

use of recycled paper in the printing of the Congressional Record; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 10295. A bill to establish a Commission on Security and Safety of Cargo; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. CELLER, Mr. BRASCO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. FODELL, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. KOCH, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. HALPERN, and Mr. BIAGGI):

H.R. 10296. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a special cost-of-living pay schedule containing increased pay rates for Federal employees in heavily populated cities and metropolitan areas to offset the increased cost of living, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (for himself, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 10297. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to provide for more effective control of aircraft noise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10298. A bill to create a National Agricultural Bargaining Board, to provide standards for the qualification of associations of producers, to define the mutual obligation of handlers and associations of producers to negotiate regarding agricultural products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 10299. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 10300. A bill to authorize an increase in funds for land acquisition at Colonial National Historical Park, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. NIX, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 10301. A bill to provide for a study and evaluation of the ethical, social, and

legal implications of advances in biomedical research and technology; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H.R. 10302. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to facilitate direct communication between officers and employees of the U.S. Postal Service and Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10303. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an itemized deduction for motor vehicle insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON (for himself, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FRASER, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 10304. A bill to provide for a procedure to investigate and render decisions and recommendations with respect to grievances and appeals of employees of the Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 10305. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Conservation Area of the California Desert and to provide for the immediate and future protection, development, and administration of such public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.R. 10306. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to facilitate direct communication between officers and employees of the U.S. Postal Service and Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 10307. A bill to suspend the obligation to repay national defense loans during periods of unemployment or underemployment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 829. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 830. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee on Classified Information; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 831. Joint resolution designating the square dance as the national folk dance of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 832. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period September 12 through September 18, 1971, as "National Square Dance Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H. Res. 575. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 576. Resolution to establish a select committee to be known as the Select Supreme Court Study Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

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

253. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to appropriations pursuant to the Guam Development Act of 1968; to the Committee on Appropriations.

254. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to firefighting; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

256. Also memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to national environmental protection programs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania introduced a bill (H.R. 10308) for the relief of Morris and Lenke Gelb, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

118. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Edward C. Rose, Chicago, Ill., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

119. Also, petition of the National Conference on Weights and Measures, Washington, D.C., relative to increasing the use of the metric system; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

120. Also, petition of the City Council, Parma, Ohio, relative to property tax reductions for persons receiving social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1971

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, so that Members may be aware of the action taken by Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on Judiciary today in ordering reported a bill to regulate congressional districting, I herewith place in the RECORD my press announcement pertaining thereto.

Text of press announcement follows:

CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

Representative Emanuel Celler (D-N.Y.), Chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary, today announced that a Judiciary Subcommittee, of which he is Chairman, had cleared legislation to regulate congressional districting (H.R. 8953, amended.)

The Subcommittee's action, Celler observed, was impelled by the prospect of imminent, complex and time-consuming redistricting litigation in both 1971 and 1972. He noted that although court rulings provide some guidelines, it is the nature of the subject that each redistricting plan must ultimately be judged on its own facts. Chairman Celler stressed that many State legislatures appear reluctant or unable to redistrict in sufficient time to assure the orderly operation of primary and general elections. To

date, only a handful of the States that must redistrict their congressional seats have done so. The Subcommittee concluded that the State legislatures, the courts, candidates for office, and above all the electorate, are entitled to a declaration of congressional policy on redistricting.

The bill, as amended by the Subcommittee, provides that:

1. If a State legislature has not redistricted its congressional seats by February 1 of the first congressional election year after the decennial apportionment (e.g., February 1, 1972), then a Federal court shall not defer issuing its own congressional districting plan "on the ground that additional time is required by the State legislature to establish such districts";

2. Congressional districts shall be com-

posed of contiguous territory in as reasonably a compact form as practicable, containing substantially equal numbers of persons;

3. Needed congressional redistricting shall occur after each decennial census, but States may redistrict more often if new census figures are available which are not more than two years old; and

4. Any qualified voter has standing to bring an action to enforce the congressional districting guidelines set forth in the statute. Exclusive jurisdiction over such lawsuits is conferred upon three-judge Federal district courts with provision for expediting direct appeal to the United States Supreme Court.

WELFARE REFORM

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 2, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Northern Virginia Daily of July 31, included an excellent editorial entitled "On Welfare Reform." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

The editor of the Northern Virginia Daily is James J. Crawford.

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

ON WELFARE REFORM

The Senate Finance Committee has just begun hearings on reform of the nation's welfare system. If the members of the Senate are as confused as most of us by this gargantuan relief system which is slowly devouring us, meaningful reform will not be easy.

One thing seems certain, however, the sensible place for the responsibility for administering relief is in the state capitals of the individual states, not the federal government. Washington has demonstrated over and over again its inability to control soaring welfare costs. The principal reason for this is a simple one. Under federal auspices welfare administration is subject to too much political influence, and it's seemingly impossible to divorce the two.

U.S. News and World Report tells us that "Latest relief figures are sending shock waves through Congress, where the welfare-reform bill passed by the House already faces hard going in the Senate." These figures show that relief costs are running at the rate of \$18 billion a year—up 30 percent over 1970.

Ten years ago there were a bit over 6 million people on welfare. Today there are 13.5 million and even on the basis of present laws this figure is expected to double in the next four years. As fast as the Vietnam war winds down, the cost of welfare goes up, leaving little for other domestic needs.

How can the costs increase so rapidly? Can poverty be increasing this fast? No, it's not an increase in poverty. Actually, the number of people living at the poverty level has decreased 50 percent in the past 12 years. There should be fewer people on welfare not more.

But, in our opinion, as long as the administration of welfare remains in the politics-oriented, paternalistic hands of federal bureaucracy we will whistle for any real reform.

The blame for increasing welfare costs lies principally with the federal government's Department of Health, Education and Welfare and with recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions. As long as HEW has the power to

blackmail the states to accept more costly welfare programs there can be little hope for improvement.

We are not suggesting that individual states do not need federal assistance in handling their welfare burden, but each state should have the power to determine how welfare money can best be spent in its own jurisdiction. In the words of Sen. Strom Thurmond:

"The dismal record of HEW in this field suggests that any state could devise a far more beneficial and creative system of welfare administration suitable to its own needs if given the power to do so freely."

If we can return the determination of welfare needs back to the local jurisdictions where local problems are understood, welfare costs will go down. If we don't do this, we may get some smattering of reform at the federal level but costs will go up, up and up.

RECENT RAIL STRIKE HIGHLIGHTS NEED FOR BASIC LAW CHANGE

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the announcement today that the current railroad strike has been settled was most welcome news, indeed. Now that this dispute is history, there will be the temptation to put it out of our minds, but this must not be done. If there is one thing that the railroad strike clearly demonstrated, it is the need for legislation which will provide the President with the necessary authority and flexibility to prevent future crippling strikes from occurring in our vital transportation industries.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the labor strike is well known—to provide workers with sufficient leverage to assure that management will bargain in good faith. If owners fail to treat their employees equitably, they are faced with the possibility of costly work stoppages. Unfortunately, strikes in the railroad industry affect many persons in addition to the railroad employees and management. As NBC Commentator Jack Perkins aptly pointed out this past weekend, those people most seriously affected by railroad strikes tend to be innocent third parties. To cite a few specific examples from the most recent rail strike:

California lettuce growers were forced to plow under their present crop because there was no way to get them to market.

More than 200 coal mines were forced to shut down.

The Ford Motor Co. announced that it would have to close assembly plants in St. Louis, Chicago, and Kansas City.

Thus, during this limited strike of relatively short duration, thousands of individuals suffered unemployment and other forms of substantial financial loss although they were not parties to the dispute. In the long run, of course, the general public will bear the brunt of the strike in higher prices and scarcer commodities, adding still another burden to the economy.

The time has come to enact legislation

which will prevent these disastrous strikes from getting underway. The creation of laws which will adequately protect the interests of labor, management, and the general public is certainly not a simple task, but it is a job which must be done. A good start has been made in this direction by my distinguished colleague from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY) who has introduced legislation, H.R. 9088, to amend the railway labor act regarding national emergency disputes. This bill, which I was delighted to cosponsor, provides equitable mechanisms for settling disputes in the railroad and airline transportation industries and ensures that ad hoc legislation regarding individual disputes will not be necessary.

H.R. 9088 gives the President sufficient flexibility to effectively deal with any situation with which he may conceivably be confronted. He may initiate an additional 30-day cooling-off period with mediated bargaining, permit selective strikes which are limited to 20 percent of revenue ton-miles in each region and assure maintenance of essential services, or invoke final offer selection in which labor and management submit sealed offers to an impartial panel that selects what it determines to be the fairest proposal. The President would be authorized to use his own discretion in employing any combination of the three aforementioned alternatives, depending upon the particular set of circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is currently holding hearings on emergency strike legislation. I am most hopeful that at their conclusion the subcommittee will report favorably on H.R. 9088 or similar legislation, and that it will receive speedy approval by the full committee and then by the House itself. We must act now to assure that our country is never again forced to endure crippling strikes in our vital transportation industries.

SPECIALTY STEEL INDUSTRY SUFFERING AS RESULT OF FOREIGN IMPORTS

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 2, 1971

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, a recent article in Business Week describes the serious situation currently facing the specialty steel industry in this country. The present economic slowdown, plus the tremendous inflow of foreign imports, has put this essential industry in a situation where it is literally fighting for its life.

As a Senator from a State where most of the specialty steel industry—and thousands of jobs for steelworkers—is located, I am very disturbed by the devastating effect which cheap foreign imports has had on our domestic steel industry. In the first half of 1971, foreign imports were up 66 percent over the comparable 6 months of 1970. If this

rate is maintained, total steel imports for 1971 would be far in excess of the 15.4-million-ton level set as the maximum for this year under the voluntary restraint program.

A major source of the problem is that the Japanese have shifted the type of their exports from basic steel to the higher priced specialty steel products.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of S. 2365, the Steel Trade Act of 1971. Voluntary restraints are certainly preferable to mandatory ones. Nevertheless, we cannot patiently await the accommodation of our economic competitors while our domestic industries—and the jobs which are dependent upon the success of those industries—are being destroyed by foreign imports. We must take action on this legislation at an early date in order to strengthen this vital industry, while still allowing foreign competitors to have a reasonable share in the growth of our domestic steel market.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing in the July 31, 1971, issue of Business Week be printed in the RECORD.

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

IMPORTS BITE INTO SPECIALTY STEEL

Allegheny Ludlum Industries, Inc., opened its \$20-million stainless steel bar mill at Dunkirk, N.Y., more than a year ago. But the new mill has never reached even half of its production capacity, and what it has produced is being sold at a loss.

This dismal situation is a sign of the deep troubles imports are causing for U.S. specialty steelmakers. To meet foreign competition, the producers are having to cut their prices as much as 15%. At the same time, raw material and labor costs are going up. For example, prices of nickel and chromium, the two major alloy ingredients in stainless and tool steels, are up sharply. Chromium has risen from \$32 a ton in 1967 to \$67 a ton today; nickel has gone from \$1,700 a ton to \$2,660 a ton in the same period.

Meanwhile, demand has weakened. Both importers and domestic producers of specialty steels are having to scramble harder for business in two of their major markets, aerospace and machine tools. Both of these industries are among the hardest hit in the current recession.

The entire steel industry, of course, has suffered setbacks from the economic slowdown and competition from foreign mills. But the specialty steelmakers, even more than the carbon steel producers, have watched in dismay as their customers switched to lower-priced foreign products. "The specialty steel business is the most insecure I have ever seen it," says Eugene A. March, vice-president of Colt Industries, Inc., and head of its Materials Group, formerly Crucible Steel Corp.

Some companies have passed the insecure stage. One of the least profitable producers, the Firth Sterling Steel subsidiary of Teledyne, Inc., closed up shop two years ago. Latrobe Steel Co. and the Advanced Materials Div. of Armco Steel Corp. are operating in the red. Carpenter Technology Corp., usually one of the industry's profit leaders, reported earnings of only \$2-million for the nine months ending last March, compared with \$8-million for the same period in its 1970 fiscal year.

LEAKING QUOTA

The specialty steelmakers blame part of their woe on a 1968 steel quota agreement

with Japan and the European Economic Community. The agreement put strict limits on the steel tonnage that could be shipped into the U.S., but it did not set a dollar limit on imports. Since the quota agreement was signed, foreign producers' share of the total U.S. stainless and tool steel market has climbed from 16.9% to 24.6% this year.

Foreign producers, especially those in Japan, have made up for lost tonnage by concentrating on higher-profit specialty products. At least one Japanese steel executive admits as much. "Is it not a common economic rule that if we have a ceiling on an ingot basis, we would want to sell higher value products?" asks Shigeo Nagano, chairman of Japan's Nippon Steel Corp. "If I tell you that I'll give you one of my suits, you would naturally choose the best one."

Since the agreement went into effect, foreign shipments of specialty products have zoomed. Imports of stainless drawn wire, for example, a product used in bicycle spokes and the like, rose from 31.9% of the U.S. market in 1968 to 53.8% in 1970. Imports of other volume specialty products such as stainless sheet, rod, and tool steels also have climbed steeply. "They are hitting us hard in all the bread-and-butter items," says Howard O. Beaver, president of Carpenter Technology.

SHARING BLAME

The mere threat of imports is enough to erode the prices of some specialty products, such as stainless steel plate, where foreign competition is still weak. "Imports are like a sword hanging over our heads," says Fred C. Langenberg, president of Athlone Industries' Jessop Steel Div. "Customers say they don't want to buy foreign steel, but they have to survive."

Some businessmen feel, however, that the specialty steel producers are at least partly to blame for their plight. All U.S. steel companies, including specialty producers, "have reacted very slowly to import price competition," maintains Daniel Y. Greiff, president of American Stainless Corp., a Boston importer. And Hendrik Houthakker, when he was a member of President Nixon's Council of Economic Advisers, scored the entire steel industry for its "friendly price competition."

Domestic specialty producers flatly deny such charges. They point out that unlike the prices of carbon steel, their prices have remained level for 10 years.

U.S. specialty steel producers claim, too, that whatever price cuts they make lead only to further price shaving by foreign producers. There is some evidence to support their argument. After long resistance, U.S. producers last spring began cutting stainless sheet prices to the level of Japanese import prices. Japanese mills retaliated with a cut that allowed them to maintain a 15% lower price in the U.S.

GAINING KNOW-HOW

Foreign producers are also catching up swiftly in quality and technical advances, areas in which the U.S. has long led the way. "In the last three years, most of the foreign specialty mills have come up to U.S. production speed," says Gopal K. Bhat, a senior fellow in metallurgy at Pittsburgh's Mellon Institute.

Overly optimistic planning—sparked by the heady prosperity of the 1960s—also has led to trouble. For example, Allegheny Ludlum, the leading specialty steelmaker, spent \$153-million on capital expansion from 1966 through 1970, compared with \$55-million in the previous five years.

The few specialty steelmakers that resisted the urge to expand can now crow about it. "Everybody talked about how you had to get ready for all the volume of the 1970s," says George P. Baumunk, president of Washington Steel Corp. Baumunk, however, kept a rein

on his company's expansion. And partly because it does not have a heavy load of debt in new mills, Washington Steel was one of the few specialty companies to show a solid earnings gain for 1970.

STAMP FOR SATCHMO

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I have written to the Postmaster General of the U.S. Postal Service suggesting a stamp be issued commemorating one of the few authentic American geniuses, Louis Daniel Armstrong.

"Satchmo," as he was known throughout the world, was a rare combination of talent and personal warmth and integrity that made him one of the most respected and beloved Americans in our lifetime. It was Armstrong who created modern jazz, the only art form America ever wholly produced, from the raw spontaneous folk music of the honky-tonks and street parades of his native New Orleans.

What made Armstrong an American classic outside jazz circles, however, was more than his musical genius. It was also his ability to mix serious and often soulful music with humor and down-home wisdom.

There was something about Louis Armstrong that drew American hearts toward him, something in his style that represented the situation of many black Americans in the first part of this century—a strong self-pride and love for the beauty in life, mixed with an inner tearing and struggle that make a man play the horn like Satchmo did.

It is testament to Armstrong that he remained the King of Jazz throughout his life, but to himself, he was "just plain old Satchmo."

He once said:

I respect me. That's all that's necessary.

I have suggested to Postmaster General Blount that a Louis Armstrong commemorative be an international air mail stamp, since he was one of America's foremost goodwill ambassadors. Through his horn he was able to communicate to people in all parts of the world the beauty he created out of the depths of the American experience.

I submit here the letter I wrote to Postmaster General Blount:

DEAR SIR: one of America's most beloved celebrities and the musician hailed as the single greatest influence on jazz, Louis Daniel Armstrong, died last month. It would be a fitting tribute to him and his work to issue a commemorative stamp in his honor.

Armstrong, as the King of Jazz, was perhaps the greatest authentically American musician, and I think it is most appropriate that he be commemorated philatelically along with the other great Americans who have made outstanding contributions to their professions, to their nation and to the world.

May I further suggest that the Armstrong stamp be an international air mail stamp, since he was one of America's foremost good-

will ambassadors and because he so ably communicated to people all over the world in the international language of his music.

I strongly urge the Citizen's Stamp Advisory Committee and you, Mr. Postmaster, to give this proposal prompt and favorable consideration. A very fitting time to issue the Louis Armstrong stamp would be July 4, 1972, which would have been his 72nd birthday.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

B.S.R.

CARLSON LISTS 12 OBJECTIVES FOR PROGRESS

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1971

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the other day I was visiting with W. P. Denman about our need in America to set strong objectives. Many times our best ideas are expressed in the church house.

The Berean Bible Class of the Park Cities Baptist Church in Dallas invited all adult classes to join them on July 4.

The speaker was Maurice Carlson who has had a distinguished career ranging from president of a leading insurance company to serving as a college professor.

Carlson made an excellent speech and concluded with 12 sound objectives for America. I know you will find the list stimulating and will agree that there is a strong relationship between God and country. Here are Carlson's comments:

12 OBJECTIVES FOR PROGRESS

(1) It is important that churches and universities receive widespread moral and financial support. The silent majority must open their mouths and their purses for the benefit of the souls and minds of men. Donors to universities can specify projects of which they approve as recipients of their contributions.

(2) It is important that emphasis be placed on the preservation of the home and family as vital forces in our society. Father, who abdicated as head of the house, must return to his responsibilities and curb permissiveness. Children must be taught that quality of life and soul is an ideal which overrides complete dedication to money and material wealth.

(3) It is important that freedom of speech and freedom of the press be scrupulously maintained, but it is also important that those who control the media realize that with freedom also goes responsibility.

(4) It is important that we reemphasize an appreciation of our rich heritage and a respect for the institutions and symbols of our nation. Be sure to fly your flag today. It is the symbol of our mighty, glorious U.S.A.!

(5) It is important that we respect the rights of the individual and that we resist the elimination of the individual, his name and his identity, in a technological society. I resent in this age of the computer being known increasingly as **XXXX** instead of Maurice I. Carlson.

(6) It is important that qualified voters go to the polls on election days. If there is an appreciation of and exercise of the franchise in our land by patriotic, enlightened people, then I am confident that outstanding public officials will continue to be elected to office.

(7) It is important that the growth of big Federal government be halted if we are to survive as a nation of free men.

(8) It is important that free men turn their backs on Federal hand-outs. Such

hand-outs are not only debasing; they have strings attached.

(9) It is important that government be returned from Washington to the States and the Counties and the Cities of the land.

(10) It is important that no man allow any government—local, state, or Federal—to do for him what he can do for himself.

(11) It is important that the Federal Government, in either of its three branches, be restrained from usurping powers not granted by the Constitution. We recall that Thomas Jefferson himself was alarmed in his own life time by the judiciary's usurping legislative power. This has a familiar, contemporary ring!

(12) It is important that we adopt an attitude that "We The People Must Build." We the people must build character and principle in the youth of the land; we the people must build a moral and spiritual code based on the old verities of the human heart: love, pity, compassion, honor, and integrity. We the people must build great cities like Dallas as monuments to the spirit, ingenuity and dignity of free individuals in a free and responsible society.

A contemporary of Thomas Jefferson wrote the following words which might well be heeded by today's silent and apathetic majority: "It is the common fate of the indolent to see their rights become a prey to the active. The condition upon which God has given liberty to man is eternal vigilance: which condition, if he break, servitude is at once the consequence of his crime and the punishment of his guilt."

THE RHODESIAN PUZZLE

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 2, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Tulsa, Okla., World of July 14 included an excellent editorial entitled "The Rhodesian Puzzle." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

The editor of the Tulsa, Okla., World editorial page is Walter Biscup.

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

THE RHODESIAN PUZZLE

With solid and practical justification, Sen. HARRY F. BYRD of Virginia has introduced legislation to permit the United States to resume the importation of chromium ore from Rhodesia.

Chrome buying has been stifled since 1968, when the U.S. followed Great Britain in a break with the all-white Government of Premier IAN SMITH.

The trouble is, stoppage of trade with Rhodesia has dangerously reduced our access to the needed ore. We have been forced since that time to buy our supplies from the Soviet Union at not only an inflated price but from a country that could cut us off at any time.

Idealistic as may have been the U.S. feeling in joining the embargo, we have foolishly placed ourselves in a position of dependence with respect to chrome supplies. We now must count upon Russian good will—and Russian good will is a commodity that is not dependable.

Great Britain's current effort to work out an amicable relationship with Rhodesia is not promising; our interests mitigate against a continuing embargo on Rhodesian trade.

Senator BYRD's bill is an out-and-out attempt to frustrate this policy. As former SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN ACHESON describes it, "THE STATE DEPARTMENT has succeeded in

putting the country's head into the bear's mouth." He favors the chrome import bill.

Actually, it is hard to imagine what could be the harm in resuming the buying of Rhodesian ore—much of it produced by American companies. Especially since we are in short supply.

In any event, the boycott of Rhodesia has failed. The African nation has prospered since its split with Britain. Its trade activity has picked up. By sticking with an embargo we had no part in ordering, we are hurting ourselves.

Senator BYRD's bill is intended to stop the charade. We are not playing a game. In the world of today, misdirected palship is dangerous. Our interests, not Britain's, are at stake. The BYRD bill is on the side of realism.

SPEECH TO ILLINOIS POLICE CHIEFS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, the Honorable HAROLD R. COLLIER, was the main speaker at the annual meeting of the Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police held at the Arlington Towers in Arlington Heights, Ill., on Sunday evening, July 25.

The dedicated police chiefs in attendance at this function heard Congressman COLLIER deliver an outstanding address. They certainly appreciated his sound philosophy and understanding of the need for a society based on law and order, and these points were effectively made in this address.

A number of my constituents were in attendance at this meeting and from them I have received extremely favorable reports of their reaction to the address by our distinguished colleague. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I insert this address in the RECORD at this point.

SPEECH BY HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER TO ILLINOIS POLICE CHIEFS

It was more than a decade ago that I last had the privilege of speaking before a law enforcement conference.

Reviewing the remarks I made at that time clearly spells out to the letter the chain of historical events which has so drastically changed public and governmental attitudes toward the whole business of law and the protection of society from the violator—the hardened criminal to the wanton violator of local, State, and Federal laws.

Looking back to the early days of my Congressional service in the mid- and late-1950's, I feel some nostalgia for those comparatively tranquil times.

During the past twelve years we have increased the per-capita spending for social and economic improvement by 300% across the country.

Yet, paradoxically, the attack upon what were held to be the prime causes of crime has been accompanied by a frightening increase in crime—particularly among younger people.

It becomes obvious, then, that we should re-evaluate the whole matter.

True, education and the socio-economic problems are still pertinent factors in our crime rate.

But they must be viewed in the light of other trends which contribute to the pressing conditions which brought us to our present situation.

The 1960's will go down in history for

many things—some progress and accomplishment, but increased violence and general disregard for law and order as well.

Whether we wish to admit it or not, the sad fact of the matter is that the authority and discipline of the home and school have given way to academic freedom.

In fact, the academic freedom became the hue and cry of the social sophisticates and their obsession with the cause has certainly boomeranged to the disadvantage of the obsessed.

To illustrate the reason for my concern, which I know is shared by every person in the audience tonight, let me review a statistic with which most of you are familiar. According to the recently completed decennial census, the population of this country has grown about 13% in the past ten years.

At the same time, the rate of crime per 100,000 persons has increased by a frightening 93%.

During the same period of time, recreational facilities and programs have been vastly expanded to keep youth of the country occupied in healthful activities.

The level of education has increased over the same 10 years, with more than a 275% increase in the expenditure of public funds for improved housing, training programs and rehabilitation.

While admittedly there is more to be done in many areas in these fields, it does not in any manner refute the obvious conclusion which must be drawn from these facts.

Still another comparison which has sad significance is the report on Violent Crime Rates in America with those in other modern, stable nations which show that our homicide rate alone is more than twice that of the second highest country, which happens to be Finland.

And our homicide rate runs four to twelve times higher than the rates in those of nearly a score of other countries, including England, Japan, Canada and Norway.

Similar patterns are found in the rates of other violent crimes.

For example, averages computed for a four-year period from 1963 until 1967 show the United States rate of rape cases to be twelve times that of England and Wales, and three times that of our neighboring nation of Canada.

Our robbery rate is nine times that of the Western Europe countries and 18 times that of Canada.

I could go on quoting statistics from the recent reports issued by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, but I believe the point has been sufficiently established.

Notwithstanding an admitted improvement in the caliber of law enforcement personnel throughout the country, crime continues to increase.

But there is one gratifying feature of the statistics; and that is that the rate of increase in crime up to the midway mark in this year, is not as rapid as it has been in any of the past five years.

If there is any consolation to be drawn out of reducing the increase rather than actually decreasing the rate, this becomes a redeeming factor of the new public awareness of the problem.

On the basis of what I have stated, it seems ominous that a basic question is posed not only to people in the field of law enforcement but certainly in the government sectors as well.

It is simply "where do we go from here?" and "how do we cope with the many problems that are somewhat unique to our social structure today?"

Obviously there are limitations to what law enforcement agencies can accomplish.

Frankly they have too long been taken for granted and even demeaned in many quarters.

We have repeatedly even witnessed cases of arrest where the law enforcement officer became suspect for the performance of his duty

with little regard for the action of the violator.

To suggest that the judicial system and even decisions of the Supreme Court over the past decade have not contributed to the problems of crime as it prevails in many large cities of the country is to ignore the reality of the situation.

In the face of this, and again on the brighter side, the public attitude has changed noticeably in the past two years, and it is not likely to be tolerant of criminal activities as it was during the first six or seven years of the 1960's.

Federal, State and local governments have taken a hard look at the consequence of permissiveness which has brought with it a frightening increase in the use of drugs and narcotics.

These have been the breeders of crime, particularly among a growing number of young people.

Alluding to my earlier statement regarding the limitation of the ability of law enforcement agencies to cope with all of these problems or finding a panacea in dealing with them, it is interesting to note that a reliable survey shows that 70 to 80 percent of police effort must be spent on such trivial matters as hushing blaring radios or other noise nuisances, rescuing domestic animals, administering first aid, and even the detailed reports necessary in the case of traffic accidents.

The same survey showed that of all reported major offenses, only 12 led to arrests, of which only 50 percent resulted in convictions and 1 percent in prison sentences.

Moreover, one-third of the inmates released from the Nation's penal institutions become repeat offenders in the commission of crime, often more serious than the original one for which the offender was originally sentenced.

We are now giving belated attention to the whole structural operations of our penal systems.

We all know what the problems have been in the past and the need for a re-evaluation of the system generally.

Hardened criminals are too frequently directly exposed to those who have been convicted of lesser offenses.

Yet even rehabilitation has failed time and again.

The challenges of law enforcement are many.

The problems have become broader in scope and the increase in the rate of crime has become one of our major domestic problems.

The federal government has belatedly recognized this fact and there is an awareness that maximum law enforcement demands the same attention in terms of public expenditures as other areas of our national life have received.

To this end it is encouraging to note that the present Administration is funneling a record \$268 million to local law agencies for various types of training and enforcement programs and that is four times the appropriation of last year, which was substantially above the previous fiscal year.

There have been other breakthroughs in the field of law and order in which President Nixon has taken real leadership.

He recommended and supported legislation, variously opposed by some as the seeds of official repression and a blueprint for a police state.

These include the highly controversial District of Columbia Crime Bill designed as a pattern for the nation, the Organized Crime Control Bill to move against crime syndicates and the Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1970 authorizing \$3.5 billion in appropriations for law enforcement assistance over a three-year period.

Beyond this legislation, the President has seized every opportunity to hold up the hand

of local police, fostered antipermissiveness in the Justice Department, cited the mass arrests in the May Day demonstrations in Washington as a national model, defended FBI Director Hoover and in general has taken a hard law and order stance.

It is hardly possible to speak of permissiveness without tying it into civil disobedience which has significantly contributed to the crime problem and consequently to that of law enforcement agencies.

Without providing any statistics, logic—confirmed by the long experience of law enforcement agencies—simply points out that any creed or action that promotes disrespect for the law and encourages disobedience to constituted authority produces lawbreakers.

These lawbreakers, in turn, infringe upon the rights of others in one way or another, and the particular cause which they espouse, regardless of its degree of merit, does not become a justification for disorder.

The fact of the matter is that a lawful society is the difference between a civilized and an uncivilized society.

Law enforcement acting alone cannot guarantee a lawful society at the local, state or federal level.

In fact, the city of New York has more policemen than the entire federal government has in law enforcement officers.

But it certainly establishes that lines of cooperation among agencies is more essential today than it has ever been in our history.

But without active support of the citizens and the communities, law enforcement's finest efforts will produce meager results.

Each generation has little choice regarding problems which reach a critical stage during their particular lifetime, but they do have a choice in the manner in which they face these problems.

And therein lies the crux of most of our problems today.

A retired career FBI official recently told a story which I think bears reiterating.

It dealt with a group of brave French villagers following World War II.

There was a quiet and peaceful village before the war which was built around a small square or plaza.

Other than a fountain which provided drinking and washing water, the only permanent structure in the plaza was a life-size statue of Christ standing with outstretched arms.

The destruction and horrors of war came to this small village and as the battles raged through it most of the buildings were razed by shelling and bombs, and the statue of Christ suffered an almost direct hit.

When the war had passed, the villagers immediately began putting their lives and property back in order.

Being people of deep faith, one of their first projects was reassembling the statue.

Searching through the rubble and debris they were able to find all the pieces of the figure except two.

The hands were missing and could not be found.

Nevertheless they put the available fragments back together.

Today that statue stands overlooking the plaza of that small French village, but the arms of Christ end at the wrist.

Now on the base of the statue is scrawled the simple message which reads: "I have no hands but yours."

In the final analysis, law observance, prosecution and enforcement policies, even the laws which provide the freedoms which all of us enjoy, rests with all of us, and particularly the millions of law-abiding citizens of this nation who respect the codes which provide for our mutual freedom and protection.

For, in conclusion, as is inscribed on the statue in the plaza of that small French village, freedom has no hands but ours.

FREE ADS FOR VIETNAM VETS

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1971

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, as I have observed on the floor of this House on repeated instances within the past several months, one of the highest legislative priorities of this, the 92d Congress, is to enact whatever legislation may be necessary to make adequate provision for the employment of our jobless Vietnam veterans.

It is true the administration has tried to focus attention on the fact that unemployment among our returning veterans is running between 10 and 11 percent as distinguished between the average rate of all unemployment running between 6 and 7 percent. Very recently, within the last 2 or 3 weeks, there was a glimmer of good news in that the percentage of returning unemployed veterans has declined by a fraction of 1 percent.

The ultimate answer may have to be a revival of the old 52-20 plan following World War II. With inflation running rampant as it is, a realistic proposal would be at least 52-75, meaning \$75 weekly benefits payable to Vietnam veterans until such time as they could secure employment, not to exceed 52 weeks. Of course, Congress should not wait any longer to liberalize training benefits for returning Vietnam veterans, but that is all the job of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to all my colleagues in the House to a most generous offer by the Kansas City Star, the largest newspaper in west central Missouri, an area which it is my honor to represent. Commencing way back on the Fourth of July, the Kansas City Star, in the morning edition, the Kansas City Times, has offered to run a situation wanted, 25-word want ad in both morning edition and evening edition for any 3 consecutive days. This offer is open to all men and women who have been members of military services during the Vietnam conflict. In other words, to guard against any imposters, all that is asked is

that each applicant for this free service provide his military service number and date and place of his official discharge from the service. He is free to write his own ad message up to 25 words and mail or bring it to the newspaper office for publication.

Our great western Missouri newspaper describes this in its own words as a "free shortcut to valuable employment contracts." Of course, it is that. But it is much more than that. It is a substantial contribution to those hapless Vietnam veterans who in these times of recession cannot find work. Remember these veterans do not come back to their homelands as those from other wars. They are not treated as heroes. There is no confetti. There are no brass bands. They are not welcomed home. They just come home. It is one thing to give lip service to the proposition that we must do something for our Vietnam veterans. It is quite another to actually make a real contribution to try to help these men and women secure employment.

The Kansas City Star may have written editorials urging the Congress to act to help these latest veterans as they return to civilian life. But that paper has also struck out on its own to do something constructive when it offers to any and all who have served in the Vietnam conflict to take advantage of a message published under "Situations Wanted" free of charge in a paper that has a circulation of over one-half million. All hats off to the Kansas City Star.

OUR POW'S IN VIETNAM

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1971

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, today, August 2, marks 7 years and 129 days since Capt. Floyd Thompson became the first prisoner taken by the enemy in Vietnam.

I wonder what thoughts must be going through the minds of these men as the days drag on. Have they lost faith?

Do they know that back home there are those in high office who dismiss their bravery as acts of aggression? I hope the answer in both cases is no.

I also hope that we have learned the lessons the Vietnam war has taught and that no American need ever again be detained in an Asian POW camp again.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 319

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following is the language of House Resolution 319, which I introduced on March 17, 1971. I was hoping it might catch the attention of the administration:

H. RES. 319

Whereas the President of the United States on March 4, 1971, stated that his policy is that: "as long as there are American POW's in North Vietnam we will have to maintain a residual force in South Vietnam. That is the least we can negotiate for."

Whereas Madam Nguyen Thi Binh, chief delegate of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam stated on September 17, 1970, that the policy of her government is "In case the United States Government declares it will withdraw from South Vietnam all its troops and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp, and the parties will engage at once in discussion on:

"—the question of ensuring safety for the total withdrawal from South Vietnam of United States troops and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp.
"—the question of releasing captured military men."

Resolved, That the United States shall forthwith propose at the Paris peace talks that in return for the return of all American prisoners held in Indochina, the United States shall withdraw all its Armed Forces from Vietnam within sixty days following the signing of the agreement: Provided, That the agreement shall contain guarantee by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of safe conduct out of Vietnam for all American prisoners and all American Armed Forces simultaneously.

SENATE—Tuesday, August 3, 1971

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

PRAYER

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

O God, whose mysterious presence fills the universe, may the power of prayer, like the force of gravity, draw us close to Thee and hold us on the course of life. May the movement of history be the movement of Thy spirit in and through us.

Grant that our actions may be governed by our love of Thee and our love of man. We pray, O Lord, that we may never regard people as problems but

only as persons, the highest beings in Thy creation and immortal souls for whom Thy Son died.

May we this day yield ourselves to Thee—body, mind, and spirit—and may we be kept by Thy grace.

"Be Thou our ruler, guardian, guide, and stay:
Thy word our law, Thy paths our chosen way."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 2, 1971, be dispensed with.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

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

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 331.