farmland in the San Joaquin Valley as well as serve the projected consumption needs of Southern California's growing population.

Construction of the Canal, costing \$250 million, is to be financed almost equally by the State and Federal governments.

In 1960, California voters authorized the sale of 1.75 million dollars in bonds to finance the California Water Plan, of which the Canal is part.

Federal contributions fall under the Bureau of Reclamation Central Valley Project (CVP) which was begun in the 1930s to provide irrigation water and flood control.

In this session of the Congress, Southern California Congressman Craig Hosmer (R-Long Beach) has introduced authorizing legislation for the project. Rarely will a "Congressman go 500 miles outside of his own district to support legislation for a project that has not direct bearing on his home district."

Opponents of the Canal either say the project would cause so much environmental damage that it should not be built at all or maintain that criteria for water quality in the Delta are vague and the Water Resources Department is not the proper agency to regulate water removal from the Sacramento.

Water Resources Department director William Gianelli argues that the Canal is the most environmentally sound means of completing the California Water Project.

In a letter to California Episcopal Bishop Kilmer Myers, an opponent of the project, Gianelli pointed out that since the Canal would contain outlet points from which water taken from the Sacramento could be fed back into the Delta, it was "the best of several alternatives to protect and enhance the ecological and environmental values of the Delta."

The Contra Costa Water Agency claims the Canal would have a detrimental effect upon aquatic life in the Delta under any conditions. Other opponents, including the Sierra Club and Bishop Myers, say the key issue is "who controls the spigot."

In a statement written for the Sierra Club, Edwin Royce, chairman of the Northern California Regional Conservation Committee and a University of California professor connected with the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore, estimated "a minimum of three to four times the net water outflow projected by the Department will be essential to maintain the Delta fishery as we know it."

The research firm of Metcalf and Eddy, hired by the Contra Costa Water Agency to study the effects of the Canal, agreed with Royce.

That firm estimated that Water Resources Department criteria, set in 1965, for Delta water needs would result in four million dollars worth of damage per year to the Delta fishing industry and agriculture.

The California Water Quality Control Board has held hearings over the past year on the subject of Delta water needs but no report has yet been issued by that board, whose members are appointed for four-year terms by the Governor.

Canal critics argue that, although by the DWR's own estimates sufficient water supplies already exist to meet the needs of Southern California for the next 20 years, water demands may rise sometime after the year 2000 to the point where the DWR will need all the water the Canal could remove from the Sacramento, 80 percent, to honor its water commitments to the Los Angeles Metropolitan Water District and other downstate contractors.

In such a situation, the critics contend, the DWR should not, particularly in time of drought, be in the position of having to

choose between environmental disaster to the Delta and paying off the 75-year bond issue which financed construction of the State Water Plan.

Contra Costa State Assemblyman James Dent recently said that Governor Ronald Reagan's veto last October of a dam at Round Swamp Valley on the Middle Fork of the Eel River complicates the situation even further.

One of the last links in the California water system, the Canal has also drawn criticism from those who argue that the entire project represents a misdirection of resources.

San Francisco dress manufacturer Alvin Duskin, author of the propositions to limit high-rise construction in San Francisco, published a full-page ad in the S.F. Chronicle last year in which he criticized the Water Project for permitting real estate developers to "make more Los Angeles."

Duskin argued that without more water from Northern California Los Angeles' growth would be curtailed.

"The California Water Plan," Duskin wrote, "will accelerate development at a time when we're choking from what we already have."

The California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, also opposes the project on the grounds that California does not need the increased agricultural production which would result from more irrigation of the San Joaquin Valley.

The Labor Federation claimed that California agriculture was already putting farmers in the South of the United States out of business.

Irrigation leaches minerals from the soil and deposits salts. Utilization of San Joaquin lands, the Federation argued, would constitute the wasting of a resource which might be more valuably used in the future than at present.

From this broad perspective the Contra Costa Water Agency ended its "Preliminary Report on the Peripheral Canal" (Feb. 1971) with the following quotation from Isaiah:

"The earth also is defiled under the inhabitants thereof because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinances, broken the everlasting covenant."

(The Biblical land of the Tigris-Euphrates, now a desert, was once a fertile plain. Its soil was exhausted by intensive, irrigated farming.)

In addition to environmental damage to the Delta, critics contend construction of the Peripheral Canal will in the long run have two additional adverse effects:

It will help cover more of Southern California's hills with smog and housing developments and hasten the return of the Central Valley to the desert it once was.

WHO SITTETH UPON THE EXECUTIVE ORDER CONCERNING OUR WILDERNESS AREAS?

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1971

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, those who keep track of the subterranean activities of the anticonservationists in the Federal establishment will recall the frantic battle which raged deep inside the administration during April of this year over release of the Executive order concerning wilderness areas. Unfortunately for the public, the timber-types who dominate policymaking in the U.S. Forest Service were able to block release of the order. That document is expected to preserve most of the potential wilderness areas in the Nation until a time

when the areas' suitability for inclusion in the national wilderness system can be properly evaluated as required by the 1964 public law.

In a recent editorial, the New York Times succinctly noted that the only way in which the Nation's wilderness areas can be preserved is for the Chief Executive to issue the long-awaited and long overdue Executive order. I quite agree with the Times' assessment that Presidential "eloquence" on the subject will not suffice in the battle to save the areas for this and future generations of Americans.

I tried to tell the White House of the consternation which would be forthcoming from the conservationists around the country if the message to Congress was not beefed up with the issuance of the order. I regret to report that my warnings went unheeded. As I predicted in April, the environmentalists now have one more reason to question the sincerity of the President's commitment to the preservation of the Nation's environment.

Nevertheless, if this administration is truly interested in wilderness preservation and is factually committed to the proposition, as stated by the President, that without wilderness, "we would all be poorer," then the solution is easily at hand.

That solution is to override the faceless and nameless sycophants who abound in the depths of the Forest Service and issue the Executive order which has hidden away for at least 4 months. Unless and until the order is issued, no one is going to believe that the President is master in the environmental house he has labored to build. Rather, conservationists and the public at large will have to believe that which is widely rumored—the timber lobbyists have control of the Nation's wilderness system.

Knowing the President's desire to chart new directions in domestic as well as foreign affairs, he could not do better than to chart a course for the enlargement and enhancement of the country's wilderness areas. The beginning step is release of the Executive order. As Secretary Morton has said in relation to administrative wilderness decisions:

We just have to bite the bullet.

The New York Times editorial on this subject follows:

[From the New York Times, July 18, 1971]

SHADOW OVER THE WILDERNESS

The Wilderness Act of 1964 gave permanent legal protection to nine million acres of wilderness land that had already been so designated by administrative order; it also provided for a review by Federal agencies of about 45 million additional acres in the wildlife refuges, national parks and national forests to determine whether these lands deserve the same protection.

Congress directed that this review take place over a 10-year period, but in these first seven years, the progress has been depressingly slow. Fewer than two million acres have been added to the National Wilderness Preservation System, most of them small and less important areas. There are roughly 140 parcels of land which would qualify under the law for possible inclusion in the system, some of them huge tracts of a half million acres or more. The agencies have concluded the necessary studies and hearings on barely a third of these tracts.

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, which is responsible for the wildlife refuges, has a generally good record in classifying its wilderness lands. The National Park Service, its companion agency in the Interior Department, is the chief offender. It has fallen so far behind schedule that it is virtually thumbing its nose at the intent of Congress.

The Park Service appears preoccupied with problems of intensive use to the detriment of wilderness values. The Park Service would like to see enclaves in Glacier National Park and in the North Cascades, for example, where overnight facilities would be available. But people seeking this kind of limited wilderness experience should be accommodated at the periphery of parks since enclaves in remote areas create serious problems of garbage and sewage disposal and endanger the fragile ecology of true wilderness.

The Forest Service in the Agriculture Department has kept to its schedule in reviewing the wilderness quality of designated "primitive areas" which were in existence prior to 1964. But it is dragging its feet with regard to approximately six million acres within the national forests which were not so designated but which citizen conservationists believe merit consideration. The Forest Service and the lumbering industry with which it is on terms of indecent intimacy would like to open up for logging these wild lands now so eminently suitable for wilderness preservation.

It has long been apparent that there is only one way to prevent the Park Service's empire-building proclivities and the Forest Service's passion for lumbering from subverting the wilderness quality of their lands before the review is finished. That way is for President Nixon to issue an Executive order directing the agencies to preserve these lands undisturbed until a decision has been reached about their status under the procedures set forth in the Wilderness Act.

It is an open secret that the draft of such an Executive order has been circulating in the upper reaches of the Administration for some months. But the Forest Service and its allies in the lumber industry have been able to block it. The political pressures which the lumber interests can bring to bear are admittedly formidable, but Mr. Nixon's decision on the issuance of this order is a critical test. His annual messages on wilderness have been eloquent, but only an Executive order can give them substance.

TAX DEDUCTION SPEEDUP TO AID LOW- AND MIDDLE-INCOME WAGE EARNERS

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1971

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to introduce on behalf of 54 colleagues a bill that would accelerate by 1 year tax reductions that are designed to aid the hard-pressed low and middle income taxpayers of our Nation. I originally introduced this measure to amend the Tax Reform Act of 1969 on June 30, 1971.

In addition to speeding up relief for those taxpayers who use the standard deduction, this bill would add some \$1.1 billion in purchasing power by making the money available in fiscal 1972 and 1973, and would further aid the economy by helping increase employment rolls. I believe this bill can accomplish this

without subjecting the economy to additional inflationary pressure.

This bill was introduced in the Senate on June 30, 1971, by the Honorable HUGH SCOTT, the distinguished Republican Senate leader and senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

I feel that the bipartisan support accorded this bill by my colleagues indicates their concern with affording a measure of tax justice to those who most deserve it while, at the same time, helping the economic growth of the country. Because the higher deductions already have been enacted into law, I think the acceleration by 1 year's time is warranted.

Through the years, various administrations have used the speedup technique in helping business and industry, and thus aiding the economy. We should be willing to do no less for the core of our Federal taxpaying citizens whose labors contribute so monumentally to filling the Treasury from which the Congress appropriates funds for hundreds of programs.

I do not think any reasonable person will quarrel with the proposition that a measure of tax justice in the form of some immediate relief is due the millions of low- and middle-income wage earners. I speak particularly of the family man of moderate means, of the single and self-supporting worker, and of senior citizens and others who must live on fixed incomes.

They deserve more relief and they deserve it now. I feel that this bill can give them some relief in a responsible and prudent manner.

My colleagues are all keenly aware of the sentiments expressed in letters and in person by their constituents. Taxes—constantly escalating taxes—constitute a major portion of citizen complaints. I know that much of their unhappiness concerns rising real estate taxes, local wage taxes, new or increased State income taxes, and burdensome sales taxes. As Federal legislators, we cannot completely divorce ourselves from the problems of State and local taxes since the Federal Government does take the lion's share of taxes. We must do what we can on the Federal level to ease the tax burden and try to make it fairer.

Tax justice is a crying need in this country. While this bill is only a step in speeding up a measure of relief for millions, I think it should be enacted into law. Let us not fool ourselves. The Tax Reform Act of 1969 was significant, but the people are not going to settle for anything less than a continuing overhaul and reform of our complicated and unfair tax picture. We can continue along this line in this session of the Congress by passage of this bill.

The additional purchasing power of \$1.1 billion entails freeing of some \$900 million in fiscal 1972. Another \$200 million would be made available in fiscal 1973.

This bill would accomplish this by advancing by 1 year the higher deductions originally scheduled to go into effect on January 1, 1972, and January 1, 1973. The minimum standard deduction of 13

percent of yearly adjusted gross income with a ceiling of \$1,500 would be increased to 14 percent and \$2,000, effective January 1, 1971. The 15-percent deduction with a \$2,000 ceiling would become effective January 1, 1972.

I feel there are two significant advantages to this bill:

First. Taxpayers who use standard deductions because they do not have enough expenses to itemize deductions would benefit directly from the year's speedup.

Second. The Secretary of the Treasury would be required to make prompt adjustments in Federal income tax withholding tables to reflect the higher deductions, thus making the money available to the taxpayers immediately.

I thank my colleagues for joining me in sponsoring this needed legislation and I insert their names in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

LIST OF COSPONSORS

James Abourezk, Democrat of South Dakota.
 Mario Biaggi, Democrat of New York.
 William S. Broomfield, Republican of Michigan.
 J. Herbert Burke, Republican of Florida.
 Shirley Chishom, Democrat of New York.
 Frank M. Clark, Democrat of Pennsylvania.
 W. C. (Dan) Daniel, Democrat of Virginia.
 Harold D. Donohue, Democrat of Massachusetts.
 Joshua Eilberg, Democrat of Pennsylvania.
 Marvin L. Esch, Republican of Michigan.
 Walter Flowers, Democrat of Alabama.
 Edwin B. Forsythe, Republican of New Jersey.
 Bill Frenzel, Republican of Minnesota.
 James G. Fulton, Republican of Pennsylvania.
 George A. Goodling, Republican of Pennsylvania.
 Ella T. Grasso, Democrat of Connecticut.
 Gilbert Gude, Republican of Maryland.
 Seymour Halpern, Republican of New York.
 Orval Hansen, Republican of Idaho.
 Michael Harrington, Democrat of Massachusetts.
 James F. Hastings, Republican of New York.
 Margaret M. Heckler, Republican of Massachusetts.
 Henry Helstoski, Democrat of New Jersey.
 Floyd V. Hicks, Democrat of Washington.
 Louise Day Hicks, Democrat of Massachusetts.
 Lawrence J. Hogan, Republican of Maryland.
 Frank Horton, Republican of New York.
 Jack F. Kemp, Republican of New York.
 Manuel Lujan, Jr., Republican of New Mexico.
 Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., Republican of California.
 Mike McCormack, Democrat of Washington.
 Joseph M. McDade, Republican of Pennsylvania.
 K. Gunn McKay, Democrat of Utah.
 Abner J. Mikva, Democrat of Illinois.
 Robert H. Mollohan, Democrat of West Virginia.
 Thomas E. Morgan, Democrat of Pennsylvania.
 F. Bradford Morse, Republican of Massachusetts.
 Tom Railsback, Republican of Illinois.
 Donald W. Riegle, Jr., Republican of Michigan.
 Howard W. Robison, Republican of New York.
 Robert A. Roe, Democrat of New Jersey.
 Fred B. Rooney, Democrat of Pennsylvania.
 Harold Runnels, Democrat of New Mexico.

Philip E. Ruppe, Republican of Michigan.
 John P. Saylor, Republican of Pennsylvania.

James H. Scheuer, Democrat of New York.
 Fred Schwengel, Republican of Iowa.
 Richard G. Shoup, Republican of Montana.
 Charles Thone, Republican of Nebraska.
 Victor V. Veysey, Republican of California.
 John Ware, Republican of Pennsylvania.
 Lawrence G. Williams, Republican of Pennsylvania.

Gus Yatron, Democrat of Pennsylvania.
 John M. Zwach, Republican of Minnesota.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE BILL

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to cosponsor the introduction of a resolution providing for home-rule government for the District of Columbia. This resolution, and the long hours of study behind it, are to the credit of the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY).

I find it ironic that the residents of the ninth largest city in the United States are all but deprived of the fundamental right of self-government assured to all Americans. Among the Nation's people, District citizens are the only ones who cannot elect the men and women who rule them.

We should be aware by now that government functions most fairly and efficiently on the local level. Citizens who have lived for a long time in a community and who are able to communicate with and move easily among its people, can better satisfy and better serve the community. With a government comprised of their peers, within reach, and devoted not only professionally but emotionally to the city, District residents will place greater trust and confidence in their municipal system. No doubt they will feel more at ease with their city's laws and will rest assured that their money is being spent in ways they see fit. They will regard the government more as an extension of their ideas and not so much as a detached and independent force. This feeling is the essence of the Constitution and the spirit of the American Nation.

There exists no doubt as to the feelings of District residents on this matter. They have the same views and expectations of their government as any other Americans. They desire a voice and a hand in the machinery which governs them. At issue is certainly not the extension of rights beyond the writ of the Constitution but an extension of rights only to be consistent with the Constitution. For this reason, I believe that the resolution providing for home rule is no extraordinary one. On the contrary, I would hope that no Member of Congress can deny this resolution once its merits are made known. I offer my continued support to Mr. FAUNTROY as he moves this bill forward.