

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. GALFIANAKIS, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BURTON, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. GIAMO, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. SIKES, Mr. HAGAN, Mrs. MINK, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. SCHWENGL, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. KEMP):

H.R. 11380. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, to increase the Federal contribution to 90 percent of the cost of shore restoration and protection projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. KEITH, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DOWNING):

H.R. 11381. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, to increase the Federal contribution to 90 percent of the cost of shore restoration and protection projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 11382. A bill to permit the donation of surplus agricultural commodities to certain nonprofit organizations serving American servicemen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 11383. A bill to provide that the imposition of taxes the proceeds of which are appropriated to the highway trust fund shall be suspended during any period when amounts in the fund are impounded or otherwise withheld from expenditure; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 11384. A bill to extend the act of September 30, 1965, relating to high-speed ground transportation, by enlarging the authority of the Secretary to undertake research and development, removing the termination date thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 11385. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 11386. A bill to limit U.S. contributions to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 11387. A bill to promote economic stability in the construction industry; to provide legislative authorization for the Construction Industry Stabilization Committee

and its wage stabilization activities; and to mandate the Construction Industry Stabilization Committee to prepare a plan for construction industry bargaining reform within 12 months of the date of enactment of this act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 931. Joint resolution to provide for the acknowledgment of the generous gift of President George Washington; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.J. Res. 932. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning on the last Monday in October of each year as "National Magic Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.J. Res. 933. Joint resolution designation of first week in February of each year as "National Salesmen's Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIZELL:

H.J. Res. 934. Joint resolution designating the square dance as the national folk dance of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.J. Res. 935. Joint resolution: Frequency of White House Conference on Aging; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H. Con. Res. 432. Concurrent resolution to relieve the suppression of Soviet Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. ELBERG, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HORTON, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROY, Mr. SCHWENGL, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WAGGONNER, and Mr. YATRON):

H. Con. Res. 433. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that there should be a boycott in the United States of French-made products until the President determines France has taken successful steps to halt the processing of heroin and its exportation to the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. SEIBERLING):

H. Con. Res. 434. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that any individual whose earnings are substandard or who is amongst the working poor or near poor should be exempt from any wage freeze under the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended, and amendments thereto and regulations issued thereunder pursuant to Executive Order 11615; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CAREY of New York (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. DOW, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. WOLFF):

H. Res. 653. Resolution calling for peace in northern Ireland and establishment of a united Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAREY of New York (for himself, Mr. RODINO, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. PIKE, Mr. MINISH, Mr. COTTER, and Mr. YATRON):

H. Res. 654. Resolution calling for peace in northern Ireland and the establishment of a united Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H. Res. 655. Resolution to authorize a study of national fuels and energy policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. Res. 656. Resolution: Peace in Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

277. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to ocean vessels, which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 11388. A bill for the relief of George E. Chiplock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H. Res. 657. Resolution congratulating the members, coach, and managers of the Campbell Athletic Club baseball team on their winning the 1971 National Amateur Baseball Federation Junior Tournament; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

147. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Larry C. Hayes, Joliet, Ill., relative to brotherhood, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DISTRICT GOVERNMENT UTILIZES THE PARAPROFESSIONAL

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, America is in the midst of a health crisis, and one of the primary problems is the shortage of medical manpower. However, the picture need not be so dreary as there is an answer which might relieve the situ-

ation—we need to increase our use of paraprofessionals in the medical field.

I would like to bring to the attention of all my colleagues a letter which I have received from Mr. Comer S. Coppie, special assistant to the mayor, regarding this very matter. I might add that it is good to see the District government getting down to the nitty-gritty of using paraprofessionals in the important work of upgrading health care in the city. I hope that the other areas of the country will follow Washington's lead.

The letter follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, Washington, D.C., October 8, 1971.

HON. GILBERT GUDE, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GUDE: I am pleased to take this opportunity to inform you of the District of Columbia's effort to increase the utilization of health paraprofessionals in city programs funded by Federal grant monies allocated under the Emergency Employment Act of 1971. The District's allocation under Section 9(a)(1) of the Act totals \$2.68 million. Through this program, the Department of Human Resources is provided a fine oppor-

tunity to expand public health manpower and services with paraprofessional assistance. This effort complements and strengthens already on-going employment of health paraprofessionals with appropriated funds.

Included in our application for funding are 21 Nursing Assistant positions, 9 Health Aide positions and 7 Physical and Occupational Therapy Assistants. This amounts to 9% of the total number of grant funded positions in the District's plan. As an indication of the kinds of the services to be expanded with these positions, I would like to cite some examples, as follows. Four Nursing Assistants will be employed at Forest Haven Residential Center for the Mentally Retarded in an effort to improve the ratio of staff to retarded patients which, regrettably, is far below standards of the American Association of Mental Deficiency. Seven school health aides will provide sorely needed on-site health care in elementary and junior high schools. Two neighborhood health aides will provide outreach services for neighborhood clinics in the PIC and Adams Morgan areas. These aides conduct community meetings, follow-up patients with broken appointments, make home visits to reach all persons needing public health services, especially children and prenatal cases.

In addition to these already approved positions, we are currently involved in formulating a proposal for funding under Section 6 of the Emergency Employment Act. This section provides funds for particular geographic areas which suffer a very high unemployment rate and the District's allocation under this section is \$689,000. We expect to request funding for additional School Health Aides, Neighborhood Health Aides and Nursing Assistants. The Nursing Assistants would be utilized in support of a recently initiated Pediatric Practitioner Program whereby nurses are being trained to relieve the pediatrician by performing physical examinations and seeing pediatric patients for routine well child visits.

The purpose of the Emergency Employment Act is to create transitional jobs for unemployed and underemployed persons in areas of priority public service need. A special emphasis is placed upon the recruitment and hiring of veterans of the Vietnam era. Indeed, the regulations of the Department of Labor for the program have set the goal of one-third of the participants being Vietnam veterans. The District is therefore making a concerted effort to communicate with Veterans offices and organizations to ensure that veterans are made aware of and benefit from these opportunities.

Another important element of this program is that these jobs be transitional—that is, that they lead to full-time employment in positions not funded by the Emergency Employment Act. We expect to be able to absorb well over half the participants as vacancies occur in permanent positions of the District of Columbia government. The Department of Human Resources is planning an intensive training program for the paraprofessionals (as well as for other EEA participants) in order to promote their capacity to perform effectively on the job, advance their personal career development, and secure permanent employment. The training will include general training and orientation to the District government, Department of Human Resources, the world of work and in such areas as community resources, reporting skills, working with the deprived and the emotionally and physically handicapped. Additionally, the Nurses Aides will be provided an 80 hour course on basic skills concurrent with on the job performance, and the Health Aides will be given more intensive training in interviewing, problem solving, medical self help, and care of children.

If you should have any further questions regarding the District of Columbia program

in this area, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely yours,
COMER S. COPPIE,
Special Assistant to the Mayor-Commissioner.

IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENT TO
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION
ACT OF 1961

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend Public Law 87-128 to permit the Farmers Home Administration to make insured loans for emergency purposes. This bill will permit emergency loans to be made on the same basis as FHA farm operating and farm ownership loans are now made.

It is a companion bill to S. 2559 introduced in the Senate on September 22, 1971, by Senator EASTLAND, for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BELLMON, Mr. DOLE, Mr. LONG, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. TOWER.

The need for emergency loans is always uncertain and they are made from an emergency credit revolving fund established on October 15, 1961, by subtitle C of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961.

In recent years the number of emergency loans made each year has varied from 13,000 to 24,000 totaling \$90,000,000 to \$108,000,000.

Because of the extended drought in Texas and Oklahoma and the tornado in Mississippi in February of this year, the fund became exhausted. This situation was not anticipated when the 1972 budget was sent forward.

When the exhaustion of the fund was anticipated, the Secretary of Agriculture sent up a request for an additional \$65 million, which fortunately reached the Senate the day they were marking up the agricultural appropriation bill for 1972. The needed funds were authorized when the need became known. Had the request been received a few days later many farmers might have lost their homes as a result of the Farmers Home Administration's being without funds to respond to their emergency situations.

Mr. Speaker, these emergency loans have saved many farm families from financial disaster. They are administered by the Farmers Home Administration in the same careful manner as all other FHA loans are administered.

Under this amendment emergency loans will continue to be subject to the appropriation process as at present. Permitting them to be sold and insured, however, will relieve the pressure on the emergency credit fund. It will permit the Farmers Home Administration to respond to emergency situations without exhausting the fund as quickly as at present.

I hope that it will be possible to obtain favorable action on this bill in the present session of Congress.

THE PLIGHT OF SOVIET JEWRY

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the plight of Soviet Jewry grows more alarming day by day. The Soviet Government's bigotry, now all but institutionalized, strikes out at the Jew everywhere in Russian life—in jobs, in housing, in education, in travel, in cultural activities of every kind.

More than 2,300,000 Jews now live under the Kremlin's yoke. Yet no newspaper—indeed, virtually no publication whatever—is published in Yiddish. No school teaches in the Jews' tradition or tongue. No theater celebrates their cultural heritage. No central organization binds them together in common purpose. Even food, the Kosher dishes Jews have savored in a tradition still surviving after thousands of years, is denied them: few shops, if any, carry these foods or their principal ingredients.

Soviet Jews endure persecution almost reminiscent of the 18th century czarist pogroms that left hundreds of thousands hanged and pilloried throughout Russia.

It is hardly surprising, Mr. Speaker, that many Soviet Jews want to emigrate to Israel. But the Kremlin grants few exit visas—perhaps 10 percent of those sought, and even these slowly and grudgingly. Their cost is nothing short of extortionate; about \$1,000, a fabulous sum to any Russian citizen. After years of groping through the redtape strewn in their path by Soviet officialdom, Jews granted visas face still more vexing obstacles. Their departures are delayed—often for months, sometimes for years. And, since they must explicitly renounce Soviet citizenship to become eligible for visas in the first place, they are suspended in a kind of eerie political limbo—without jobs, without permanent living quarters, without official status of any kind. They become, as the newspapers whimsically say, "nonpersons."

I know my colleagues join me in urging the State Department to renew its efforts for Soviet Jews.

We in the Congress must continue to make their plight known to the world. We must continue to make speeches. We must continue to sponsor resolutions. We must continue to plead with worldwide organizations like the United Nations.

Even the Soviet Union, no matter how glacially aloof to the world community, cannot ignore public outrage.

A rally held Sunday night in my home city of Springfield, Mass., helped muster just that kind of aroused opinion.

With permission, Mr. Speaker, I put in the RECORD a Springfield Union article describing the rally.

The article follows:

SOVIET JEWS BREAKING THEIR SILENCE

Jews living in the Soviet Union are breaking their "silence" in response to government oppression of Jewish culture, a keynote speaker told 2000 persons at a rally Sunday in Springfield.

DIVERGENT VIEWS

The struggle between the Soviet government and Jews is seen by Jews as one for cultural freedom, but the government sees it as a political struggle threatening the state, Eugene Gold, district attorney of Kings County, (Brooklyn) N.Y., said at the Jewish Community Center, 1160 Dickinson St., yesterday.

"The Jews of the Soviet Union are no longer Jews of silence and many have gone to prison for their demonstrations against religious oppression," he said at the rally, sponsored by the Springfield Jewish Federation.

According to Elie Asher, federation assistant director, about 2000 persons marched from Beth El Temple, 979 Dickinson, at 10:30 a.m. to the parking lot of the center for the rally.

UNDER CANOPIES

He said 10 rabbis led the march, walking under five Chupoth, the canopy under which Jewish couples are married.

The rabbis marched with Torahs, since the rally in support of Soviet Jews coincided with the celebration Sinchat Torah, he said.

Sinchat Torah marks the conclusion of the yearly reading cycle of the first five books of the Bible and the beginning anew of the cycle, he said.

Persons in the procession carried signs reading, "I am my brother's keeper," "History shall not repeat," "Free our Soviet brothers," and "Jews of silence no more."

"There is no Soviet Jewish plan to change the government of the Soviet Union. The Jews living in Russia want the right to live and worship as Jews, or be given visas to go to Israel," Gold said.

According to Gold, who visited Kiev, Moscow, Riga, and Leningrad in the Soviet Union last April, a Jew who applies for a visa to Israel is subjected to harassment by the KGB, the Soviet secret police.

He said a person who has applied to go to Israel may lose his job, perhaps be arrested, or have his apartment taken away.

\$1000 PRICE

"The cost of a visa is about \$1,000 and you must renounce Soviet citizenship to get one. But even after a visa is granted a person may not be allowed to leave Russia. Instead, he may be held in limbo, as a non-person, unable to get work or find an apartment to live in as an object lesson to frighten others from applying for visas," he said.

While in the Soviet Union, he said, the Jews he talked to expressed fear of what might happen to them.

"Not all 3 million Jews wish to leave the Soviet Union, but most hope for a time when they can realize their Jewishness openly in the country," he said.

The rally was attended by representatives of 10 Western Massachusetts congregations, Asher said.

They were Beth El Temple, Kodimoh Synagogue, Sinai Temple and Temple B'nai Jacob, all in Springfield, Congregation Rodeph Shalom and Congregation Sons of Zion in Holyoke, Congregation B'nai Israel in Northampton and representatives from Pittsfield, Greenfield, and the University of Massachusetts, he said.

Speakers at the rally were Rabbi Stanley M. Davids of Sinai Temple, Elliot Allen, community relations chairman of the federation, Rabbi Marc E. Samuels of B'nai Jacob, Rabbi Jordan Ofsever of Beth El, Rabbi Daniel Jeyzer of Sons of Zion and Rabbi Arthur Langenauer of B'nai Israel, he said.

As the names of 40 Jewish prisoners in the Soviet Union were read, the Hakofah, or procession of Torahs symbolizing the different cities where Jews are oppressed, concluded the rally, he said.

BUSINESSMAN GETS FOOD STAMPS

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lee M. Koster, a highly respected businessman in my congressional district, recently took the time and trouble to provide a concrete example of how the food stamp program is abused. I urge each and every one of my colleagues to read the article entitled "He Tests System" by K. W. Lee which appeared in the Sacramento Union:

HE TESTS SYSTEM: BUSINESSMAN GETS FOOD STAMPS

(By K. W. Lee)

SAN JOSE.—Lee M. Koster, 35, is an up-and-coming capitalist.

He's worth a quarter million dollars in real estate and other holdings, he says.

He travels a lot and vacations in Bermuda and Mexico.

His four-member family lives in a two-story home valued at \$50,000. He has an office and a secretary. He estimates his annual income ranges from \$35,000 to \$50,000.

And the Kosters have been on food stamps since July 1.

It's all above board.

To his social worker and presumably the food stamp law, this entrepreneur is technically without income.

So, each month Koster pays \$2 and receives \$106 worth of food stamps.

But why would an affluent man like him want to be on a program intended for the needy?

"I wanted to test if the food stamp system is as loose as what people say it is," he said.

"I need the food stamps like a hole in the head. Sure anybody can use them but very few people are in dire need of them.

"The amazing thing is that just because you have no cash you are entitled to food stamps."

As Koster explained it, this is how his more-than-willing social worker has reduced his income to zero for food stamp purposes:

"About a month ago I went down to the food stamp center on Gish Road (San Jose) to apply for food stamps. This social worker seems like a nice guy. He's about 26 or 27 and wore long hair, a beard, and an earring in his left ear. He said he had a degree in music.

"I showed all my records, expenses and bills. He went over them. It took about 10 to 15 minutes. He didn't ask a lot of questions. If somebody wanted to cheat, he could walk right over him but that was not my intention.

"I showed him everything. My business expenses ran about \$2,000 a month. I told him my annual income. He said that doesn't matter. He said what counts was the income of the preceding month. I explained to him I was anticipating a big check and had got back from a vacation in Bermuda.

"He said, according to his calculation, I had technically no income. He said my income was offset by the cost of operating my business. So I had no income.

"I could hardly believe it. It was absolutely incredible. They mailed me \$106 worth of food stamps for \$2."

Koster, a former investigator with the district attorney's office and a Los Angeles County ex-sheriff's deputy, said he went into sales work seven years ago. "I deal with professional people and business men—I make money on sales of life insurance, health insurance, real estate, stocks and various annuities."

Koster said he regarded himself as "the last breed of entrepreneurs.

"In my business," he said, "you can start with almost nothing—no capital—but you can build your business and be successful."

Koster's "zero" income for food stamps purposes is an exaggerated but quite plausible example of loopholes in the food stamp law.

There have been numerous stories of food stamp abuses.

Perhaps the most flagrant abuse of all is the one which allows hippies and young people from ordinary families to get food stamps intended for the poor. The resentment has been especially keen among those who, like Koster, believes in working for a living.

"This is still a country where a person can start with nothing and if he worked hard and did the types of things that successful people require themselves to do, he could become a success," Koster said.

"It's very hard for some people to understand this. They seem to feel a person born in life has something coming to him. I don't think so. Life is like banking. You have to make some deposit before you can make any withdrawals.

"I get sick and tired of taking care of some people who don't like to work. I work hard. I am a responsible man. I take care of my family and me. I get tired of my taxes going up and up. Another \$50 increase this year is due to welfare alone.

"My attitude is this: If my elected representatives who are more concerned with re-election than representing the people who elected them keep passing the law and passing the money out, I am going to take advantage of the very system they created and spend the money to bring my tax right down to what it ought to be.

"If everybody would get on the bandwagon and take advantage of the system, then all these incompetent legislators—which most of them are—would be forced to re-evaluate the monster they have created."

Koster said he received the second monthly batch of \$106 food stamps Friday from his social worker.

Asked if he plans to apply for his stamps next month, he replied:

"I think I have established a pattern, and it is obvious to any prudent person who looks at the evidence that this isn't just a mistake by a social worker.

"It's a part of a parasitic system, and I think I have made my point."

THE POLLUTION PRAYER

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, as we approach consideration of a constitutional amendment and the issues it presents, one of my constituents has submitted a "non-denominational prayer" which may be relevant today, although it may not be acceptable:

The polluter is a shepherd I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in DDT pastures.

He leadeth me beside waters that smell like a still.

He restoreth my gall.

He leadeth me into the paths of gaseousness for his profit's sake. Yea, as I walk through the valley of the shadow of smog, I fear his evils for they art with me—his hot rod and graft discomfort me. He prepareth a table before me from which I dare not eat.

He anointeth my head with oil-spills; my sewers runneth over.

Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life—but only if I dwell in the house of Ralph Nader for ever.

GAINS SEEN IN WAR AGAINST
ABUSE OF AMPHETAMINES

HON. WILLIAM R. ROY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the October 4 issue of the American Medical News, entitled "Gains Seen in War Against Abuse of Amphetamines."

The article tells of some of the efforts of doctors and medical societies to reverse the rising tide of drug addiction in this country.

As a physician, I realize all too well the dimensions of the problem we have facing us. I am proud that members of my profession, who daily see the necessity of proper drug usage, are acting voluntarily to curb the use of amphetamines and other drugs subject to abuse. The article follows:

GAINS SEEN IN WAR AGAINST ABUSE OF
AMPHETAMINES

The medical profession's positive efforts to help stem the tide of the nation's drug abuse problem are gaining momentum.

More state medical societies are joining the growing movement to voluntarily curb the prescribing of amphetamines. They are getting dramatic results and have drawn praise from President Nixon for their efforts.

The President, in an address to the American Medical Association House of Delegates last June in Atlantic City, challenged the medical community to join in an all-out battle against the drug menace (*AMN*, June 28, 1971).

President Nixon's more recent comments were contained in a letter to Edward M. Harrell, MD, president of the Louisiana State Medical Society, who had urged presidents and secretaries of the state's parish medical societies to seek a total ban on the prescribing of amphetamines and methamphetamines with the exception of clearly recognized conditions, such as narcolepsy and selected cases of hyperactive and brain-damaged children.

Dr. Harrell also asked each member to look at his individual prescribing practices to insure that all prescriptions for drugs with abuse potential "are written with caution."

"As a profession, we have a clear-cut obligation to provide leadership in this mounting problem," Dr. Harrell wrote.

In a letter sent from the Western White House in San Clemente, President Nixon lauded the effort.

"You and your colleagues across the country are the indispensable front-line soldiers in this 'war' on illicit drugs," the President told the Louisiana Society president. "During earlier periods of great difficulty, our people have come together in a unified national effort and prevailed over adversity."

"I am confident that, by working together once again, we can meet the drug abuse crisis and eliminate this threat to the well-being of our society. The splendid contribution you are making toward this end represents an important beginning, and I want you to know how grateful I am to you and your fellow physicians."

In Oklahoma, where Oklahoma State Medical Assn. President Ed L. Calhoun, MD, called for voluntary restrictions on the writing of prescriptions and approving of refills for amphetamines, the number of prescriptions for the drugs being filled in the state

has taken what is described as a "remarkable" dip.

Pharmacists responding to a poll in Oklahoma City reported declines in amphetamine prescriptions of from 50-90%.

Response to a Vermont State Medical Society House of Delegates resolution urging restraint and careful selection in prescribing of all drugs subject to abuse—particularly amphetamines—drew these reactions from pharmacists in central Vermont:

One called the decline in prescriptions "dramatic"; another said the reduction was "at least 80%, probably higher"; another druggist reported only one amphetamine prescription in the three weeks following the ban.

Porter H. Dale, MD, VSMS president, said that in his opinion the legitimate use of amphetamines is "essentially controlled" in his state.

He noted in a recent newsletter, however, that the "real problem remains, as before: illicit drug traffic." Dr. Dale called for the "moral and financial support of those engaged in the enforcement of drug laws," and the identification and regulation of all supply channels.

Dr. Dale also said physicians can help curb the thefts of amphetamines from office and medical bags that have been occurring "with alarming frequency" in recent months by eliminating any inventory of the drugs.

The latest to seek curbs on drug prescribing is the Medical and Chirurgical Faculty of Maryland.

In a strongly worded resolution passed by its House of Delegates, the medical society requested physicians in the state to "cease use" of methadone except in carefully controlled addict-treatment programs, in cases of "urgent medical need" and when exceptions are granted by the state Secretary of Health and Mental Hygiene.

A companion resolution urged physicians to restrict prescriptions of amphetamines and methamphetamines to "truly recognized cases of medical need." The measure was modeled closely after a resolution approved last June by the AMA at its annual convention.

POW'S, NIXON, AND MEDDLERS

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD today an editorial from the October 1, 1971, issue of the Knoxville, Tenn., News-Sentinel. This touches on a subject that concerns all of us—POW's:

POW'S, NIXON, AND MEDDLERS

About the only thing heartening about being a prisoner of war is that it probably is better than being killed in action, or being shattered by a boobytrap.

But it is a heart-breaking, frustrating experience for relatives at home. They rightly are impatient to get their men back. The uncertainty as to when, if ever, this will happen makes for painful weeks, months and years.

This week a group of these relatives, meeting in Washington, were addressed by President Nixon.

Nixon said everything possible is being done to repatriate the prisoners. And he added a "personal commitment." He said he believes "we will eventually succeed in our goal."

The tragic problem with that "commitment" is that there will be no prisoner return until the North Vietnamese Communists, for one reason or another, decide to return them. So far, all overtures have met with outright rejection or doubletalk.

The prisoner relatives also heard from Sens. Edward M. Kennedy and George S. McGovern.

McGovern broadly implied that the Nixon Administration had not negotiated a release of the prisoners for political reasons. Kennedy struck an even lower blow. He tied in Nixon's projected visit to Red China and said:

"While he's over there in Peking, your husbands and sons are rotting."

The purpose of this intemperate type of insinuation, of course, is to belittle the President politically. That, in itself, would be of no great moment; Nixon is competent to defend himself.

It is of no great moment, either, that such utterances reflect the political and moral standards of the men who make them.

What is most deplorable is that while the target is a political adversary, the victims are the hearts and minds of the helpless families of prisoners of war. The word for such tactics is despicable.

WENDELL COLTIN CITED FOR HELP-
ING AGED, ILL

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to share with my colleagues the honor that was recently accorded Mr. Wendell Coltin of the Boston Herald Traveler who has received national recognition for his devoted efforts to ease the burden of loneliness and illness shared by so many senior citizens.

Through his energies, our elderly in Massachusetts have found a more productive life and have gained a better understanding of this rapidly changing and complex society.

I am pleased to bring to my colleagues' attention the following article from the Boston Herald Traveler noting Wendell Coltin's selection to receive the Better Life Award of the American Nursing Home Association.

The article follows:

WENDELL COLTIN CITED FOR HELPING AGED,
ILL

Wendell H. Coltin the Herald Traveler medicare columnist will receive the annual Better Life Award of the American Nursing Home Association in recognition of his outstanding service to the aged and the ill.

The award was announced yesterday by officials of the national association and Arthur B. Stein, president of the Massachusetts Federation of Nursing Homes.

Coltin will receive the citation at the annual convention of the ANHA next month in Anaheim, Calif.

The recipient of the Bay State Better Life Award in 1969, Coltin was then commended as one of the nation's top leaders in the communications media for "outstanding service and effective efforts that have resulted in lasting contributions to the improved institutional health care of the aged in the community and the nation."

The Massachusetts Federation represents a majority of the 690 nursing homes and ex-

tended care facilities in the Bay State, comprising more than 32,000 beds.

**THE RESEGREGATION CONTINUES—
WHITE STUDENTS FLEE NORFOLK
SCHOOLS**

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, just before the August recess I called attention of the House to the increasing phenomenon of white children leaving public schools in increasing numbers where massive busing has been ordered by the court. In my remarks I include the result of a survey conducted on my staff which showed an alarming degree of resegregation—schools going from white to all black—as a result of massive busing and I warned that unless courts take another look at this whole problem of busing, the Nation's public school system in many areas of the Nation will become an all black school system.

Mr. John Mathews of the Washington Star has performed a notable public service by calling attention to the problems unfolding in Norfolk, Va., as a result of massive busing.

I am placing Mr. Mathews' excellent article in the record as a followup to my own remarks last August. I hope it will help the Nation's courts sober up in this whole issue of massive busing. Mr. Mathews' article follows:

**"WHITE FLIGHT" IN NORFOLK: SOUTHERN
SCHOOLS ENTERING CRUCIAL INTEGRATION
PERIOD**

(By John Mathews)

NORFOLK—This vibrant port city, currently basking in the warm afterglow of summer, and other large cities throughout the south, are now entering "Phase Two" of the school desegregation process.

"Phase Two" is the crucial period of this school year when sweeping court-ordered desegregation plans are in effect and the future health of Southern school systems and the success or failure of racial integration hang in the balance.

During "Phase One" of the last several years, Southern school boards accepted a degree of integration, but argued in the courts against abandonment of neighborhood school and against large scale busing. That phase ended abruptly on April 20 when the U.S. Supreme Court handed down its historic Swann decision, requiring maximum possible desegregation and the use of busing where needed.

The new phase has a new vocabulary, which is no longer legalistic, but practical.

"WHITE FLIGHT" CITED

The talk is now of "white flight"—middle-class whites pulling their children out of public schools and placing them in private schools or fleeing to white suburbs; of "resegregation"—schools becoming blacker because there are not enough whites to go around; and of physical dangers on school buses, racial frictions and violence in the schools.

"Phase Two" strife surfaced here in Norfolk a week ago when the moderate school board chairman, Vincent J. Thomas, shocked and shook the city by declaring in a lengthy

statement that the court-imposed desegregation plan for these schools—in effect for three weeks—was not working.

In the last 15 months, Thomas said, some 7,000 white children have left the school system, removed by parents in anticipation of and in reaction to extensive desegregation. The "white flight" represents a 20 per cent drop in the total white population and has produced a city school system now at the "tipping," with 52 per cent white children and 48 per cent blacks.

D.C. GIVEN AS EXAMPLE

The steady abandonment by the white middleclass of city schools in Norfolk, and elsewhere in the South, Thomas asserted "can only lead to the graduate deterioration of our public educational system, as it has in communities like Washington, D.C."

The school board chairman made clear his game plan for "Phase Two." If a "workable" desegregation plan "acceptable to the great majority of our people" can be developed, then the courts, it is hoped, will yield in the face of the destructiveness caused by the plan they had imposed.

To Joseph A. Jordan Jr., the only black on the seven-member elected city council, that prospect spells disaster. "There's no in-between," he said in an interview last week. "If the courts stand firm, things can be resolved, but if they weaken, we're headed for another 20 years of confusion."

Jordan accused Thomas and other officials of undermining the desegregation plan. "If you work to degrade the system, you'll have all kinds of flight, from blacks too, who don't want a poor school system," he said.

The councilman maintained that "black flight" is already a reality. Nearly half of the city's younger middle income blacks, Jordan said, are fleeing to black enclaves in the suburbs of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake, or to Portsmouth, because they cannot find adequate housing or schools in Norfolk.

ALTERNATIVE OFFERED

While making his judgment that the court-ordered desegregation plan has failed, school board chairman Thomas offered his own alternative. He suggested busing of older children in 5th through 12th grades, but retention of neighborhood schools—with no busing—for the youngest children, from kindergarten through the 4th grade.

Thomas estimated that his plan would provide about three-quarters of the system's children with 13 years of integrated schooling and the remaining fourth with at least 8 years.

The Thomas plan is considerably less comprehensive than the plan required by the Fourth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals last July which now is being appealed by a white parent group, but not by the school board. The court plan suggested by an educational consultant of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, required that virtually all schools reflect the system-wide ratio at the time of 55 per cent white and 45 per cent black.

After children were counted at the end of September, school officials discovered an absolute loss of 5,600 white children in the last 15 months, taking into account the declining birthrate. The loss figure is substantial, but less than the 7,000 estimate used by Thomas.

With the overall white population down to 52 per cent compared to the 55 per cent estimate used by the courts, the individual school racial balances were seriously affected. Half the 56 elementary schools now have black majorities and the overall elementary school population is evenly divided between the races. Blacks also are in the majority in three of the 10 junior high schools and in one of the five high schools.

Despite the shift in expected enrollments,

the court plan went into effect when schools opened nearly four weeks ago. School officials say about half of the system's 50,000 students now attend school outside their neighborhoods, probably 8,000 more than last year when a more limited desegregation plan was implemented.

Much of the increase in busing is at the elementary school levels. Bus trips for 1st through 6th grade children average less than a half hour one-way, but can last close to an hour where some schools in the upper, largely white, Northern section of the city are paired with schools at the extreme Southern black section of the city.

Children are assigned to a school for grades 5 and 6, and neighborhood, for the first four grades, then to another school for grades 5 and 6, and of course to different junior and senior high schools. In many cases, parents this year did not know where their children would be assigned until two or three weeks before school opened.

COST ADDED IRRITANT

An added irritant in the situation here is that parents pay out of their pockets for the court-ordered busing: a quarter a day or about \$45 per child a year and possibly even more if the private bus company gets a post price freeze fare increase approved.

Like most Virginia cities, Norfolk schools have never had a bus fleet, although many children in junior and senior high schools have ridden regular public bus lines to school. School board chairman Thomas and others have suggested the schools establish their own "yellow bus" system, a capital expenditure of \$3.5 million and an annual operating cost of about \$750,000. The state would foot about half the annual operating cost, but none of the initial spending for buses, garages and other equipment and facilities.

City hall officials oppose such a plan, arguing that taking away school busing business from the Virginia Transit Co. would bankrupt the private company and force the city to take over the entire public bus system.

Officials also say there is no money in city or school budgets to pay the approximately \$1 million annually in bus fares now paid by parents. NAACP lawyers, charging the city with a deliberate attempt to sabotage the desegregation plan, are asking the appeals court to require the city to provide immediate free transportation for all school children.

The busing costs have caused many hardships, which have come to the attention of Jesse L. Allen, an assistant superintendent for pupil personnel services. He cited the case of a family on welfare with five children bused to schools—an annual cost of \$225. Following a headline school board policy against granting any exceptions to school assignments, Allen had to refuse any relief to the welfare family which presumably is readjusting its limited budget to get its children to school.

Allen's office also keeps figures on disciplinary problems in the schools. Last year, he said nearly 5,000 suspensions were issued in the school with probably a majority to black students. Just last week a police report said disciplinary incidents had increased this year, most of them occurring on buses.

Thomas, the school board chairman, acknowledges that disciplinary problems are prevalent, but he notes: "We used to have fights and now we have racial incidents if it happens to be between a black boy and a white boy."

The black councilman, Jordan, maintained that police reports invariably indicate more fights or other incidents involving blacks than whites. "The reason for this," he said, "is that if a black assaults a white as a matter of course, the white reports to police. But, blacks have no confidence in police and won't make reports, but will handle the matter themselves."

Jordan and other blacks in Norfolk continually become angered by what they view as a concentrated campaign on the part of whites to prove that desegregation is not working, like the Thomas statement and the police report, both issued after less than a month of the school year.

Mrs. Vivian T. Mason, the only black on the seven-member appointed school board which oversees a school system with a 48 per cent black population, points to what she sees as many successes in the last two years of large scale integration. Schools like Booker T. Washington, a formerly black high school, attracted only half the assigned whites in September, 1970, but after a positive, uneventful school year double the number showed this past September.

Like other blacks interviewed in Norfolk, Mrs. Mason insisted that the black community dislikes the inconvenience of busing, but fee. It insures equality of school resources. As a black teacher aide in a school put it, "With whites here, you can be sure we will never have part-time schools again."

DAY OF INFAMY

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is at times unbelievable to see to what depths some persons will sink. The following editorial from the Indianapolis, Ind., Star concerning plans of the new left for Veterans Day gives an excellent example:

DAY OF INFAMY

"New Leftist" Rennie Davis, friend of the Old Leftists who run North Vietnam, has announced plans to give a unique touch to Veterans Day, Oct. 25, at Washington, by having representatives of the Viet Cong address an antiwar assembly near the White House.

The Vietnamese Communists will not be there in person. They will be in Paris and will speak via a telephone circuit connected to a public address system.

This will happen on a day set aside to honor the veterans of this nation's wars.

Some 50,000 of these veterans were slain by the forces of the enemy who will be addressing the so-called antiwar assembly near the White House.

It is perhaps an indication of deep changes that have taken place in the nation to reflect what would have happened if Nazi-Japan Axis sympathizers had arranged for Hermann Goering, Heinrich Himmler, Hideki Tojo and Admiral Yamamoto to address an "antiwar" rally in the nation's capital during the closing months of World War II.

"New Leftist" Davis indignantly told an outdoor rally of some 500 students at the University of Vermont several days ago, "There is absolutely no evidence to support the view that the Vietnam war is winding down. This is the most incredible deception yet to come from the office of the presidency."

He did not say anything about the desirability of the Communists winding down their part of the war. This is perhaps unfortunate, for he seems to have more of an in with Hanoi and the Viet Cong than he does with the American government, and if he could persuade the Reds to wind down their war, the whole thing might stop.

But then, different people have different attitudes about different wars. Or as Mao Tse-tung, chairman of the Chinese Communist Party, once put it:

"We Communists oppose all unjust wars

that impede progress, but we do not oppose progressive, just wars. Not only do we Communists not oppose just wars, we actively participate in them."

It is apparent what kind of war Rennie Davis and his followers think the United States and the South Vietnamese are fighting.

What kind of war do they think the Viet Cong and the Hanoi Communist dictators are fighting?

THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT AND CAREER EDUCATION

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House is scheduled to begin consideration of the Higher Education Act of 1971. I would like to once again call my colleagues' attention to the fundamental improvement this bill offers to career education in America.

This bill offers an opportunity for occupational and career education to every American who desires it, and assures that this option is clearly spelled out at every level in the educational process. Our present emphasis on an academic degree as the only socially acceptable educational goal is costing us dearly.

Aimless college students waste 4 years of their lives, at great public expense, and graduate with little or no preparation for how they must make a living. Many of them awake rudely to the realization that a bachelor's degree counts for very little in a world filled with other degree holders. They tend to blame "the system" for their dilemma, and to some extent they may be justified.

Tomorrow the House can take a giant step toward correcting this imbalance by supporting the occupational education title of the higher education bill. I urge my colleagues to do so.

A recent article from the Wall Street Journal describes eloquently the problem this title aims to correct.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 18, 1971]

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—CAREER EDUCATION

One of the hopes of Sidney P. Marland Jr., U.S. Commissioner of Education, is to take some of the aimlessness out of secondary education in the United States.

There can be considerable doubt about how far the federal government should be permitted to go in pressing its curriculum ideas on the states as the quid pro quo for federal money grants. Educational administration should be left as decentralized as possible to meet the diverse needs of different communities.

However, Mr. Marland was himself a local school superintendent and his belief that schools need more purpose is well worth the attention of state and local superintendents. Some in fact already are proceeding along the lines Mr. Marland suggests.

What Mr. Marland is concerned about is the large number of high school students who have no plans either for college or for a specified type of work after they finish high school. Somewhere close to half the nation's high school students fall into this category and end up in what are known as "general education" courses, the commissioner observes. When they finish high school they

often are possessed of few of the skills the job market demands.

The true purpose of secondary education can, of course, always be debated. Some educators have long held that for those who are not college bound the main objective should be a general education that prepares them for citizenship in a democratic free society. Job training can come afterwards when they actually find a job, the argument goes.

There is some logic to this, but it is a logic more applicable to the past than the present. Certainly, it is difficult to gear public education to the changing needs of the job market. Students who are encouraged to pursue a specialty and then find it difficult to get a job to make use of their skills will almost certainly feel frustration.

All the same, public school vocational training does not have to be so narrow that it would lock a student into a specialty. It can be argued that in this era it is better to have some skill than none at all, even if that skill is not instantly marketable. And given what appears to be a dearth of proficient talent in all sorts of skilled and semi-skilled occupations the problems of finding a job would seem to be not so much greater than the problems some college graduates face.

There are, however, even stronger arguments than these. The drift away from career orientation in education—at the college level as well as the high school level—may well be partly responsible for some of the confusion and frustration that afflict many young people. To introduce stronger encouragement to think in career terms at a younger age may well help to restore a sense of purpose among your people who now lack such a sense.

But perhaps most important is the possibility that introduction of career orientation in secondary education will remove some of the damaging stigma that attaches to pursuit of careers that do not involve college training. There can be little doubt that this stigma has caused too many students to drift aimlessly into college when they could have been spending their time more usefully training for other pursuits.

This drift has several undesirable effects. It may discourage the individual from developing his or her best talents or skills. It denies needed talents and skills to the economy. The presence of aimless students on college campuses dilutes the efforts of the colleges to provide first-rate education to those students with a genuine academic bent.

In other words, the present system is highly inefficient if we are to assume that one role of education should be to prepare people for a useful role in the economy as well as a responsible role as citizens. To fill that role some educators will have to adopt some new attitudes toward their task. These also will be some considerable expense in developing the curricula, teachers and laboratories for this purpose.

Even so, if the fruits of such an effort will be to improve the skill level and productivity of the economy, to create greater job satisfactions for a wider number of people and to remove some of the class and status considerations that have attached themselves to work, the effort will have been well worth making.

WHEELCHAIR ATHLETE

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, in this era of automation and computerization, the marvels of modern technology make us

forgetful of the plain, old-fashioned satisfaction of doing things for ourselves—with our hands. Sometimes, we need to be reminded by the example set by the less fortunate who have had to overcome severe obstacles to do the ordinary things of life.

Such an exemplary person is Mr. Johnny O'Brien, of Louisville, Ky., who has refused to allow cerebral palsy to keep him from the pleasure and satisfaction of doing things for himself. He is a courageous, admirable young man whose life is a reproach to those of us who let minor aches and pains get the upper hand.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the endeavors of Mr. O'Brien by inserting in the RECORD an article from the Louisville Courier-Journal by John Filiatreau. It is entitled "Athlete."

The article follows:

ATHLETE

(By John Filiatreau)

Ours is a nation of armchair athletes. We sit in our living rooms, beer in hand, and soak in the vicarious thrills.

We share in the excitement of a football game contested a thousand miles away, and second-guess the quarterback when a pass is intercepted. We delight in the grace of a professional iceskater, the precision of a golfer, the daring of an automobile racer.

We look for perfection. We admire athletes whose nerves are icy-cold and always in control. And—because we are a body-conscious nation—we demand physical beauty of our heroes.

So it is seldom that we watch an athlete like Johnny O'Brien, who recently bowled a 51 at Parkmoor Lanes, 2545 S. Third.

O'Brien is hardly graceful. Watching him bowl is not a poetic experience. His scores are seldom even average. But his courage is richly instructive to those of us who take our bodies for granted.

O'Brien, 31, is physically handicapped. Cerebral palsy has robbed him of most of his motor control since an injury he suffered at birth. Much of his energy is sapped by involuntary, random motions of his arms and body.

He is a wheelchair athlete.

Mrs. Toni Wheatley, cashier at Parkmoor, says O'Brien's handicap hasn't kept him from improving his game. She said he plays two or three times a week, and has been coming to Parkmoor for about four years.

"At first he could hardly get any of them down there at all," she said. "Now, I think he plays a pretty good game . . . He gets a big kick out of it."

Most of us have seen wheelchair-bowlers before. Some are good at the game. Some can compete with able-bodied athletes. But O'Brien's disability is severe. He bowls with extreme difficulty, and intense concentration is required.

On a recent afternoon, when Parkmoor was nearly deserted, O'Brien interrupted a conversation to ask one of the men relaxing at a table to help him down to the lanes. "No, you go on," groused the first man he asked for help. A second man rose to assist O'Brien, and the first yelled, "Just roll him all the way down!" O'Brien smiled.

As the men resumed their conversation, he got ready to bowl. It took several minutes to locate the holes in his bowling ball. After putting the ball into a special holder attached to his wheelchair, he wheeled himself, backwards, to the line, spun the chair around, put on the brakes to keep it from moving, and with a pendulum motion released the ball.

The ball rolled extremely slowly. It seemed

balanced on the edge of the gutter all the way. But it stayed up and knocked three pins down.

O'Brien released the brakes, backed up to the ball-return area, and carefully marked the score.

He repeated this routine for nearly an hour in scoring his 51. He later said, with justified pride, that his highest score ever was 104.

Several balls ended up in the gutter. When this happened, O'Brien made an elaborate gesture of disgust.

After he had released the ball, he often seemed to try to communicate with it, to correct its errant course with an awkward "body English." Then the automatic pinsetter would effortlessly and precisely sweep away the pins he had left.

"Johnny plays every chance he gets," his mother said. "His brother-in-law usually takes him over to the bowling alley, and a friend of his brings him home."

Mrs. O'Brien said her son has made several friends while at Parkmoor. "One of his friends took him up to Cincinnati for a baseball game one day last week. Everybody likes Johnny. Of course, he's got a good personality."

Mrs. O'Brien says that next to bowling, her son's greatest interest is baseball. "Oh, he'll tell you anything you want to know about baseball. He reads an awful lot about it. He's a St. Louis Cardinals fan."

By the time O'Brien had finished all 10 frames of his recent bowling effort, a small crowd had gathered to watch him. He smiled openly at the group and prepared to bowl a second game.

"Isn't he something?" one bystander asked of no one in particular.

"Sure is," replied another spectator. "I had a sister who once bowled a 31—and she's as sound as you and me."

JAMES LEE CARTER NAMED OUTSTANDING DOORMAN OF THE HOUSE GALLERY

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the New York delegation is proud to claim James Lee Carter as one of its own.

Mr. Carter, who was named "Outstanding Doorman of the House Gallery," U.S. House of Representatives, by the Doormen's Society, is well known on Capitol Hill. James Carter is always courteous, efficient in his tasks and helpful to the Members and guests.

Jimmy, as he is known by all Hill people, has been employed at the Capitol for approximately 25 years and has worked on both the House and Senate side.

In his first job, Jimmy worked in the Senate restaurant and recalls with pleasure his association with some of the outstanding members of the U.S. Senate, such as President Truman, Vice President Barkley, Senator Robert Taft, Senator Robert Wagner and many more.

Jimmy transferred from the Senate restaurant to the Sergeant at Arms and after spending 11 years on the Senate side, transferred to the House.

His family, his church and his work are high on Jimmy's list of priorities. I hope for James Lee Carter many more years of happy association with this House.

While I am not totally familiar with the background of Jack Russ, who was selected as "Outstanding Doorman of the Year for the House Floor," or of Sgt. Earl Gassett, winner of the "Outstanding Police Officer of the Year" award, I wish to extend to these two gentlemen my congratulations and best wishes.

Our work here in this Chamber is made a little bit easier and smoother because of the dedication of people like Jimmy Carter, Jack Russ and Sergeant Gassett.

IS CANCER A PROPRIETARY DISEASE?

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of October 14 took editorial note of the advertising campaign mounted against the effort of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) "to win congressional approval for a sensible approach toward cancer research."

Comparing the Senate's cancer bill and the national cancer attack amendments introduced by Mr. ROGERS, the editorial concluded:

The Rogers bill is far superior to the one the Senate passed, and the American Cancer Society does the cause of combating cancer no favor by its campaign against the useful Rogers initiative.

Today the Washington Post editorially applauds Mr. ROGERS' subcommittee for voting down the proposed independent cancer agency and adds its hope that—

The House subcommittee will be sustained in its judgment on this emotion-laden subject when the matter reaches the floor and that the Senate can be persuaded to follow the recommendations of those who oppose stripping cancer studies out of the existing framework of biomedical research.

Mr. Speaker, today's Post also carries a letter from Dr. John A. D. Cooper, president of the Association of American Medical Colleges, in reply to one of October 6 from Dr. H. Marvin Pollard, president of the American Cancer Society. I think Dr. Cooper's letter is commendable in its detail and its restraint.

The two editorials and the letter show how a voluntary health organization can tend to regard a disease as proprietary, and can seem to imply that non-proprietary do not care or that nothing is being done. In the case of cancer, both implications could not be more wrong.

I include the three items at this point: [From the New York Times, Oct. 14, 1971]

CANCER POLITICS

The effort of Representative Paul G. Rogers to win Congressional approval for a sensible approach toward cancer research has apparently produced panic among the proponents of a rival measure that the Senate passed last summer. Such panic is the only explanation for the high-powered advertising campaign launched by the American Cancer Society in support of the Senate measure.

The Senate last summer was persuaded to establish an essentially separate cancer research agency whose head would report only

to the President. The most likely result if the Senate bill became law would be the beginning of the destruction of the National Institutes of Health—probably the world's greatest biomedical research institution. The negative reaction among scientists was summarized in these words by the magazine "Science" recently: "Few issues have so united the biomedical community as the proposal to remove the National Cancer Institute from N.I.H. . . . No major scientific body, apart from the American Cancer Society, supports the proposal, and numerous organizations from the National Academy of Sciences downward have spoken out against it."

With expert help from the biomedical community, Representative Rogers has fashioned a substitute bill that would safeguard the vast research program of the N.I.H., while permitting greater flexibility for the Institute's efforts against cancer and other diseases. The Rogers bill is far superior to the one the Senate passed, and the American Cancer Society does the cause of combating cancer no favor by its campaign against the useful Rogers initiative.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 19 1971]

THE CONQUEST OF CANCER

The fight over the proposal to establish a new Conquest of Cancer Institute is building toward a climatic finish. A House subcommittee last Friday voted down the proposal backed by the White House for creating such an independent agency, substituting in its place a bill strengthening the position of the existing cancer institute inside the structure of the National Institutes of Health. Since the Senate had previously passed the White House plan by an overwhelming majority and since the White House shows no signs of backing down, the way seems clear for a fight on the House floor or in a conference committee or both.

There have been few other legislative proposals in recent years that have divided the nation's medical community so sharply. In our letters column today, the President of the Association of Medical Colleges challenges some of the points raised earlier this month by a letter from the President of the American Cancer Society. We might let the exchange go at that except for the full page advertisement in this newspaper last week in which it was asserted that objections to the bill come mainly from those "who do not have expert cancer knowledge" and "do not fully understand the situation." The implication of the ad, like the implication of similar ads that have appeared elsewhere, is that the only way to conquer cancer is to establish a new institute with that as its goal and that only those who want the new institute are ready to support an all-out attack on cancer.

If the situation were really as simple as the authors of this advertisement make it seem, there would be no dispute over the White House proposal. There is no opposition that we know of to increased federal funding for cancer research nor to a federal commitment aimed at providing whatever funds are necessary to find a cure for cancer. But it does not follow that the creation of a new free-wheeling agency which reports only to the President is either the only or the best way to channel those funds. And that is what the fight is all about.

It is true that many of those researchers who focus solely on cancer favor the establishment of a new agency. That is hardly surprising. Any group of researchers on any subject would love to have an agency devoted exclusively to their field. If there is to be a special institute for cancer, why not one for heart diseases? They kill twice as many people. Or for arthritis, from which far more people suffer.

Part of the need for a new agency, if we are to believe the advertisement, is that it would be "an advance in the mechanics of administration" which would free cancer researchers from the "red tape which now slows the cancer fight." That statement, plus the assertion that it "would be futile just to pour more money into the existing system," is a charge of gross mismanagement against the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It is a charge that we think has not been and cannot be proved. Indeed, if the situation is that bad, it seems strange that the panel of experts which first recommended the new agency never saw fit to discuss the problems of research management with any of the top officials of either HEW or NIH.

Inherent in the drive for a new cancer agency is the promise that a cure can be found if only enough money is devoted to the search and administered in a particular way. This is a promise which the supporters of the new agency are careful to hedge, knowing as they do that the cure or cures may still be years or decades away. Yet it is that appeal which has given the drive for a new agency its popularity, a popularity underlined by the heavy mail to members of Congress which resulted when columnist Ann Landers took up the cudgels for the agency some months ago. Nevertheless, President Nixon was right when he said last winter that "scientific breakthroughs are still required and they often cannot be forced—no matter how much money and energy is expended." It is worth noting in passing that many of the basic discoveries which have helped doctors to understand cancer better did not originate in the context of cancer research.

We hope that as the House subcommittee will be sustained in its judgment on this emotion-laden subject when the matter reaches the floor and that the Senate can be persuaded to follow the recommendations of those who oppose stripping cancer studies out of the existing framework of biomedical research.

HEAD OF MEDICAL COLLEGES ASSOCIATION ON THE CANCER AGENCY PROPOSAL (By John A. D. Cooper, M.D.)

In The Washington Post of October 6, there appeared a letter from H. Marvin Pollard, president of the American Cancer Society, Inc., entitled "A New Opportunity to Fight Cancer." Dr. Pollard states that the recent House hearings in Washington on legislation aimed at expanding the national attack on cancer makes it pertinent for the public to have a clear understanding of the both the facts and the issues surrounding the proposal contained in the bill S. 1828 to establish an independent Conquest of Cancer Agency within the National Institutes of Health, which has been passed by the Senate but now rejected by Congressman Paul Rogers and his Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment.

Unfortunately, Dr. Pollard's letter will add only to public confusion and misunderstanding concerning the legislation now being considered by the Congress and the most effective way to confront this dread disease.

Dr. Pollard states that S. 1828 is supported by the majority of doctors who are cancer specialists and opposition comes only from scientists who are not experts in cancer and thus do not fully understand the situation.

Many distinguished investigators in the field of cancer, most of whom are also concerned with the care of patients, have appeared before the House committee in opposition to this bill. Among them are Dr. Howard H. Hiatt, Head of the Cancer Division, Department of Medicine, Beth Israel Hospital, Boston; Dr. Robert Handschumacher, American Cancer Society Professor of Pharmacology, Yale University; Dr. George Nichols, Jr., Director, Cancer Research Insti-

tute, New England Deaconess Hospital, Boston; and Dr. Henry Kaplan, Chairman of the Department of Radiology, Stanford University, and a member of the Panel of Consultants. The major advances in cancer have come from scientific fields which have not been the center of the applied cancer research effort. The views of "scientists" can carry at least as much weight in this matter as those of "doctors."

It is stated that S. 1828 is based upon exhaustive study by a panel of experts who would have liked to support the "status quo" but reluctantly came to the conclusion that an independent cancer authority is necessary because the facts so dictate.

In the report of the Scientific Committee of the panel referred to by Dr. Pollard (a report that comprises 140 pages of the 149 page report of the overall panel), which exhaustively examines and assesses the problems, obstacles, and opportunities relating to further progress in cancer research, there is no mention of the need for an independent cancer authority or of any organizational problems. It is quite clear from the assessment of this scientific group that the major barriers to progress in cancer are scientific and not organizational. The report of the panel provides no evidence or findings to support the sweeping organizational changes recommended.

Dr. Pollard states that "... all that S. 1828 boils down to is an advance in mechanics of administration. The essential intellectual and scientific relationships would remain the same..."

S. 1828 would give to the Director of the Conquest of Cancer Agency extraordinary power and authorities which would be unavailable to the Director of the NIH for all other disease and biomedical research programs in the NIH. Thus, the cancer effort would be separated out of the other research activities in the NIH and the contributions they can make to advancing our knowledge about neoplasia.

Creation of an independent cancer program would force into the over-burdened Office of Management and Budget and the Executive Office of the President decisions which neither is capable of carrying out.

Dr. Pollard notes that the creation of a national cancer agency will not fragment NIH but rather strengthen it and that the American Cancer Society was one of the original supporters of the National Cancer Institute and obviously would not "embrace any proposal that would harm what we helped to create."

Dr. Pollard testified before the Senate committee in support of a bill that would abolish the National Cancer Institute.

No one who has appeared before the committees in the House and Senate has urged any delay or diminishment in the attack upon cancer. As stated by Congressman Rogers, there is a need for a most careful and deliberate examination of a proposal which holds within it the potentiality of destroying the one institution, the NIH, that has made so much of the scientific progress underlying a greater medical capability in cancer possible.

Dr. Pollard holds that S. 1828 will not financially harm the budgets of the other NIH Institutes, citing the fact that the Congress appropriated \$142 million more than the President requested for FY 1972 for NIH research institutes, other than the National Cancer Institute, as evidence.

The President's request for 1972, while supporting a \$100 million special appropriation for new cancer initiatives, drastically cut the support for other institute programs. Thus, the much-publicized increase of \$100 million for cancer research in the President's budget was obtained programs upon which further progress in cancer is dependent.

True, the Congress appropriated, as Dr. Pollard has noted, some \$142 million more for the NIH programs other than the National Cancer Society had little to do with this reversal of the President's budget. Dr. Pollard, in testifying before the HEW appropriations subcommittee in the House, urged only a further increase of \$66 million in the backs in the other NIH research programs. The American Cancer Society, although invited, did not join the Coalition for Health Funding, whose activities were principally responsible for the increase in research funding.

Dr. Pollard suggests that if S 1828 is not passed, the "status quo" in respect to cancer research will be retained, and implies that such action will contribute in some way or another to the death of 300,000 persons in this nation from cancer.

Such an implication is untrue. There is before the Congress an alternative, approved last week by the subcommittee. This bill will provide the means for mounting a broadly coordinated assault upon cancer using the full scientific resources of the NIH as well as the National Cancer Institute. It provides for the high level of leadership, and the administrative authorities to undertake this urgent cancer effort. Rather than sowing the seeds of division and destruction, this approach will strengthen the entire structure of the NIH so that this nation can continue to be the beneficiary, not only in cancer but also in the other major disease areas, of the vigorous biomedical research programs which this institution has brought into being and so well advances.

The nation's academic medical centers find it unfortunate that essentially subordinate administrative problems have been utilized to obscure the fundamental scientific and policy issues. These centers, which carry out a major part of the basic and applied research in cancer and a substantial part of the treatment of cancer patients have carefully examined the bills in Congress. They enthusiastically support the Rogers bill as the most effective instrument to mount the attack against this dread disease.

REDUCE THE U.S. CONTRIBUTION TO THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the U.N. General Assembly is now debating the question of Chinese representation in the United Nations. The lackeys of Communist China have called for the expulsion of the Republic of China from the organization which Nationalist China helped to create, and to bring in, in their place, the representatives of the People's Republic of China. We in the Congress have been particularly distressed over this situation because we unconditionally oppose the expulsion of the Republic of China from the United Nations. To expel the Republic of China from the United Nations is to ignore and to nullify its 26 years as an honorable and active member of the United Nations. To expel the Republic of China from the United Nations is to brand it an outlaw, since article 6 of the U.N. Charter allows for expulsion from the organization when a member has

"persistently violated the principles" of the charter.

Expulsion of the Republic of China from the United Nations is an unjust and unjustifiable act—and this, Mr. Speaker, is a view which is shared by many of my colleagues in this Chamber and in the Senate. Mr. Speaker, on October 13, a congressional delegation presented the President with a petition, signed by 336 Members and stating that we "are strongly and unalterably opposed to the expulsion of the Republic of China from the United Nations."

Mr. Speaker, when I last addressed this body on this subject, on October 6, I suggested one approach which the United States could take to insure that the Republic of China would not be expelled from the United Nations. Since that time, I have written to U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., George Bush, outlining the same proposal.

However, we in the Congress must not stop at making policy suggestions. If we are serious in our opposition to this insanity of expelling the Republic of China, and, Mr. Speaker, we are dead serious in this opposition, we must act. Today, I am introducing a bill to limit all of the U.S. contributions to the United Nations. We can no longer continue to finance an organization which not only acts against the national interest of the United States, its primary source of funds, but also fails to fulfill its primary tasks.

According to this legislation, U.S. contributions to the regular budget of the United Nations and its specialized agencies and U.S. voluntary contributions to the multitudinous special programs of the United Nations will be reduced from about 37 percent to about 7 or 8 percent. This is the approximate percent the population of the United States is of the total population of U.N. members.

U.N. officials will then realize how unfair it is for them to depend on one country. An international organization should depend on the resources of each and every member nation, and not just on one member. Since the organization has its headquarters in the United States, it is already consuming some of the resources of this Nation. The land in New York City which the United Nations is using could otherwise be used for park and recreational facilities. The policemen who guard the diplomats could be used to offer better protection for the people of the city. The addition of at least 4,900 people in New York places a greater burden on city communications, transportation, and housing. Thus, we in the United States give to the U.N. quite a lot apart from the direct financial contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I referred to the failure of the U.N. to live up to its obligations to keep peace in the world. Some people say that the ineffectiveness of the United Nations is due to the lack of willingness on the part of the member nations to allow the U.N. to be effective. If we stop giving the U.N. more than one-third of all its money, other member nations will learn how to shoulder the burden of responsibility, and then maybe the United Nations will have a chance to be an ef-

fective instrument for peace, because it will truly be the organization of the United Nations.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate, that the United States cannot continue to pay the price for the United Nations if it expels the Republic of China and brings in Communist China.

COMPENSATION FOR VICTIMS OF CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, street crime threatens to destroy the very fabric of our society. It is a daily and nightly fact in every city of America, and the District of Columbia is unfortunately no exception.

To the people of the District who must walk the streets to and from their homes, whose homes and families are ever in danger of being victimized, crime and the fear of crime intrudes rudely upon their daily lives and security.

As a society, we must do all within our power to combat the continuing increases in the crime rate. But in the meantime, we have an obligation to help those people we have failed to protect, the countless victims of street crime who suffer personal and financial injury.

It was the need for mutual protection from his enemies that first brought man out of the cave. As society developed, a tacit agreement was reached among the members that they would give up their individual rights of self-protection in return for a system of laws which all would be obligated to obey. For its part, the state agreed to enforce those laws for the protection of all its members.

Every time a citizen is victimized by crime, society has failed to live up to its half of the bargain. Until we are successful in providing better protection against criminal injuries, I propose that we implement a compensation system which would spread the burden among all the taxpaying members of society, rather than leaving it to be borne by the unfortunate few who happen to be victimized.

To accomplish this I have introduced the Crime Victims Compensation Act of 1971. It would establish a five-member commission, appointed by the Mayor of the District of Columbia, to award compensation to persons victimized by street crime in the District of Columbia.

Compensation would be limited to medical expenses, lost earnings, and funeral expenses in the case of death—in other words, losses due to personal injury suffered during the commission of a crime of violence. Property loss would not be compensable.

Any loss over \$50 would be compensated, up to a maximum of \$10,000. The bill provides an initial authorization of \$2 million for fiscal year 1973.

Mr. Speaker, the need for compensating victims of crime is as compelling as the rationale. Most victims of street crime are poor. While crime is a threat to wealthy and middle class communities, it thrives in poor communities. The Crime Victims Compensation Act would distribute evenly among the citizens of the District the financial burden of our collective failure to protect individual citizens.

We have properly expressed our concern, through numerous laws and court rulings, for the constitutional rights of people who are accused of crime. We have amply expressed our concern, through legislation and Federal assistance, for the agencies and officers who fight crime. It is high time we provided some assistance for our fellow citizens who are victimized by crime.

BUSING

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation which will act to postpone the effectiveness of a U.S. district court order requiring busing to achieve racial balance until all appeals to that order have been exhausted.

This measure does not seek to decide the merits of the busing issue. Clearly, this is a legal problem and properly within the jurisdiction of the courts. However, it is designed to delay busing until the question has been completely adjudicated. It provides an automatic stay of proceedings on a lower court's busing order pending the hearing of all appeals.

To my mind, this is a fair and equitable approach to this most difficult problem and a review of the facts will confirm this.

First of all, there are conflicting judicial, legislative, and administrative statements on the validity of forced busing, under what circumstances it may be implemented and to what extent children can be bused. This confusion as to just what the law says and requires is further compounded by the extremely long time that a process of appeals will take.

Mr. Speaker, surely one of the paramount ingredients of any law is its clarity. The law, to be meaningful, must be clearly defined so that the public can understand and obey it. The courts have no greater responsibility than to resolve through the cases which come before them any confusion or ambiguity that may exist within the law.

However, when there are conflicting judicial decisions on a point of law, when the judiciary itself appears to be uncertain, when there is a delay in the resolution of a problem, it is not surprising that this confusion should be reflected by the public.

I propose that this is the situation in my home State. The suddenness and abrupt nature of recent district court orders, together with the confusion which

I outlined above, has only been successful in producing greater disruption and heightened tensions. In short, it has generated more heat than light on this critical issue.

This bill is designed not to restrain the courts, not to interfere with the judicial process, but to delay the implementing of forced busing in order to give the courts the time they need to resolve this difficult situation once and for all. Presently, the lack of a clear-cut decision and understanding of this question has only served to erode the credibility of our court system.

Furthermore, because of the length of time needed to complete the appeals process, busing will be an accomplished fact before the issue has been decided by the Supreme Court. I can find no rhyme or reason in following through on busing with its great cost in terms of time and money which would uproot children from their neighborhood schools when there is a possibility that in 2 or 3 years the district court order will be overturned. Indeed, I find that not only lacking in good sense but also unjust.

Mr. Speaker, surely, the more reasoned, prudent course of action is to hold back on busing for the time being. Even in those cases where the Supreme Court has sanctioned busing it has indicated that it should be used only as a tool of last resort. I would now ask that opponents to busing be allowed to plead their case at their forum of last resort before any action is taken.

In conclusion, I would emphasize that the approach that this legislation takes is fair to both sides of the busing controversy. I, therefore, urge that it receive the careful and immediate deliberation of the House.

JACK RUSS NAMED "OUTSTANDING DOORMAN OF THE YEAR FOR THE HOUSE FLOOR"

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, it is always a great honor to be selected for an award by your peers. A young man from my congressional district was recently given the Doorman of the Year award by the House Doormen's Society. This young man, Jack Russ, hails from Picayune, Miss., and has been a doorman for the House of Representatives for 4½ years. He is blessed with a combination of virtues. He is not only affable, but he also is capable and industrious.

Jack was born in Poplarville, Miss., on March 26, 1945, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Walter Denny Russ. Jack is happily married to an attractive and talented young lady and they have one son. After being graduated from Picayune High School, he attended Pearl River Junior College where he was selected for Honorable Mention All American on the football team, and now is enrolled in the University of Maryland. He is a member of the District of Columbia National

Guard, holding the rank of Sergeant; member of the Methodist Church; the Boonsboro, Md., Historical Society; Jaycees; and the Sons of the American Revolution.

I am proud of the recognition of this outstanding young man, and I take this opportunity to call the attention of my colleagues to his work as doorman on the main door of the House of Representatives.

RESPONSE TO OBEY QUESTIONNAIRE CALLS FOR LESS SPENDING ON SPACE AND ARMAMENTS

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this fall I distributed to all of the residents of Wisconsin's Seventh Congressional District a questionnaire seeking opinions on the important issues which the 92d Congress will face during the coming months.

Nearly 10,000 persons responded to the questionnaire and I believe a report on the results may be of interest to my colleagues.

An overwhelming majority of those who responded to the questionnaire favored less Federal spending on space programs and armaments. Ninety percent of the respondents favored less spending on space programs and 88 percent indicated a desire for reduced spending on armaments. Meanwhile, 86 percent favored more funds for pollution cleanup, 85 percent favored more money for health, 82 percent asked for more for law enforcement, 70 percent wanted more for fighting poverty, and 65 percent favored more funds for education.

The questionnaire featured several questions relating to the war in Southeast Asia. By better than a 60-to-40 margin Wisconsin's Seventh District citizens favor withdrawing all American troops from Vietnam by the end of 1971. In addition, 66 percent of the respondents said they oppose continued U.S. involvement in an air war in Southeast Asia after U.S. ground troops have withdrawn. By a better than 4-to-1 margin the respondents favor increased congressional participation in decisions relating to war policy and by the same margin they expressed the belief that it is unlikely that the release of American prisoners of war can be secured before a ceasefire is agreed upon.

Mr. Speaker, my questionnaire included 29 questions. So that other Members of Congress may be aware of the thinking of the residents of central and northern Wisconsin I ask that the complete results be printed in the RECORD at this point. The questionnaire follows:

OBEY QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

(All percentages rounded to nearest whole)

THE WAR

Are you satisfied that President Nixon is ending the war in Vietnam?

(In percent)

Yes	53
No	34
Not sure	13

There is a proposal in Congress to require the President to bring home all U.S. troops by the end of this year. How would you vote on this measure?

(In percent)
 For it ----- 61
 Against it ----- 39

Would you be satisfied if by the end of 1972 the U.S. were no longer involved in combat operations in Vietnam but was still financing and conducting an air war in Southeast Asia?

(In percent)
 Yes ----- 20
 No ----- 66
 Not sure ----- 14

Should Congress permit the President to conduct the war in Southeast Asia as he alone sees fit or should Congress participate more fully on decisions relating to war policy?

(In percent)
 Leave to President ----- 13
 Congress participate more ----- 82

Do you think we can get American POW's back before the shooting stops?

(In percent)
 Yes ----- 14
 No ----- 60
 Not sure ----- 26

AGRICULTURE

Do you favor legislation to curb the spread of corporation and hobby farming? At national level?

(In percent)
 Yes ----- 75
 No ----- 25

At state level?
 (In percent)
 Yes ----- 72
 No ----- 28

Do you favor stricter sanitation standards for dairy imports?

(In percent)
 Yes ----- 84
 No ----- 4
 Not sure ----- 12

PRIVACY

Do you think there has been more of a tendency recently for the government to infringe unnecessarily upon the average American's privacy than there was ten years ago?

(In percent)
 More ----- 67
 Same ----- 30
 Less ----- 3

To protect the privacy of American citizens should Congress:

Prohibit government agencies from selling mailing lists (such as the IRS list of registered gun dealers or state motor vehicle registration lists)?

(In percent)
 Yes ----- 83
 No ----- 9
 Not sure ----- 8

Pass a "Truth in Mailing Lists" law to require a company or charity to disclose how it got your name if it makes unsolicited offers or appeals to you by mail?

(In percent)
 Yes ----- 86
 No ----- 9
 Not sure ----- 5

Order all government agencies to keep their files as confidential as the Census Bureau does? (the Census Bureau is required by law not to open its files to any other agency.)

(In percent)
 Yes ----- 72
 No ----- 15
 Not sure ----- 13

Require that government agencies notify a citizen when they start a file on him (except in cases of crime or espionage), and

allow him to see and correct the information in that file?

(In percent)
 Yes ----- 86
 No ----- 9
 Not sure ----- 5

Attempt to restrict the information-gathering activities of government agencies, so that fewer files are started in the first place?

(In percent)
 Yes ----- 70
 No ----- 18
 Not sure ----- 12

Do you think that the U.S. Attorney General should be able to bug or wiretap citizens without first obtaining the permission of a judge?

(In percent)
 Yes ----- 29
 No ----- 61
 Not sure ----- 10

Do you think that surveillance of the political activities of private citizens and public officials by military intelligence personnel should be allowed to continue?

(In percent)
 Yes ----- 28
 No ----- 56
 Not sure ----- 16

HEALTH CARE

Please rank the following health and medical care problems from 1 to 6 in what you consider to be their order of seriousness:

- 19%—Accessibility of doctors.
- 8%—Quality of health care.
- 7%—Availability of medical care (clinics, pharmacies, hospitals etc.).
- 62%—Cost of health care.
- 6%—Inadequacy of health insurance coverage.

In response to problems of the availability and quality of health care, should the federal government:

Leave it to doctors, hospitals and insurance companies to try to work out these problems?

(In percent)
 Yes ----- 26
 No ----- 60
 Not sure ----- 14

Increase grants and loans to medical schools and their students to turn out more doctors and other health care personnel?

(In percent)
 Yes ----- 72
 No ----- 15
 Not sure ----- 13

Assign Public Health Service doctors and nurses to rural and urban areas where private practitioners are in short supply?

(In percent)
 Yes ----- 79
 No ----- 15
 Not sure ----- 6

Encourage the growth of pre-paid group health organizations offering a full range of medical services to all residents of a given region?

(In percent)
 Yes ----- 61
 No ----- 19
 Not sure ----- 20

To help pay the high costs of medical care, should the federal government:

(Select one)

35%—Provide or subsidize health insurance coverage only for catastrophic illnesses? (This kind of program would take effect after you had used up other health insurance benefits, or had spent a certain amount—say \$2,000—for your family's doctor bills, X-rays and other medical services in one year.)

26%—Require that employers make available to their workers a basic health care plan (with employees and employers sharing the cost of the plan), while setting up a separate

subsidized health insurance program for the poor and the unemployed?

39%—Establish a single national system of comprehensive health insurance for all citizens, to be financed out of a government trust fund?

POLLUTION CLEAN-UP

Throughout the country, some industries, ordered by government agencies to install pollution abatement equipment are threatening to shut down or relocate if forced to comply. Do you think companies that say they cannot afford to install equipment required by cleanup orders and still stay in business should be required to make public sufficient economic data to support their claims?

(In percent)
 Yes ----- 89
 No ----- 7
 Not sure ----- 4

THE ECONOMY

Please rank these problem areas of the economy from 1 to 6 in what you consider to be their order of seriousness.

- 31%—Inflation.
- 34%—Government Spending.
- 13%—Taxes.
- 5%—Prices.
- 16%—Unemployment.
- 1%—Interest Rates.

Do you think the Administration's economic policies are working?

(In percent)
 Yes ----- 13
 No ----- 62
 Not sure ----- 25

TAX SHARING

The President has suggested that the federal government distribute \$5 billion of federal tax money to state and local governments to spend as they choose, with no strings attached. Do you think this is a good idea?

(In percent)
 Yes ----- 24
 No ----- 59
 Not sure ----- 17

Do you think this tax sharing can be done only when the federal budget runs a surplus (as opposed to a year such as this when the federal government is running a \$21 billion deficit)?

(In percent)
 Only with surplus ----- 76
 Even with deficit ----- 24

If you were voting in Congress would you: (Please rank 1-2-3 in order of your preference)

12%—Support the President's tax sharing plan described above?

33%—Rather see the federal government take over the cost of welfare, thereby removing the burden from the local property tax?

55%—Prefer a system of tax credits, which would permit you to deduct a portion of your state income tax payments from your federal income tax bill?

How would you rate the ability of each level of government to spend your money wisely and operate effectively?

(In percent)
 Federal:
 Excellent ----- 3
 Good ----- 12
 Fair ----- 32
 Poor ----- 53
 State:
 Excellent ----- 5
 Good ----- 20
 Fair ----- 26
 Poor ----- 49
 Local:
 Excellent ----- 7
 Good ----- 21
 Fair ----- 31
 Poor ----- 41

SPENDING PRIORITIES

Do you favor spending more or less money on the following programs?

(In percent)

Pollution cleanup:	
More	86
Less	14
Law enforcement:	
More	82
Less	18
Space programs:	
More	10
Less	90
Transportation:	
More	44
Less	56
Armaments:	
More	12
Less	88
Education:	
More	65
Less	35
Poverty:	
More	70
Less	30
Health:	
More	85
Less	15

LUTHERANS OPPOSE PRAYER
AMENDMENT

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, as evidenced by the following statements, a large portion of the Lutherans in this country are opposed to the proposed constitutional amendment regarding prayer in public buildings:

PRAYER AND BIBLE READING IN THE PUBLIC
SCHOOLS

(Adopted by the Second Biennial Convention, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, July 2-9, 1964)

(Note.—In June, 1963, the Executive Council of the Lutheran Church in America adopted a brief statement on prayer and Bible reading in the public schools in the light of decisions on those matters by the United States Supreme Court (Engel and Schempp cases, 370 U.S. 421 and 374 U.S. 203).

The Biennial Convention of the LCA in July, 1964, received an interpretive memorandum attached by the Executive Council to the prior statement. The significance of the memorandum was in its fuller analysis of the Court's decisions and in the attention it gave to related proposals to amend the Constitution of the United States.

The convention ratified the statement of the Executive Council (in the words of the pertinent resolution) "as amplified and interpreted by" the memorandum.

The statement of the Executive Council (I) "as amplified and interpreted by" the memorandum (II) constitutes the official position of the Lutheran Church in America on prayer and Bible reading in the public schools and the question of constitutional amendment.)

I. STATEMENT BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, 1963

We do not believe that much has been lost in terms of the specific points covered by the recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court in the school prayer and Bible reading cases. If the Lord's Prayer were to be recited in schoolrooms only for the sake of the moral and ethical atmosphere it creates, it would be worth nothing to the

practicing Christian. The Lord's Prayer is the supreme act of adoration and petition or it is debased. Reading the Bible in the public schools without comment, too, has been of dubious value as either an educational or religious experience. The more we attempt as Christians or Americans to insist on common denominator religious exercise or instruction in the public schools, the greater risk we run of diluting our faith and contributing to a vague religiosity which identifies religion with patriotism and becomes a national folk religion.

At the same time, in candor, these decisions must be seen as a watershed. They open an era in which Christianity is kept separate from the state in a way that was foreign and would have been repugnant to the minds of our ancestors at the time when the Constitution was written and ever since. They signalize the fact that the United States of America, like many other nations, is past the place where underlying Christian culture and beliefs are assumed in its life.

This event intensifies the task of the church. It heightens the need of the church for strength to stand alone, lofty and unshaken, in American society. It calls for greater depth of conviction in all Christian men and women.

II. INTERPRETIVE MEMORANDUM, 1964

The United States Supreme Court has declared it unconstitutional for states to require religious exercises such as prayer recitation and the reading of the Bible without comment in the public schools. (Engel and Schempp cases, 370 U.S. 421 and 374 U.S. 203.) It is natural that the Court's decisions have created controversy and have aroused misgivings and questions on the part of those who have both an interest in the public schools and a concern for the religious and moral nurture of our children. To some it has seemed that the Federal Constitution should be expressly amended to nullify these decisions and otherwise restrict the application of the religion clauses of the First Amendment.

Criticism of the Court's rulings has been directed to the following points: that prayer exercises and Bible reading in the public schools have the sanction of historical usage, that to call these practices a form of religious establishment is to carry constitutional interpretation to an unwarranted extreme, that to invalidate these practices at the request of a minority is to deny majority rights, and that exclusion of such religious practices has the effect of conferring a constitutional blessing upon secularism as an official philosophy.

The Church is properly concerned about these questions. The validity, the meaning and the effect of the Court's decisions touch on matters of vital interest to Christians, both in terms of their responsibility under God for the good of the public order and their special calling in Christ for the sake of the Gospel.

It does not appear, however, that the church need be alarmed over the results reached by the Court in these cases. Persons of goodwill may have differences of opinion on the correctness or desirability of these decisions. At the same time believers and nonbelievers alike may share the view that in the end these decisions may have a wholesome effect in clarifying the role of the public school with respect to religious matters.

The Executive Council statement of June 1963 recognizes that from a religious point of view not much is lost as a result of the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in the school prayer and Bible reading cases. Recitation of prayers when prescribed by public authority easily becomes a formal, mechanical exercise that neither reflects nor contributes to genuine religious piety and reverence. Bible reading without comment may take on the form of a ritualistic exercise that

contributes little to a genuine educational program or to understanding of the Bible.

Moreover, both the Lord's Prayer and the Bible belong to a particular religious tradition, and their use in religious exercises in the public schools does result in a religious preference and invites the risk of sectarian divisiveness in the community. In turn, any devotional use of the Bible designed to avoid or minimize the sectarian aspect results in a distorted conception of the Bible and a dilution of its religious message.

Furthermore, any religious exercise designed to minimize the sectarian element, whether it be a nonsectarian prayer or Bible readings that ignore religious teachings, serves to promote a vague or a syncretistic religion that conveys none of the substance, the depth, and cutting edge of the historic Christian witness.

The nature of our contemporary pluralistic and democratic society requires a re-evaluation of practices which though sanctioned by historical usage had their origin at a time when the Protestant influence was dominant in the shaping of many public practices including the public school program. A due regard for all religious faiths and also for nonbelievers and nonconformists of all kinds makes it imperative that the public schools abstain from practices that run the risk of intrusion of sectarian elements and divisiveness. The public school serves a unique and valued place in helping to build a civic unity despite the diversities of our pluralistic culture.

It should also be noted that when the state deeply involves itself in religious practices in the public schools, it is thereby not only appropriating a function properly served by the church and the family but subjecting the freedom of believers and unbelievers alike to the restraint that accompanies the use of governmental power and public facilities in the promotion of religious ends. This construction is particularly relevant in the case of religious exercises in the public schools. Children are required to be in school by compulsion of public law, the religious exercises are prescribed by public authority, public school facilities are used and the teacher—the symbol of authority in the classroom—supervises the exercises. These factors combine to operate with indirect coercive force on young and impressionable children to induce them to take part in these exercises, despite a freedom to be excused from participation. Even persons with a genuine regard for prayer and the Bible may object to having their children engage in these exercises when they are supported by the compulsion of law.

Having said this, however, does not foreclose the legitimacy of having any reservations about the Supreme Court's decisions. The legal question whether the establishment clause of the First Amendment is properly interpreted to apply to religious practices in the public schools is a matter on which scholars disagree. It is quite valid to ask whether the Fourteenth Amendment should be used to make the First Amendment apply to every school community in the United States, regardless of the religious character of the local community.

A more serious question, moreover, goes to the concept of neutrality respecting religious matters, which played a central part in the Court's decision handed down in 1963. Clearly public school programs must be directed to secular purposes, and yet the schools cannot be absolutely neutral in regard to religious matters. Any education premised on indifference to the religious factors in history, in American life and in the life of the individual, is an inadequate education. Furthermore, the vacuum introduced by the exclusion of religion opens the door to the cult of secularism. The Con-

stitution prohibits the establishment of all kinds of religion—whether theistic or secular in character.

Recognizing these considerations, the Court has wisely stated that schools may properly present programs for the objective study of the Bible and of religion. How successfully this can be done, without the intrusion of sectarian elements, remains to be seen. This points up the challenge to the churches and to the public schools to give serious attention to ways of studying the Bible and religion that will do justice to the religious factor and at the same time serve the larger neutrality which an even-handed interpretation of the Constitution requires. The LCA Commission on Church and State Relations in a Pluralistic Society is currently exploring this question and will report its conclusions to the Church in due time.

Christians should realize, however, that not too much may be expected of the public schools in dealing with religious matters. The schools must be careful to abstain from practices and teaching programs that involve commitment to ultimate truth or values. On the other hand, it should be possible for the public schools to teach respect for the spiritual and moral values that reflect the community consensus and which for most citizens have their roots in the Christian, and in the antecedent Hebrew tradition.

Our democratic society rests on certain moral assumptions. But even here the public schools must be careful. In teaching respect for the ethics of a democratic society, they cannot commit themselves to either a theistic or a humanistic philosophy respecting the sources and motivation for ethical conduct. The nurture of an informed, vital and relevant religious faith remains the responsibility of parents and the churches.

In view of these considerations it does not seem that anything of importance is to be gained through an amendment to the Constitution that would sanction prayer and Bible reading in the public schools. The Supreme Court has not held that there can be no prayers in public schools. Nothing in the Court's decisions precludes school authorities from designating a period of silence for prayer and meditation or even for devotional reading of the Bible or any other book during this period. Opportunity for voluntary participation in prayers of the student's own choice is not governed by these decisions which dealt only with situations where school authorities were directly involved in prescribing the kind of prayer and in giving direction to it. Moreover, the Court's recognition that the objective study of religion and the Bible in the public schools is consistent with the First Amendment gives promise to a constructive approach to neutralizing secularistic tendencies in public education.

Furthermore, the Supreme Court has not outlawed reference to God in public documents, proceedings or ceremonies. No constitutional amendment is necessary to assure the freedom of the federal and state governments to give appropriate expression to the religious factor in our history and in the lives of our people.

On the other hand, there is disadvantage in using the amendment process to deal with the present issue and there is risk in the results that would be achieved by it. The proposed amendments would represent only a piece-meal way of dealing with religious practices in public schools in public life. It would be a use of the amendment process not to state general and fundamental principles but to sanction certain specific and detailed practices. That is, to say the least, a questionable use of the amendment process. Moreover, such an amendment would raise new problems of interpretation and could lead to unintended and unsuspected results

in areas vitally touching on religious liberty. Finally, and this is most important, the proposed amendments in their substance would give constitutional sanction to distinctively sectarian practices in the public schools with all the risks involved or impinging upon freedom of conscience and belief and creating religious divisiveness in the community.

The Constitution should not be amended except to achieve large and important public needs and purposes consistent with the basic nature of our constitutional system. The current proposals for constitutional amendment do not meet these standards. Parents, churches and school authorities would be better advised to direct their efforts to programs for study of religion and the Bible in the public schools and to the formulation of types of programs which coordinate the secular educational programs of the public schools with programs of a strictly religious nature conducted by the churches themselves, rather than to seek constitutional sanctions for devotional exercises in public schools that have at most a minimal religious value, which invite the intrusion of sectarian influences into the public school system risk the violation of the rights of religious freedom and are a potential source of conflict in the community.

STATEMENT OF THE BOARD OF PARISH EDUCATION, LUTHERAN CHURCH, MISSOURI SYNOD, JULY 29, 1966

The Dirksen Prayer Amendment seeks to encourage the opportunity for a voluntary participation of students in prayer without prescribing the form or content of any prayer. To encourage prayer is a laudable objective. The public school, however, does not seem to provide appropriate circumstances for joint prayer.

The amendment would forbid any authority to prescribe the form or content of prayer. Yet in any group situation prayer without imposed form or content is impossible. One possibility of avoiding imposing form and content is in providing a time for meditation and prayer where each in his own words and in his own way prays privately. Such private prayer is already a possibility, although it might be desirable to provide a time-slot for a moment of private prayer.

While the public school is not the place for group prayer or worship, there are some things that it can do with respect to religion. The public school can take a positive attitude toward religion and point to the large role that religion plays in the lives of many people, and it can point to the influence that religion has exerted on individuals and on society in general. The public school can study religious art, religious music, and religious literature. More of this ought to be done. In all this, however, the public school must show respect for all religious faiths, and respect the rights of those who are irreligious to hold their opinions.

We are sympathetic to public school teachers and administrators in their problem of dealing with religion in the public school program. We support the idea that community representatives must work with public school educators to define the proper role of the public school in teaching about religion.

The Board of Parish Education of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, feels that the Dirksen Amendment fails to recognize fully the religious pluralism of the American scene. We believe that Christians cannot join with non-Christians in addressing God in circumstances that deny Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord. We believe likewise that non-Christians should neither be expected to participate in Christian prayer nor should they expect Christians to join them in prayers that deny Christ.

The concept of voluntary participation in prayer provides either a coercive force or an embarrassing situation for both Christians

and non-Christians. Under these circumstances we believe that it is best for the public school not to engage in prayer or other religious worship exercises.

We support the idea that home and church have the responsibility for a religious education which seeks commitment and provides time for prayer or devotional exercises.

SECTION ON "RELIGION IN THE SCHOOLS" FROM CHURCH-STATE RELATIONS IN THE U.S.A.

(A Statement Commended by the Second General Convention of the American Lutheran Church, October 21-27, 1964)

RELIGION IN THE SCHOOLS

27. Reading of Scripture and addressing deity in prayer are forms of religious expression which devout persons cherish. To compel these religious exercises as essential parts of the public school program, however, is to infringe on the distinctive beliefs of religious persons as well as on the rights of the irreligious. We believe that freedom of religion is best preserved when Scripture reading and prayer are centered in home and church, their effects in the changed lives of devout persons radiating into the schools and into every area of community life. It is as wrong for the public schools to become agents for atheism, godless secularism, scoffing irreligion, or a vague "religion in general" as it is for them to make religious rites and ceremonies an integral part of their programs.

28. It is a distortion of the constitutional principle of neutrality of the state toward religion to insist that public schools ignore the influence of religion upon culture and persons. A rounded education ought to include knowledge of major religious groups and their emphases, the influence of religion upon the lives of people, and the contributions of religion to society, taught in history, literature, social science, and other courses at levels consistent with the maturity and comprehension of the pupils. The objective for the public schools in this direction is understanding rather than commitment, a teaching about religion rather than a teaching of religion. Churches ought to offer their assistance to the public schools in preparing for and in supporting the teaching of such courses.

29. Whether and how distinctive religious holidays should be recognized in the public schools, and whether public property may be used for religious displays and ceremonies, we believe are matters best decided by the responsible authorities in each community in light of (a) the interests and desires of the people of that community, (b) government's obligation to benevolent neutrality in religious matters, (c) the protections and opportunities for redress guaranteed any minorities and (d) the possibility that the religious significance of the holiday will be lost as it becomes simply a seasonal rite or ceremony.

30. Released time, dismissed time, and shared time are means deserving of greater exploration so that the churches can give religious education, competently and in accord with their distinctive doctrinal emphases, to pupils enrolled in the public schools. Such programs would require rejection of the dogmatic and inflexible approach fostered by the slogan "separation of church and state." Such study might result in encouraging genuinely benevolent neutrality on the part of government and a fresh approach to the free exercise of religion in education not otherwise attainable.

PRAYER IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(A Statement Commended by the Church—the American Lutheran Church, Oct. 26, 1964)

Voted by the Second General Convention, The American Lutheran Church, October 26, 1964 (GC64.26.118) to adopt the following resolution:

Whereas, The president of the church in his message has called attention to the deep concern among our people regarding the Supreme Court decision on prayer in the public Schools, and

Whereas, There are attempts from many sources to achieve changes via legislative process and constitutional amendment; and

Whereas, The president of the church has indicated the desirability of guidance by the church for its people; and

Whereas, Dr. Paul Kauper, a professor of constitutional law, has prepared a statement at the request of the president of the church (Report of the President, Exhibit A, pages 89 and 90); therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention commends the president of The American Lutheran Church for his concern relative to the Supreme Court decision regarding prayer in the public schools and the events following the decision; and be it further

Resolved, That the statement by Professor Kauper concerning proposals to amend the United States Constitution to give constitutional sanction to certain types of religious practices in public institutions be commended as a carefully reasoned document for study by the members of The American Lutheran Church.

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON PRAYER IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(A Statement by Professor Paul Kauper Concerning Proposals to Amend the United States Constitution to Give Constitutional Sanction to Certain Types of Religious Practices in Public Institutions.)

Proposals are now pending before the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution in order to give constitutional sanction to certain types of religious practices in public institutions and in the public life. Some of these proposals are directed only to the matter of prayer and Bible-reading in the public schools and are designed to overcome the effect of the Supreme Court's decisions dealing with these practices. Others go further and would give constitutional sanction also to references to God and to expressions of belief in God in public ceremonies, in public documents and on the coins or obligations of the United States.

We believe that it would be unwise for the Congress to give its approval to any such amendment. Without attempting to pass judgment on the soundness of the Supreme Court's decisions in declaring officially prescribed prayer and Bible-reading practices to constitute an establishment of religion in violation of the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution, we do recognize that such practices are essentially ritualistic in character, that any form of religious practice opens the way for sectarian intrusion into the public school program, that such practices offend minority groups, and that in the end religion suffers and religious liberty in its fullness is threatened when government uses the power of its laws and the public school program to prescribe an official faith. Devotional exercises for the cultivation and nurture of religious faith belong in the home and the church.

Insofar as some of these proposed amendments are directed to the further purpose of validating references to God on public occasions, and in public ceremonies, proclamations, and documents, they are unnecessary since neither the holdings nor the chief opinions in the cases decided by the Supreme Court support the view that the Constitution outlaws reference to God and to expression of belief and dependence upon him whether it be in the public school or on various public occasions. Moreover, any attempt to deal with these matters by constitutional amendment creates problems and difficulties of draftsmanship and may open the door to

practices which encroach upon freedom of belief and conscience.

The Constitution as the basic law of the land should not be amended, particularly in the vital and sensitive areas of religious liberty and of church-state relations, except to achieve some great and compelling public purpose or need. For the reasons stated above, we believe that it would be a step in the wrong direction to amend the Constitution in order to achieve the purposes of the proposals now pending before Congress.

This expression of our disapproval of these proposals for constitutional amendment does not mean that we disapprove of reference to God and to belief in and dependence upon him as found in various aspects of our public life. On the contrary, we believe that these are appropriate practices, not because they contribute to the vitality of the nation's religious life, but because they are a legitimate expression of our religious heritage. Indeed, to say that the Constitution requires the deletion in the public life of all such references rooted in the history and life of our people is to interpret the Constitution as manifesting hostility to religion. It is important also that our public schools recognize the relevance of religion and afford opportunity for study of the Bible and of religion as essential to the purposes of public education.

The Supreme Court's decisions do not outlaw prayer and study of the Bible in the public schools. They prohibit only officially prescribed religious exercises calling for corporate participation. Unfortunately, the Supreme Court's decisions have been relied upon in some instances to furnish pretext and license for the use of the public school classroom both to discredit religion and to deny opportunity for the voluntary expressions by students of their faith. This is a gross distortion of the Supreme Court's decisions. The Constitution assures the free exercise of religion. The schools must see to it that this freedom is fully respected.

Commission on Research and Social Action. The American Lutheran Church. 429 South Fifth Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415.

Sgt. EARL D. GASSETT NAMED OUTSTANDING POLICEMAN BY THE HOUSE DOORMEN'S SOCIETY

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the House Doormen's Society made a wise choice in its selection of Sgt. Earl D. Gasset as its outstanding policeman.

It has been my pleasure to know Earl Gasset since he came to Washington over 6 years ago to join the U.S. Capitol Police, after serving honorably for 20 years in the U.S. Navy.

Sergeant Gasset is a native Alabamian, and his home, Skipperville, is in my district. I consider him a constituent of mine, as well as a friend, and am proud to do so.

Since becoming a member of the finest police force in America, Sergeant Gasset has achieved an outstanding record. His performance has consistently reflected the high professional standards required by the department.

Members of this body and the many

visitors who come to watch the proceedings in this great Chamber are well served by Sgt. Earl Gasset. We are fortunate indeed to have this outstanding individual in our police department.

The members of the Doormen's Society recognizes this fact as well. I gladly offer my warmest congratulations today to Sergeant Gasset on his well-deserved honor.

STEVE BLASS—CONNECTICUT NATIVE

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Washington Post sports writer Shirley Povich has given excellent testimony to a young man from "the land of Canaan, Conn."—Steve Blass, who in two eventful games of the world series reversed a losing streak and clinched a series victory for the Pittsburgh Pirates.

Blass is a Connecticut native, and still lives in our State with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. William S. Blass, his wife, and two sons, David and Chris. I hope that I shall not be thought parochial when I say that all the citizens of Connecticut share the pride of the Pirates victory—due in a large part to the strong pitching arm of Steve Blass.

Maybe it was by "divine instructions," that the Pirates scouts found Steve Blass, as Mr. Povich states. But whatever the reason, the citizens of Connecticut, and sports fans across the Nation, hold great respect for this star athlete.

The article follows:

THIS MORNING—WITH SHIRLEY POVICH

BALTIMORE.—Back in 1960, scouts of the Pittsburgh Pirates, as if given divine instructions, went down to the land of Canaan (Conn.) and signed a young schoolboy pitcher named Steve Blass, and today for the Pirates it came up milk and honey in the 1971 World Series, plus paychecks of at least \$18,000 for each man, because Steve Blass was here, pitching another beaut against the Orioles.

He's the same chap who turned the whole Series around Tuesday by winning the third game, succoring the twice-floored Pirates. Today, if Blass didn't quite match the elegance of that three-hit pitching job, he made everything supremely conclusive for the Pirates with a four-hitter amidst all the pressures of the decisive seventh game.

For the second time in the Series, Blass was again proving he could lick one of Baltimore's four 20-game winners, Mike Cuellar. It was a near thing, with the final score a squeaky 2-1, because Cuellar, too, was magnificent. Like Blass, he had a sly curve ball and a good fast one and a change of pace, plus his screw ball, and after seven innings, Cuellar, like Blass, was pitching a two-hitter.

But, unlike Blass, Cuellar didn't have a Clemente going for him. In the fourth, Roberto Clemente, as he often does, hit one out of the park to set Blass up in a 1-0 lead. And that proved to be the difference, with the two teams matching each other's one-run eighth innings.

The last cruel frustration for the Orioles came with the game-ending out, which evolved from what appeared to be a Baltimore hit that would put the tying run on

base. But shortstop Jack Hernandez, stationed himself brightly behind second base in the special shift the Pirates used against Merv Rettenmund, grabbed off the ground ball that was headed toward center field and had an easy play.

It set off an on-field celebration by the Pirates among themselves, and they embraced and kissed each other, indiscriminately, before cutting out for the dugout to avoid the flood of fans onto the field. Blass led the sprint to safety, his cap lost, his shirt-tail flying and his upraised arms showing his happiness.

At the outset of today's game, Secretary of State William Rogers was tapped for the throw-out-the-first-ball role. He performed the ceremony, and it was an episode that evoked a rare unanimity among Rogers-watchers on both sides of the Suez Canal. Both the Arabs and Israelis agreed that Rogers threw a curve.

Baltimore manager Earl Weaver called time in the first inning with Boog Powell at bat. He complained to umpire Nestor Chylak that Blass was not obeying the pitching rules, that Blass' right foot was not in contact with the pitching rubber when he was delivering the pitch. Blass scoffed at the whole idea, but umpire Chylak nevertheless took pains to go to the mound and show the Pirates' pitcher how it must be done.

Inevitably, there were cynics among the crowd who suspected that Weaver was merely attempting to psyche Blass or provoke him to temper. But those who know Weaver best would not agree to this, and hasten to point out to the dum-dums who are quick to think evil of all persons that the Orioles' manager is merely a strict constructionist who wants enforcement of both the letter and the spirit of the rules, and in fact has possibilities as a Nixon nomination for the High Court.

Blass was completely unaffected by Weaver's gambit, if it was a gambit, although after the fifth inning Weaver tried the same stuff again. But by this time, Blass' game plan was being revealed. It was the simple blueprint that called for shutting out the Orioles while waiting for Clemente to hit a home run, which he did on Cuellar's last pitch to him in the fourth.

Blass also dealt personally with Don Buford, the pesky Oriole who got on base the first two times up, with a walk and a hit. After Buford singled with one out in the third, Blass made a deceptive little motion that taught Buford not to take too big a lead off first against right-handed pitchers, and picked him off cleanly. It went into the books as "Buford caught stealing," but it was a clean trap by Blass, who baited the Oriole into going.

The useful second run of the Pirates was scored in the eighth on Jose Pagan's two-bagger off the left-center wall. There were some carpers who said center fielder Rettenmund bobbled the rebound a bit, and others who said Boog Powell shouldn't have cut off the relay to the plate. But all of this fault finding with the Orioles could have been avoided by Willie Stargell, who scored from first on Pagan's hit. Among the 47,291 plus in the park, only Stargell, who stopped almost too long at second base, was unaware that the ball was hit too deep to be catchable.

The Orioles finally put two hits together in the eighth and came up with one futile run, which scored on an infield out. If Blass was to buckle under the pressure, the time appeared ripe when he took his skimpy one-run lead into the last of the ninth against the power and the glory of the Baltimore batting order, Boog Powell, Frank Robinson and Merv Rettenmund, any of whom could tie the game with one swipe. None of 'em got on base, none of 'em got the ball out of the infield, against the imperturbable Blass, to whom this game, and this day, belonged.

WIFE PLEADS FOR MATE IN RUSSIA

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, during the past months, Americans have grown increasingly aware of Jewish Soviet citizens and their struggle to combat the efforts of cultural homogenization by the Soviet Government.

Not only are the Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union denied the right to enjoy their culture and heritage, they are also prohibited from emigrating so that they might enjoy it in a more open society.

Despite numerous international agreements signed by the Soviets, which affirm both the right of cultural diversity and the right of emigration, Jews living in the Soviet Union are not permitted to have their own schools, a national religious organization and are strictly limited in terms of the number of books and magazines they may publish to serve the intellectual interests of their fellow Jewish citizens.

If they express a desire to emigrate, Soviet Jews face discrimination and harassment. The latest evidence of this which has come to my attention is a story in the October 18 edition of the Atlanta Constitution. It tells of the plight of a young Jewish mother who left the Soviet Union before the birth of her child, believing that her husband would be permitted to emigrate shortly after she did. This young woman, Rita Gluzman, left Russia with her family in September of 1969, after an application process that took 15 years. To date, her husband has been denied permission to join her in Israel.

I insert this newspaper article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mrs. Gluzman has come to the United States in the hope of bringing public opinion to bear which might allow the release of her husband. I hope that, after reading this article, my colleagues will join me in protesting this latest example of Soviet hypocrisy in the treatment of its Jewish citizens.

Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to my colleagues, that if they wish to protest, as I do, this latest discriminatory act of the Russians against their Jewish citizens, that they write the Soviet Ambassador, expressing their outrage at this denial of a basic human right by the Russians. Further, may they bring to the attention of the Soviet Ambassador that his nation signed the Declaration on Colonialism in 1960, which in part affirms that "Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and return to his country," yet the Soviets, in this instance, are willfully violating and refusing to live up to the agreement they signed.

The article follows:

WIFE PLEADS FOR MATE IN RUSSIA

(By Gene Ray)

A young Israeli woman whose husband has been denied permission to leave Russia tearfully pleaded with Jewish leaders in Atlanta Sunday to "help us get Papa back."

Rita Gluzman, 23, asked 125 delegates to

Atlanta Jewish Welfare Federation's Leadership Forum for help in bringing public opinion to bear against the Russian emigration policy which has left her stranded in Israel with the child her husband has never seen.

After 15 years of submitting applications Rita, her parents and sister were allowed to leave Russia in September 1969.

She had been married a month and the permission did not include her husband, Yakor Gluzman.

He lives in the Ukraine where he works as a carpenter. He is a university trained biologist but under current policy cannot pursue his professional career because of his desire to emigrate to Israel.

Soviet officials indicated to Rita that she should go to Israel and once there send an affidavit to her husband requesting that he be allowed to emigrate.

"We thought that a father to a child and a husband to his wife would be allowed to go without delay," she explained.

"Immediately after the birth of my son, Ian, I sent an affidavit to my husband.

"We waited for half a year for an answer, and in August of this year my husband received a refusal to his request to reunite with his family in Israel. Two weeks later my husband made an appeal, but the refusal was confirmed, she added.

Rita came to the United States in the hope that enough sympathy and support will rectify the injustice she feels she is experiencing.

"I believe that your intervention before the Soviet authorities will help to give my child his father and to give me back my husband," she said.

"Every mother and wife will understand me and will be able to imagine my terrible horror of the future. Every father that caresses his son's head will be able to imagine the suffering of my husband, who cannot even look at his child.

"My son has already learned to say 'Papa,' but who knows when his papa will be with us? My child is growing up as a fatherless child, while his father is longing with all his heart to be with him."

CHARLOTTE T. REID

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over the years Congress has been fortunate in having a number of competent and well-qualified ladies as legislators. Since 1962, Congresswoman Charlotte T. Reid has served the people of her home State of Illinois most admirably and must, therefore, be included in that number.

Although Mrs. Reid had not held office prior to her election to the Congress, she was far from an amateur in the arena of public affairs. She had worked diligently for her late husband in many local political contests and in his successful primary for Congress. She was also a veteran of many years' service in civic and charitable organizations in her hometown of Aurora, Ill.

During her first term in Congress Mrs. Reid served on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Her service on this committee plus her work for her party was outstanding enough to earn her selection as one of the two first-term

Members of the House of Representatives to speak at the opening session of the 1964 Republican National Convention in San Francisco.

Mrs. Reid's outstanding service and attention to her legislative homework earned her selection to the House Committee on Appropriations in the 90th Congress, after serving only two terms. Her contributions to this committee, as well as to the House as a whole, have been exceptional. It is in recognition of her devotion to country, constituents, and fellow Members that I join with others in expressing mixed feelings as to her leaving. On the one hand, she will be missed by her colleagues in the House who shall lose the benefit of her graceful presence; on the other hand, we honor her and wish her well in her new service with the Federal Communications Commission. All of us who have had the privilege of serving with Mrs. Reid in the past look forward to working with her in her new capacity in the future.

HELPING NEIGHBORS IN NEED:
MARCIA ARTHUR

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. HICKS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, recently, I cited the efforts of Mrs. Jean Logan of Tacoma, Wash., to combat hunger in Pierce County which is a severe problem in view of high unemployment, the exhaustion of unemployment compensation benefits, and the administration's failure to deal with or even recognize the problem. I am deeply gratified that in response to the plight of the hungry, Washington citizens have rallied to help their neighbors in need.

The supervisor of a "temporary" Vashon Island project to keep needy families and individuals from going hungry.

The article follows:

BACKGROUND: FOOD BANK SERVES HUNGRY ISLANDERS
(By Nelson Phillips)

The supervisor of a "temporary" Island project to keep needy families and individuals from going hungry said this week that there is no relief in sight, but that "they would like to be able to go out of business."

Marcia Arthur, of Neighbors in Need, said the group's operations continue to grow, but that an alternate solution to the hunger problem is needed.

The overall program, which was set up originally on a six-month basis, will mark its first anniversary of operation this month, twice the expected time, although the facility on the Island has operated only eight months.

"We're still ahead of the game," Mrs. Arthur said. "We're filling in the gaps before a regular program can be initiated."

FEW REPEATERS

She stressed that, contrary to the belief of some Islanders, the group claims to have a repeater rate of only one percent.

"We are not designed to be a maintenance program," she explained.

"We think of ourselves as helping people once. We try to get people over the hump. Often, in recent months, we have helped unem-

ployed families in the time between when their unemployment compensation is exhausted and the time they are eligible for public assistance."

Although critics of the project have charged that the food bank supports a steady clientele of long-hairs, Mrs. Arthur says that the greatest percentage of repeaters are older people.

ELDERLY ARE PROUD

"They are usually elderly people who are too proud or fearful to participate in regular programs," Mrs. Arthur said. Such regular programs might include public assistance, food stamps or social security.

Up to 80 percent of the people assisted by the food bank are classified as "unemployable" by Mrs. Arthur. They are either too young or too old to seek work.

NEW POOR

"We're also dealing with a new class of poor," Mrs. Arthur believes. "Because they have some resources, they don't come under regular assistance programs."

"A chunk of people who come in are recently unemployed and have never received any sort of assistance before."

The volunteer worker points to several reasons for the growing draw on the food bank: "Unemployment benefits are running out for many people hit by the job recession."

"We're feeling the effects of welfare attacks."

"The general assistance curtailment really hurt a lot of people."

"There is a lack of flexibility on the food stamp program. One-half the people eligible for food stamps cannot afford to buy them because there are minimum levels. Either they have to be able to purchase a certain amount, or they get none at all. Some people cannot afford to buy even the minimum amount."

HALF ARE CHILDREN

The percentage of children served by the food bank comes very close to matching those of Neighbors in Need facilities in Seattle, according to Mrs. Arthur.

Figures she cited show that nearly 51 percent of recipients from the facility are children. Seattle shows that service to 56 percent of its clients are to those under age 17, according to Mrs. Arthur.

1,000 SERVED

The number of people served on the Island is expected to top 1,000 within a week, figures projected by Mrs. Arthur indicate.

Since its inception on the Island early in February the program has distributed food to 966 people through the fourth week of September, Mrs. Arthur said.

"August was our heaviest month, with 237 people served," she added.

"The food bank gave away 63 boxes of food, but our heaviest day was September 14, when 79 people came to the food bank. A couple of days like that, and we could be out of food."

WISE SHOPPING

"We buy food every two months, and spend about \$300 in donations."

In order to get more food, she explained, volunteers travel to a warehouse that stocks unlabeled cans rejected by retail grocers and cases of food in which a jar or two may be broken.

"It's a real mess when a couple of jars in a case of applesauce are broken," she said, "but the volunteers wash each jar, and stick labels on all the cans."

She feels that this allows distribution of more food per dollar than would be possible if the organization shopped at regular retail outlets.

MONEY IS PROBLEM

Money, of course, is always a problem with charitable organizations, and Neighbors in Need is no exception, says Mrs. Arthur.

"Our income has pretty much stabilized. It's the individuals who keep us going, not that the groups don't help. It just seems that we depend to the small donations to keep the food bank open."

"We need volunteers to help man the food bank nearly as much as we need donations," she added.

Volunteers should contact Mrs. Teddy Norkett at 3-9049 and donations may be sent to the group's treasurer, Mrs. Elsie Fields at Rt. 2 Box 557, Vashon, Mrs. Arthur explained.

"Vashon isn't that different from other places," she concluded. "We have poor; we have unemployed; we have elderly; and we have people with problems. They all need our help. Maybe they're just not as obvious here."

UNITED STATES A TREATY-BREAKER

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, that the United States might come to lead the nations of the world in its willingness to violate international treaties would be shocking to most Americans who regard this Nation as honorable in its international dealings. In today's Washington Post, however, Stephen M. Schwebel, Professor of International Law at the Johns Hopkins University and Executive Director of the American Society of International Law, presents compelling evidence that the United States is on the verge of becoming just that—the world's leading treaty-breaker. Professor Schwebel's article bears thoughtful attention by the Members of this Congress. The text follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 19, 1971]
AN EXAMINATION OF FOUR RECENT CASES—
UNITED STATES NEARS FRONT RANKS OF
TREATY-BREAKERS

(By Stephen M. Schwebel)

The congressional threat to withhold funds from the U.N. if its membership does not vote our way on Taiwan is only the latest in a series of American actions that display a pronounced indifference to treaty obligations and a trend to ignore international law.

The President of the United States has had a good deal to say about the rule of law, internationally as well as nationally, especially when he was Vice President. Democratic ideals and the rule of law marched together, in his view, while, in contrast, the dictatorship of the proletariat was notorious for its record of broken treaties.

But more recently, Mr. Nixon has said less about the world rule of law. More important, the United States gives signs of emerging in the front rank of treaty-breakers.

Violations of treaties by states are, of course, not unusual, though they are far less common than often supposed. The great instances of treaty violation or alleged violation tend to concentrate in problems of war and peace. Often the legal issues are contentious. In the Cuban missile crisis, the United States quarantine was widely, though by no means universally, accepted by international lawyers and other governments to be lawful. United States actions in Indochina have been vigorously attacked, and defended, on legal as well as political, strategic and humanitarian grounds. The United States intervention in the Dominican Republic in

1965 was also attacked but weakly defended, for, in law, it was virtually indefensible.

What is relatively new is that in areas which go much less to the heart of a state's security, actual or perceived, and where the law of the matter is clear rather than contentious the United States has increasingly evidenced contempt of the law. This is no partisan matter; the phenomenon is a bipartisan brew of reaction in a Democratically led Congress and indifference in a Republican-held White House.

Four cases in point may be cited. A substantial number of members of Congress and the Senate, under the leadership of Senator Buckley, have indicated that, if the United Nations General Assembly expels the government of the Republic of China in Taipei, they will oppose payment on the current scale of U.N. assessments upon the United States. Secretary of State Rogers and Ambassador Bush are reported to have taken note of this congressional sentiment in the course of their current intensive diplomatic conversations in New York.

The United Nations might well act unsoundly were it to unseat Taipei—prejudging as it would the chances of Formosa's continuing independence of Communist rule—but it would not act unlawfully. However, the United States (whether or not on congressional initiative) threatens or seems to threaten to react illegally to a policy decision with which it, or important elements of its Congress, disagree. Ambassador Bush and Assistant Secretary of State Samuel de Palma have now denied that the government of the United States means to make any such threat, denials which are reassuring. And it may be expected that, if Taipei were to be unseated, the Secretary of State actually would be among the last to support such congressional retaliation. Virtually bankrupt as the U.N. now is by reason of the unlawful defaults of the Soviet bloc and France, a severe reduction of payments imposed by the United States could topple its shaky financial structure altogether. Nevertheless, there is exploitation of a congressional disposition toward the internationally unlawful—with the gravest risks both to the credit of the United Nations and the United States.

A second case goes back 14 months, when George Meany appeared before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee to urge that the United States threaten to withhold its assessed contribution to the International Labor Organization. He proclaimed himself to be fed up with what he saw as increasing Communist dominance of the ILO, of which "the last straw" was the appointment by the ILO's director general of a Soviet national as assistant director general.

The chairman of the subcommittee, Congressman John J. Rooney, was not satisfied with the threat to withhold funds; he insisted that they be withheld. What was the administration's reaction? The representative of the Department of Labor supported Mr. Rooney, while the representative of the Department of State had the guts and good sense to oppose him. With the assent of organized labor and business, Mr. Rooney's viewpoint carried in both Houses. It holds to this day. The United States has failed to pay half its assessment for last year and all of its assessment for this. There is not the least dispute that failure to pay these binding assessments is in violation of U.S. legal obligations; Mr. Rooney himself on the floor of the House stated, in reply to the charge that his policy would cause a default by the United States on an assessment which had already been levied upon it: "There is not any question about that."

After a while, the administration adopted a unified policy in favor of payment of U.S. assessments to the ILO. President Nixon has publicly set out that policy, and the Secretary of State forcefully, if belatedly, has

stated the case for payment in no uncertain terms. Even George Meany has reversed himself and called for payment, thus eliminating the political tool which White House espousal of payment could involve. But the fact remains that the influence of the White House has not really been brought into play. Pressure has not really been exerted. The impression on Capitol Hill is that the President does not care, while Congressman Rooney does; and as long as that impression prevails, so does Congressman Rooney.

A third case arose last week. The Senate has voted to require the United States to resume imports of chrome from Rhodesia. Those imports would violate a universal ban on importation of certain Rhodesian products imposed by binding resolution of the United Nations Security Council. The United States legally could have vetoed that resolution. It voted for it. Pursuant to it, and to his authority under the United Nations Participation Act, President Johnson ordered that imports of chrome from Rhodesia to the United States cease. Again, in this case, there is no controversy about the international law of the matter; it is absolutely clear that the United States is bound not to import Rhodesian chrome and that, if it does, it will violate its obligations under a treaty, namely, the United Nations Charter. Article 25 of the charter provides that: "The Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter."

In this case too, there is the pattern of right-wing congressional initiative (Senators Harry Byrd and John Stennis) coupled with White House compliance. The Secretary of State reportedly voiced opposition to the congressional move when he met with a visiting delegation of the Organization for African Unity. But the President has remained silent, and White House legislative liaison reportedly has not been seen. Senators Fulbright and McGee put up a good but losing fight to give the President an authority he did not seek, the authority to debar chrome imports if U.S. interests or treaty obligation required. They were not helped by the absence during critical votes of Senators McGovern, Bayh, Harris, Muskie, and Jackson, among others. As of this writing, the House Conference Committee has not been appointed or instructed; accordingly, it is not impossible that the Byrd-Stennis amendment will still be stricken.

The fourth example is that of the international aspects of President Nixon's economic program. The surcharge, among other measures, violates United States obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). The closing of the gold window does not comport with United States obligations under the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund (IMF). If the administration, in deciding upon these illegal steps, weighed their negative impact upon the international legal structure, there has been no public sign of it. These measures have, however, aroused less international criticism on legal grounds than on grounds of economics, equity and diplomacy. This in part is because it is widely recognized that, in this case (unlike the foregoing three) the United States has had good reason to act, and because other states had earlier violated their GATT and IMF obligations when economic crisis impelled them to do so. Yet the obdurate diplomatic stance taken not by the diplomats but by the Secretary of the Treasury has tended to dissipate the initial understanding with which U.S. measures were received. Criticism of the lack of law as well as of tact on the U.S. side is now considerable.

Performance of treaty obligations is important if the "credibility" of the United States is important. To be credible is simply to be believed. If the United States per-

sists in violating or threatening to violate undisputed treaty obligations, other states will be the less inclined to credit its fresh commitments. Little more than a year ago, Washington rightly protested Egyptian, if not Soviet, violation of international understandings respecting the stationing of missiles at Suez. Today, the United States seeks at SALT to define and assume mutually binding treaty obligations with the U.S.S.R. of the highest moment. If not the essence of security, then the whole structure of international trade and credit and the whole being and potential of international organization, are bound up with the vitality of treaty obligations. This fundamental of international law and life is so real that it may be hoped that even the realists of the White House staff will recognize—and act upon—it.

ABORTION LAW BRINGS TROUBLE, BRITON ADVISES

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable debate in the Nation about liberalizing State abortion laws.

I should like to call attention to an article which appeared in the Chicago Sun Times quoting the results of abortion law changes in Great Britain.

A member of the British Parliament strongly urges we let American laws stand and he cites results England has experienced with her liberalized abortion laws. I believe the observations of Mr. Norman St. John-Stevass deserve the widest attention.

The Chicago Sun Times article follows:

ABORTION LAW BRINGS TROUBLE,
BRITON ADVISES

(By William C. Harsh Jr.)

A Conservative member of the British Parliament said Sunday that Britain has had "a bad time" with its liberalized abortion law and warned that the effects of such a law here "would be far worse."

Norman St. John-Stevass, who led the fight against Britain's abortion law that took effect in April, 1968, told more than 1,000 persons meeting in the Pick-Congress Hotel that "the law has created an abortion consciousness that puts tremendous pressure on girls to have abortions."

John Cardinal Cody of the Archdiocese of Chicago and Illinois House Majority Leader Henry Hyde (R-Chicago) joined St. John-Stevass in greeting the overflow crowd at the meeting, which was sponsored by Birthright of Chicago and the Illinois Right to Life Committee, both anti-abortion groups.

SOME BAD EFFECTS

St. John-Stevass said legal abortions in Britain, which will exceed 90,000 this year, have strained Britain's limited gynecological facilities, "upset" some medical personnel who feel forced to participate in abortion operations, and allowed "a racket in the private sector in which doctors will perform an abortion on demand if the price is right."

Britain's law allows abortion if two doctors agree that the operation would safeguard the mother's life or health, that the child is likely to be born deformed, or that the operation would benefit other children in the family.

He said the majority of operations are performed to safeguard the mother's life or health, a provision he charged is construed too liberally by some doctors outside Britain's National Health Service. He said that, within the health service, the provisions are strictly adhered to.

SOME ARE CALLOUS

St. John-Stewas said he is opposed to abortion "because I don't like taking life" and charged advocates of liberalized abortion "are callous about this form of life (the fetus)."

He said it is his impression that sentiment is developing against liberalized abortions in this country, and he urged the courts and legislatures in this country to let strict abortion laws stand.

St. John-Stewas conceded that, in general, he is opposed to injecting the law into philosophical questions, but argued that "the law in this sphere does help reinforce moral attitudes."

**AMERICAN CAMPING ASSOCIATION
ENDORSES YOUTH CAMP SAFETY**

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in a special meeting last Friday in Martinsville, Ind., the board of directors of the American Camping Association officially endorsed title 19, the Youth Camp Safety provision of H.R. 7248, the Higher Education Act of 1971.

The American Camping Association, a national and international nonprofit organization, was founded in 1910 by men and women interested in organized camping for boys and girls. Its membership of more than 7,000 men and women represents the leadership of almost every aspect of camping, and these camps are attended by about 4 million children every year.

Since I am the sponsor of title 19, it is especially rewarding to me to have the enthusiastic support of this outstanding organization whose first and foremost aim is to protect the lives and well-being of our youngsters who attend camp.

We expect the Higher Education Act to come before the House any day now, this week or next, and I call upon all my colleagues to give title 19 their wholehearted support.

I herewith submit for the RECORD the letter of endorsement of title 19 from Mr. Ernest F. Schmidt, executive director, and Dr. John J. Kirk, national president, of the American Camping Association.

The letter follows:

AMERICAN CAMPING ASSOCIATION,
Martinsville, Ind., October 15, 1971.

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
Chairman Select Subcommittee on Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DANIELS: The Board of Directors of the American Camping Association enthusiastically endorses HR 7248, The Youth Camp Safety Act.

This Association appreciates the opportunity that has been afforded it to apply the expertise gained in 61 years of experience in

operating youth camps to the formulation of this bill.

We would like to offer to HEW the standards developed by the American Camping Association and the professional skills of its officers and members as we work toward a common goal—healthy, safe, and happy children in our American Camps.

Sincerely,

ERNEST F. SCHMIDT,
Executive Director.
DR. JOHN J. KIRK,
National President.

SOUNDS GOOD, BUT—

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union, the so-called workers' paradise, is still a very long way from remotely resembling what it claims to be. The following editorial from the Indianapolis Ind., Star puts the matter in proper perspective:

SOUNDS GOOD, BUT . . .

A recent press release from the Soviet embassy in Washington contains this glowing excursion into life in the good old USSR: "In the morning the rustling of newspaper pages in the kitchen drowns out the frying and spattering noises of bacon and eggs."

Sounds kind of cozy, doesn't it? But is it really so?

A reliable source of facts about the Soviet economy and Soviet life in general is the New York based Radio Liberty Committee which specializes in research on the USSR through analysis of official Soviet data and specialist journals published in Russia.

A recent RLC report on Soviet agriculture points out that only one per cent of the Soviet Union's cultivated area has more than 28 inches of rainfall a year, compared with 60 per cent in the United States, and that this natural handicap has been immensely aggravated by the Communist hierarchy's refusal to deviate appreciably from a centrally "planned" economy which has made about every mistake in the book so far as agriculture is concerned.

As a result, RLC says, "The approach to what are known as 'scientifically determined norms of consumption'—not to mention what the Soviet consumer would like to eat—is proving to be a very long haul" and "even the reduced targets for meat, eggs and vegetables (well below present U.S. consumption levels) are hardly likely to be reached much before 1990 at the earliest and probably not before the turn of the century at anticipated rates of progress."

The ordinary Soviet citizen's diet in fact consists largely of edible grains and potatoes. Comparing actual consumption of selected foods in the U.S. and USSR in the 1960s, the RLC report shows that the Soviet consumer eats 2.4 times as much bread and grain products and 2.9 times as many potatoes as the average American consumer, while the American consumes 2.4 times as much meat and 3 times as many eggs as his Soviet counterpart. The Russian concept of edible meat, incidentally, includes such things as offal, suet and slaughter fats.

Relating all this to the pay check, it should be remembered that Russian men and women work long hours at wages often no better than welfare payments in the U.S. So their ability to purchase many items, luxuries to them, is strictly limited.

For instance, a U.S. News and World Report study of worktime and purchasing power, based on average wage and price levels in the U.S. and USSR during the '60s, showed that a Soviet worker labored twice as long as his American counterpart to buy a loaf of bread and 9 minutes, compared with 2 minutes, for a pound of potatoes. For the luxury of a pound of butter, he had to work 2 hours and 41 minutes against his U.S. opposite number's 20 minutes and an hour and 48 minutes, compared with 12 minutes, for a dozen eggs.

A pound of roasting beef, likely to be of very different quality in the two countries, could be bought by a U.S. worker after about 14 minutes' work, while a Russian had to put in close to an hour.

No, the occasions Ivan Q. and Mrs. can flip the pages of Pravda or Izvestia to the sound of bacon and eggs "frying and splattering" are not exactly numerous. Neither are the poor souls likely to be able to enjoy such simple pleasures on any kind of regular basis until, as RLC says, there is "a change in the style and content of Soviet leadership" and "a more tangible link is established between effort and reward."

Meanwhile, isn't it sad there are so many around who keep saying America is bad and that everything would be A-okay if only we had a system more like they have in the good old USSR?

**POLITICS AND THE SUPREME
COURT**

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court, established by our forefathers to uphold the Constitution, is currently overworked and undermanned. Two vacancies exist on the Bench. These vacancies should be filled by qualified individuals so that the Nation's highest court can function efficiently and effectively.

Mr. Speaker, the President has the constitutional responsibility to nominate individuals whom he feels are qualified for the Supreme Court. There is no legal definition of "qualified," thus, the President has a wide latitude in this regard. However, on two previous occasions, the President's definition of "qualified" has not necessarily been that of the majority of the Senate. Yet, the fact remains, he may nominate whomever he pleases.

But, Mr. Speaker, I respect the Court, and I feel that it—as an institution—has been degraded by the method that nominees are considered by the administration. Partisan politics and the forthcoming election seem to be the overriding considerations in selecting nominees to the Supreme Court.

It appears that the administration has defined "qualified" as "any person who pleases the South."

I am not opposed to the South or to southerners, but I am opposed to a system of selection which completely disregards the legal ability of a person. Perhaps I am naive but I feel that those appointed to the Supreme Court should: First, be thoroughly acquainted with the

Constitution; second, have a high degree of expertise in legal matters; and third, possess unquestionable integrity.

If the person meets those three qualifications, and if they happen to be southerners and "strict constructionists," then so be it. But, Mr. Speaker, let us look for highly qualified individuals and not be so concerned with the political advantages of such an appointment.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I insert the following article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which appeared in the October 18, 1971, issue of the Washington Post:

NIXON AND MATERIAL FOR COURT

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

President Nixon's astonishing attitude toward the Supreme Court, which has now painted him into a political corner, was revealed Oct. 8 when he met at the White House with top advisers to discuss filling the two vacancies.

Blatantly mediocre prospects were suggested and, consequently, the possibility of disapproval by the American Bar Assn. (ABA) was raised. Mr. Nixon bristled and, starting his unbelieving aides, made clear in uncharacteristically colorful language just what the ABA could go do about it. In short, the President was not going to let questions of legal quality interfere with his political designs for the Supreme Court.

That led to two incontestably mediocre elections, a wave of public and professional repugnance and, finally, a White House decision to rethink the whole business. At the weekend, Mr. Nixon had dug himself into another hole.

At the heart of Mr. Nixon's court troubles is his determination to appoint law-and-order conservatives pleasing to the old segregationist South without regard to ability. That determination is shared, with monomaniacal inflexibility, by Mitchell and Deputy Attorney General Richard Kleindienst.

Kleindienst, in particular, is convinced of boundless political capital flowing from anti-liberal court selections. In charge of recommending judicial appointments, Kleindienst sought out hardliners without worrying about quality.

Two weeks ago, during a session of top administration officials, a fascinating possibility for the court was put forward: Elliot Richardson, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. A former attorney general of Massachusetts, the greatly respected Richardson would be an adornment on the court. Under no conditions, said Kleindienst. The reason: Richardson is too liberal on civil rights and, therefore, would displease the South.

Later, moderate administration officials proposed Edward Levi, president of the University of Chicago. A renowned legal scholar, Levi is a strict constructionist and scarcely a wild-eyed radical. Besides, he would end the absence of any Jews on the court, an absence begun under Mr. Nixon in 1969 for the first time in 53 years. But Levi, too, was vetoed. The reason: He did not fit the law-and-order, anti civil rights formula.

The wholly political nature of the selection process can be seen in the attitude toward a woman justice. Originally, Mr. Nixon had no intention of appointing a woman but, gradually, realized that would be bad politics, indeed.

That set off a mad search for a law-and-order woman judge. Perhaps the best qualified prospect, Judge Shirley Hufstader of the U.S. Court of Appeals in Los Angeles, was immediately ruled out as a liberal Democrat. Finally, Kleindienst hit pay dirt. He gleefully told associates he had found in

California State Appeals Judge Mildred L. Lillie a very tough lady with no use for the Warren court's libertarianism.

The line was finally drawn at conservative Democratic Sen. Robert Byrd of West Virginia, who has never practiced law and is not a member of the bar. He was just too unqualified for Mitchell. The upshot last week was the selection of Mrs. Lillie and Herschel H. Friday of Little Rock, Ark., best known as attorney for anti-integration suits.

Four other names were sent to the ABA for approval, in case trouble developed over Friday or Mrs. Lillie. Until the last minute, the list also included U.S. District Judges Ariin Adams of Philadelphia (who is Jewish) and the highly regarded Frank Johnson of Montgomery, Ala. Finally, however, they were eliminated for being too liberal. Their inclusion might generate a late campaign for them. Thus, the six names sent the ABA were uniform in both mediocrity and acceptability to the segregationist South.

Mr. Nixon was ill-prepared for what happened when those names were published last Thursday. The press and the bar condemned the choices. Even high White House staffers were heartsick. Moderate Republicans wondered out loud whether Mr. Nixon's interest in excellence, meager in many other governmental appointments, had hit bottom. Prominent Jewish Republicans were furious that no Jew was on the list.

The furor forced Mr. Nixon to rethink his position. Although Judges Friday and Lillie definitely had been picked, the White House issued a smokescreen statement that 15 names were still under consideration. So, at this writing, the President must either stick to his undistinguished selections or ignominiously retreat. Once again, playing politics with the Supreme Court has proved the worst politics of all.

TROUBLE IN THE MOJAVE

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of all my colleagues an article in the October issue of Reader's Digest entitled "Trouble in the Mojave." This article deals with the tragic way the Mojave Desert is being despoiled.

The authors described the desert as "a treasure in trouble." They said that under present conditions "it may soon become one vast sandy slum."

This article further illustrates what I told the Members of the House on July 8, 1971, when I introduced the California desert bill. At that time I said:

The overall environment of the California Desert with its ecological, economic and recreational resources is in danger of being destroyed.

I introduced H.R. 9661 to preserve the desert's environment and to satisfy the public demand for new and expanded uses. This bill will provide for the immediate and future protection, development, and administration of the desert's 12 million acres of public land.

I am happy to say that this bill was cosponsored by 27 of my colleagues in the California delegation. It also has the support of the California State Legisla-

ture, the county boards of supervisors, and other public agencies in the desert counties, the National Wildlife Federation, the Sportsmen's Council of Central California, the National Audubon Society, the Desert Protective Council, Inc., and the Sierra Club.

Secretary of the Interior Rogers Morton issued a statement on July 1, 1971, in which he said that because the California desert is "so attractive to so many people, it is in serious trouble and immediate action is needed if the desert as we know it is to survive the mounting pressures being placed upon it." He continued by stating:

There is need for a program that will give us an opportunity to protect the California Desert and its resources.

The Congress must act promptly to enact my bill so that natural, scientific, economic, and social values in the Mojave Desert can be saved. Because as the authors of the Reader's Digest article said, "there is no time to wait."

The article follows:

TROUBLE IN THE MOJAVE

(By Earl and Miriam Selby)

The mystique of California's great Mojave Desert is that of a land bitterly hostile to life, barren, a place where, as some geologists once wrote, they were "20 miles from water, 20 miles from wood, and 40 feet from hell."

Like millions of other Americans, we shared that idea—until we spent time in the Mojave. Then we came to see it as a national treasure unlike anything else in this country.

The problem is people: some 11 million people who live in the cities of southern California just two hours away; people who want to escape, even for a little time; people who want to collect rocks, or hunt, or ride their motorcycles; people who want to build a jetport, or speculate in land, or prospect for mineral riches. The temptation is to believe the Mojave can absorb anything man does to it. To understand why this is not so, you need to see the desert as it really is.

Nature has spread a table of richness in the Mojave. Last spring we walked in fields so fertile they sprout seven cuttings of alfalfa in a single year. We saw lilies 40 feet tall, as well as micro-dot flowers visible only when we were flat on our stomachs. We fished for rainbow trout, fed wild berries to robins.

As many as 25,000 cattle and 140,000 sheep graze on the Mojave. One of every four fryer-chickens in California is desert-bred. The annual worth of minerals taken from the ground is \$170 million.

Even the topography has become an asset. In the last 20 years, dozens of prototypes of military planes have been flight-tested at Edwards Air Force Base, where 45 square miles of dry lake bed make an ideal runway for emergency landings.

But the Mojave is more. William Pitt once called public parks the "lungs of London," and that is what the desert is for America. It offers city residents a chance to breathe, to escape their tensions, to look on land undisturbed by man.

Like a giant scoop, the Mojave stretches westward from the Colorado River to the Sierra Nevada, from the transverse mountains bordering the Los Angeles basin northward into Death Valley. In this vastness—three times as big as Connecticut—the Mojave has an endless panorama of life and moods. The kangaroo rat, for instance, has learned to live here without much water by developing kidneys four times as efficient as man's. Some desert plants have seeds with a coat-

ing that washes off only when rains are heavy enough to assure moist soil for the entire life cycle. Cactus wrens have some inner sense that tells them not to lay eggs in years when there would not be enough spring flowers to support the insects the birds need for their young.

It can be an inhospitable land. A few years ago, hundreds of robins scouring the Mojave for water during a particularly virulent hot spell finally found it, but died on the edge of it, too exhausted to drink. Mojave's sands have been measured at 170 degrees in July. But with an average elevation of 2100 feet above sea level, it also has winter snows. Spring sandstorms can denude cars with a 75-mile-per-hour sandblasting. Vicious thunderstorms set off canyon mud flows that shove giant boulders 600 feet a minute.

None of this keeps people out. In 1940 the Mojave had a population of about 30,000. Today there are ten times that number. The biggest concentration is in the western end's Antelope Valley, but the swelling is also communities as Barstow, Needles and Twentynine Palms. With more people come more cars, more homes, more industry, more pollution, more trash.

Smog is beginning to ravage desert vegetation. In Antelope Valley the underground water is being used up twice as fast as mountain runoff can replenish it. Even the new supplies anticipated from the \$3-billion project bringing water from northern California's Feather River may not meet all the demands. Still, talk of boom abounds. Several years ago, Lockheed invested \$50 million in a new plant for its L-1011 TriStar jets at Palmdale. And the city of Los Angeles has already begun acquiring land for the \$900-million airport it is planning in the same area.

Precisely because the Mojave is so big there has never been any unified plan for controlling developments. Real-estate promotions unacceptable in one county find haven in another. While some subdividers plan conscientiously, with paved streets, deed restrictions and open-space provisions, others use only a bulldozer blade to denote roads to come, someday; and in staking out the smallest possible plots they invite the worst of suburbia's ticky-tack.

There is ample evidence of the results of poor planning. About 80 percent of the Mojave, more than seven million acres, is federal land. In the 1950s, when the pressure was to get public lands onto tax rolls as private property and damn the consequences, the Federal Bureau of Land Management (BLM) auctioned off tens of thousands of the acres under its jurisdiction. Much of it wound up as the pawn in land speculation. People met the "residence" requirements by putting up small shacks, then abandoning them. And they will remain until torn down, because hardly anything rots in the hot, dry air. We saw one canyon road, known locally as "tin-can alley," littered with thousands of cans. They had been used to feed silver miners—90 years ago.

J. Russell Penny, a plain-talking man, took over as the BLM director in California five years ago. He has brought a fresh breath to the agency. But BLM at present is hopelessly outmatched in the desert. Although it still controls nearly three fourths of the Mojave and is charged with maintaining it in public trust for all of us, it has never been given enough men or money to do its job. Visitor-days—a technical term in which the number of visitors is multiplied by their days in the desert—now run about five million a year on BLM lands. Yet, BLM has only enough men to assign one to every million acres. The results are shocking:

Under the best of care, it takes from 25 to 35 years to nurse fragile desert vegetation from poor to good condition. Yet hundreds of thousands of desert acres have been

wantonly chewed up by ORVs—"offroad vehicles" such as motorcycles, dune buggies and jeeps. When cycles roar across BLM lands, they scar the desert for decades. Tank trails left from World War II maneuvers are still clear after 30 years of weathering.

Petroglyphs and pictographs, priceless rock carvings, drawings and paintings made by Indians up to 3000 years ago, have literally been quarried out or, in some cases, shot into shambles by gun addicts using them for target practice.

In Penny's view, it is futile to think that the desert is not going to be used by people; to him, the only question is *how* they will do it. He has spearheaded action to channel ORVs into certain parts of the desert which have already been ruined. Penny also got federal, state and local officials to join in the first comprehensive studies of the desert's recreational uses, which showed that with proper management up to 50 million visitor-days a year could be accommodated. Management would include such things as giving BLM staffers the status of rangers with powers to enforce regulations; federal protection of the desert's irreplaceable resources; and initiation of a conservation and education program. BLM estimates that this work, plus needed long-range data collection and planning, could be done for \$28 million over a five-year period in both the Mojave and its smaller sister desert to the south, the Colorado. Without such procedures, the enormous potential will be lost.

The plan has been submitted to the U.S. Interior Department and Congress. On their decision rests the future of the Mojave. And there is no time to wait.

THE ARMS RACE HAS NOT STOPPED

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, a number of us in this body have made several attempts recently to dramatize a situation which we feel has grave implications for the future peace and security of this country. I refer to the status of our military and defense capabilities vis-a-vis those of the Soviet Union.

We have organized two events in particular which we thought were especially successful, though the press coverage was somewhat disappointing. These were a special order on national defense on August 4, in which 88 Congressmen participated, and a hearing on September 2, of the Special Committee on Defense Priorities, attended by four Congressmen and three distinguished experts in the field of national defense.

Our hope has been to convey to the American people the frightening facts we have uncovered about our military posture, thus changing the atmosphere in which such matters are discussed in this country these days. Hopefully, we could reverse the alarming fashion of berating and deriding all things military, so that it would no longer be expedient to be antidefense.

While the results of our efforts have frequently been discouraging, every now and then something happens which

makes us think we may be getting through.

Such an event occurred when the October 15 edition of Life magazine appeared on the newsstands.

Life's main editorial was an essay entitled "The Arms Race Hasn't Stopped" by Hugh Sidey. Mr. Sidey made several points which I consider important:

Years ago, when our advantage was huge, some degree of unilateral disarmament by us sounded vaguely plausible. But now even Senate Doves grow silent when shown the Russian figures: 550 Soviet ships on the NATO north flank alone; half again as many land based ICBMs as we have; a nuclear sub fleet that will be bigger than ours in a couple of years.

Sidey also points out that a "really major Soviet breakthrough" is expected by our top experts. It seems that the Soviets are spending far more on research and development than is necessary for parity with us. And our spy satellites are seeing objects and construction in Russia that none of our experts can explain.

Mr. Speaker, I am familiar with these points, as are those of my colleagues who have done research in this area. There are many other, more disturbing facts Mr. Sidey could have discussed. But the chief significance of the article is the very fact that it appeared in Life, which can hardly be characterized as a tool of the military-industrial complex.

We are excited about this breakthrough. I would like for all of my colleagues to read this remarkable article and I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

THE ARMS RACE HASN'T STOPPED

Back in 1962, the story goes, New York attorney John McCloy was assigned by President Kennedy to make sure that the Russians followed through on Nikita Khrushchev's promise to remove their missiles and bombers from Cuba. Not long after, McCloy and Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister V. V. Kuznetsov were sitting on a rail fence at McCloy's country place in Stamford, Conn. "We will live up to this agreement," said the intense, athletic Russian. "But we will never be caught like that again."

In a few months there began in Russia a program of arms buildup and development that, except for a few pauses, has been accelerating for almost a decade. Even as arms limitation talks went on, the Soviet Union has been producing more new weapons and at a faster rate than any nation in peacetime in history.

There is a pressing awareness today in Washington about the consequences of the Soviet effort. It does not dominate thinking or even catch the imagination in the way China does (Henry Kissinger had another of his finest hours last week announcing his latest trip to Peking). But it lurks naggingly in the background. In Kissinger's own strategic shop in the White House, for example, they calculate that we have only one more year to try for an agreement at the SALT talks. If none comes and the Russians continue their buildup, they say, in all likelihood we will be forced to rejoin the arms race.

Years ago, when our advantage was huge, some degree of unilateral disarmament by us sounded vaguely plausible. But now even Senate doves grow silent when shown the Russian figures: 550 Soviet ships on the NATO north flank alone; half again as many land-based ICBMs as we have; a nuclear sub fleet that will be bigger than ours in a couple

of years. Pentagon officials say they hesitate to release all the new intelligence on Soviet arms for fear of credibility problems. A new program of Soviet missile tests, for example, has just been detected.

The Pentagon's research and development director, John Foster, paces agitatedly in his office and tells visitors that new developments in Russian weaponry are now coming so fast and are so complex that it is difficult to know how to tell the press and the public about them. They run across the board, the Pentagon charts show; in missiles, planes, ships, undersea warfare, radar. Foster has gone to Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird's office so frequently over the past weeks with fresh news about Soviet advances that finally he stopped and compiled a list. It had more than 20 items on it. Laird and his men then ordered a detailed study of the Russian buildup of the past ten years and a new assessment of where we stand.

Laird, Foster, the admirals and the generals expect to hear of a really major Soviet breakthrough one day soon. The Soviet military research and development budget is known to have been extremely high for years, exceeding anything necessary for mere parity with us. The Pentagon thus considers a development comparable to Sputnik in 1957 or the gigantic H-bomb of 1961 to be a virtual certainty. Suppose, suggest the experts, that one day our satellite pictures reveal in sequence how a high-powered laser beam developed by Russia instantly cuts the wings off a jet bomber? Or, they say, maybe we wake up some morning to find that the Soviets have assembled a fleet of hundreds of surface and undersea ships out in the Pacific, capable of preventing America from sending a land army beyond the shores of North America.

In such an event, Pentagon worriers say, a violent political reaction here would turn doves into hawks and hawks into vampires. Nixon's defense budget cutbacks would be denounced as blind irresponsibility, and a frenzy of arms spending would be touched off.

This kind of thinking has brought a new somberness in some levels of Washington officialdom. And the military men who go to suburbs, luncheon clubs and campuses report more receptive audiences now for their descriptions of expanding Soviet power. Not long ago their claims were being contested, even ridiculed.

Even the men most concerned in the Pentagon concede that the United States, with its elaborate mix of weapons, still holds a slight edge over the Soviet Union. Our technology still has a two-year lead. We have begun work on new undersea weapons and a new long-range bomber. Merely to keep up with the Russians, Laird is now planning to seek an increase in defense spending for the next fiscal year, just when everyone else talks of defense cutbacks, reduced taxes and peace dividends. But grim surprises could upset even this kind of planning. At this very hour there are photographs from our unsleeping aerial cameras, say intelligence sources, showing objects and construction in Communist territory that so far have baffled all the experts.

For the last two and a half years Laird has begun each week with his Armed Forces Policy Council, gathering all the top civilian and military men around his conference table to chart the broad objectives. Inevitably, Vietnam led the list. Then one morning a few months ago the group assembled, stood up for the arrival of Laird, settled back in their chairs and scooped up the agendas laid out on the blue felt before them. The first topic on the list was the balance of strategic forces. Vietnam was fourth. It has been that way in Laird's office almost every Monday morning since then.

BAY AREA CHAPTER OF NATIONAL BUSINESS LEAGUE

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, during the 1970's a major thrust of the black effort for freedom, justice, and equity will be in the direction of translating the civil rights victories of the past decade into the kind of concrete economic achievements that will make the attainment of these goals possible.

One of the more notable thrusts being taken in these efforts has been mobilized by the National Business League. The league has its main offices here in Washington, and there are energetic branches all over the country. Behind the leadership of Mr. C. J. Patterson, the Bay Area chapter of the National Business League has begun an ambitious series of programs in my congressional district and surrounding communities.

I have received from Mr. Patterson a brief summary of the aims and objectives of the Bay Area chapter, and I would now like to insert them into the RECORD so that my colleagues can also see the nature of this impressive program:

NATIONAL BUSINESS LEAGUE—BAY AREA CHAPTER

THE NATIONAL BUSINESS LEAGUE: ITS PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES, AND GOALS

The NBL program is essentially a program of community organization and coordination of management and technical assistance primarily directed toward the disadvantaged minority owners and prospective owners of small businesses located initially in the Bay Area. The purpose which it seeks to accomplish is to increase the management skills and business performance of Black and other minority-group business owners. The following is a detailed description of the Chapter in terms of its general purpose, objectives and scope.

A. The general purpose of the NBL Bay Area chapter

The Chapter is a concentrated effort to mobilize critical resources within both the affluent and disadvantaged communities for the purpose of marshaling a comprehensive attack upon the complex set of obstacles to the achievement of business success by disadvantaged persons. The ultimate purposes of the Chapter basically are the same as those of earlier NBL Projects—i.e., to encourage and stimulate the growth and expansion of businesses located within minority communities, to increase business entry on a sound basis with increased probabilities for success, to develop the most viable of such businesses into sources of gainful employment for minority-community residents, and to develop the owners into responsible community leaders who can plan the economic growth and development of their communities.

A major difference between the current Project and earlier NBL Projects, however, is that the current Project envisages the establishment of a local development corporation (LDC) in each of the target cities which will (1) make possible a more comprehensive and effective program for minority economic development that has been true to-date; (2) combine all the components of economic development into one program in order to

achieve the most synergistic effect as regards minority economic development; (3) foster the growth and expansion of existing and new indigenous business enterprises, and attract new industry from outside the minority communities which will create jobs and reduce or eliminate minority underemployment and unemployment; (4) constitute a focal point for the mobilization of minority community financial and other development resources, and for external financial and other development resources; and (5) provide the means for minority community residents to invest in themselves and their individual and collective destinies, since these corporations will be community-owned, community-controlled, and community-oriented.

As an indirect result, the project will probably strengthen the program and operations of the National Business League and its local chapters within the target cities. The accomplishment of this indirect result, however, is not to be confused with the project's ultimate purpose, although this purpose is very similar to that of the NBL. It is hoped that each NBL chapter in assisting in the implementation of this project will devote more attention to the ways and means through which they can attract more members and develop more substantial funds for local operations.

The NBL has had a reasonable degree of success in conducting the kinds of activities as set forth under previous projects, despite the inadequacy of funds provided for that project. We hope, through the implementation of current projects, to build on that success, to attract the membership required to provide additional financial resources, to achieve a greater degree of organization effectiveness, and to progress further toward the goal of each chapter being able to support required minority business development services from its own budget.

B. The chapter's objectives

There are four major objectives sought by the Chapter:

1. To effect economic development in minority community through providing a focal point for combining resources for a stated goal;
2. To identify, evaluate, and develop business opportunities within the management capacity and financial resources of the community and its LDC;
3. To collect, catalogue, and evaluate information about franchises, dealerships and distributorships, including those in the SBA program, and to disseminate such information through the LDC as a reference center; and
4. To conduct research and prepare business feasibility studies so as to provide up-to-date economic, commercial and business information in target areas.

C. The scope of the project

The program can begin operation on a one to ten cities basis. Each office would be staffed by a minimum of three persons and would conduct to a large extent the same activities that are conducted under existing programs, with the exception that the Local Development Corporation would be the core of their activities as well as the core of economic development within the minority community.

These local staffs would have comprehensive back-up, in terms of research, marketing management, and technical expertise, from the national office of NBL. This would include business proposals and joint ventures with white industry—already packaged and actively soliciting minority entrepreneurs to implement them. The services of the NBL's Council of Economic Advisors will also be a strategic adjunct in this area.

Local project offices would be responsible to a National Director. The National Di-

rector would have as his immediate back-up a management and technical assistance staff which would be prepared to render specific or general management and technical assistance in any of six areas. The areas are:

1. Economic Base Studies—Determining the development potentials of target areas and projections of employment, population, income, land requirements, housing, and public facilities.

2. Retail Business—Feasibility, timing and priorities for downtown and inner-city retail development, marketing feasibility for shopping centers, and marketing site studies for drug, food and other retail outlets.

3. Industrial Development—Marketing and economic analyses of potentials for industrial development and the ability to make cost analyses of specific proposed business projects.

4. Financing Business Development—Ascertaining public and private financial sources and acquiring funds for the local development corporation in order to make it effective.

5. Manpower Training—Development of needed skills, including the managerial capabilities required for specific business enterprises.

6. Inner-City Redevelopment—Studies of the need for public improvement in target area neighborhoods and subsequent investment possibilities. This should encompass housing and commercial resources needed to redeem and sustain rebuilt areas. This will include the economics of large-scale developments, to include locational analysis, cost and timing of infrastructure investment, employment and tax status potential, as well as pricing and financial policies.

Such assistance would consist of and involve fund raising, financing, legal matters, one-to-one counseling, business seminars, and economic development workshops conducted to deal with general as well as specific problems. Outside specialists and consultants would be used where deemed appropriate.

When the local development corporation takes on a project—whether in the retail, industrial, or manufacturing field, regardless of the excellence (however desirable) of the product or service—the project must be able to market and sell that product in order to make a profit. But modern marketing and sales techniques are almost unknown to most minority businessmen. Therefore, the national office will provide market research—e.g., what products are needed in the market, where these products can be marketed, how they can be marketed and at what profitability. The national staff would be thoroughly familiar with the latest marketing techniques, such as the Market Dominance theory. This information would then be made available to the local development corporation staff and then to the community. The national staff will assist the minority business in marketing and distributing its product and/or service. The local and national offices will also provide management and technical assistance. The local staff will have access through the national staff to paid and volunteer consultants where needed.

The objective is to educate the minority community to understand the increasingly complex mechanics and economics of the business and commercial world in order to be able to function effectively in that world. Only in this way can businesses and projects be established which contribute meaningfully to the economic development of the minority community. NBL will orient them to and equip them with modern management and financial tools which will permit them to function as creative, efficient and effective participants in the free enterprise system.

The ultimate objective is to enable minority peoples to own and operate profitable business enterprises which employ other mi-

nority people and serve both the minority and white communities, thereby giving minorities a participatory role in the economic life of the nation. Products and services are important, but equally important is management, for, in the long run, it is the management of companies which creates the base for competition with each other.

A third function of the national office will be research and development. This entails initiating research as well as acting upon request. This information will then be made available to the local development corporation's staff, as well as disseminated through NBL publications as a regular service. Actual packaging of proposals will most often take place as a result of cooperative actions between the local staff, the national staff, and the involved portion of the community.

The research and development function would identify areas of opportunity in order to be alert to marketing and distribution problems and opportunities, as well as to any management and technical assistance necessary in developing a particular project. The research and development function will likewise be capable of utilizing modern management and financial tools such as EDP, CPM, firm valuation theories, value of money theory etc., and be familiar with the economic as well as the political environment.

The objective of all these functions is to find, analyze, and package opportunities in sales, distribution, marketing, and manufacturing for the establishment of business and projects owned and managed by minority-group members. The policy is to encourage and assist minority businessmen to move into the economic mainstream of America by making available to them attractive business packages involving new or existing enterprises. If deemed necessary, a business model will be established.

The fourth function would be the establishment of a community relations department. Sound community relations require the recognition of mutual expectations of NBL and the community in which both must operate, as well as the existence of mutual trust and respect. In addition, effective communication is a requisite for getting things accomplished. Its basic purpose is to establish and insure a favorable climate in which the community is willing and able to satisfy the legitimate needs of minority businessmen. NBL chapters and the LDC's are an integral part of this program—both as participants and as recipients.

The minority businessman has been short of capital, management experience, and general know-how. These reside in the white business community. Representatives of white business and industry have expressed a desire to transfer these to minority businessmen, and the effectiveness of our community relations staff will have a definitive impact on whether this transfer occurs at all and, if so, whether it is accomplished effectively.

The minority businessman must be made receptive to new ideas, a new jargon, and the assistance he vitally needs. The white community must be made aware of the unique problems facing minority businessmen or the communication gap will widen instead of closing. Further, it must be tied into a meaningful program that assures equally meaningful results. The community relations component must work closely with the economic development programs of NBL and SBA in order for the programs to have maximum effect.

In addition to creating a favorable climate for minority businessmen, the community relations group will assist them in pooling resources, concentrating efforts, and establishing a "bank" of management experience in the local community; make important technical data and information available through publications; run training conferences; hold tradeshows; and assist minority

and white businessmen as well as communities in a variety of ways.

SBA PROGRAMS

The NBL will maintain close contact with the National Office of the SBA, and keep informed of any new programs or directives. These will then be disseminated to the local project directors and chapter presidents. The primary purpose of this relationship is:

1. To thoroughly understand and interpret to the disadvantaged business community the "rules of thumb" and interpretations given to the guidelines for administering the 502 and other minority assistance programs;

2. To follow-up loan applications for disadvantaged persons who experience inordinate delays before receiving decisions;

3. To assist the SBA in developing and providing management assistance programs suited to the needs of the disadvantaged community; and

4. To make the SBA aware of any alleged grievances which members of the disadvantaged community may have about any aspect of any SBA program and to assist in the solution of these grievances or misunderstandings.

SLIPPING DEFENSE CAPABILITY

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I would like to insert the major portions of a speech made by Maj. Gen. George J. Keegan, deputy chief of staff, Air Force Logistics Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base delivered to the Fourth Joint Services Logistics Data Exchange for Inertial Systems Meeting which took place in Los Angeles, Calif., on August 2 and 3 this year.

The general's talk goes far beyond the field of logistics to encompass important facets of economics, history, technology, and the continued massive Soviet military buildup. Pointing to the decline of our forces relative to the Soviet Union in the last 10 years, the general states that:

As a professional military man I find it quite incomprehensible that the security of the free world and 3,000 years of the works of man should now rest on such a slim margin of assurance.

One need not be a professional military man to feel a sense of growing disbelief and anxiety at our failure to adequately respond to the growing Soviet strategic threat. Just last week Secretary of Defense Laird brought to our attention the fact that the Soviets will catch the United States in number of Polaris-type ballistic nuclear submarines in 1973, 1 year ahead of the intelligence estimates cited by Secretary Laird last February.

Secretary Laird also pointed out that the Soviets have recently been testing SS-11's with three warheads, the Soviets have approximately 900 of these Minuteman-type missiles, have tested a longer range submarine weapon, their current submarine missile can reach practically any point in the United States within 7 minutes when fired on a depressed trajectory, and have been testing a new ABM weapon.

The talk by General Keegan follows:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS "LOGISTICS SUPPORT OF INERTIAL SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY" BY MAJOR GENERAL GEORGE J. KEEGAN, JR.

Today, for the first time, industry and the commercial airlines have joined with governmental agencies to review the status of US inertial systems technology—from its most expensive point of view, namely that of logistic support. This is as it should be.

America is now caught up in a technological crisis of great dimension. Since what is happening to inertial technology is common to the larger problems, I suspect that what we do here collectively may help to point the way out—by permitting the nation to do more with less.

I am not certain that my limited knowledge of inertial systems engineering and design necessarily qualifies me to be your keynote speaker. On the other hand, I have had a long peripheral relationship with Research and Development—including a supporting role in nuclear detection, thermonuclear technology, and ICBM decisions, the establishment of a separate command for R&D in the Air Force, the U-2, the SR-71, and the authoring of several pre-Sputnik works on Soviet Science, R&D, and technical education.

Today I am involved in the logistics support planning for weapon systems and inertial subsystems. Therefore, my frame of reference shall be on the larger historical relationships and perspectives which influence our work today. I have had to rely on some of our better logistic engineers at Newark (AGMC) for specific comments on inertial technology. My comments may appear long on philosophy—that's what Air Force Generals do—and short on the engineering end.

My message to you today is made up of a few simple propositions.

First, we are riding on the declining crest of the greatest sustained period of technological growth in mankind's history. Our developments in inertial navigation are having a substantial impact upon the growth and development of the United States economy, upon our venture into space, and upon the improvement of implements for the defense of the free world.

Secondly, our great technological base is not keeping pace with the external threat and internally, our technological futures are now being circumscribed by competing economic demands and the reorienting of our social values.

Thirdly, our unrequited romance with design for the sake of performance and undisciplined neglect of logistics support has brought us to the point where the life cycle costs of maintaining our weapons systems far exceed the original costs of their acquisition. As a result, US industry and defense are pricing themselves out of the defense competition from abroad.

As a consequence, we can no longer afford that which we need in order to assure a comfortable margin of national security. Our experience with inertial navigation systems seems to provide a classic example of the problem at hand.

Lastly, we now have an unsurpassed opportunity to exploit the costly errors of the past and for converting the liability into the pace setter for the solution of some of our more serious technology related logistic support problems.

Inertial technology—as with much of defense technology—must now be made simpler, more reliable, and cheaper to maintain. I think we have a reasonable understanding of what is now needed—and we have some perceptions of how to go about it. All that is left to overcome is our own intellectual and bureaucratic inertia. However, neither of the latter are to be underrated.

Also I am especially concerned about the pervasive moral overtones one hears about profit taking—especially from those in gov-

ernment charged with large acquisition programs. There was much of it in evidence at last night's reception. In times of difficulty we are sometimes quick to find fault and probably a bit emotional if not indiscriminate in our assignment of responsibility for our larger ills. Witness the Ivy League's recent dissolution of its ROTC detachments along with efforts to end defense sponsored fundamental and applied research in the nation's top universities and their associated laboratories. I would offer a simple reminder that profit motive and incentives have been, and continue to be, a most powerful force for freedom and economic growth.

More often, it is our neglect of profit incentives and their proper administration which should be the target of our approbation.

Our challenges here today is to share our experience, profit from our mistakes, and concert our management efforts in such a way as to restore the economic credibility of our technological industrial base—by setting the pace in the field of inertial systems development.

Let me start with the first of the larger propositions which circumscribe our technology.

In today's world, freedom, economic health, and survivability are interdependent if not indivisible. The foundations of each, in my judgment, are under assault as never before. Our futures are being circumscribed increasingly by important "characteristic" compulsions—compulsions which can only be ignored at our peril. These compulsions relate: to the strategic environment in which we live; to the loss of momentum in the great American logistic and economic revolution; and thirdly, to the options or choices open to us in the future.

Trends in the strategic environment are not favorable.

The age of American plenty—of American military—and economic world dominance is coming to an end. Yet, war and its prevention continue to be the central preoccupation of the major powers. Defense continues to take and demand the lion's share of our budget, our human and intellectual resources, as well as our materiel treasure. While the world has been made a much better place to live in—in large part due to US efforts since World War II—I believe it to be a more dangerous place than ever.

The overwhelming strategic superiority of the United States of the 50's and early 60's—which provided us with a great margin of security and diplomatic leverage is now gone. The delicate and fragile balance must now be measured with a "micrometer."

As a professional military man I find it quite incomprehensible that the security of the free world and 3000 years of the works of man should now rest on such a slim margin of assurance. Hope has never been a sound premise for the ultimate security of nations. It takes a great deal more.

For sheer size and rate of investment in defense, the Soviet technological base and effort are now greater than our own. Investment in the development, test, and production of modern weapons of war exceeds that of the US by a substantial margin. In sheer megatonnage throw weight capability; in numbers of advanced fighter prototypes—the Soviets have long since surpassed the United States. Soon the numbers of their Polaris-type submarines will probably surpass our own.

The geographic implications are demonstrably serious. Soviet nuclear submarines now sit astride most of the world's major logistic waterways. The Eastern Mediterranean is now becoming a Soviet "mare nostrum." Throughout the eastern littoral of Africa, the Indian subcontinent, the Indian Ocean, and the Sea of Japan, the story is a similar one. And the Soviet economic and military penetration of the Persian Gulf area

and its sources of Middle Eastern oil is no less distressing.

The Soviet investment in support of Hanoi—from a conflict point of view—appears to have been quite profitable. The United States has been demoralized, her people divided, and her councils of defense become more uncertain. A vast public debt and down turn in our economy has forced us to look inward. And we have been forced to cut our investment in defense technology to the bone. It is a challenging strategic climate to say the least. And it is one which invites greater irresponsibility and risk taking on the part of our opposition.

The picture of the economic environment is also a spotty one.

Professional economists know only too well that American prosperity and a strong defense posture have gone hand in hand. Thus, at a moment when our values are under great assault, a reordering of priorities has fallen upon us rather sharply.

These trends are part of the great price for responsibly trying to keep the world free from aggression while trying to sustain the most enduring social revolution in history. Somewhere in the process, we seem to have lost sight of the need to keep our expenses in balance with our profit and investment margins. Possibly my meaning can be clarified by historical analogy.

According to some social scientists, we see in England—separated by some forty to fifty years—much of what may be happening here at home.

England as the seat of the first great industrial revolution became and remained for many years the hub of the world economic universe. Under the aegis of the "Pax-Britannica," America prospered, flowered, and emerged into the Twentieth Century as did the once viable British empire. Whatever the historians may claim for the British empire and its colonial character, it is also to be noted that the underdeveloped peoples of the world achieved more materiel, medical, educational, and psychological gain under the brief span of that empire than they had in the previous two thousand years. It was also out of the same wellsprings of industrial empire that the first formally organized social conscience emerged on a national scale. And out of that strength, the tide of conflict was turned in World War I and the bastion of freedom in Europe held through the initial and decisive phases in World War II.

For England, the cost and sacrifice have taken an enormous economic toll. With wisdom and foresight, the British met what has been called the revolution of rising expectations in the developing countries by voluntarily granting independence to her colonies, a series of actions which exacted a further economic toll. We see it today in all its forms and manifestations. Finally, a point was reached when England could no longer sustain herself in defense and in fulfilling the domestic needs of human welfare. These can be paid for only out of profits earned in the world's free markets.

And in the process, "Fabian Socialism" struck further blows at the whole philosophical foundation of the very profit and property concepts which had nurtured the industrial revolution and mankind's two greatest centuries of human progress.

The lesson is one which we must understand. When you cease being competitive in those markets, you retrench or die—you cannot borrow or tax your way to freedom indefinitely. You must pay your way through economic growth and you must protect that growth by balancing the needs of society, those of national survival and the investment stimuli in improved productivity which assure your ability to afford that which you need most.

Defense planners and suppliers have a very special obligation to assure that their demands are necessary, prudent, and do not im-

pinge negatively on the nation's economic growth.

I believe there are some parallels to be drawn from England's experience.

In America, we have spent enormous sums in the defense and strengthening of the free world. Was it all worthwhile? And could we afford it all?

Morally, the answer must be in the affirmative. Whether we could afford it all or whether we spent more than was required is a more difficult question.

Asia today, as a consequence of America's great sacrifices, knows more hope and freedom from want than at any time possibly in the past one or two thousand years. In one of the great Christian acts of modern history, Japan was rekindled into a responsible experimental democracy. The line against brutal aggression was held in Korea. And from the ashes of that war, a great new, free country has arisen. The same can objectively be said for our experiment with Nationalist China—a new viable and self-sustaining economic democracy. In the Philippines, which we granted independence, a brutal communist-inspired insurgency was defeated.

In Southeast Asia—where I recently spent nearly two years as Chief of Air Force Intelligence—I have seen what may, in time, come to be judged as an achievement no less worthy of history's judgment.

Those of you who have marched the battlefields of Europe and Asia and seen the re-birth of prostrate economies and the building of new nations such as Japan and Korea can only recall and compare. The comparison is a striking one. And it is from such firsthand perspectives that we should judge the achievement in Southeast Asia.

However, the greater economic lesson in all this tends to be submerged: since World War I, defense has been the primary stimulus to this nation's industrial and technological growth. Since the free world's economic health depends in large measure upon the stability and growth rate of America's economy—it seems to be that some restraint in our "off again on again" approach to defense investments is in order.

Meanwhile, less is what we must learn to live with.

Now that I have disposed of our declining strategic and economic futures, I would like to mention two other problems likely to influence defense technology. One relates to the quality of our intelligence about the opposition, and the other relates to shifts in the balance of power.

As a somewhat cynical and intimate observer of the national intelligence scene since World War II, I would judge that we have been characteristically inconsistent in our projections of the threat. The constancy of Soviet purpose is sometimes clouded by the outpourings of hope which characterize our zealous search for safer and more peaceful ways. Bureaucratic arguments over whose threat is the least exaggerated have tended, in my judgment, to obscure the central dynamic thrust and conflict-oriented purpose underlying Soviet ambitions.

We have and shall continue to underestimate the basic thrust and rate of Soviet investment in military technology so long as the threat assessment process drives the national defense budget as hard as it does.

Despite our best efforts to the contrary, limitations inherent in the arts of forecasting will remain. The factor of surprise is therefore likely to stay with us. And, threat projections are not likely to push technology as they have in the past.

My second comment relates to the shifting balance of power.

We have failed often to perceive another essential of Soviet behavior. It has long been a principal tenet of Soviet doctrine—first documented by Raymond Garthoff and Nathan Leites—that the Soviet leadership is slow to be provoked by other than power vacuums. A power vacuum left unfilled is

regarded as a threat, hence Soviet opportunism. As we move out—they will move in—unless what is in between can stand on its own.

Our experiences of the sixties seem to bear this out.

The U.S. no doubt hoped, by its nuclear restraint of the sixties, to induce a like behavior on the part of the Soviets. The impact on U.S. nuclear and technical superiority is now a matter of record. Mr. Laird has recently described this situation thusly: "We have shown our restraint in many ways. Unfortunately, it has not been matched by the other side."

Today, far too much nonsense is spoken about "parity," "near parity," and "stalemate."

I would submit rather, that there are no static situations in today's power relationships. There is stability only in the dynamics of progress and competition.

In fact, I see little that smacks of "stalemate" in what Soviet science and technology are doing. The USSR is surpassing the U.S. rate of progress and investment in many sectors of militarily related technology.

Today, nothing is safe or absolutely secure—neither the submarine, nor the bomber, nor the missile. Modern sensor technology is putting an end to the protective invisibility of the ocean depths. The bomber and the missile are no longer safe unless "cocked," at the ready, and fully prepared to fight their way through the most modern of defenses. So it is with the modern submarine. It too must fight to survive.

Those of us who lived through the discovery in the late 1950s of the Soviet surface to air missile threat to our high flying bombers, the discovery of the USSR's first operationally deployed Soviet antiballistic missile system over ten years ago, and those who have come face to face with a Soviet nuclear attack submarine technology superior in some respects to our own—need few reminders about the fragility of deterrence—be it strategic, tactical, or diplomatic.

What then does all of this mean for the future?

It means many things. It means retrenchment, cut back, slow down, and others doing more for themselves. It means a diversion of attention from a world which is certainly no less hostile than any previously known and probably considerably more dangerous.

It means that American dominance in the world market place is declining—with Japan, Eurasia, and Western Europe becoming highly competitive centers of productivity and international commerce.

It may mean a slow down in some areas of defense sponsored research and development—which since before World War I has been a principal trigger and stimulant to our economic growth and viability as the bastion of world freedom.

It means a continuing reduction and phasing down of our armed forces.

And it means a paring of our defense thinking. Consequently, the technological and logistic resources so essential to the maintenance and support of our armed forces, as well as those of our allies throughout the free world are being affected.

And now, for my last bit of philosophizing before getting down to the hard core discipline of inertial systems. Our futures are being circumscribed by another negative trend. Dr. Wernher von Braun, in a recent speech to the Aviation/Spacewriters Association in Washington, gave it expression when he said:

"I speak of the climate of irrational hostility that seems to be growing in this country—especially among our college and university students—regarding science and technology."

The "chronic misunderstanding . . . concerns the role that science and technology play in the development of society and the economy . . . We are not dealing with a rational body of opinion. We face a militant, highly emotional, even fanatical segment of

the population which has seized upon a valid and good cause, but which will accept no facts, no reasoning that run counter to its own fixed ideology. The anti-science/technology people are demanding that we pull the plug on modern civilization in the belief that somehow we shall all be better off in a more primitive state. . . ."

"But it isn't the young people, the students, who are really to blame for this attitude of hostility to science and technology. They are simply misguided by certain social philosophers, cultural historians, and the like, whose teachings and published works provide only a very lopsided view of science and technology pictures as causing the downfall of man."

"When you teach impressionable and idealistic youth that the rational, logical, puritanical approach to life is bankrupt, and that technology serves only to erode the quality of life, you are bound to ring responsive bells in many minds of the generation that has never known the privation, the want, the poverty of some older generations."

After condemning the negative work of Lewis Mumford and Arnold Toynbee who view all space technology as a waste of society's "slender surplus product," Dr. von Braun concluded: "The Mumfords, the Toynbees, the Charles Relches, and others of similar persuasion, who are teaching the young suspicion and hatred of science and technology apparently do not realize the incalculable harm they may do to the very society they wish to preserve and spiritually enrich."

"It seems strange that America is about the only nation in the world where technology and science are held in such low repute. All the so-called have-not countries in Africa and Asia are straining their limited resources to gain what some of our students seem bent on destroying. The older European countries would give their eye teeth to have our technological capabilities. The Soviets are especially envious, and frequently announce they will surpass the United States . . . in . . . technology."

Last night I listened to a precise example of what Dr. Wernher von Braun was talking about. The Draper Laboratories at MIT have been responsible for virtually all of the truly significant advancement of inertial system technology since World War II. Yet this laboratory, which remains the primary source of much of the nation's inertial technology, has come very close to being dismantled by the voices of dissent.

I have but one fear—that in turning inward our society will fall to make the concentrated material investment in technological growth—which I believe necessary to the future viability of our society.

The Soviet Union is making that material investment. We are not. Hence the ethic is being placed at greater risk—in my judgment—than at any time in the past.

There are some who still have doubts about the scale of the USSR's material investment. However, there seems to be less room for doubt that the world's greatest copycats may now be reaching a point where, just maybe, they have a thing or two to teach us about reliability, repairability, and maintenance engineering in general.

A few years ago, we thought it a great waste for the Soviets to be training so many aeronautical engineers. Now we know why. Today, the Soviet insist that all personnel involved in the management of aircraft design, acquisition, development, or logistic support be qualified as aeronautical engineers before they are allowed to manage.

Today, the results of such over investment in talent are becoming obvious.

Soviet front line fighters rank very high on reliability, maintainability, and simplicity. In fact, a MIG-21 ranks as one of the most trouble-free aircraft in any operational inventory today. In the area of corrosion control or freedom from corrosion, it probably ranks first among the world's aircraft.

Soviet management today insists upon a degree of reliability, maintainability, ruggedness, and simplicity unheard of in the free world. Successive generations of weapons frequently have a standardization of design and installed equipment which contributes significantly to the reduction of logistic support and maintenance costs.

For instance, one of the USSR's latest fighter interceptors—comparable in performance to the best American designs—incorporates wing sections, horizontal stabilizers, vertical fins, speed brakes, pylons, and other systems such as the canopy, landing gear, hydraulic systems, engines, and avionics that are virtually identical with those used on several earlier proven and tested Soviet aircraft. The result is that by using old and reliable components, the Soviets are required to design little more than a new fuselage. Yet, the new design out-performs by a wide measure any previous aircraft from which its parts were taken.

Thus, by using proven off-the-shelf components and adapting only such new state-of-the-art developments as are necessary, the Soviets have been able to increase performance at low cost and to achieve acceptable trade-offs between performance and logistic supportability.

Better still, they are able to reduce lead time for development by one-third to one-half over that required in the United States.

The Soviet approach to no-nonsense management and design for logistic supportability is one that looks more attractive with each passing day. When coupled with the use of design competition, extensive prototyping, the maintenance of a hot production and design base, and the systematic modernization of their operational inventory, the Soviets appear to have moved from "Potemkin" place to Park Avenue within the span of one generation.

As for the ethic being salvaged for future generations—I believe this time it is technology—and not the "preachers"—who will show the way. For I know of no major problems confronting society today from the moral to the ecological or those of developing affordable life styles which are not principally dependent upon technology for practical solutions.

I agree with Dr. Killian—recently retired Chairman of the Board of MIT—that in turning away from Science and Technology, society is losing the only road to a better life and national security. We are now at the fork in the road. Dr. Killian believes, as I do, that society will choose the right path. However, someone will have to show the way.

There is no reason why those of you in the inertial business cannot help to show part of the way—by setting the pace.

For each man who advances the state of the art—there are fifty in administrative overhead—whose only real contribution is to added costs. For each ten companies there is a market for the product of but two. If, in order to preserve the fifty and the ten, we place the one or two who are creative and productive beyond the reach of the marketplace—we will not keep pace. We have some hard decisions to make.

Let us not forget what has happened in England. It can happen here.

A GLIMMER OF HOPE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the veteran newsman and columnist of the Chicago Tribune, Willard Edwards, pro-

vided in his column of October 2, what could well be another example of the vicious and oppressive treatment accorded faithful State Department employees who dare to rock the boat, thereby incurring the wrath of the free-wheeling, unrestrained officialdom of that Department. According to Mr. Koczak, a talented Foreign Service officer who reported security violations on the part of his superior and was later selected out of the Service, not only does State have the authority to oust an employee of the Foreign Service without proper grievance recourses, but their bad recommendations to prospective employers can haunt a former State employee who seeks later employment.

The second column by Mr. Edwards conveys a glimmer of hope as information on State's past abuses are slowly being brought to public attention.

I include at this point the two above-mentioned columns of October 2 and 14 by Mr. Edwards in the RECORD:

FIRED U.S. AIDE GETS SOME ADVICE

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON.—A chilling insight into brutal and arbitrary methods of the federal bureaucracy has just been provided in sworn testimony before a government grievance board.

The board has been holding hearings for many months in virtual secrecy. It is examining the charges of John D. Hemenway that he was dismissed by the State Department on the basis of false and malicious accusations.

Stephen A. Koczak, a former Foreign Service officer, was called as a witness to recite the circumstances of his own dismissal under similar circumstances.

He, like Hemenway, had announced he would fight this action, asserting his legal rights to a hearing. He was then lectured by a superior, Jules Bassin, at that time a special assistant to Idar Rimestad, the deputy undersecretary for administration. Bassin's words, as quoted by Koczak, follow:

"Steve, you have two choices before you. You can go the route of Otto Otepka. I think he is a damned fool."

Otepka, at the time, was in the midst of his celebrated eight-year legal fight against dismissal as the State Department's chief security officer. He was never to win reinstatement, but President Nixon in 1969 named him to the Subversive Activities Control Board.

A submissive Otepka could have been a "consul general," Bassin told Koczak, but he chose to fight for his rights. Bassin continued:

"He chose to set himself up as the equal of the State Department. He got himself involved in a great big scandal. The newspapers all wrote about him.

"The department is an institution, and institutions don't die. Otepka is a human being with a heart, a liver. He is under great tension. He doesn't know how the case will come out. I can tell, you Otepka will never have a job in the State Department again, no matter what happens in his case.

"Now, you have a choice. Let's assume that you will be able to prove in court that the department broke its regulations, that there was a forgery in your case. How long will that take? What will you be doing in the meantime?"

When Koczak sought employment elsewhere, Bassin remarked, employers would write the State Department asking about his record.

"Those letters will come to me. What kind of answer can I give any employer if you are challenging the system, degrading it? I

will say you are a determined, almost fanatic human being. You are considered one of the most brilliant officers in the service, but I will have to reply that the department cannot say you are a sober, rational human being. What do you think of your prospects for getting a job? Reflect on this."

If Koczak accepted dismissal meekly, not making trouble, the State Department would help him get a job with some foundation, Bassin said. He also suggested that Koczak had been unwise in not obtaining a congressional sponsor, perhaps thru a political contribution to a powerful committee chairman.

"I was like you once," concluded Bassin. "I was naive. I then began to realize that one had to have access to power. You can't do good unless you're at the top. You bend and you survive."

Bassin survived, was duly promoted, and is now deputy chief of mission at Geneva. His philosophy may be attacked as cold and cynical, but none will question its verity. It warns all government employees that it is dangerous and probably futile to fight "the system."

ENVOY OK NOT ROUTINE THIS TIME

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON.—The nomination of an ambassador to a small African nation customarily receives the Senate's yawning "advice and consent" after cursory inspection of his credentials.

But drama has suddenly enveloped Senate hearings on the appointment of Howard P. Mace as ambassador to Sierra Leone, a nation about the size of South Carolina, population 2,500,000, where the United States keeps a staff of 12 persons.

A former Foreign Service officer's despairing suicide is only one of the incidents elevating this inquiry to prominent status. It has illuminated conditions which approach corruption in the State Department.

Mace, 55, is no more unfit for the post than most appointees who are rewarded for political purposes or for long and faithful service in the bureaucracy. He has never seen Sierra Leone, has had little field service, and has spent much of his career in office work as the personnel director of the State Department.

Appointed two years ago, he would have been given routine approval and would now be enjoying the title of ambassador, which is the aim of all career men.

In his final year as the supreme arbiter of all employe grievances, however, Mace became the symbol of many of a rigid, domineering, ruling class which crushes independent State Department thinking and vengefully removes all who dare to air grievances.

Thus, when he was named an ambassador and subject to questioning before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he became an open target for charges that he had been malicious, untruthful, dishonest, arbitrary and capricious in assisting the careers of his favorites and punishing those who disputed top echelon policy.

Under questioning, he reluctantly accepted responsibility for the tragedy of Charles W. Thomas, a Foreign Service officer who killed himself last April. For two years Thomas had fought his dismissal, contending that key records commending his performance had disappeared. After his death, they were discovered in another file.

Thomas, in his forties, unable to collect his pension until he was 60, unable to find other work because of the stigma of his discharge, decided he was worth more to his family dead than alive. He proved his point. His widow and two children became eligible for a \$5,500 annuity and the tardily repentant State Department gave his widow a job.

Mrs. Cynthia Thomas, the widow, testified against Mace. So did John D. Hemenway, another ousted Foreign Service officer, who, un-

der oath at his own request, accused Mace of responsibility for "a sick and corrupt, personnel system which had wrought havoc to the careers of dedicated officers."

In addition to his Senate ordeal, Mace was forced to appear before a grievance board hearing charges by Hemenway that his dismissal had been based on false and slanderous records. He spent 90 minutes squirming under cross-examination, evading and failing to recall. At the end of this, one of the three-member panel asked him if he would like to be judged by "someone with the same attitude which you have with regard to grievances." The board appeared unimpressed by his insistence that he would.

Chairman J. W. Fulbright [D., Ark.], after the Senate committee hearings, said he would vote against confirming Mace's nomination. But Mace's boss, William B. Macomber Jr., deputy undersecretary for management, hurried before the committee to plead for him. It was "terribly unfair," Macomber said, to make Mace the target of all that was wrong with State Department.

Mace may eventually win Senate approval. The State Department hierarchy is mustering heavy pressure in his behalf. It has been put on notice, however, that it can no longer, with impunity, eliminate talented subordinates whose only fault is fearlessness in expressing opinion.

BUSING IS MICHIGAN'S BIGGEST POLITICAL ISSUE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the turmoil being created in American public school systems in the wake of massive busing orders by local courts is best described in a recent New York Times analysis of the situation in Michigan.

That the courts have gone berserk in their orders is no longer a matter of debate. But the fact that they will destroy this Nation's public school system is a matter of deep concern to all.

This usurpation of power by courts all over the Nation will lead to the only logical alternative, a constitutional amendment prohibiting busing out of neighborhood schools against a child's or his parents' will.

The New York Times article follows:
BUSING IS MICHIGAN'S BIGGEST POLITICAL ISSUE

(By Jerry M. Flint)

ROSEVILLE, MICH.—"We just came back from vacation yesterday. They didn't say how are you. They said, 'Did you hear?'" And when Margaret Hagen and her husband, Don, heard, they were about as angry as the hundreds of thousands of other white suburbanites around Detroit.

What they heard was that their children were to be taken from their suburban schools and bused into the inner city of Detroit, and that black children from Detroit would be streaming to the suburbs.

That possibly has made busing the biggest political issue in Michigan. Meetings are held nightly in suburbs. School boards and city councils are passing resolutions. Petitions are being sent to Washington, and local politicians are jumping to make sure they are on the right side of the school bus.

JUDGE FINDS SEGREGATION

In fact, no such busing has been ordered. But a Federal judge, Stephen Roth, raised

the possibility Sept. 27 when he ruled that the Detroit public schools were segregated, said he doubted the problem could be solved without a metropolitan-area school district, and ordered the state board of education to come up with a plan for such a district in 120 days.

To the parents of the Detroit metropolitan area—Wayne, Oakland and Macomb Counties—that means busing.

There are nearly one million students in the public schools of the three counties and 108,000 of those are black, according to last fall's count. Most of the black students, 84,000, come from the Detroit schools.

The thought of busing was enough to make eight women at their monthly pinochle game in Roseville put down their cards and talk for two hours.

"My husband said it's really something at the shop," said Grace Vert. "The older men are really bitter."

"They're treating the children like a bunch of cattle," said Lorraine Skirke. "Why can't they put it up to a general public vote, like daylight savings time?"

The specter of city-suburban busing raised all the old fears among the white women: that their children would be sent to inferior schools—the Detroit school board spends \$675 a child per year while the suburbs spend up to \$1,200—that there would be beatings and robberies, and no more after-school activities, and intermarriage.

The panic spreads completely around Detroit from the old rich suburbs to the east—the Grosse Pointes—to the working class suburbs of Warren, Roseville, East Detroit, Dearborn and Southgate; the white collar suburbs of Oak Park and Southfield, and the rich auto executive lands of Birmingham and Bloomfield Hills.

If the near hysteria was predictable, there are a few reactions that were not.

One effect: The idea of a black's buying a house in a white suburb almost sounds * * * do to some whites, compared to the thought of busing.

"It would be different if a colored person moved in and sent their children to our school," said Mrs. Hilda Miller, one of the pinochle players.

"If they take care of their property," added Mrs. Jackie Medici. She and the other women made it clear they did not necessarily want black neighbors, but they said they found the idea less unacceptable than they did three years ago.

A SATISFYING DISCOMFORT

Another effect has been a grim satisfaction among blacks over the discomfort of white liberals in the white suburbs.

"Seeing that the white liberals don't mean a thing to us" brings more support from younger, more militant blacks, said Francis Kornegay, director of the Urban League in Detroit, noting some liberals' complaints about the possibility of busing.

The political outlook has also been affected. Michigan had been counted as a safe state for the Democratic Presidential nominee in 1972, and Senator Robert P. Griffin, a Republican, had been expected to have a tough fight for reelection. Now, Senator Griffin has introduced a constitutional amendment against busing. His most likely opponent in the Senate race, Frank Kelley, the State Attorney General, a Democrat, signed a statement supporting busing.

But the heart of the Democratic vote is in the white working-class suburbs where busing is probably the biggest issue. And, as the uproar grew, Mr. Kelley announced that when he signed the pro-busing statement, he had not meant busing between city and suburb. He also predicted that no such busing would come to Michigan.

The statement Mr. Kelly had signed was also signed by several of the state's leading Democrats.

"I'm afraid they [the political prognosticators] will have to reassess Michigan," said Mrs. Irene McCabe, who put together a large antibusing group in Pontiac. The support of the leading Democrats for busing was "political suicide," she said.

Democrats facing election soon have not necessarily supported the leaders' position. Two noted liberal Democrats, representatives James G. O'Hara and John D. Dingell, recently come out strongly against busing for integration. They both depend on suburban votes.

Another effect has been a split between antibusing whites in Detroit and in the suburbs. Detroit whites who generally oppose busing want the cross-busing to the suburbs. The bulk of the children in Detroit's schools are black and such busing would mean more whites in schools in the city to keep company with the children of the white Detroiters.

In one integrated neighborhood in the city, a white called to his white neighbor, who is selling his house and moving to the suburbs: "Gerry, Gerry. Take the sign down. They're all going out to Birmingham."

Blacks probably do not want their children bused either, "but if that's what it takes [to get a good education] I'd have her bused from here to Mississippi," one black man said of his daughter.

William Penn, executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, said that "if white folks are going to the same schools" as blacks, then those schools will be improved.

INTEGRATION WAS FOSTERED

The impact of Judge Roth's decision is the more stunning because Detroit—and this the judge acknowledged—may have done more to foster integration than any school district in the North.

The Detroit school system created the first integrated textbook. It created its own black history program—years ago. It put much of its new-school money into areas that had become predominantly black. It aggressively recruited black teachers until two-fifths of the teaching force is black, and it built up a large number of black administrators and school principals. White students were forbidden to transfer from schools that were turning black.

A PATTERN DISCERNED

But Judge Roth said that practically all society, particularly the Federal Government, had conspired to create a segregated housing pattern, and that the Detroit school board and the state had failed to act effectively to change this pattern.

In addition he could find instances in the past of boundary juggling to allow whites to avoid schools in changing neighborhoods, and of the busing of black children past white schools to other black schools.

And while the judge has not yet ordered busing to and from the suburbs, he made it seem inevitable.

"My daughter, she's a teacher, she doesn't think it's such a bad idea," says Mrs. Medici of the pinochle group here. She and her daughter had argued the point "hot and heavy," she said. "She sees things different."

"If she had kids of her own, she wouldn't," said Mrs. Miller.

GUN CONTROL ACT OF 1968

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Gun Week, a weekly newspaper serving shooters and

collectors, has published in its October 22, 1971, issue a mature assessment of the operations of the Gun Control Act of 1968. It deserves careful reading, particularly by those who wish to take weapons away from the law-abiding as well as the criminal elements. I submit it for reprinting in the RECORD:

UNHAPPY BIRTHDAY FOR GCA

It was three years ago this month, Oct. 22 to be exact, that the Gun Control Act of 1968 was signed into law by President Lyndon Johnson. To gun owners, dealers, manufacturers and other associated in any way with firearms, it seems more like 30 years.

During the signing ceremony, President Johnson remarked: "Today we begin to disarm the criminal and the careless and the insane. All of our people who are deeply concerned in this country about law and order should hail this day. In our democracy, crime control is a community problem." He went on to lament the fact that licensing of owners and gun registration had not been accomplished during his administration.

From our vantage point, the Gun Control Act has not marked any kind of "beginning" as far as control of crime is concerned, but it has marked the "beginning" of several other things. For instance, it has marked a "beginning" of:

Increased harassment of law-abiding gun owners and licensed dealers by the Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms Division of the Internal Revenue Service, the agency responsible for enforcing federal gun control laws.

A continued push for the total elimination of all firearms from private possession.

During the emotional atmosphere of 1968, when the Gun Control Act was being hammered into shape by the anti-gunners following the assassinations of Sen. Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King, those who sought additional gun controls denied emphatically they wanted anything more than the licensing of gun owners and registration of individual firearms. How times have changed!

Today, the anti-gunners don't mind admitting they want to eventually confiscate firearms, but they stress just as emphatically as they did in 1968 that they only want to control handguns, the guns that are involved in a majority of violent crimes. It matters little to them that only an infinitesimal number of total handguns are used in crime. They disregard the fact that more than 99 per cent of all handguns are owned by law-abiding, God-fearing people who are just as much against the criminal use of firearms as they are.

Instead of plugging away for the enforcement of existing laws, or passage of laws aimed at punishing the criminal misuse of firearms, rather than the guns, themselves, the anti-gunners carry on with their hackneyed chant that we must have licensing and registration—and eventually confiscation to reduce crime. Well, then, let's take a look at what has happened under the Gun Control Act, which President Johnson called a "beginning."

Figures revealed recently by the AFTD show the agency has a conviction rate of 86 per cent of those charged with a violation of the Gun Control Act, compared to 32 per cent of those charged with violent crimes. This could be good news if the defendants in the cases consisted solely of hardened criminals who were facing charges of misusing guns in crime or possessing guns illegally. But this is not the situation. The Gun Control Act has created a new class of criminals, the unfortunates who violated nothing except the 1968 Act. All too often, the harshest punishment is directed at gun owners and dealers who have no connection

with the crimes of violence that the Act was intended to control.

In the first 2½ years of enforcement, 543 Americans never before convicted of any crime were adjudged guilty of violating the Gun Control Act and were branded as felons. Also found guilty during the same period were 1,164 defendants who did have previous criminal records. Another 258 were acquitted while 2,500 others were arrested and are awaiting court action.

There are those on the anti-gun side who claim that the Gun Control Act is ineffective and additional laws are needed. Their unofficial proposals range from licensing-registration to total confiscation of all guns. Yet, enforcement under existing law is something less than desirable. Take for instance: Undercover agents posing as gun buyers to entice gun owners to sell them firearms illegally; homes of citizens raided by armed enforcement parties of as many as 10 to 20 men, sometimes with drawn guns; suspects, some later acquitted by juries, dragged off to jail in handcuffs in front of neighbors and relatives; valuable firearms forfeited as a consequence of enforcement raids, despite the owner's subsequent acquittal.

Currently the big rage is to ban the cheap handgun, the so-called Saturday Night Special, which, admittedly, figures in a large percentage of armed crime. But there are too many people, including some misguided sportsmen, who fail to grasp the real meaning of the dispute over Saturday Night Specials. Unfortunately, it is not simply a matter of drying up a source of weapons used frequently by criminals. Other factors are involved.

As Gun Week has said repeatedly, there is no inherent criminality in any firearm, whether it is a \$5 cheapie or a \$500 target pistol.

GEN. LEWIS "CHESTY" PULLER,
U.S.M.C.

HON. JOHN H. TERRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Lewis "Chesty" Puller died last week. Those of us who served in World War II associate him with men like General MacArthur and General Patton. General Puller was obviously a man born to lead men into battle and relished his job. One by one the great men who served the United States in that span from World War I till the present are dying off. In these days of the antihero who is taking or will take their place?

When President Nixon visits Peiping next year sometime, he may step where "Chesty" Puller and his "Horse Marines" rode their shaggy Mongolian ponies out across the countryside to map and gather information. Signs of his men were still visible when the Americans entered Peiping in 1945, but they may already have been obliterated. No one who ever rode those short-legged ponies with the "Horse Marines" has ever forgotten it.

General Puller fought in every campaign possible, but particularly developed his reputation in the island assaults that characterized the fighting in the Pacific theater during World War II. Only the discipline of the marines and the leadership of officers like "Chesty" Puller could have brought our men through such battles where every Japanese soldier had

to be individually blasted out of his cave or dugout.

In my view, however, one of his finest hours was in Korea. General Puller landed with the Marines at Inchon in September 1950 as commanding officer of the 1st Marines. This campaign demoralized the North Koreans and after a short sharp fight for the possession of Seoul, the remnants of the North Korean Army fled north. The Chinese Communists, meanwhile, were gathering across the Yalu River for their entrance into the war. General Puller went with 1st Marine Division which drove to the Chosin Reservoir in North Korea from the port of Hungnam, only to be assaulted by vastly superior Chinese Communist forces.

The Chinese were hoping to cut off the American force and decimate it, but the Marines retreated step by step to the coast taking all their dead, wounded, and equipment with them. General Puller is said to have vowed at the time that in future years he would hold the regiment's annual reunions in a phone booth before he would permit a single dead or wounded Marine to be abandoned.

It is my hope that General "Chesty" Puller will remain an example to the cadets at the Virginia Military Institute and to our young people as a whole. For in spite of Vietnam and our Nation's great longing for peace, it is a very uncertain world and we may, God forbid, need more "Chesty" Pullers to defend our freedom.

HOW TO KEEP 'EM DOWN ON THE
FARM

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, recently a scientist and communications industry executive sent tremors through business circles by turning down an impressive title and a five-figure salary in favor of retirement. Retirement from the business life he now leads that is. He intends to remain active in a new venture. His goal is to make it possible for the profit world and the non-profit world to get together and pool their knowledge and resources to more effectively work at improving the society in which we live.

The sensitive and farsighted man to whom I refer is Dr. Peter C. Goldmark who will retire in December from his post as president of Columbia Broadcasting System Laboratories. It is rare to find a man like this in industry who recognizes the need for approaching as a national problem the revitalization of small towns and communities in sparsely populated areas. Dr. Goldmark has recognized that need.

He discussed his views in a recent interview with *Forbes* magazine, I recommend this article to the attention of my colleagues.

The magazine articles follows:

[From the Forbes magazine, Sept. 15, 1971]
 AS I SEE IT—HOW TO KEEP 'EM DOWN ON
 THE FARM

It's not often a man walks away from \$750,000. Why did you?

GOLDMARK. Because there are things I feel I have to do that I can do more easily on the outside than at CBS. I believe that communications technology can solve many of the problems facing the nation. I don't mean new communications technology. I mean the existing technology. We don't need new inventions. We've been putting an awful lot into inventing but not enough into applying what we've invented. Our need is now to take our existing technology and put it to work, to create new systems with our existing technology that will help shape the future of the nation.

The profit world can't do this because the profit world can't set forth national goals. This is a job for the nonprofit world. On the other hand, the profit world can help to achieve the national goals. Now that I'm leaving CBS, I hope to create an institute where the profit world and the nonprofit world can meet and work together.

What kind of problems do you believe communications technology can help to solve if put to work?

GOLDMARK. At the present time, 90% of the people in this country live on 10% of the land. People have been moving into a few great metropolitan areas. You know the problems this has created: crime, narcotics addiction, pollution, traffic, educational problems, social problems. Small towns have the same problems, of course, but they have them on a manageable scale. In the cities, the problems have become too big to manage.

By 2000, the U.S. will have 100 million people more. If present trends continue and they all crowd into urban areas, we're going to have a crisis. The problems we already can't manage will destroy us.

We must create conditions that will make it possible for this growth to take place in the rural areas, in small towns. It's not a question of moving people from the cities into small towns. You can't do that. It's a question of giving people a choice, which they do not now have, of living in a small town or a big city. I believe communications technology can give people such a choice.

In the words of the World War I song, "How Ya Gonna Keep 'Em Down on the Farm?"

GOLDMARK. Why do people move from rural areas into the cities? First of all, for jobs. Then, and this is very important, educational facilities: universities. And for excitement: theaters, cultural centers, sports arenas.

With our present communications facilities, we can provide all these things in the small towns. We can keep them physically small; if we keep them physically small, we can keep their problems small. At the same time, we can give them all the things a big city has.

The big cities became big for observable reasons: coal, iron and other natural resources; harbors, rivers, the Great Lakes. . . .

GOLDMARK. That is true, but present growth in employment in this country is not in manufacturing but in the service industries. By the year 2000, when we have a population of 300 million, two-thirds of the people employed in this country will be employed in the service industries. The service industries have been expanding even faster than the population.

Now there's no reason, given modern means of communication, why they have to expand where they are now. Let's say you have an insurance company based in Hartford which projects that it will eventually have to hire

an extra thousand workers. With two-way television, broad-band cable or microwave and with facsimile, there's no longer any reason why it has to build office space for them in Hartford. It could set up offices in five different small towns in a radius of several hundred miles, each one housing 200 workers. Two-way television and facsimile would enable instant communications, more rapid communications even than you now have in a skyscraper office building.

There's no longer any reason why a service company like an insurance company has to concentrate all its employees in a single skyscraper.

For that matter, there's no longer any reason why all state government offices should be concentrated in the state capitals. With modern communications, state governments could easily be dispersed.

What about the other factors that make youngsters leave the small towns for the cities?

GOLDMARK. Education? We could establish minicolleges, small colleges with small staffs. Such a minicollege could be linked by two-way television with a great university hundreds of miles away. Students at the minicollege would be able to participate in all the important things taking place at the great university: lectures, seminars. They wouldn't just sit and look and listen. With two-way television, they could participate, ask questions, enter into discussions.

Entertainment? Through the use of satellites and cables, we can bring anything exciting happening anywhere in the country to every corner of the country: sports events, concerts, anything.

We can do something about the medical problems of the country, too. In many depleted areas, it's impossible to keep doctors. In such areas, we could establish telemedicine. With two-way TV, we can have remote-distance diagnosis.

How do you go about establishing the new systems you are talking about?

GOLDMARK. I was a member of a committee on telecommunications of the National Academy of Engineering which studied this question. We published a report discussing how it could be done. The big problem now is to convince business that it's economically feasible to expand into rural areas. Unless you can prove to the service industries that it's not necessary to concentrate company headquarters in 50-story buildings, you can't get anywhere.

We now have a pilot project in Windham in the northeast part of Connecticut to demonstrate the feasibility of the idea. We're linking Windham to Hartford by two-way microwave television.

What would be the technological problems of such a project?

GOLDMARK. As I said, they do not involve the necessity for new technological developments but of devising the systems and getting them set up. CATV companies are now laying cables with 20 or more channels. We can just as easily lay cables with 40 channels. We could lay them along the state and federal highway systems, dig a moderate trench beside the highways and lay them there.

I've discussed this with the Connecticut State Highway Commission. They're enthusiastic. Why not? It will put them in the communications business.

We know that setting up these communications systems is technologically feasible. We believe that in Windham we can prove it's economically feasible.

I'm not saying that communications technology can solve all our urban problems; I'm just saying that it can arrest the present concentration of the nation's population into a few areas, creating problems of such magnitude they cannot be dealt with. Communications technology can give people a choice of where to live.

How would these two-way cable and microwave systems you hope to establish affect commercial television? By establishing cable systems with 40 channels, wouldn't you completely disrupt commercial television, creating unlimited competition for the three TV networks?

GOLDMARK. I don't believe the new systems will supplant the networks. The networks will continue pretty much as they are because they provide a service people want and business is willing to pay money for. They are economically viable and they will continue to be.

The new systems will provide new services for business, education, government. They won't supplant existing television, but merely fit into the present structure.

I don't know of any development in communications that replaced the existing system. Movies didn't replace books. Radio didn't replace the phonograph. Television didn't replace radio. People have a growing appetite for ideas. Communications may evolve into new forms, but what we already have won't stop.

HERR KISSINGER—THE MEMOIRS OF A MAN OF PLEASURE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Henry A. Kissinger, the No. 1 adviser and chief confidant to the President, plays a vital role in the decisionmaking of our country and the course we are pursuing. I thought that our colleagues would find of interest a recent report on Henry A. Kissinger which, along with recent newspaper articles on the social activities of a Presidential adviser, reveals the personal character of the man and his vulnerabilities.

I insert the October 1 issue of the *Herald of Freedom* edited by Frank A. Capell, and related news account in the RECORD:

HENRY A. KISSINGER—REVISITED

Well-informed Washington sources, including some members of Congress, consider Presidential Adviser Henry A. Kissinger to be the second most important individual in the U.S. Government and have referred to it as the Kissinger-Nixon Administration.

Henry Alfred Kissinger, born at Fuerth, Germany, May 27, 1928, has come a long way fast since his immigration to this country at the age of fifteen. The West German magazine *Der Spiegel* carried an article entitled "This German in the White House" in which it is stated that Kissinger's birth is recorded in the town hall at Fuerth as Alfred Heinz Kissinger, son of Paula Kissinger (nee Stern) and Louis Kissinger, address was Mathilden Strasse 23, Fuerth (which is in middle Franconia). At the time of Kissinger's appointment by President Nixon, French newspapers reported that his father had been a rabbi in Germany. *Der Spiegel* states that Louis Kissinger was principal of a state school for girls of the upper class. The Kissingers came to the U.S. in 1938 as Jewish refugees from the Nazis, Kissinger's father, although over 80 years old, now lives in Washington Heights, N.Y. and has been working as a bookkeeper. His mother has helped support the family by working incognito in Jewish households for bar mitzvahs and parties.

Kissinger was 15 years old when his family came to the U.S. After graduating from George Washington High School in Manhattan, he obtained an AB from Harvard in 1950, an MA in 1952 and Ph. D. in 1954. On February 6, 1949, he married Ann Fleischer and they had two children. The marriage ended in a divorce in 1964. Noel E. Parmentel, Jr., writing in the *Village Voice*, March 18, 1971, stated: "When he (Kissinger) was married to Ann, who was a genuine human being, he couldn't stand it. After she literally slaved to send him through graduate school he almost turned her into a zombie with all that screaming and shouting. Just like the Gestapo. He was ashamed of her New York accent and always told her how she embarrassed him in front of 'important people.' It got so bad she was scared to even open her mouth. That house in Belmont was like 'Gaslight.'" Little wonder his wife divorced him.

Kissinger became a U.S. citizen in 1943 through service in the U.S. Army. In view of the fact that German had been Kissinger's native tongue, he became an interrogator in counter-intelligence. Later, although only a sergeant, he was put in charge of administering a German town. By 1946, because of his capabilities or connections, he was made a civilian employee at a salary of \$10,000 a year. While working for his Master's Degree at Harvard, Kissinger was made executive director of the Harvard International Seminar, a CIA-financed center which sponsors student exchange programs. By the time he received his Doctorate Degree in 1954, he was already serving as a consultant to a number of government agencies and teaching at Harvard. In 1955 Kissinger was appointed director of Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy Studies for the Council on Foreign Relations, and also became a member of that organization. The following year he became director of special study projects for the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Inc. (having been appointed by Nelson Rockefeller) and served in that position for two years. Thereafter he continued teaching at Harvard but took time out during the 1961-62 period to be a consultant for the National Security Council and the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. He also served intermittently as a consultant to the State Department and worked closely with Walt W. Rostow in Washington.

One of Kissinger's students at the CIA-financed Harvard International Seminar was Uzi Narkiss who was a senior officer in the Israeli Army at the time and who visited Kissinger at the White House in 1969. Narkiss was the commanding general of the Israeli troops that took Jerusalem in 1967. According to *Life* magazine (September 5, 1969), Narkiss advised Kissinger that Israel will hold the Arab territories as long as it likes.

Confidential sources reported that Kissinger was considered a security risk but obtained his security clearance through President Nixon. Kissinger actually received his appointment as Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs through the recommendation of Nelson Rockefeller and key people in the C.F.R. Professor Henry Pao-luelli, of St. John's University, wrote a study about Kissinger which appeared in the *Congressional Record* of August 4, 1971, a portion of which states: "Henry Kissinger, too, expressed as recently as 1965 the conviction that the time was at hand for a surrender of nationhood because 'institutions based on present concepts of national sovereignty are not enough.' The ultimate goal of a supranationalist world community, he wrote, 'will not come quickly; many intermediate stages must be traversed before it can be reached. It is not too early, however, to prepare ourselves for this step beyond the nation-state.'"

After Kissinger's appointment, he increased the staff of his assistants, consultants, and advisers until today he has 110 people working directly for him, including a number of individuals with dubious backgrounds. One of them is Helmut Sonnenfeldt who is very close to Kissinger and was formerly Chief of Soviet and Eastern Europe matters in the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research. During the Eisenhower Administration Sonnenfeldt had been the subject of an intensive FBI investigation regarding the giving of secret information to agents of a foreign power. Although it was reported that the FBI had an iron-clad case, William P. Rogers, who was the Attorney General, refused to prosecute Sonnenfeldt on the grounds that the State Department felt it would not be in the interest of the U.S. Government to have the information become public knowledge. Sonnenfeldt, acting as Kissinger's top assistant, accompanied President Nixon on his trip to Communist Rumania.

Kissinger arranged contracts with the Rand Corp. in California without knowledge of the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of State. One contract had to do with what the Soviet reaction would be to U.S. atomic attack on Egypt. Another study was for the purpose of preparing a report on the "feasibility" of restoring political, economic, and cultural relations with Castro's Cuba. Kissinger encouraged persons working on Nelson Rockefeller's Latin-American Report in 1969 to press the view that U.S. should offer Cuba normal relations and trade. Kissinger also had a major role in getting the National Council of Churches to call for the U.S. to drop its quarantine of Cuba and re-establish diplomatic relations. Another study ordered by Kissinger was how the anti-Communist government of Brazil might be overthrown.

Kissinger has his own direct connections with the Communist government of North Vietnam. Paul Scott reported on November 12, 1969:

"Although it has been one of the best kept secrets of the Vietnam war, Kissinger has been deeply involved in secret talks with the North Vietnamese.

"Two mysterious Frenchmen have been Kissinger's go between with Hanoi. They are Raymond Aubrac and Professor Herbert Marcovitch, friends of Wilfred Burchett, the Australian correspondent whom the Kremlin and Peking uses frequently for high-level intelligence and diplomatic operations." (Burchett is a known KGB Agent)

Aubrac has been director of the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization, was a close personal friend of Ho Chi Minh, and on his U.N. job found it easy to travel to Communist countries from which most Americans are barred. Aubrac had been introduced to Kissinger, then a Harvard professor, in 1967 by Marcovitch, a professor at the University of Paris. Kissinger and Marcovitch had met earlier at one of the Pugwash meetings organized by pro-Soviet millionaire Cyrus Eaton.

It was on Kissinger's recommendation that President Johnson made an offer to Hanoi to stop the bombing of North Vietnam if Hanoi would give assurances that it would not take advantage of the halt. Kissinger's channels reported that Hanoi would cooperate but they never did and American intelligence officers reported that Hanoi used the lull to rebuild its stock piles of arms and military supplies at advance bases in Cambodia, Laos and South Vietnam . . . which resulted in the deaths of thousands of Americans.

President Nixon endeavored to have Kissinger negotiate the U.S. out of Vietnam but, as it turned out, Kissinger convinced President Nixon that the only way out was for him to unilaterally withdraw U.S. troops.

After the FBI had arrested on con-

spiracy charges a group affiliated with the East Coast Conspiracy to Save Lives (the Berrigan Case), Kissinger actually entertained in the White House three of the co-conspirators arrested in the plot to kidnap him.

In 1971, prior to the Communist-inspired and-directed demonstrations for May Day, Kissinger entertained some of the key leaders in the organization that controlled the demonstrations which were aimed at shutting down Washington, D.C. and which resulted in thousands of arrests.

A former employee of Kissinger told Noel E. Parmentel, Jr.: "He's (Kissinger) got us all buffaloed. He can (and will) lift your security, get you a foundation black ball, bong you at the colleges, put you in Coventry. He's got spies in every department. He's running the Ministry of Fear. All his phones are tapped and he keeps long dossiers."

According to numerous newspaper and magazine articles, Kissinger had developed the reputation of being a ladies' man and has been dating a number of women, including Women's Lib leader Gloria Steinem, who is national sponsor of the Committee to Defend the Black Panthers. After graduating from college, Gloria Steinem worked for the National Student Association, which was CIA-financed and which paid for American students to attend Communist youth festivals in Europe. According to *Newsweek* of August 16, 1971, Gloria Steinem has had a close relationship also with Negro track star Rafer Johnson, movie director Mike Nichols, and they reported Cesar Chavez is proud to call her his friend.

The West German magazine *Quick* created a sensation with the publications of secret telegrams of Rolf Pauls, West German Ambassador in Washington, to his home office which disclosed very unusual behind-the-scenes political conversations between West German State Secretary Egon Bahr and Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, Henry Kissinger. Informed sources state that Henry Kissinger has been promoting the West German concessions to Moscow and Communist East Germany. In fact, a Washington source advised that when Henry Kissinger made his trip to Peking, China, he actually traveled on a West German passport.

One of Kissinger's special assistants who accompanied him on the trip to Red China is Richard Smyser, described by the *Washington Post* as Kissinger's Vietnam expert and former member of the Paris peace talks delegation. On January 2, 1971 Congressman John R. Rarick told his colleagues: "Mr. Speaker, it appears that the District of Columbia social event of the year was a trouserless orgy and was held by a member of the staff of Dr. Henry Kissinger, special assistant to President Nixon for national security affairs." A large number of Kissinger's national security affairs staff, other White House staffers and some employees from Capitol Hill and other branches of government attended the "trouserless orgy," during which underwear made from an American flag was revealed. Congressman Rarick remarked that it is little wonder our young people over the country "have become disillusioned with this so-called establishment, when such total disregard for decency and morality is flaunted by people who are related to as representative of our Government. If other members of the Paris peace talks delegation are of the same character as exhibitionist Richard Smyser, we can now begin to understand why even the Vietcong cannot communicate with them."

The withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam without the release of American prisoners of war is looked upon in this country, as well as abroad, as surrender to the enemy. However, the unilateral withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam is the fulfillment of Dr. Kissinger's plan. In the

January 1969 issue of Foreign Affairs, the quarterly publication of the Council on Foreign Relations, an article by Dr. Henry Kissinger states his formula for ending the war in Vietnam which calls for a series of steps to bring about a phased withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam and for a political settlement. Dr. Kissinger did not rule out a coalition government with Communist participation.

When the U.S. March for Victory in Vietnam was held last fall, it was expected that South Vietnam's Vice-president, Nguyen Cao Ky, would attend and speak at the rally which called for a military victory in South Vietnam. The New York Times of September 26, 1970 noted that Henry A. Kissinger, President Nixon's adviser on foreign policy, had scheduled a meeting in Paris with Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky to try to "persuade him not to attend the March for Victory rally here next week." The White House confirmed that Mr. Kissinger was flying to Paris and would meet with Mr. Ky, with the end result, of course that Ky was pressured into not appearing at the patriotic rally.

Another of Henry Kissinger's secret activities was to obtain a \$100 million cut-back in the Defense Department's budget for intelligence-gathering operations. Veteran intelligence officials viewed this as a move by Kissinger to tighten his White House control over all intelligence operations. Since intelligence estimates are used as a key factor in the formation of American foreign policy, a tighter control of national intelligence operations would greatly increase Kissinger's already tremendous influence in the making of foreign policy.

In 1970 when the Soviet Embassy held a grand scale celebration of Lenin's birthday, Henry Kissinger was designated as the Nixon Administration's representative for the Lenin birthday celebration, this designation reportedly being Kissinger's own idea.

Through the unusual media of the society section of the Washington Post of February 20, 1971, in a column written by Dorothy McCordle, we learn that it was Henry Kissinger who worked on President Nixon's State of the World message. So powerful has Henry Kissinger become at the White House that even the liberal editor of the Harvard Crimson, David Landau, writing for the Washington Post of July 11, 1971 observed "Kissinger has used his position in government as a protective cloak to conceal his larger ambitions and purposes. Far from being detached, objective arbiter of presidential decisionmaking, he has become a crucial molder and supporter of Mr. Nixon's foreign policy. Instead of merely holding the bureaucracy at comfortable arm's length, he has entangled it in a web of useless projects and studies, cleverly shifting an important locus of advisory power from the Cabinet departments to his own office." Mr. Landau also noted that, as a confidential adviser to the President, Kissinger has successfully claimed executive privilege when asked to testify on the record in congressional hearings.

Informed sources state that Henry A. Kissinger is not only a protege of Nelson A. Rockefeller, but has been an adviser to him for over 15 years. The original relationship goes back to Kissinger's student days at Harvard when he received a Rockefeller Fund Fellowship for political theory. Kissinger attended both the 1964 and 1968 Republican Conventions as a Rockefeller aide and is credited with having pushed the Republican platform towards a more dovish position on Vietnam. Kissinger was also associated with the Rockefellers in the special studies project in 1956-57 and then from 1958-59 when he was research secretary for a Council on Foreign Relations special discussion group, again on Rockefeller's recommendations.

Henry Kissinger's program for trade, cultural and diplomatic relations with Commu-

nist China (now embraced by Nixon), Kissinger's plan to restore relations with Cuba, his arranging for the President to visit Communist countries are all a part of a Rockefeller program to stimulate worldwide trade with Communist countries. In January 1967, Nelson Rockefeller and Cyrus Eaton, Jr., son of the sponsor of the Pugwash Conferences, joined forces to profit by trading with the Communists. The International Basic Economy Corp. (which was organized in 1947 under the principal direction of Nelson Rockefeller and is controlled by the Rockefeller Brothers) and Tower International Inc. (headed by Cyrus Eaton, Jr.) announced plans as revealed in the N.Y. TIMES of January 16, 1967 in an article entitled "Eaton Joins Rockefeller to Spur Trade with Reds." The TIMES noted that the joint effort of International Basic Economy Corp. and Tower International, Inc. is seen as combining the investment skills and resources of the Rockefellers and the special entree to Communist officialdom that Tower enjoys largely as a result of contacts cultivated over the last 15 years by Cyrus Eaton, Sr., always welcomed as a V.I.P. in Communist countries.

After his return from the secret meeting with Chou-En-Lai, Kissinger made a hurried and secret trip to London where reportedly he conferred with a mystery man named Victor Louis at the Soviet Embassy. Victor Louis, whose real name is Vitaly Yevgenyevich Lul, is a high ranking member of Soviet Intelligence who carries out secret diplomatic missions for the Soviet government with heads of state and key internationalists throughout the world.

It was Victor Louis who arranged the sale of the Khrushchev Memoirs to LIFE magazine after their careful editing by the KGB, Louis, who is reportedly a millionaire, is so important that he resides in a three-story mansion located 15 miles outside of Moscow with a swimming pool, pine wood sauna, private tennis court and garage which contains his five automobiles. His standard of living exceeds that of some of the most important members of the Soviet hierarchy. Although the secret meeting between KGB agent Victor Louis and Henry Kissinger was not reported by the world press, NEWSWEEK magazine on August 9, 1971 did report that Victor Louis has made application for an American visa and has put out private feelers for a meeting with Kissinger.

In addition to having been on the payroll of the Council on Foreign Relations and having been a long-time member of that organization, Henry Kissinger was accepted by the Bilderberg group and was permitted to attend at least one of their meetings. His name appeared on the list of participants at the Bilderberg Conference held at Williamsburg, Va. March 21-22, 1964. [He also attended the April, 1971 Bilderberg meeting at Woodstock, Vt. Ed.] A number of other C.F.R. members are also connected with the Bilderberg group whose meetings are so secret that the American press does not even report them. The C.F.R. has had as active members Soviet agents Alger Hiss, Lauchlin Currie and Harry Dexter White; Herbert Matthews, who assisted Castro to power; Joseph Feis Barnes, identified as a Communist, who wrote Eisenhower's "Crusade in Europe" for him; Cyrus Eaton, pro-Soviet multi-millionaire; identified Communist John K. Fairbank, whose advice on Chinese Communist affairs is now being sought by U.S. officials.

Another interesting member of the subversive C.F.R. is George A. Lincoln, Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, an executive agency which has jurisdiction and control of the carrying out of the executive orders issued by President Nixon when he declared a state of national emergency "for economic reasons" and then announced his wage and price freeze. This 90-day "freeze" is but "Phase I" of bigger but unfortunately

not better things to come, a transitional period while the dictatorial powers now being assumed by the President and his top "adviser" Kissinger are being more carefully worked out.

Informed sources in Washington are of the opinion that, although he is a known security risk and obviously working against the interests of our country, Henry Kissinger is so firmly entrenched in his position that even President Nixon is unable to remove him. Perhaps we should call it the Kissinger Administration.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 15, 1971]

KISSINGER TO LEAVE SATURDAY

The White House announced yesterday that Henry A. Kissinger, assistant to the President for national security affairs, will leave Saturday for Peking to make arrangements for President Nixon's visit to China.

Kissinger will be accompanied by nine officials to make arrangements and to work out an agenda for the President's trip.

No date has been announced for the President's visit except that it will be before May 1. There has been speculation that it will be substantially before that time, and Kissinger's visit at this point strengthens the belief the President's trip will not be long delayed.

White House press secretary Ronald L. Ziegler said Kissinger and his party will fly on a presidential jet via Hawaii, Guam, Shanghai and Peking. They will return the northern route with a single stop in Anchorage, Alaska.

The longer route to Peking is to give the party some time to rest before arriving in the Chinese capital for four days of negotiations, it was said. The group will spend the night in Guam and arrive in Peking Wednesday, Oct. 20 (Tuesday, Oct. 19, Washington time).

Col. Ralph Albertazzi, the President's pilot, will command the aircraft and thus have the experience of landing in China before carrying the President. He will pick up a Chinese navigator on landing at Shanghai.

Since English is the universal language of air traffic controllers, Albertazzi will not need an interpreter to communicate with controllers in China.

The party is expected to make only a refueling stop in Shanghai. But it will be met there by a Chinese delegation that will accompany it to Peking, a flight of less than two hours. The flight from Guam to Shanghai is just under four hours.

Accompanying Kissinger will be Brig. Gen. James D. Hughes, military aide to the President; Dwight L. Chapin, deputy assistant to the President; Brig. Gen. Albert Redman, head of the White House communications agency; press assistant Timothy G. Elbourne; Secret Service agent Robert H. Taylor, head of the White House detail; Alfred LeS. Jenkins, director of the State Department's division of Asian Communists Affairs; and the following members of the National Security Council staff: John H. Holdridge, Winston Lord and Jonathan Howe. Jenkins and Holdridge speak Chinese and will act as interpreters.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 15, 1971]

PROBLEMS OF A PRESIDENTIAL ADVISER

(By Maxine Cheshire)

Presidential adviser Henry Kissinger is having girl problems again.

This time it's movie starlet Judy Brown, best-known for her role in the X-rated Danish sex film, "Threesome," which was impounded briefly by the U.S. government two years ago. (She has also appeared in R-rated films "Women in Cages" and "The Big Doll House.")

In the current issue of Silver Screen magazine, the 27-year-old actress and the 48-year-

old Kissinger are the subject of a cover story headlined: "Does Nixon Know? His Top Adviser Is Having a Secret Romance With Desi Arnaz' Special Girl."

Miss Brown, a former Miss University of Missouri, said yesterday that she had decided to make public her year-long friendship with Kissinger because she was "tired" of being kept in the background while he allows himself to be photographed on dates with other, better-known actresses such as Marlo Thomas and Jill St. John.

Kissinger, informed that the article is now on the newsstands, called Miss Brown "a publicity maniac." He has never seen her on the screen, he said, and has seen her in person only three times.

But other sources, including Los Angeles television newsman David Horowitz, say the meetings have been more frequent. They insist that she has visited Kissinger at both San Clemente and Palm Springs and dined with him in Hollywood at such well-known restaurants as Chassen's, the Chianti and The Bistro.

Kissinger says their last date was at The Bistro on July 14, the night before President Nixon announced he was going to China. He has had no contact with her since.

"When these ladies start using me for publicity," he said, "that is when I decide to terminate the relationship."

Several weeks ago, at a Hollywood party given by Comedian Buddy Hackett, Kissinger was introduced to June Wilkinson, whose figure is familiar to readers of Playboy magazine. With measurements of 43-22-36, she has been featured four times as "The Bosom."

Kissinger and Miss Wilkinson both confirm that he called later and asked her to have dinner with him. But there is some disagreement about what happened after that.

She says she accepted and they went to Scandia. He says he began having second thoughts about the publicity which might result and broke the date to go out instead with All McGraw and her husband, Bob Evans.

Miss Wilkinson says Kissinger must have his dates confused. It was the third time he called her that he canceled at the last minute. The second time he called her, she says, she was the one who couldn't make it.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 25, 1970]

BLACK TIE, BUT NO PANTS

(By Maxine Cheshire)

The engraved invitation read: "Black Tie sans pantalons"—meaning that male guests should arrive without trousers.

The party was given two weeks ago by John Lehman, a member of the staff of Dr. Henry Kissinger, special assistant to President Nixon for national security affairs, Kissinger did not attend.

The event should be forever memorable in an administration where the social highlight of the week can be Julie Eisenhower having her girl friends over for an afternoon cup of tea and a movie showing of "Othello."

Visualize, if you can, Adm. Rembrandt Robinson, Kissinger's liaison with Chief of Naval Operations Adm. Thomas Moorer, resplendent topside in gold braid and artistically attired below in flower-bedecked skivvies trimmed in ruffles.

There was Richard V. Allen, key Nixon campaign adviser on foreign affairs and formerly deputy to Kissinger, wearing a tuxedo jacket over a pair of women's knee-length bloomers dyed psychedelic colors.

A stockholder from Villanova, Pa., Lehman noted, wore a costume that could get him arrested in some states. His underwear was made from an American flag.

Richard Smyser, Kissinger's Vietnam expert and former member of the Paris peace talks delegation, wasn't trying to remain anonymous in the crowd.

He had his name stenciled in large letters across the back of his shorts.

The host, John Lehman, wore his Cambridge University rowing blazer over a pair of boxer shorts that had been tie-dyed and then stitched strategically by his girl friend with a toad in needlepoint.

The toad is the emblem of the Cambridge dining society to which Lehman belonged in his student days, the Ancient Order of Gonville Loungers.

Trouserless parties are a tradition with that group according to Lehman a former University of Pennsylvania faculty member and a cousin of Princess Grace of Monaco.

The Gonville Loungers, whose members include television's David Frost, recently celebrated their 511th anniversary at a *sans pantalons* gathering for which Lehman flew to England.

This is the second trouserless party that Lehman has staged in Washington with the help of two bachelor roommates who share his Georgetown row house.

Last year's was held in December, "But some people complained of getting a little chilly," Lehman explains. "So this time we moved it up to a warmer month."

He had a six-piece rock band and most of his guests had a rollicking time. "But there is always someone," he says, "who stands around looking very sheepish in his garters."

Women guests all wore elegant long dresses. Men who did not take the invitation's wording seriously were met at the door by a maid who insisted they remove their trousers. She provided boxer shorts for those who came in briefs.

Only one man resisted. Kent Crane, of Vice President Agnew's staff, firmly refused to shed his dignity or anything else.

The guest list included a large number of Lehman's colleagues on Kissinger's National Security Affairs staff, various other White House staffers, plus a few from Capitol Hill and other branches of the government.

Kissinger, who gets asked almost everywhere else in Washington, did not get an invitation. "I knew he was going to be out of town," said Lehman.

ANOTHER SETBACK FOR CONSUMERS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the House was guilty last Thursday of engaging in a deceptive consumer practice. After beating back the efforts of 160 Members to strengthen the bill, the House approved legislation to establish a new Federal Consumer Protection Agency. In my judgment the House's action was a disservice to the cause of consumers, because the Agency will be prohibited from representing their interests when most of the decisions are made and policies established affecting the health and economic well-being of the consuming public.

One can only hope that the Senate will approve a stronger bill—one that will do the job.

An editorial in the Long Island Press of Sunday, October 17, sums up the dilemma in an effective way. I am inserting this editorial in the RECORD at this point.

ANOTHER SETBACK FOR THE CONSUMER

The House of Representatives has thrown the consumer a bone, but unfortunately there's very little meat on it.

The creation of a consumer protection agency is a vital step in giving the average citizen a voice to counter those special-interest lobbyists in Washington. But when that voice is merely a whisper instead of a shout, the agency may delude rather than protect the consumer.

That is why Rep. Benjamin Rosenthal of Elmhurst, one of the leading consumer advocates in Congress, voted against the bill to create the very agency he himself proposed. "Mediocrity and compromise won out over excellence and courage," he said.

Mr. Rosenthal's—and Ralph Nader's—complaint is that the new agency will be restricted against acting in most cases coming before federal regulatory agencies. And these agencies, unfortunately, have been too prone to favor those they are supposed to regulate, rather than the consumers they are supposed to represent.

Mrs. Virginia Knauer, President Nixon's special assistant for consumer affairs, parroted the administration line that the House bill will "provide the consumer effective representation on matters that affect his health, his safety and his pocketbook." She insists that its "wide margin of support . . . refutes the contrary claims of the few remaining critics." How, then, does she explain the wide margin of support in the Senate for the stronger bill preferred by Mr. Rosenthal and Mr. Nader? The Senate vote last year was 74 to 4, and a similar vote this year is likely.

The Senate is the consumer's last hope. If the strong bill passes there, perhaps the conference committee can put some bite back into the bill. We doubt if Mr. Nixon will veto any consumer bill—even the strong one he doesn't want—just before an election year.

NIXON ADMINISTRATION TURNS ITS BACK ON HUNGRY AMERICAN CHILDREN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration has callously turned its back on millions of poor children in its attempt to cut back the free school lunch program.

Apparently, the specter of hungry children does not haunt the consciences in the White House and the Department of Agriculture. Proposed changes in school lunch regulations—changes which are in definite conflict with the intent of Congress—would return approximately 1 million American schoolchildren to the level of hunger they faced prior to enactment of the National School Lunch Act.

House Joint Resolution 923 which would assure that the school lunch program continues and that the breakfast program for needy children would be expanded is a promising sign. It is crucial that Congress have the courage to tell the President to stop playing politics with the health and well-being of disadvantaged children.

A recent article in the Washington Post describes exactly what a backward and regressive step the administration proposes at a time when we should be work-

ing to fulfill our commitment that no child should go to bed hungry.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 17, 1971]

UNRESOLVED QUESTION: WILL THE GOVERNMENT FEED THE HUNGRY?

(By Nick Kotz)

When the Johnson administration asked Congress for \$1 million to start a pilot school breakfast program for poor children, Rep. Jamie Whitten replied indignantly: "Do you contemplate having a pilot dinner program—evening meals—called supper where I grew up?"

Whitten's reaction was predictable. As chairman of the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, he never has showed much sympathy for federal programs to feed the poor or do anything else to help them. But Whitten, in his own folksy manner, posed a question which is still unresolved—the extent of the federal responsibility to feed the hungry of this nation.

Resolution of that question becomes increasingly important as the Nixon administration in program after program has attempted to impose a ceiling on federal food aid. In almost every instance, Congress has reacted by ordering the administration to feed all of the poor.

Only five years ago—or 10 at the most—there was no issue. The problems of hunger and malnutrition, along with the other results of poverty, were seen dimly if at all by the public and the government. It was assumed that the Salvation Army, local government or private charity kept anyone from going hungry.

There were relatively small federal food programs—food stamps, surplus commodities, and school lunches—but no one in or out of government looked closely to see whether they actually met the needs of the poor. The programs were adopted to help American agriculture dispose of its surpluses, and they were administered with that thought in mind.

Since 1967, however, an ever-growing band of food aid reformers has zeroed in on the problem of hunger and the inadequacy of federal programs. This awakening to hunger was part of a larger awakening to the problems of severe poverty in our affluent land.

It was not by accident that educators such as Leslie Dunbar of the Field Foundation concentrated on hunger. Thinking pragmatically, they saw little hope of achieving rapid gains for the poor in welfare, housing, or job training. But perhaps hunger was a basic enough human need and problem to arouse public support for action. As a result of the work of the reformers, the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition, and the last two administrations, the federal government has assumed a greater responsibility for feeding the poor.

In just a few years, participation in the Food Stamp program increased from less than 2 million to more than 10 million. Seven million poor children receive free or reduced price school lunches today compared with 2 million earlier. The school breakfast program has gone from a pilot program resisted by Whitten to one reaching almost 1 million children. And a summer feeding program is feeding several million children in day care and recreation centers.

The federal costs of these programs has risen from several hundred million to more than \$3 billion a year. Congress repeatedly has passed legislation liberalizing each of these programs. President Nixon has signed the bills with fanfare, pledging "to put an end to hunger in America" and to provide every poor child with a free school lunch.

Local citizen, church and welfare rights groups have insisted that their communities fully implement the improved food programs.

In short, the federal government, in a series of ad hoc decisions—mostly initiated by

Congress and the reformers—has repeatedly made far larger federal commitments to meet the food needs of the poor. The federal government, in effect, moved to fill a basic human need that had been largely ignored by state and local government.

But at the very moment that the country may be on the verge of fulfilling a commitment, the Nixon administration has begun to reexamine its implications.

It is balking at completing the job of reaching several million children, who still don't have free lunches. It tried to cut 1 million persons from the food stamp program. It is now trying to eliminate 1 million children already in the free lunch program. And most ironically, it is pushing a welfare reform bill that would eliminate food stamps, and could leave 90 per cent of the welfare poor with less total aid than they receive today.

Part of the administration's reexamination of its food aid commitment is purely fiscal. The Bureau of Management and Budget has repeatedly resisted providing more funds for programs that keep outgrowing their budgets.

Part of the administration's re-thinking is philosophical. The administration believes that state and local governments are shirking from their duty to pay part of the cost of school lunches.

Finally, the administration's commitment to feeding the hungry is compromised by its political approach to welfare reform. In trying to design a welfare bill that appealed to conservatives, the administration had to save money and minimize benefits.

Thus, it has pushed through the House a welfare bill that could badly blur its commitment "to put an end to hunger in America." A family of four in Los Angeles, Calif., that now gets \$2,600 a year welfare cash and \$600 in food stamp benefits could come out with \$2,400 in welfare and no food stamps. Food once again would be the budget item, which has to give way to paying the landlord and the doctor.

So the hunger issue is yet unresolved. The country, in a surge of emotion, legislation, and political rhetoric made a large commitment to alleviate one problem of poverty. Perhaps the implications of that commitment were not thoroughly understood.

Nevertheless, Congress had repeatedly, by large bi-partisan votes, told the administration it wants to end hunger in America.

And the poor have been given good reason to believe that they now will have more to eat than empty promises.

COALITION FOR RURAL AMERICA

HON. JOHN H. TERRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, recently I met with representatives of a new group calling themselves "Coalition for Rural America." This is certainly a lobby whose time has come, in my view. The case for such an organization was put very succinctly in a guest editorial from the Des Moines Register, which was placed in the Daily Messenger of Canandaigua, one of the very fine dailies in my congressional district. What is said in the editorial applies to all of rural America and I certainly wish the "Coalition for Rural America" well in its work. The editorial follows:

RURAL AMERICAN LOBBY

The new "Coalition for Rural America" formed in Washington the other day looks like it might succeed where other organiza-

tions aimed at rural development have failed.

This lobby group has been formed by a number of experienced politicians who want to provide an effective voice in government for rural areas, including small towns and small cities as well as agriculture itself. Prominent in the new organization are a number of ex-governors of states which have rural development difficulties.

The two who seem to be the principal leaders at this point are Norbert Tieman, a Republican and former governor of Nebraska, and Edward Breathitt, former Democratic governor of Kentucky. Other ex-governors involved in the organization are Winthrop Rockefeller of Arkansas, Dewey Bartlett of Oklahoma, Leroy Collins of Florida, Philip Hoff of Vermont, Harold LeVander of Minnesota, Orville Freeman of Minnesota (who is also an ex-U.S. secretary of agriculture), and Robert McNair of South Carolina.

Senator James Pearson (Rep., Kan.) and Senator Hubert Humphrey (Dem., Minn.) spoke at the organizational meeting of the Coalition for Rural America. But members of Congress are not officially members of the coalition. The coalition is intended to do for rural interests what the National Urban Coalition does for cities. Presumably, the Coalition for Rural America will lobby for such rural development bills as those introduced by Humphrey and Pearson.

For a hundred years state and federal governments have been pouring vast resources into the development of commercial agriculture, largely ignoring the interests of the towns and nonfarm workers associated with agriculture. The by-passed people who are squeezed out of farming by the advancement of new technology have been sorely neglected by government on all levels.

The theory that building a strong, efficient commercial farm industry would build prosperity for rural America has not worked out.

Clearly, the time has come for reorientation of government effort in rural communities. Commercial agriculture cannot be ignored, because the business of farming depends heavily on government help in supply management, credit, price supports and so on. But the large commercial farmers of today need little attention in the form of technical assistance and education on new technology. The commercial suppliers of fertilizer, machinery and other inputs are providing much of this assistance, which was formerly the monopoly of the Land Grant agricultural colleges.

In the rural communities of today, Extension and other government agencies ought to be concentrating more and more on the people of small towns, the "people left behind" in the process of farm enlargement and reduction of work opportunity in farming.

A new thrust is needed toward developing nonfarm business opportunities in agricultural areas. In addition, there is a crying need for better social services, especially education and health.

The problems of rural America are not new. They have been studied and reported upon by academic experts for many years. Now what is needed is the practical effort of politicians to get something done in the directions that research has pointed out.

LAKE FOREST, ILL.—OUTSTANDING AMERICAN COMMUNITY

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the New York publication, Women's Wear Daily, there appeared a

highly prejudicial, irresponsible, and factually inaccurate article concerning Lake Forest, Ill.—a residential community located in my 12th Congressional District.

The article in question is an example of the type of sensationalism which is sometimes peddled as journalism.

The Women's Wear Daily article, having been reproduced in the October 11 issue of the Chicago Tribune, produced such a reaction that the Tribune has now printed a factually accurate and balanced article which describes the true character and makeup of one of the outstanding residential communities of our Nation.

I should add that while many residents of Lake Forest enjoy the advantage of uncrowded living, in my opinion, they embrace and express few prejudices based on race, color, religion, economic status, and other frequent bases of personal bias.

At the conclusion of the Chicago Tribune article, I have included the Tribune's explanation and apology regarding factual inaccuracies in the Women's Wear Daily story:

LOOKING AT LAKE FOREST
(By Joan Beck)

Mrs. Beck is a Tribune writer specializing in child care and development who lives in Lake Forest.

Describing Lake Forest in the old clichés of social snobbery seems as superficial and irrelevant to many residents of the Far North suburb as reporting on Gloria Steinem in terms of bust, waist and hip measurements. Like women weary of being viewed as nothing more than sex symbols, most Lake Foresters are angry and embarrassed when stereotyped as nothing more than society symbols.

Feminique's article about Lake Forest [Oct. 11], reprinted from Women's Wear Daily, followed the shallow, old party line about "right clubs" and the "right private schools" for children who "all have Ferraris." Dozens of Lake Foresters have objected sharply to this portrait of their home town, calling it "grossly inaccurate, outdated and unfair."

The most obvious error was the statement that there is only one black family in Lake Forest. It can be refuted only by the kind of black-white statistics that seem so demeaning to those of us who do not see neighbors and friends in racist and ethnic terms.

There are 340 black residents in the community, according to the 1970 census, up from 224 in 1960. This represents 2.17 per cent of Lake Forest's total 15,642 population. Only Evanston and Glenoco, among Chicago's Northern, Northwestern and Western suburbs, have a larger percentage of blacks.

WORK FOR INTEGRATION

Some examples of prejudice can still be found; more are undoubtedly covered skillfully with polite veneer. But many Lake Foresters have long worked energetically and sincerely to achieve a genuine racial integration in the community. At least one white family has adopted black children. A black family acted as hosts to a white Norwegian exchange student thru the American Field Service program this past school * * * wealth still very much a part of the city.

But they are only a part. Lake Forest has doubled in size in the last two decades and much of the influx has consisted of business executives, lawyers, bankers, brokers, artists and other successful professionals who now make up an upper middle class majority in the city.

Lake Forest's attractions for most of this growing group are not so much social prestige as open land, comparatively low taxes, schools and the suburb's great physical beauty.

Altho the newcomers are generally affluent, Lake Forest is not Chicago's wealthiest sub-

urb. It ranks 6th in a recent Chicago Regional Hospital study based on median home value [\$68,100], percentage of homes over \$50,000 [68 per cent], assessed valuation per capita [\$8,214] and other factors. At about the same time, a new survey by Chicago Today put Lake Forest 10th among Chicago's 267 suburbs in terms of median income [\$18,691] and average household wealth [\$34,346].

Lake Forest money is generally not spent ostentatiously in the community. [A burglar reportedly robbed five Green Bay Road mansions early one pre-dawn morning and netted only \$35 for his efforts.] "Fewer families have live-in help, or leave their children with nursemaids or send them away to camp for all summer than in Highland Park," observed a woman who has lived in both adjoining communities.

Market Square, the city's central shopping area and reputedly the first planned shopping center in the United States, usually impresses newcomers as having a kind of great-aunt dowdiness. But most find themselves defending its cramped status quo against slurs from outsiders like they would a great-aunt's virtue.

Zoning ordinances are intended to keep commercial establishments in Lake Forest as low-key as possible. Stores are prohibited from using more than 15 per cent of their window space or front area to display their name or for other advertising signs. Neon lights are banned. The zoning board recently turned down a drug chain's standard plans to modernize its Lake Forest branch as too garish, but worked with the outlet to develop a more suitable design.

"It's probably the only Walgreen's in the country with a wood-paneled front," says Paul Reaume, Lake Forest city manager.

VAST OPEN AREAS

Lake Forest's 15 square miles of land make it the 6th largest community in Illinois in terms of area. It still contains vast open acreages of woods, weeds, farm crops and pasture—a fact which arouses keen local interest in zoning provisions.

Community planners hope to control the city's growth to a maximum of about 25,000 by 1980 and have set a three-acre minimum on much of the remaining tracts of vacant property. Ordinances requiring that no two Lake Forest buildings can be "excessively similar or excessively dissimilar" also tend to discourage mass builders—and probably some architectural innovation as well.

Zoning rules and high land costs have kept Lake Forest growth to a slower pace than most Chicago suburbs. New home building did reach a peak of almost 200 homes annually, but has slacked off below predicted levels in the last two years—which has led some Lake Foresters to complain that the just-opened second high school may not have been necessary yet. The Lake Forest-Lake Bluff District 115 now operates an east campus with about 800 juniors and seniors in the old McKinley Road location and a new east campus, still under construction at Kennedy and Waukegan Roads, with a similar number of freshmen and sophomores.

It is true that private schooling in Lake Forest tends to split much of the social old guard from what is now the majority of the community. About 25 per cent of the city's youngsters do attend private or parochial school, chiefly Lake Forest Country Day School; Lake Forest Academy for boys; Ferry Hall for girls; Woodlands Academy, a Catholic preparatory school; and St. Mary's, a Catholic elementary school.

That Lake Forest's school taxes need provide for only 75 per cent of the city's children makes local real estate taxes noticeably lower than those in many other suburbs. The city's public schools offer rather standard kindergarten-thru-4th grade fare. But a city-wide intermediate school brings 5th and 6th graders together where they can be grouped by ability in math and English. Bright youngsters get enrichment programs which eventually make it possible for an 8th grad-

er to be taking two high school subjects and for 12th graders to be graduated with enough credits for a year of college work.

If the private clubs and private schools tend to be somewhat divisive, Lake Forest churches and civic organizations have a strong unifying effect on the community. So does the desire of most residents to preserve the monetary, esthetic and ecological values they find in their home town. Most contribute to the teen-agers' efforts to collect old bottles and newspapers for recycling, thru C. L. A. [Clean Land, Air and Water].

City government boards and committees, church groups, women's associations, and other civic organizations all cut across social and economic lines in Lake Forest. So do the Deer Path Art League and the Community Music Association with its women's committee, which support the Lake Forest Symphony Orchestra. Its conductor is Victor Altay, concertmaster of the Chicago Symphony.

Most Lake Foresters are also united in feeling there is something unique, altho largely undefinable, about their city. For many, it is a sense of "smalltown" in contrast to "suburb," of old-fashioned neighborliness and courtesy. Altho 1,100 of its residents ride the commuter trains to Chicago daily, an increasing number have offices or studios or businesses in the community itself.

This is still a place where traffic regularly stops on Green Bay Road to let a row of ducks parade across from pond to park where pre-Pottawatomie arrow heads can be found in the muddy fields in the spring.

BEG YOUR PARDON

A story supplied by the Women's Wear Daily News Service and printed in the Feminique section of The Tribune Oct. 11 contained several factual errors.

The story described how various people in Lake Forest live.

The story stated: "Things that used to shock, such as white socialite Flossie Curtis getting married to black garbage collector Jack Casselberry some 20 years ago, hardly lift an eyebrow today. The Casselberrys still are the only black family in town."

That statement is false. Miss Curtis did not marry Jack Casselberry.

Mr. Casselberry's wife, Joan, is Negro. The Casselberry family is highly respected in Lake Forest.

The Casselberrys are not the only black family in Lake Forest.

The 1970 United States Census Bureau report states that there are 340 black people in Lake Forest. In the 1969 census, there were 224 black people living in that Lake County suburb.

The Tribune regrets publication of the errors appearing in the article from Women's Wear Daily and apologizes.

JET CURFEW NEEDED AT LAGUARDIA

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the problem of excessive noise abuse from jet traffic has dominated citizens' concerns ever since the first jets began swooping and soaring over their homes. The situation has deteriorated for residents as jet traffic has increased to a point of a constant bombardment of noise. Studies amply demonstrating the psychological and physical traumatic effects on people

have been made on the debilitating effects of jet noise. The noise impact is 10 times more disturbing during the normal sleeping hours, when it is much more difficult to assimilate sounds, than during the day.

Action by airports and airlines to remedy the problem have been inadequate for the most part. The constitutional right to domestic tranquility includes freedom from noise. Unfortunately, this generally has been blatantly ignored by the noisemakers.

One of the few successful attempts at regulation has been the ban on late evening and pre-dawn jet traffic at Washington National Airport. I strongly urge other airports to follow this example. It is morally, socially, and environmentally necessary.

I wish to insert into the RECORD the following letter that I have sent to the Port Authority of New York, LaGuardia Airport management and the airlines using that airport, requesting them to agree voluntarily on a curfew at LaGuardia in the interests of all concerned citizens:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 19, 1971.

DEAR SIR: Increasingly, and at a very disturbing rate, residents of Queens are furiously complaining about the "sleep-shattering whine and roar" of jet aircraft operating out of LaGuardia Airport. The complaints have been present for some time but are even more vociferous today because the Port Authority and those responsible have failed to substantially reduce engine noise levels.

Acoustics experts have said that everyone living in a city could be stone deaf by the year 2000 if noise levels keep rising at the present rate. Noise pollution is becoming a serious health hazard. Urban noise has been rising at the rate of one decibel a year and if it continues every urban dweller will be deaf by the end of this century, less than 30 years from now.

Noise, like so many other forms of pollution, is a product of our technological advancement. But this need not be. Pollution does not have to be the price of progress.

Noise is more than uncomfortable. It is debilitating. It can and does interfere with our sleep, our work and our leisure.

Studies have indicated that loss of efficiency due to noisy working conditions could be reducing our Gross National Product by several billion dollars a year. Millions more in potential workmen's compensation claims are believed generated annually by noise-induced hearing losses in perhaps as many as 15 million American workers. There is evidence of a close relationship between noise exposure and body fatigue as well as psychological and social stresses.

The community residents near LaGuardia suffer the consequences of decades of neglect of the noise pollution problem. Most of them have lived in New York City for many years. They live in established communities and not in hurriedly-assembled subdivision tracts. Most of them were there before the jets arrived.

They used to live in comfortable, convenient neighborhoods which, while noisier perhaps than rural areas, nonetheless struck a reasonable balance between city hustle and bustle and suburban quietness. But today, that balance is gone. Now those people come home from their jobs and find themselves beneath an intolerable roar as jetliner after jetliner screeches over their roofs. The night does not bring peace to them because LaGuardia does not understand or recognize the citizen's right to quiet.

These city dwellers have lost that balance

of toleration which once existed in their neighborhoods. They find that their homes offer not less, but more noise, more distraction and more simple human discomfort than their jobs in the heart of the city.

Recognition of this serious problem is a first step for the Port Authority, LaGuardia Airport management, and the airlines themselves. Alleviation of this situation is not terribly difficult. A reasonable solution would be to begin curtailment of all commercial, especially jet, traffic at LaGuardia from scheduling departures and arrivals between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m., the hours normally used for sleeping.

About 7.2 percent of the total operations at LaGuardia were conducted between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. during a nine-month period from June 1970 to March 1971, according to the Federal Aviation Administration. This may seem like a small number—about 67 total flights per night—unless you happen to live nearby. Then the din of the aircraft becomes almost unbearable. Aircraft noise during the normal sleeping hours has a compounding impact on residents because the noise cannot be assimilated as it is during the day with other noises. One jet liner taking off at midnight has ten times the effective noise impact of the same plane taking off at noon.

This point cannot be overly emphasized. FAA records of scheduled air flights on an average day during March 1971 shows that there were 36 scheduled arrivals and departures during the stated nine-hour period out of a total of 718 regularly scheduled flights. Thirty-four of these operations were jet aircraft. These flights represent a constant bombardment to nearby residents, especially during the night-time hours when their noise disturbance is at its worst.

Washington National Airport prohibits scheduled jet commercial traffic between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. The FAA, which runs National, and the airlines operating out of the airport, have a voluntary agreement on the night flight limitations. The agreement began in 1966 and has worked rather well. Only minor adjustments by the airlines were needed in rescheduling flights to conform. Similar agreements exist in Los Angeles, Boise, Idaho, and Fresno, California.

I strongly urge you to act promptly to secure voluntary agreements to discontinue all commercial, and especially jet, traffic operations at LaGuardia between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. I recommend such actions be taken now, before tough legislative measures become unavoidable. The constitutional right of domestic tranquility includes freedom from oppressive noise. Steps must be taken by the Port Authority, airport management and the airlines to protect and respect the right and to halt the acoustic abuse heaped mercilessly upon the citizenry. If I may be of help in securing such agreements and providing the residents of Queens a quieter environment, please call on me.

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL,
Member of Congress.

COLLEGE STUDENTS SPEAK OUT ON EQUITY IN STUDENT AID LEGISLATION

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, in the next few days the House will consider H.R. 7248, The Higher Education Act of 1971. For almost 2 years the Special Subcommittee on Education has been holding hearings on the needs of higher educa-

tion. Most of our witnesses have been college presidents, members of national associations representing institutions of higher education, and others who view higher education through institutional eyeglasses. We have not heard enough from faculty. We have heard almost nothing from trustees. And the opinions of students—the main reason for our support of higher education—have not been solicited.

One of the encouraging results of my efforts to insure greater equity and predictability in the Education Opportunity Grant—EOG—program has been the interest and concern of students. My proposal, which failed in committee, is designed to get the aid where student need actually exists. The committee bill holds to the old approach that money should first be distributed according to some arbitrary State allotment formula, then subjected to a process of institutional grantsmanship, and finally made available to students who can convince their financial aid officer of their need. Such a program has worked for 6 years with these inequities to the student. The committee bill will open up even greater potentiality for inequitable treatment of students in need.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that each of our colleagues will take the time to study this issue. I intend to raise it on the floor of the House when H.R. 7248 comes before us for consideration.

Because I believe that Members would like to see what student groups are doing and saying on the EOG issue, I am inserting a letter which I just received from Mr. Peter Coye, acting executive director of the National Student Lobby. Following his letter is some information directed to students around the country on the newly formed National Student Lobby.

Following that information, I am inserting into the RECORD a news bulletin put out recently by the Washington Campus News Service. Attached to their news bulletin is a fact sheet which compares the new EOG proposal with the program proposed in H.R. 7248.

The letter and bulletin follow:

NATIONAL STUDENT LOBBY,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1971.

Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUIE: For the past several weeks I have been following the bill H.R. 7248 and the amendments which you are considering to that bill. I would like you to know that I support your proposed reform of the Educational Opportunity Grants program.

I have been in contact with several Congressmen concerning this bill and I have urged them to support your amendments. I feel that I have been successful at explaining the value of targeting money on students rather than on institutions when the Federal government distributes aid to needy students. Your proposed reform of the E.O.G. program would assure that minority and underprivileged students are given an equal chance to attend college.

In the past weeks I have been in constant contact with our constituency and without hesitation I can say that the students of America are in support of your proposed reform of the E.O.G. program. They have asked me to inform you about their position on this issue and to furthermore express to the Congress the seriousness of this matter in the minds of students.

To fail to pass H.R. 7248, with the amendments you propose, would be to short-change thousands of needy students in both the urban and rural areas of our country.

If there is anything which the National Student Lobby can do to insure the passage of H.R. 7248 with the amendments you propose please speak with me.

Sincerely,

PETER L. COYE,
Executive Director.

The ratification of the 26th amendment to the Constitution has created an opportunity for students to dramatically increase their influence in American politics and society.

Organized, this new force can begin to make its impact felt on the federal government—where the crucial decisions are made on matters of civil liberties, higher education, war, poverty, and the environment.

This potential force will not, however, organize itself spontaneously, nor can it be organized effectively by people outside the campus community. What is needed is a mechanism that is controlled by students that will aid campuses in organizing for effective political action, and will give them a strong voice in the government that affects their lives.

In the past, students have not been heard in committee hearings on the extension of the draft, on aid to higher education, or on protecting the environment. Nor have they been heard at election time, when their votes could mean the difference in vital races across the nation.

The experience of the California Student Lobby has already demonstrated the effectiveness of having a well-defined mechanism to lobby for student interests. Dick Twohy, legislative counsel of the California Student Lobby, has reported an 81% success rate on 47 bills on which he has taken a position, and has played a major role in influencing bills ranging from an effort to raise graduate tuition to \$2,500 (dropped by the author) to increased funding for the Economic Opportunity Program (passed Education Committee).

We invite your student government to become a member of the National Student Lobby—an organization which will both lobby in support of student interests and work to maintain the political strength at election time to make the student voice meaningful to legislators.

The NSL is a non-profit, registered lobby in Washington, D.C. It is the only national student organization with a tax status that allows it to lobby Congress in behalf of student interests. It has a permanent staff and office in the national capital to monitor the activities of Congress and the Executive, and to make the needs and interests of students known throughout the government.

This permanent mechanism will make students a constituency to which Congressmen will listen, for it will not disappear in the summer, nor will its memory be only one to four years long.

In order to be effective, the lobbying efforts of the NSL must be followed up at election time. The NSL, with other groups across the nation, will seek to aid campuses in organizing into an effective political bloc—capable of defeating public officials who refuse to recognize the need for change in this country, and electing representatives committed to a reordering of this nation's institutions.

The NSL will not endorse any candidates, but it will take positions on issues, and will seek to affect government policies related to those issues.

The positions taken by the NSL will be adopted through an annual ballot to be sent to each member student government of the NSL by the national office. The ballot will then be put before the student body as a referendum, and the results of such referendum on campuses across the nation will determine the policies of the NSL.

Every effort will be made to time such referenda to coincide with scheduled student government elections so as to avoid the needless cost of an extra balloting. If, however, it is impossible to hold both the student government elections and the NSL balloting simultaneously, and the student government cannot afford a separate NSL referendum, the student council will be authorized to cast the student body's votes on the NSL ballot. Each student government will cast a number of votes proportional to the number of students at that college.

The membership of the National Student Lobby will be divided into regional caucuses so as to increase communications within an area small enough to make travel and telephone calls financially reasonable to members of the NSL.

Each regional caucus will meet once a year to vote on matters such as the Executive Director (the hired staff person responsible for the activities of the national office), the annual budget, and the Executive Committee.

Each regional caucus will elect two members to the Executive Committee, which will act as watchdog of the national office.

The Executive Committee will make independent reports to the NSL membership, will hire members of the staff other than the Executive Director (who is hired by the membership), and will assist in the preparation of the annual budget.

Thus, students will have both direct and indirect controls over the activities of the office that will be speaking in the name of students.

The National Student Lobby will have three major elements:

One, an office in the Capital with staff and facilities adequate to discover, in the mass of legislation, those bills and issues of key importance to large groups of young people; to analyze, follow, and influence such legislation; to initiate and propose new laws.

Two, a communications network through which to help mobilize campus communities to register to vote and to vote on election day, to convey current information to thousands of students on each campus, to determine the thrust of student opinion on given issues, to develop an exchange of information and resources between campuses and the Capital—to involve directly the greatest number of young people in helping shape a more equitable and responsive legal and social system.

Three, an extensive network of lobby offices throughout the nation which can provide direction for the activities of the NSL, work to increase student participation in the political process (through voter registration and get-out-the-vote drives), and mobilize local public pressure in the home districts of key legislators.

Extensive challenge though it is, we believe this triple aim can be accomplished through the combination of many competent young people and adequate financial resources.

Of the two, financial resources are by far the more rare in the student community. Nonetheless, the University of California student governments have shown that an effective lobbying operation can be supported by student funds.

It is essential that the NSL also be supported by students, for the structural guarantees of student control will be meaningless if the NSL is dependent on large, non-student contributors.

During the first year, it will be necessary to depend on some private funds while the membership of the NSL grows, but it is hoped that by its second year the NSL will be self-sustaining.

For the first year, membership fees will be 30 for schools with less than 1,000 students, \$40 for schools with between 1,000 and 4,999 students, and \$50 for schools with 5,000 students or more. In succeeding years, however, membership fees will be proportional to the number of students attending a

school, and will be set at a level determined by the membership to cover the entire annual expenses of the NSL.

We invite your student government to become a part of the National Student Lobby, and ask you to do what you can to convince your student government to join.

This will involve contacting members of your student government and student newspaper who might be interested in the NSL and obtaining their help in placing our proposal before the student council. It may involve a great deal of effort on your part, but this is an opportunity that will not come again for decades.

The NSL is part of the effort to insure that the enfranchisement of the 18- through 20-year olds in this country will result in meaningful change. We cannot and should not depend on big, non-student contributors. Therefore, we ask that a check for the first year's membership fee be enclosed with your student government's membership application.

Working together we can make the National Student Lobby a strong and effective student voice in government.

Sincerely yours,

PETER BIRDSALL,
PETER COYE,
CRAIG FENECH,
SPENCER REIBMAN,

Coordinating Committee, National Student Lobby.

Following is the news release put out by the Washington Campus News Service and a fact sheet comparing my proposal with that in H.R. 7248:

EDUCATION GROUPS BAND TOGETHER ON AID GRANTS

WASHINGTON (WCNS).—Representatives of a score of education groups—from the College Entrance Examination Board to the National Student Association—have banded together in support of federal aid to the neediest students.

The group is attempting to solicit support among college students and various organizations for a proposal to ensure that poor students retain first access to federal grants, regardless of where they study. The proposal is expected to be made in the form of an amendment to H.R. 7248, "The Higher Education Act of 1971," when that bill reaches the floor of the House in the next week or so.

President Nixon also proposed a new student aid program in his higher education message to Congress last February. With new legislation he hoped that more than 1 million more students would receive aid. It would assure that federal funds go first, and in the largest amounts, to the neediest students in order to place them on an equal footing with students from higher-income families. It would mean that (high school students') choice of a college would be based on their educational goals rather than upon their families' financial circumstances.

"The most emotional issue Congress faced this year in the area of higher education centered on institutional grants," Representative Albert H. Quile (R-Minn.) told the group at a recent meeting. "But no one stood up for students."

Under H.R. 7248 as it was passed by the House Education and Labor Committee, higher income students could have access to these grants, through their colleges, even before poor students. A student could not receive more than \$4,000 in four years, but his grant would not be automatically renewed from year to year as is presently the case under the Education Opportunity Grant (EOG) program; and financial aid officers would have authority to determine a family's "contribution" and decide who was eligible.

Under the amendment being proposed by Rep. Quile and others, students would receive \$1,400 per year less the contribution of

his family, or half his estimated "need" to attend an institution, which is less. Student aid officers would use a standard formula for determining what each student could contribute. And students would continue to have the same assurance of receiving aid from year to year if they continue to qualify.

Quie told the "coalition" group recently that the committee-passed bill would seriously erode the six-year federal commitment that "federal aid should go first where the need is the greatest."

"A serious problem in this bill is the increased power given to financial aid officers," Quie said. "There is a 28 percent turnover of aid directors annually, which means many directors have little experience. Under our bipartisan proposal, they would follow standard guidelines less susceptible to mischief."

"Students from families of middle and upper incomes would still have access to federal work-study and loan programs," Quie said. "In fact, under the EOG proposal, families with incomes of \$12,000 and above would qualify—but the student would not receive an EOG as large as those in greater need."

Rep. Quie said student leaders and student editors should make their views known by writing to their Congressman and sending copies to him for possible publication in the Congressional Record. "My colleagues in the House do not know the wishes of students. Only this eleventh hour effort will turn the tide in favor of the students who need financial aid the most."

FACT SHEET ON THE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT (EOG) ISSUE

PRINCIPLES BEHIND NEW EOG PROPOSAL

EOGs should be available to eligible students wherever they study.

A student's financial resources should be evaluated alike by all institutions.

Students with similar need should receive similar grants.

Prospective students should be able to count on aid, according to their resources, well in advance of entering college.

Whatever Congress appropriates, students with the least financial resources for further education should receive the grant aid first.

These principles form the basis for a new proposal (outlined below) which is expected to be introduced on the floor of the House in the next few days as an amendment to H.R. 7248, "The Higher Education Act of 1971."

BASIC FORMULA FOR NEW PROPOSAL

Each undergraduate student enrolled in an eligible institution would receive an amount equal to either \$1,400 minus "family contribution, or one-half of his "need" to attend that institution, whichever amount is less.

COMPARISONS OF EOG IN THE NEW PROPOSAL AND THE COMMITTEE BILL H.R. 7248

New Proposal

1. No state allotment formula. EOGs available to neediest students wherever they go.

H.R. 7248

1. Includes state allotment formula unrelated to number of needy students; results in inequitable distribution of money, favoring some states (students) over others.

New Proposal

2. Each institution would use the same system (similar to Amer. College Testing or College Scholarship Service) for analyzing "contribution," considering income, assets, number of children in college, unusual medical expenses, cost of living.

H.R. 7248

2. Requires consideration of same factors, but does not prohibit different interpretation of them; different colleges could re-

quire different "contributions" from the same student.

New Proposal

3. Student would be assured of the same amount of EOG, depending on the "contribution" he could make and the "cost of attending. Possible for student with high cost and no contribution to receive \$5,600 in four years.

H.R. 7248

3. The same student could be denied any EOG or given amount up to \$1,500. A grant could not exceed half his total financial aid package. Could not receive more than \$4,000 in four years, or if necessary, \$5,000 in five.

New Proposal

4. Sophomore, junior or senior in good standing has same assurance of EOG if he continues to qualify under the formula.

H.R. 7248

4. Unlike the present law, an initial year EOG recipient has no assurance for renewal; must compete for a grant each year.

New Proposal

5. Institution would receive whatever amount all of its eligible students are entitled to under the formula.

H.R. 7248

5. Institution receives part or all (if program is fully funded) of its approved request. The requesting procedure allows institutions with large aid base and experienced aid officer to get greater shares.

New Proposal

6. Views EOG as a "base" of aid to provide equal access to college. State & institutional aid, work/study etc. would be built upon this base. Most needy have first access to available funds.

H.R. 7248

6. Views EOG as grant for students who could not otherwise attend "but for" the grant. Allows middle & high income families to have same first call on available funds, when they cannot afford expensive schools.

New Proposal

7. Half-time students eligible proportionately; after first year, students at proprietary schools eligible; no family contribution expected for veterans.

H.R. 7248

7. Same.

New Proposal

8. Authorizes "such sums as may be necessary." Estimated first year cost—\$500 million.

H.R. 7248

8. Authorizes \$295 million for fiscal 1973, then "such sums as may be necessary."

SUMMARY

The new proposal, which will be presented on the House floor, adopts the same philosophy as the basic education opportunity grant program in the Senate's bill, S. 659. Aid is "targeted" on the students with the least in the way of family contribution. The amount of discretion available to both the Commissioner of Education (HEW) and any financial aid officer is less than under present law. Students themselves are the major factor in determining who gets a grant and how much.

H.R. 7248 (the Committee bill) relies on arbitrary state allotment formulas; the ability of the financial aid officer to be a good "grantsman" in getting funds for his institution; and finally his own human judgment about who should get a grant and in what amount. This approach would allow higher income students to benefit even before needy students if the aid officer decides they could not attend his institution "but for" an EOG. It is a totally different philosophy.

LEAD: THE INEXCUSABLE POLLUTANT

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, over the course of the past few years, the American public has become increasingly aware of the host of chemical contaminants plaguing our health and our environment. Most of these hazards carry complex and strange-sounding names such as polychlorinated biphenyls. Others are known by a jumble of letters and numbers such as DDT and 2,4,5-T. But perhaps the most devastating of all is known by a simple, four-letter word: lead.

Lead is directly responsible for the poisoning of some 400,000 young children each year who are afflicted with lead-based paint poisoning as a result of ingesting lead-tainted paint and plaster fallen from dilapidated housing. Of these children, 1,600 will incur moderate to severe brain damage; 800 will be so severely afflicted that they will be forced to spend the remainder of their lives institutionalized; for 200 others, there will be no hope at all—for they will die from the devastating effects of this chemical.

Countless others will take potentially harmful levels of lead into their bodies as a result of the emissions from automobile exhausts, from chewing on lead-tainted pencils, from coming in contact with any of the multitude of unfettered uses of lead.

The pervasiveness of this substance and its danger are cited in an article by Paul Craig which appeared in the October 2 edition of Saturday Review, entitled "Lead, the Inexcusable Pollutant." I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Saturday Review, Oct. 2, 1971]

LEAD, THE INEXCUSABLE POLLUTANT

(By Paul P. Craig)

If the crust of planet earth were to be chopped into a million pieces, somewhere between ten and fifteen of them would consist of the chemical element lead. As far as scientists have been able to discover up to now, lead contributes nothing to the development or maintenance of life, either in plants, or in animals, or in man. On the contrary, the evolutionary process that brought forth the human species seems to have recognized long ago that lead is poisonous to life; the farther upward one searches in the chain of species that feed upon other species, the less lead is found.

Yet, within the degree of accuracy to which such matters have been measured, the scientific indications are that the surface waters of earth's oceans today contain ten times as much lead as they did before the human animal emerged.

And the American people today are carrying around in their bodies one hundred times the amount of lead they would have absorbed from a primitive environment.

What does this mean?

Simply that man has changed his natural environment to such an extent and has employed lead in making the changes in such a way as to systematically poison himself.

Originally, all the lead on earth was buried in the planetary crust. Man began digging out the metal about 5,000 years ago, probably after finding it accidentally in the ores from which he obtained silver. Tin also was present in silver-bearing rock, and could be mixed with lead to form pewter and so provide a protective coating for copper pots and pans that otherwise poisoned the food prepared in them. Lead was likewise popular with potters, who used it as glazing for ceramic vessels.

The poisonous effects of lead on the human organism have long been recognized. The early Romans, in their quest for silver, smelted large amounts of ore that contained lead. About 400 tons of lead were recovered for each ton of silver. The mining and smelting were performed by slaves, who undoubtedly often died of lead poisoning.

The lead was used for a wide variety of purposes, including roof sheathing, and cooking and wine vessels. Democritus noted that the acidity of wine could be reduced by the addition of lead oxide. Pliny specified that leaden pots must be used in making grape syrup; dissolved lead apparently improved the flavor of the syrup.

Since the ruling classes had most access to leaden vessels, they constituted the group that was most poisoned. The resulting decline in their birth rate and in their creative and governing ability has been documented impressively by Dr. S. C. Gilfillan in an ingenious piece of detective work (see *SE*, Aug. 7, 1965).

Centuries after the Roman Empire collapsed, apparently without understanding what had happened to it, pioneers of modern American civilization acted to prevent a repetition of the performance. Governors of the Massachusetts Bay Colony in New England outlawed the distillation of rum in leaded vessels in order to prevent what were then called "the dry gripes."

Generations of boys on both sides of the Atlantic played with toy lead soldiers until the toys were shown to be connected with sickness and the death of children who nibbled on them.

During the early years of the twentieth century, lead poisoning was common among house painters. The most characteristic symptom was wrist drop, a tendency of the wrist muscles to sag. The sagging resulted from lead interference with the nerves that control the muscles.

The early mortality of painters and workers in the lead processing industry was relatively high and easily identified. On diagnosis, action could be taken to eliminate the sources of exposure. The most decisive action was banning lead from interior paint some years ago. This protected the painters, but not the infants and toddling children who picked off and ate paint peeling from neglected walls. New coats of lead-free paints blocked off the danger residing in the old leaded paints, but when the new coats wore thin and were not in their turn covered, the underlying lead paints again came within reach of the children's hands.

Convulsions, delirium, coma, severe and irreversible brain damage, blindness, paralysis, mental retardation, and death can result from lead poisoning. In children, the early symptoms are particularly subtle. Victims become irritable, sleepy, or cranky. They may be troubled either with diarrhea or its opposite, constipation. Only if a pediatrician is looking for lead poisoning is he likely to identify it in a child, for most children are frequently irritable, sleepy, or cranky. So, although lead poisoning is known to be one of the major sources of injury to young children in low-income families (two hundred die every year in America alone), lead's impact on other children can only be surmised.

Most lead that enters the human body does

so through food. This lead, which enters the stomach, is rather inefficiently absorbed by the body, and only about 5 to 10 per cent of the lead ingested actually enters the blood stream. Inhaled lead is far more serious, for the fine particles emitted by automobiles are retained within the alveoli of the lungs and are absorbed by the body with an efficiency of about 40 per cent. Thus, a small quantity of lead inhaled can do far more damage than a large quantity consumed. By emitting lead into the atmosphere, man has bypassed complex and effective mechanisms designed by nature to keep the lead burden of humans low.

Because of these circumstances, the emission of lead through the exhaust pipes of internal combustion engines automobiles has become man's greatest worry in connection with lead poisoning—greatest because it has been growing constantly since 1923, when lead was first introduced as an additive to automotive fuel. Although concentrated in the cities and hence visited most heavily on city dwellers, atmospheric lead is carried by the winds and deposited all over the globe. The index of its presence is the lead content of the Greenland icecap, which has been traced back to 800 B.C. and shown to have been explosively accelerated during the last half century.

The total daily intake of lead in the food and drink of an individual American is typically about 300 micrograms, of which 15 to 30 micrograms is absorbed. The average city dweller experiences an atmospheric lead level of about 2 micrograms per cubic meter. He inhales about 20 cubic meters of air per day, of which 40 per cent, or 16 micrograms, is absorbed. Thus, at least one-third of the total lead absorbed by average American urban dwellers arises directly from atmospheric lead.

In unfavorably situated cities, the concentration of atmospheric lead can be substantially higher than the levels just mentioned. In midtown Manhattan, for example, average values of 7.5 micrograms of lead per cubic meter of air have been reported. Lead content of some city dust approaches 1 per cent, which is equal to the proportion of lead found in some ores. Grass harvested from alongside highways has been found to contain as much as one hundred times the lead concentration of grass not exposed to automobile exhaust. Recently, at the Staten Island Zoo, two leopards were paralyzed, a horned owl's feathers dropped out, and a number of captive snakes lost their ability to slither. All proved to be victims of lead poisoning, and the source of the lead was the grass, leaves, and soil in outdoor cages, as well as the paint on the cage bars. Dr. T. J. Chow of Scripps Oceanographic Institute recently reported that in San Diego average values of lead are now 8 micrograms per cubic meter of air; he noted that the concentrations are rising at a rate of 5 per cent per year. There can no longer be any question that atmospheric lead is at a dangerous level.

The degree of the danger cannot be stated precisely without an accurate measure of the amount of the lead burden now being carried by the bodies of Americans and of the margin between this level and that known to produce crippling or fatal effects. If the margin is small, it is important to search for subtle effects that would not be noticed in a conventional public health survey.

The most commonly used indicator of exposure to lead is the concentration of lead in the blood. There is at present a narrow margin between the average blood level in Americans and the level associated with severe poisoning. The level considered diagnostic of lead poisoning in healthy males is 0.8 parts of lead per million (ppm) parts of blood. Today the average American's blood concentration is about 0.2 ppm—one-

fourth of the amount commonly considered hazardous to adults and almost half the lead indicative of acute poisoning in children.

At best, the margin of safety concept is questionable; at worst, it can be disastrous. The definition of the margin depends in large degree upon the sophistication of diagnosis. Safety levels are set so that known deleterious effects do not occur—at least not often. As diagnostic techniques improve, effects in individuals can be detected at lower levels. As statistical techniques improve, it becomes possible to search for subtle effects in large populations, as well as for synergistic effects in which the sensitivity of the body to a particular insult is increased due to the presence of some other pollutant, dietary deficiency, or the like. With increased sophistication, one also can detect groups of people who are especially sensitive. In the case of lead, it is essential that the most sensitive group—the children—be given particular emphasis in setting permissible criteria and standards.

There has developed in recent years a considerable body of data indicating that a margin of safety for lead exposure may not exist at all and that damage may occur even at low exposure levels. If this is the case, it is imperative that unnecessary exposure to all types of lead be held to an absolute minimum.

Experiments with animals offer an excellent approach to the search for low-level effects. In an elegant series of tests carried out over many years in a special low-lead-level laboratory, Dr. Henry Schroeder of Dartmouth College has found that chromium-deficient mice carrying lead burdens typical of those found in the American people have reduced life spans and increased susceptibility to disease. Chromium deficiency is thought to occur in many humans. Recent experiments in Russia have shown that rabbits exposed to atmospheric lead at levels not much different from those found in some U.S. cities exhibit various functional disabilities and pathological anomalies.

Detailed statistical studies are necessary to delineate the extent of these subtle effects, which may consist of a diminishing of intelligence by a few points, a decrease in nervous coordination and mechanical dexterity, or a general rundown feeling.

In contrast to many other pollutants, lead is a cumulative poison. Studies of Americans show that the older a person is, the more lead is concentrated in his body. (A slight decrease occurs in persons over sixty years of age.) The total body burden of lead in middle-aged Americans is about 200 milligrams, of which about 90 per cent is concentrated in the skeletal structure.

As the impact of lead effluent upon our health and our economy becomes recognized, the need for controls is increasingly evident. The most stringent of these will have to be adopted by the United States which now consumes about 1.3 million of the total world lead consumption of 2.2-million tons. Some of this consumption—the part that goes into electric batteries, solder, and pewter—can be recycled at the end of the useful lifetimes of those products, but lead used as a gasoline additive cannot be recovered. It can only be prevented from entering the atmosphere in the first place.

The impact of atmospheric lead emitted from automobile exhausts constitutes a threat to health so severe that on this count alone lead emissions should be prohibited. However, the major pressures for the elimination of lead from gasoline so far have not resulted primarily from this important concern, but rather from the fact that lead in gasoline interferes with the control of many other automobile emissions.

Of the many methods proposed to control the amount of hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, and oxides of nitrogen leaving the ex-

haust pipes of automobiles, one of the most discussed is the catalytic converter. The catalytic converter depends on the filtering capability of porous material with a large surface area in proportion to the volume occupied. The pores in the material fill rapidly with lead particles when leaded gasoline is used, and the process of converting the other pollutants to their harmless constituents is blocked.

To end the blockage, major auto makers equipped most of their 1971 models with low-compression engines able to operate on 91-octane lead-free gasoline. This surprise action forced the oil companies to shift petroleum refining methods. Several of them have introduced low-lead and lead-free gasoline throughout the country.

Low-compression engines get fewer high-speed miles per gallon of fuel. Also, there is some evidence that emission of aromatic hydrocarbons increases as lead content of fuel falls. These points have been argued forcefully by the Ethyl Corporation and by Du Pont, the primary makers of tetraethyl lead, the gasoline additive. Pollution control devices that will operate on leaded gasoline can be built, they say. As alternatives to catalytic converters, they have demonstrated prototype thermo-reactors, which are claimed not to foul when leaded gasoline is used. Theoretically (but not yet practically), lead particulates can be removed from the exhaust stream by special filters and separation devices. Continued use of lead in gasoline, Ethyl and Du Pont contend, will provide needed engine lubrication and avoid a controversial phenomenon called "valve seat pound-in," which may cause rapid wear of valve seats in cars using unleaded gas.

From an environmental point of view, the Ethyl and Du Pont approaches to the lead problem cannot be rejected or ignored. The environmentalist is primarily concerned with what comes out of the exhaust pipe rather than what goes into the gasoline. Reaction processes occurring in the internal combustion engine are complex and poorly understood. What is essential is that automotive emissions be controlled as expeditiously as possible, using the best technology currently available.

While the gasoline suppliers are now providing low-lead gasoline, it costs several cents per gallon more than leaded gasoline of the same octane rating. Cost-conscious motorists therefore are avoiding the new fuel. They will have to be encouraged to buy it. The encouragement could come through governmental regulation. With official standards in force, all manufacturers would compete on an equal footing. Unfortunately, such standards have yet to be set, although the Environmental Protection Agency has promised them for mid-December. By that time, a year and a half will have passed since the Environmental Defense Fund's petition to the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for establishment of criteria and standards for lead.

President Nixon has demonstrated his concern over lead poisoning by ordering all federally owned vehicles to operate on unleaded gasoline; however, because of bulk buying under long-term contract, the order cannot take practical effect until the next fiscal year. The President has also proposed a tax on lead, but Congress has not been enthusiastic about enacting one.

Spurred by the 1970 Clean Air Act amendments sponsored by Senator Edmund S. Muskie of Maine (they authorized consideration of environmental health effects of fuel additives), the Environmental Protection Agency has issued several reports on the danger of lead pollution and on the economics of its removal. One recent document, published in August, said lead-free gasoline could be made available across the country by 1975 at an additional cost to the motorist of between 0.2 and 0.9 cents per gallon of fuel.

The EPA published in June an interim report on a massive study of lead in several major cities. A comparison between atmospheric lead levels measured in 1961-62 and again in 1968-69 showed that ambient levels had increased by 13 to 33 per cent in Cincinnati by 33 to 64 per cent in Los Angeles, and by 2 to 36 per cent in Philadelphia. The results of this important and alarming EPA study were unfortunately omitted from a National Academy of Sciences' study of lead released early in September, which concluded from older information that "the lead content of the air over most major cities has not changed over the last fifteen years." The omission of the most recent and best study from the NAS report led the Academy to recommend in its final conclusion only that more research is required on the health impact of automotive lead. Subsequently, the press reported that the Academy study showed that "lead is an overstated peril" (*The Wall Street Journal*, September 7). Meanwhile, the President's Council on Environmental Quality reported that there is little doubt that, at the present rate of pollution, diseases due to lead toxicity will emerge within a few years. The National Academy lead study is a dramatic example of how our most prestigious scientific body is incapable of taking a stand regarding the risks associated with introduction into the environment of substances that damage people in insidious epidemiological ways.

It seems fair to say that if we did not now have lead in our gasoline, and if some gasoline manufacturer proposed to add lead to his product, his proposal would be denied. We are clearly risking our health for the sake of cheap speed on the road. Although lead in gasoline does not constitute the most severe threat to health and well-being confronting society, it is one of the most unnecessary threats—hence an unforgivable one; yet, one we must all bear.

NATHAN E. PROMISEL NOMINATED AS PRESIDENT, AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR METALS

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, Nathan E. Promisel was elected today to serve as president of the American Society for Metals for a 1-year term. It is a great honor for the society to have such a distinguished president. I wish Mr. Promisel well during his term in office.

Mr. Promisel, executive director of the National Materials Advisory Board of the National Academy of Sciences, brings to the presidency a distinguished career in the materials field. He was with the Navy Department for many years, retiring in 1966 as chief materials engineer and the administrator for materials exploratory development. In 1966 he assumed his present assignment with the National Academy of Sciences.

Mr. Promisel is a member of numerous technical societies. He is chairman of the Aerospace Materials Division of the Society of Automotive Engineers and has served on the board of trustees of the American Society for Metals. He is a consultant to the NATO Science Committee and chairman of the long-term study on nonmetallics of the NATO defense research group; he is U.S. representative to the OECD materials re-

search advisory group, and consultant to the Interdepartmental Materials Council of the Federal Council for Science and Technology; he serves on the naval research and development advisory group; he is a fellow of the British Institution of Metallurgists, and has been the recipient of various university, technical society and Navy Department awards.

It has been my honor to have had the benefit of Mr. Promisel's wise advice when he served as a member of an ad hoc committee evaluating the need to establish a national materials policy. Mr. Promisel's suggestions and counsel were very instrumental in the reports that led to legislation creating a National Commission on Materials Policy, and to the approval of the Commission members by the Senate this past July.

Again, Mr. President, I wish to reiterate my congratulations to Mr. Promisel on his election to the post of ASM president.

FAMILY PLANNING SERVICES AND POPULATION RESEARCH ACT

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the September 15, 1971, Federal Register contained proposed regulations for the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970. These regulations have provoked widespread protests, because they would allow family planning services to be provided free of charge only to those who are classified as medically needy under State Medicaid programs or those who fall below the official poverty level, whichever is higher. Forty-five States, containing 89 percent of the national need for subsidized family planning services, have no definition of medically needy, so the effective cutoff point would be the poverty level of about \$4,170. Those who do not fit this strict definition of low-income family would be charged for family planning services.

Many Members of Congress have expressed their opposition to these regulations because all generally accepted estimates of need for subsidized services are currently based on the near poverty Federal income level, which is a far more realistic estimate of patients' real ability to pay for preventive medical care. Such a strict, low definition of eligibility would have disastrous effects on the entire program, since it would appear then that the Federal Government is only interested in limiting the number of children born to the poor and minority groups. The appearance of such a program emphasis would also seriously threaten our international credibility in establishing and expanding family programs abroad to combat unrestrained population growth.

I am including at the end of my remarks several of the letters sent to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by my colleagues in the House.

As one of the principal sponsors of this

act, I urge the National Center for Family Planning Services to revise these regulations so that they conform with congressional intent, the administration's stated objectives, and the best interests of the country:

OCTOBER 15, 1971.

DR. FRANK BECKLES,
Director, National Center for Family Planning Services, Health Services and Mental Health Administration, Rockville, Md.

DEAR MR. BECKLES: As one of the principal House sponsors of the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970, I protest the proposed regulations for that Act which were published in the *Federal Register* of September 15, 1971. My objections focus on two sections of the proposed regulations. Section 59.2(e) defines "low-income family" so that most States would have to limit provision of free services to families with annual incomes of \$4200 or less. Section 59.5(5) requires that service agencies charge for family planning services provided to those who do not fit this strict definition of "low-income family."

These sections of the proposed regulations distort Congressional intent. While I believe that it is important for women from low-income levels to be priority recipients of program services, the Congress intentionally did not tie these programs to a particular income level. Instead, your Department was to target these programs through any other of a number of alternatives. For instance, the regulations might have required that clinics be located in areas with high concentrations of poverty which would ensure that the overwhelming majority of patients would have income levels low enough to force them to dwell in poverty neighborhoods. Regulations might have emphasized the recruitment of patients through the maternity wards of public hospitals or through outreach programs in poverty areas. In this way residents of low-income neighborhoods would receive the most news about family planning services offered in their area.

By leaving open the arrangements through which priorities for service might be established, the Congress hoped to provide the Secretary with enough latitude to assure that no one in need of subsidized family planning services would be turned away. We assumed that, while giving priority to low-income women, the Department would continue its present policy for provision of family planning services as prescribed in the guidelines for Title V of the Social Security Act, which reads:

"Require no direct charge for services to the patient. Income standards shall not be used to exclude individuals from receiving services." (Page 5, Conditions of Grant Award—#7)

In fact, the 5-year plan HEW recently submitted to the Congress contains the following cogent statement of the rationale for such a policy:

"To wait until families increase to the point of becoming classified as poor or near-poor before subsidized family planning care is provided would defeat the program's secondary objective of helping individuals and families to avoid the dependency which may be caused by the birth of an unsought child. The universe of need for family planning should, therefore, include a group of individuals larger than that which already falls below the official poverty line."

In view of this statement it is incomprehensible that HEW has chosen to use income level alone as a determinant of eligibility for services. Denying these family planning services, with consequent costly results to the individual, the family and the community cannot be justified by economic considerations, since the program's benefits far outweigh its moderate costs.

The policy of making services available to patients at the near-poverty level has also been recognized in all estimates of need used by both public and private agencies, by the President, and by the Secretaries of HEW in Congressional hearings. The goal of providing subsidized family planning services to 5 million women in the United States, as proposed by the President, is based on 125 per cent of the poverty level as an income factor. Congress clearly intended this goal to be reached within the next 4 years. Although artificially reducing its potential caseload below the 5 million women goal might lessen the fiscal pressure on HEW, we do not think it is either consistent with Congressional intent, the administration's stated objectives, or the best interests of the country.

Some additional objections must also be raised. Income level eligibility requirements are cumbersome and costly to administer. The establishment of a "means test" also deters the voluntary participation of many persons who need and desire the service. Potential patients would be unsure of their eligibility and unnecessarily offended by having to take a "pauper's oath." Rather than face possible refusal, many would simply stay away from the service clinics. Further, clinics restricted solely to the poor would be extremely vulnerable to charges that the Federal government is only interested in limiting the number of children born to the indigent.

Such charges, given the ethnic background of poverty in the United States, would of necessity have racial undertones. The atmosphere thus created for the program and for potential consumers of the service would hardly be conducive to increased patient enrollments necessary to meet the HEW and Congressionally determined goal—first set forth by the President—of service to 5 million women.

Given these objections, I fail to understand the setting of an eligibility standard based solely on income, unless it is to limit artificially and arbitrarily the number of women to be served. We hope that your Department will ultimately promulgate regulations for this program which will facilitate, not hinder, the implementation of the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act, and which are acceptable to the Congress and to the people for whom the program is designed. To produce anything less is to condemn millions of women to continued ill health, to the suffering involved in infant and maternal death now so ignominiously high among the poor, to the continued oppression of unwanted childbearing, and to lasting poverty.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. SCHEUER, M.C.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., October 13, 1971.

HON. ELLIOT RICHARDSON,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ELLIOT: We read with some alarm regulations concerning Grants for Family Services, published in the September 15, issue of the *Federal Register*. As we have strongly supported Congressional efforts to establish voluntary family planning programs to be available to all citizens desiring such services, we take serious issue with Section 59.2(e) of the above-cited regulations—the definition of "low-income families" for whom subsidized family planning services are allowed.

We are well aware that the population problem is a problem of all Americans, not any one group, and, as such, it must be dealt with at the Federal level. Although Federal leadership in population has been largely indirect in the past, Congressional recognition of the import of population on the future well-being of this nation has emerged in the

past year with the passage of the Family Planning and Population Research Act of 1970 and the creation of the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. We supported these measures wholeheartedly.

We feel that the proposed definition of eligibility would represent a very serious setback for the Federal program, particularly as we understand that previous HEW analyses of the health care needs of the poor have set the medical indigency level at, as a minimum, the near-poverty level—125% of the poverty level. While it is true that 7 out of every 10 babies are born into middle- and upper-class families proving that it is not the poor with inadequate medical resources who contribute the lion's share of births, we firmly believe it is vital that all segments of our population be provided the education and the funds to effectively limit family size, if they desire. The poverty level is not an adequate level to define those who need subsidized preventive services such as family planning, and the effect of this regulation would apparently reduce the prospective caseload for subsidized family planning services by a substantial percentage—estimated as high as 40%. As we stated in the Declaration of Purpose of P.L. 91-572: "It is the purpose of this Act to assist in making voluntary family planning services readily available to all persons desiring such services" (emphasis added). In our opinion, it is obvious that Federal funds must be directed at that portion of our population which does not now have access to family planning.

As the prime sponsors of House Joint Resolution 837, declaring a United States policy of achieving population stabilization by voluntary means, we cannot overemphasize our concern with the possible effect of this regulation. The time clock which records the population—natural resource balance in our nation is quickly running out, and it is long past time for America to work toward population stabilization. We believe that we must now recognize that we do not want to race ahead to find the breaking point for our society or to determine at what fatal number our society begins to break down from stress and crowding. Federal programs must be aimed at preventing these occurrences.

We feel it is essential, therefore, that Section 59.2(e) of these proposed regulations be carefully restudied, with a view to providing family planning services for those citizens who, because of lack of knowledge or financial means, do not now have access to these services.

With kind regards,
Sincerely,

MORRIS K. UDALL,
FRANK HORTON.

OCTOBER 14, 1971.

DR. FRANK BECKLES,
Director, National Center for Family Planning Services, Health Services and Mental Health Administration, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Rockville, Md.

DEAR DR. BECKLES: I am concerned by the proposed regulation, Section 59.2(e) to Title 42, Chapter 1, Subchapter D, Part 59, announced in the *Federal Register* on September 15, 1971, and dealing with the subject of qualification for free family planning services.

The regulation, if adopted, would require that persons seeking free services meet the test either of "medically needy" as defined under State Medicaid programs or of income below the official poverty level, whichever is higher. Few states, at present, have any definition of "medically needy". Thus, the basic qualifying test will be a poverty line measure.

In many areas of the nation, the poverty line is below the level which reflects the

need for this family planning assistance. If, in the judgment of the Secretary of HEW, an income test is administratively necessary, it should be set at a point which reflects the urgency of establishing an effective free family planning program.

The Planned Parenthood World Population Association recommends that if a means test is used, eligibility should be set at the lower minimum budget level as established by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In their experience, such a level will be more realistic in providing the vital services to the people who need it most. I support this proposal and commend it to your careful attention.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM.

OCTOBER 13, 1971.

Dr. FRANK BECKLES,
Director, National Center for Family Planning Services, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Rockville, Md.

DEAR DR. BECKLES: I have received a copy of Dr. Alan Guttmacher's letter of September 30th addressed to you concerning Title 42, Chapter 1, Subchapter D, Part 59 regulations issued in the September 15th issue of the Federal Register.

I should like to advise you that I concur with his position—that I too believe that the Department would be falling short of the goals established by both the Congress and the President in 1969 if the proposed "means" test were implemented.

I would of course be interested in your thinking in proposing the means test and why you find it necessary in this instance but not in other HSMHA health programs, as a rule.

Thanking you, I am,
Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

OCTOBER 13, 1971.

Dr. FRANK BECKLES,
Director, National Center for Family Planning Services, Health Services and Mental Health Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Rockville, Md.

Re: Title 42, Chapter 1, Subchapter D, Part 59, Federal Register, September 15, 1971.

DEAR DR. BECKLES: I am writing in protest against the proposed regulations cited above which define, in Section 59.2(e), "low-income family" for whom subsidized planning services are available.

The regulation would provide free family planning services only to those classified as "medically needy" under the State Medicaid programs or those who fall below the official poverty level, whichever is higher. Reportedly only five states (Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, Rhode Island, Washington) have "medical needy" levels above the current poverty level while the remaining 45 States (89% of the national need for subsidized family planning) would be eligible by using the poverty level of \$4,170 for a family of four.

The "poverty" and the "near poverty" level are inadequate and too low to define those who need subsidized preventive family planning services. The proposed regulation makes it more difficult to administer local programs under restrictive requirements, reduces prospective caseloads by at least 40 percent and basically thwarts the intent of P.L. 91-572 which provides for national family planning services to reduce unwanted pregnancy. P.L. 91-572 does not require a specific eligibility criterion in order to implement priority for low-income families. Specific eligibility criterion as stated in the proposed regulation will reduce services to low-income families.

I request that you give this your careful attention and urge that the proposed regu-

lation be revised to carry as the eligibility level for free family planning services the lower minimum budget level formulated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics so that more low-income people will be able to take advantage of the subsidized family planning services.

Thank you very much.
Very truly yours,

PATSY T. MINK,
Member of Congress.

OCTOBER 6, 1971.

Dr. FRANK BECKLES,
Director, National Center for Family Planning Services, Health Services and Mental Health Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Rockville, Md.

DEAR DR. BECKLES: I am writing to you to express my concern over proposed regulations which would effect the implementation of P.L. 91-572. These regulations were published in the Federal Register, September 15, 1971, Title 42, Chapter 1, Subchapter D, Part 59.

I believe the proposed eligibility standard to be self-defeating to the purposes of the Federal family planning program. This regulation permits family planning services to be provided without fee only to those classified as medically needy under State Medicaid programs or those falling below the official poverty level, whichever is higher.

Few states have established a level below which the state government considers an individual or family indigent with regards to ability to meet their own medical expenses. Even where such standards exist the question of their validity remains highly open to question.

A nonfarm family of four earning approximately \$4,170 can barely provide for their basic needs. The social and economic situations families of this type find themselves in do not lend themselves to initiating proper medical attention except in the most dire circumstances as social workers employed by State and Federal health, welfare and education programs can well attest to.

While I appreciate and recognize that it is the goal of the National Center for Family Planning Services to promote family planning and lend assistance whenever possible to needy families seeking information and medical attention in this area I strongly question whether these proposed regulations will accomplish such goals. I propose that these regulations in fact will delay the realization of these goals. I believe these regulations hamper rather than facilitate the intent of the Federal family planning program as outlined in P.L. 91-572. The purpose of this program is to expand, not restrict the number of families eligible for such assistance. By limiting the number of families entitled to subsidization of family planning services by the Federal government we may well, when the total picture is evaluated a few years from now discover such restrictions have cost this nation dearly in both financial and emotional terms, well beyond the savings indicated on a formal balance sheet.

The legislation as approved by Congress does not require an established eligibility standard and will restrict the availability of these services for families of low-income, the very ones who historically need these services the most.

Knowing that the aims of the legislation and the National Center are identical I urge a re-evaluation of these proposed regulations so that the goals sought in P.L. 91-572 may be realized.

Your very kind consideration of this matter is deeply appreciated and I look forward to hearing from you relative to this matter of mutual concern.

Sincerely,

GUY VANDER JAGT,
Member of Congress.

THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC— ANOTHER POINT OF VIEW

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, last July 27, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a review of two books on the Dominican Republic by the noted Latin American authority, Norman Gall. The review appeared in the New York Review of Books. In his review, Mr. Gall presented a study of terrorism in the Dominican Republic—a study which implicated certain U.S. personnel.

This week, a rebuttal to Mr. Gall's article was presented to me by Ambassador Quisqueya Damiron de Alba, Consul General of the Dominican Republic in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. In the interests of fairness, I present herewith for inclusion in the RECORD, that opposing point of view:

THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC—ANOTHER POINT OF VIEW

HON. HERMAN BADILLO,
Representative in the House of Representatives, New York.

DISTINGUISHED CONGRESSMAN BADILLO: Inspired by my unswerving conviction, concerning the ample spirit of understanding and confraternity which characterizes you, I do not hesitate to state as a Dominican woman, arguments, facts and events that demonstrate the repeated and great achievement in the social and economic process in which the Dominican Republic have been actually surging which are contrary to any distorted images about our country in the exterior.

Thus, receive this exposition, with the assurance that it carries a message of the highest feeling of every Dominican mother, Dominican sister, every Dominican bride and every Dominican woman. . . .

THE CURRENT SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

In a recent essay published by U.S. writer Norman Gall—the literary critic, and the author of several articles in which he has accused the U.S. Government of attempting to—maintain its hegemony over Latin America by terror through the armed forces and police pursuant to U.S. Foreign Aid Legislation from which you quoted for the Congressional Record has added a new target to the extensive series of objectives which international communist conspiracy has set for this part of the free world. It involves destroying the new born democratic process initiated by the Dominican people at the end of the 1965 civil war.

In his articles "Santo Domingo: The Politics of Terror", Mr. Gall writes with a perfect mastery achieved through his long years spent in exercising political intrigue.

According to this so-called "noted Latin American authority", the direct effect of U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1965 has been the creation of a state of "chaos, corruption, political instability, social and economic dislocation, including the suppression of civil liberties, the stifling of the voices of constructive dissent and terrorism." Such an imaginative description of infernal conceptions is an open and impudent challenge to the unbelievable, shameful realities which only Stalin and Hitler in their mad degeneration could create.

Gall's technique in trying to obtain that credence be given to his article is not new although well plotted: the deformation of isolated facts, malicious construction of

newspaper features, vague statements and, of course, complete omission of the astonishing progress achieved by the Dominican Republic under the leadership of its present President Dr. Joaquin Balaguer. Let us see now how consistent is the barrage of accusations launched by Gall.

Chaos.—Chaos is confusion and certainly chaos at its highest was what President Balaguer inherited when he took office in 1966. The country was deep in bankruptcy. There was confusion in the affairs of the State, just as in the sugar industry, the backbone of the country's economy, the recovery of which seemed impossible. The State-owned enterprises were in shambles.

The schools in the country were inadequate and under the control of young communist leaders who had laid their hands on them to carry their indoctrination work. The road network was in bad repair and new land communications systems badly needed at the time had become a problem which could not be solved at once. Public health was at the peak of inefficiency with the hospitals bursting with patients and completely lacking medicines.

Farming was in disarray as a result of neglect for several years under administrations which would disregard the claims of thousands of peasant families badly in need of land, and hungry who in dangerous mood, would switch to larger civil commotions. The bureaucracy, ill-composed and not in the least interested in fulfilling its duties, fell prey to fraud and bribery. The Dominican tragedy at the time was exceedingly critical and threatened to worsen as a result of bitter hatred and rancor between the factions who had fought in the civil war and who were increasingly calling for more blood to quench their insatiable thirst for violence.

But President Balaguer was not a man to be overcome by such problems. He immediately drafted and put to work a plan which in a few months resulted in the operation of the sugar industry with a profit. He asked the Dominican Congress to approve an austerity program designed to balance the national budget and to allocate huge amounts to cover the more urgent needs in education, public health, agriculture, agrarian and other important sectors of Dominican life.

He used international loans in building new roads as well as in repairing those that had deteriorated. He organized the bureaucracy, created a safe atmosphere for private investment, distributed lands to over 20,000 peasant families in farm projects and followed up plans which are still in progress, enacted laws encouraging industrial development, animal husbandry and agriculture, built and continues to build housing projects for workers and low-income groups. Through the implementation of other measures varying from tax reforms through a government program of reproductive investment has laid the foundation of what is known as the first flow of integral economic development that the Dominican Republic has known in its 127 years of independence.

Corruption.—Norman Gall does not specify in his article the kind of corruption that exists in the country. Ill-informed and worst-motivated he is surely referring to corruption in the Dominican Administration.

In all countries throughout the world there are in larger or lesser number, public officials who gain wealth through favoring certain interests. Those cases which have been discovered in the Dominican Republic are few. They have been brought to court and sanctioned whereas President Balaguer is alert to keep this type of vice to a minimum.

It is proper to mention at this time a unique feature in the history of Latin America. The Dominican government, complying with precise instructions issued by President Balaguer, has been—publishing since the first of every month of his administration a detailed statement showing all the

government revenues and expenditures. Thus the Dominican people are kept informed of the use of every single cent they pay in taxes.

Political Instability.—Except for the bloody events occasionally brought about by left and right-wing forces, which have been sensationalized, peace prevailed in the country. Not the peace imposed by sheer force of arms or by the military but the peace arising out of satisfaction and gratefulness of a people who presently are leaving behind the historic deficiencies which had been hindering their progress and who see in the future under Dr. Balaguer achievements never dreamed of.

Social and Economic Dislocation.—In this respect, Gall shamelessly lies. Even the most destructive opposition against Dr. Balaguer's Administration does not dare approach such subjects. Dominican society, as a direct effect of the activity of Dr. Balaguer's government is now characterized by a sense of progress and well-being during the last five years.

With respect to the economic field there is much to say. In the years of Dr. Balaguer's rule, the national gross income has been consistently increasing as well as the per capita income; both foreign and domestic private investment in large and medium businesses and in small enterprises reaches a figure over 500 hundred million pesos (\$500,000,000) and has created over 50,000 new jobs and other productive activities which did not exist when Dr. Balaguer took office.

Government investment, which is under the personal direction and supervision of Dr. Balaguer, whose day of work averages 14 hours and spends at least two days every week flying in a helicopter to all the areas of the country, amounts to a similar figure, including credits from various international institutions and U.S. Foreign Aid. Among the notable works under construction are two hydroelectric dams, power plants, important irrigation systems, bridges and other major infrastructure works for the furtherance of the country's economic development.

The Dominicans are awed at the fact that it has been possible to do so much in such a short span.

The Suppression of Civil Liberties and the stifling of the Voices of Constructive Dissent.—Again, Norman Gall's evaluations are fully in error. The Dominican people have never lived in such an ample environment of guarantees as they are now enjoying. This does not mean that the institutions in charge of maintaining law and order are perfect. They are not in any country and, in the Dominican Republic as elsewhere, there may be from time to time errors or excesses which must be corrected or some control at least must be applied to prevent their repetition.

Dominicans, those who rule and those who are ruled, are far from being perfect citizens. But one thing is certain: in the Dominican Republic both the people and the government are increasingly strengthening their association and mutual understanding with a view to solve any problems affecting civil liberties and human rights.

As to stifling the voices of "constructive" dissent, a strange phenomenon is taking place: the opposition has been so exceedingly slanderous in its expressions that the people themselves are now turning a deaf ear to their utterances. The noble institution of the right to dissent has been so abused by the opposition that most parties and groups opposing the government are disintegrating at a fast pace. Even the second largest party in the country, Juan Bosch's Dominican Revolutionary Party, has lost a large number of adherents who have formed new groups or associations rather than oppose Dr. Balaguer's government. They try from non-political positions to collaborate on the strengthening of the democratic process and economic development of the country.

Political Terrorism, Professor Juan Bosch and Norman Gall.—The 1965 civil war have had deep repercussions that only time and good will among the Dominicans will evanesce forever.

Revolutions and foreign interventions are not new to the Dominican Republic. The Dominican people have an amazing capacity for suffering and for overcoming misfortunes. However, people like Norman Gall can find many things to comment upon and much more to infer from Communism—a new factor which has a foothold in this small country. When the April 1965 civil war broke out, the communists had progressed farther than expected by Dominicans themselves. The success of Fidel Castro in Cuba and the halo of prestige that surrounded him in the first years, together with the period of extreme liberalism which followed the disappearance of Trujillo's iron-fisted dictatorship, left a wide vacuum open to the progress of Marxism and Leninism which centered mainly on hundreds of young people. This youth who followed the communist preaching and practice because they believed it would make the Dominican Republic into a new world of unlimited liberties, with the enjoyment of the good life without obligations of any kind whatsoever to be assumed either now or in the future by those of them who would be called to become components of the Socialist State.

Prof. Bosch, while writing stories unfolding a native Dominican atmosphere, became acquainted with mass communication systems during his exile and studied political science, thus a great mastery in the art of mass agitation to a such high degree as to become a true professional in this field.

So although unknown to most of the Dominican populace who hardly had heard of him under the propaganda apparatus of the Trujillo regime, he won the first free election held in the country in 40 years in 1962. But Bosch did not know the people he was to govern and the knowledge lost during 25 years in exile he could not possibly recover in just a few months.

So, his attempts—as an unexperienced theorist out of touch with the people—to put into practice an ultra-liberal platform way to Bosch, the beginning and the end of his new born administration. Seven months later, a campaign launched by the right-winged forces in collusion with a military group from which again emerged an unknown man, Col. Elias Wessin y Wessin, was enough to overthrow his government and send him into bitter exile from which he came back in 1965, but only when the revolution was already under the control of the Inter American Peace Force of the OAS and there was no hazard to his life.

Undoubtedly, Prof. Bosch, whom the "constitutionalist" faction wanted back in power, had engendered the policy of violence and political violence, which since 1965 generated into what is known in the Dominican Republic today as political terrorism.

In 1966, Bosch ran again as the candidate of his party in the election held in June of that year under the auspices and the supervision of the OAS during the provisional government of Dr. Hector Garcia-Godol. But Bosch could not win this free election not even with the help of all the Dominican Communist organizations and groups.

The majority of the country had laid its eyes on a brilliant Dominican philosopher, lawyer, a Dominican man of letters who while serving in high posts in Trujillo's regime even as high as the presidency, had not imbued his hands in the blood of his countrymen nor received a single cent from graft. That man was Balaguer. Through his election, the people had solved two problems all at once. Firstly, it had put at the head of its destinies a fellow countryman whose unimpeachable conduct was known well to them and secondly, it had definitely

rejected Prof. Bosch, who insisted with his alienating demagogic verbosity in implanting a class struggle which he himself took pains to divide into at least five different strata.

This wise and praiseworthy decision of the Dominican people at one of the most difficult crossroads of their history is treated with an ignominious lack of respect by Norman Gall when he says that "President Balaguer . . . was placed in power by U.S. troops and U.S. money". How can such falsity and brazenness be possible?

In ascribing political terrorism to Dr. Balaguer's Administration, Norman Gall withheld facts which are not in the interest of Red subversion.

Norman Gall does not mention in his review that during the provisional government of Dr. Garcia Godoy more than 200 Dominicans were killed in vendettas of the factions that fought in the revolt, notwithstanding the presence of over 25,000 soldiers of the Inter American Peace Force. Those uncontrollable forces, which even that large international army could not control, continued in existence even after Dr. Balaguer took office.

But Gall has his own intrigue system. One of his quotations from a book by Professor Jerome Slater regarding U.S. intervention in Santo Domingo, a book which Gall claims to review as a "literary critic", reads as follows: "It is not clear what Balaguer's role is in this, but although he has condemned what he calls 'uncontrollable forces' behind the violence and on several occasions has shaken up the police leadership, there is a growing feeling among moderate Dominicans that he (Balaguer) is encouraging the rightist terrorism or, at best, has been inadequate in his response to it." Both Slater and Norman Gall are wrong. Moderate Dominicans, informed Dominicans and the people know very well the origin and development of the political terrorism.

Gall, quoting Jose Moreno, a former priest who is now teaching sociology at the University of Pittsburgh says in his review that the rebel faction which backed Bosch "agreed to let the civilians organize themselves into commando (neighborhood militia) units which became the most powerful instrument in the hands of the rebels. By the end of May there were in the city 117 commando posts where 5,000 men lived, ate and slept together." Among those 5,000 men there were many young men who from 1962 to 1965 had been indoctrinated in Communist tactics. After the revolt, the commando units killed over 100 policemen who had been taken prisoners by the rebels.

The identifications of these young men have not been recorded but it is well known that a large number returned to normal, regenerative tasks while others formed autonomous bands that have operated as common criminals and the rest have taken lodgings in the slum areas bordering Santo Domingo which they use as hangouts for their political terrorism activities.

Those centers of violence must be controlled at all times as in any other democratic country in the world and the Police carry out frequent raids which are described in the attacks by the opposition as "police brutality and excesses." But 4 million hard-working Dominicans cannot be at the mercy of a few small Communist bands.

The government makes an all-out effort everyday to prevent violence at the same time tries that those young men get the message of peace that the country is living now and offers them an opportunity for regeneration.

According to Gall, behind every "repressive action" is the hand of the CIA or of any other branch of U.S. Intelligence, and also emphatically mentions that the Dominican police organized a terrorist group "La

Banda" which operated for several months in the Dominican capital and many other cities.

The truth of the matter is that the group, made up mainly of former members of the Maoist Dominican Popular Movement (MPD) and known as "La Banda," was disbanded after personal instructions were issued by Dr. Balaguer as he suspected that some members of the Police might have been using the group for illegal purposes.

On September 10, 1971, in a televised speech to the country, President Balaguer said: "I do believe, as I want to be frank even with myself, that the Police has tried to make avail of the strife within the left-wing parties and that it has used it in a manner not always proper to the members of the groups called 'La Banda' as informers to help locate many rogues and discover a number of facts that the authorities have not been able to clear up through their own means. Such tactics are self-defeating."

"If it is true that La Banda has helped in no small part to stop both common and political delinquency, it is no less true that it has also projected into the minds of the people a false image of the Police, making it appear to be in connivance with a certain type of political gangland in order to put an end to terrorism with its help."

"It is necessary for the National Police to take radical steps to destroy every vestige of any blamable understanding between this institution and the 'Anti-Terrorist Band.'"

"To this end, I have asked General Perez y Perez (Chief of the National Police) to secure the resignation of Lieutenant (Oscar) Nunez as a controversial figure which the opposition accuses of serving as liaison between the Police and 'La Banda'. I have also ordered that this group be dissolved without hesitation. There is a fact in connection with La Banda which the citizenry should bear in mind: the revolutionary leftists and the opposition parties have been indulging all over the country, especially in the last few days, in a series of repugnant atrocities in order to make public opinion ascribe them to that group of transgressors of public order."

In the days following Dr. Balaguer's address, several hundred alleged members of La Banda were arrested by the National Police and brought to court. This was curbed by President Balaguer, once more, a dangerous attempt by extremist groups to disturb the peace and hinder the progress prevailing now in the Dominican Republic.

As for Juan Bosch, who since has written a thesis which is a blend of Communism and Fascism, entitled "Thesis on Dictatorship with Popular Backing", which has been adopted by his Dominican Revolutionary Party and the reiterated support of the majority of Dominican communists, fearing that a number of members of his party might be fostering terrorist acts in the name of La Banda, as was denounced by Dr. Balaguer, issued a simplistic statement in which he attacks historical and sociological facts to this type of phenomenon of political violence which was reported in *El Caribe*, on September 1, 1971, which is attached herein and translated as follows:

"Former President Juan Bosch declared yesterday that the existence of La Banda has a social explanation and justification. But he denied that said organization explained or justified itself from a political point of view."

"The President of the Partido Revolucionario Dominicano (Dominican Revolutionary Party) pointed out that what has happened to the members of La Banda is exactly what has been happening to thousands of young men in our country for at least one hundred years."

"During another radio presentation on *Tribuna Democratica*, the political leader analyzed the cause which in his opinion, originated "La Banda" and the damage it has in-

flicted upon the national image and government."

"Bosch says that the communist or anti-communist label is applied now to political foes, but that the problem remains 'the same with these names or the ones it had before.' But he adds that actually the problem 'seems greater because the country has 12 to 14 times the population as in the times of Baez, and because we now have newspapers and radio and television stations and due to these factors the people in every corner of the country can know in a matter of minutes what is happening at the capital city or in Santiago, and that whoever lived in El Seybo cannot die of old age without knowing what was happening in Santiago or in the northeast of the country. The ex-president added that so then as now the members of that social group which he calls low bourgeoisie 'have dedicated themselves to politics hoping to raise socially and economically and therefore have changed parties more often than changing shoes'."

"He expressed that many poor people 'grow up with bad habits and develop from their early years an enormous ambition to rise without acquiring the capacity to rise economically and socially by means of studies and without the means to go into business.'"

"A great part of these persons, consider Bosch, become policemen or go into the armed forces, and another 'minor' part becomes 'revolutionary' or at least they believe to have become revolutionary."

"According to the perredista leader, those who become policemen or go into the armed forces, 'are subject to a certain discipline and to anti-communist lectures so permanent that it leads to act in the same manner at all occasions; but others, those who believe themselves to be revolutionaries, are not subject to any type of discipline, are not prepared ideologically, and when someone tells them that they have to kill to overthrow the government, they start killing so naturally and call it a revolution.'"

"He added that those who today killed civilians were the policemen killers of yesterday and condemned the practice that of today and yesterday."

"He expressed that the members of the low bourgeoisie, poor and very poor who considered themselves revolutionaries, believe that they could have an immediate revolution, right away, and that the only thing needed was that everyone would have a revolver and that to have a revolver the only thing to do was kill a policeman."

"That was what they believed", affirmed Bosch, "and their leaders also believed this, because it happened that their leaders also came from the same social groups." And what happened, in his opinion, was that those young men changed ideas and dedicated themselves to do with their own group what they did before with their policemen and armed forces groups."

"Bosch thinks that it was inevitable that such a thing would happen, but he said to be surprised that the leader of such groups 'were not aware that would happen, in the same manner as he is surprised that the same who now protect and help revolutionaries are not aware that they are incurring in the error as prior revolutionary leaders.'"

"When those boys call themselves communist," he added "without really being communist or anything of the sort, what they were doing with the actions was to discredit communism; and now when they call themselves anti-communists, or its equivalent which is the beginning of the revolutionary spirit". (Emphasis added.)

"He emphasized that last Saturday three articles referring to "La Banda" were printed: one in the *New York Times*, the most important newspaper in the United States; another in the *Miami Herald*, the most important paper in the southern part of the United

States and another in a weekly publication edited in New York by a very important association, the "Trinity Church". "And yesterday, Monday the three newspapers of the capital city (Santo Domingo) published editorials referring to La Banda, all condemning it very energetically." (Emphasis added.)

"He reiterated that 'La Banda' is discrediting the country here, and in foreign lands, those who are using it are finishing the revolutionary spirit of the people, and let's wait and see if Dr. Balaguer and his government are capable of resisting the discredit 'La Banda' is producing outside the country in the same manner that they are resisting the discredit here". (Emphasis added.)

"He assured that neither the government nor Dr. Balaguer will be able to overcome the discredit."

BOSCH ANALIZA LAS CAUSAS EXPLICAN EXISTENCIA BANDA

(Por Alvaro Arvelo hijo)

El ex presidente Juan Bosch declaró ayer que la existencia de "La Banda" tiene explicación y justificación social.

Pero negó, asimismo, que dicha organización se explique o se justifique desde el punto de vista político.

El presidente del Partido Revolucionario Dominicano (PRD) manifestó que a los miembros de ese grupo "ha venido pasándole lo que a miles y miles de jóvenes en nuestro país desde hace por lo menos cien años".

Durante otra intervención por Tribuna Democrática, el dirigente político analizó las causas que han provocado, a su juicio, la integración de "La Banda", y el prejuicio que ha causado a la imagen nacional y al gobierno.

Pero añade que en la actualidad el problema "se ve más grande porque el país tiene 12 ó 14 veces más población que en los tiempos de Báez, y porque tenemos periódicos y estaciones de radio y de televisión y debido a eso la gente del último rincón de la República sabe al minuto lo que está pasando en la capital o en Santiago o en El Seybo, y en los tiempos de Báez, el que vivía en el Seybo se moría de viejo sin saber qué cosa había pasado en Santiago o en la Línea Noroeste".

Entiende el ex presidente de la República que tanto entonces como ahora los miembros del grupo social que él llama baja burguesía "se han dedicado a la política para ascender social y económicamente y han cambiado de partido como quien se cambia los zapatos".

Expresó que mucha gente pobre "crece con malos hábitos y desarrollan desde sus primeros años una enorme ambición de ascender sin que puedan adquirir la capacidad para ascender social y económicamente por el camino del estudio y sin que puedan conseguir los medios para establecer negocios".

Una parte de esas personas, considera Bosch, se hace policías y guardias y otra parte, "la menor", se hace "revolucionaria, o cree ella que se hace revolucionaria".

Según el criterio del líder perredeísta, los que se meten a policías y a guardias "están sometidos a una disciplina y a una prédica anticomunista permanente, que los lleva a actuar siempre en una forma igual; pero los otros, los que creen que son revolucionarios, no están sometidos a ninguna disciplina, no se preparan ideológicamente; y cuando alguien les dice que hay que matar para tumbar al go gobierno, rompen a matar como si tal cosa y creen que eso es la revolución".

Reiteró que "los que hoy matan civiles son los que ayer mataban policías y guardias", y condenó esa práctica "de ayer y de hoy".

Expresó que los integrantes de la baja burguesía "pobre y muy pobre, que se consideraban revolucionarios, creían que aquí podía hacerse la revolución inmediatamente,

ahora mismo, y que para eso lo único que había que hacer era que cada uno tuviera un revólver, y para tener un revólver lo que había que hacer era matar un policía".

"Eso lo creían ellos", afirmó Bosch, "y lo creían sus líderes, porque resultaba que sus líderes procedían de las mismas capas sociales de donde procedían ellos".

Y lo que ocurrió a su juicio, fue que "esos jóvenes dieron media vuelta y se dedicaron a hacer con sus antiguos compañeros revolucionarios lo mismo que antes hacían con los policías y los guardias".

Bosch opina que era inevitable que tal cosa suca apoyan a esos antiguos revolucionarios no se den cuenta de que ellos están cometiendo exactamente el mismo error que antes cometieron los líderes revolucionarios que los usaron dizque para hacer la revolución".

"Cuando esos muchachos", añadió, "se llamaban a sí mismos comunistas, sin que fueran comunistas ni cosa parecida, lo que hacían con sus actos era desacreditar al comunismo; y ahora, cuando se llaman a sí mismos anticomunistas y exterminadores del comunismo, lo que hacen es desacreditar al anticomunismo, o lo que es lo mismo, fomentar el espíritu revolucionario, y al mismo tiempo, desacreditar al gobierno y al sistema en capas de la sociedad que hasta ahora los apoyaba o por lo menos no los combatía".

Advirtió que "así como se equivocaron los que creyeron que con esa gente podía formarse lo que algunos llamaban el ejército revolucionario de tal o cual grupo, así se equivocan los que creen que los bandidos pueden formar el ejército anticomunista".

Para Bosch, "los bandoleros son bandoleros siendo comunistas o anticomunistas, y aquellos que los usan para fines políticos cometen la misma equivocación que los que pretendieron usar los para fines políticos de izquierda".

"Los bandoleros desprestigian cualquiera causa a la que sirvan y a cualquier persona que les dé apoyo", precisó.

En este punto de su alocución radial, Bosch criticó la entrevista televisada que se hizo el pasado sábado del jefe de "La Banda".

Más adelante, dijo que en los procesos revolucionarios, "que a veces duran muchos años, la lucha de clases se hace muy intensa, como se ace fuerte el oleaje en la mar cuando hay vientos de ciclones; y así como el oleaje fuerte va tirando a los orillas y a las playas todo lo que no es propio del mar, así la intensificación de la lucha de clases propia de los tiempos revolucionarios va tirando a las orillas de sociedad a todos aquellos que no tienen las condiciones naturales para mantenerse dentro del campo de la lucha".

Indicó que en el país el movimiento social "produce muchos bajos pequeños bur gueses pobres y muy pobres, y así como un alto número de ellos acabará siempre cansándose de luchar contra el sistema, así sucepacitan estudiando y se hacen cargo de que para que este país cambie hay que trabajar por el cambio, y hacerlo todos los días, a todas las horas, de manera organizada, sin hacerse la ilusión de que una revolución es un juego de quinielas en el que uno puede sacarse el premio sin hacer más esfuerzo que pedirle a un amigo 35 ó 30 centavos para comprar un vigésimo".

Acerca de las actuaciones de "La Banda", el ex presidente de la República aseveró que la misma "recorre los barrios de la capital provocando a los jóvenes; haciéndolos presos, golpeándolos y con frecuencia matándolos".

Y afirmó que los miembros de La Banda "andan provocando a la gente del pueblo porque ellos viven de eso; necesitan golpear, matar, prender para ganarse la comida, aunque, desde luego, muchas veces comen sin ganarse el plato que se tragan, pues se van sin pagarlo".

Dijo el ex mandatario que "en muchos sitios la gente no puede ya resistir tanto agravio".

Pero añadió que está convencido de que las cosas que hace ese grupo "no desacredita a sus miembros, sino que desacredita a las autoridades".

"Y no los desacredita solamente aquí, sino también en el extranjero", siguió diciendo.

Puntualizó que el sábado último "sallieron en los Estados Unidos tres artículos sobre La Banda; uno en The New York Times, que es el periódico más importante de aquel país; otro en The Miami Herald, que es el más importante de la región del sur de los Estados Unidos, y otro en una publicación semanal que publica en Nueva York una asociación religiosa que es muy importante, la de la iglesia de Trinity Church".

"Y ayer lunes los tres periódicos de la capital (Santo Domingo) publicaron editoriales sobre La Banda, todos condenándola de manera enérgica", añadió.

Reiteró que La Banda "está desacreditando aquí y fuera de aquí a los que están usándola para acabar con el espíritu revolucionario de este pueblo, y vamos a ver si el doctor Balaguer y su gobierno son capaces de resistir el descrédito que les produzca La Banda fuera de aquí en la misma forma en que resisten el descrédito que les produce aquí".

In this respect, it is of interest to recall that just before returning in 1970 from his third exile period which this time had been self-imposed, Bosch made a trip to a number of communist countries including North Korea, Communist China and North Vietnam, where he was treated as a true comrade and although he wrote lightly about his experiences, he has never stated the true objectives of his trip to the Communist camp. But, it is generally agreed that Bosch went there to obtain backing to seize power in the Dominican Republic.

The belief that an infamous campaign aimed at impairing the reputation of Dr. Balaguer's Administration abroad, especially in the United States, which can pave the way to results similar to Allende's in Chile explains why in the last few months Dr. Pena Gomez, Secretary General of the Dominican Revolutionary Party, has been personally directing in New York, Washington, D.C. and Puerto Rico an offensive to bring into disrepute the image that Dr. Balaguer has created abroad through repeated magnificent achievements in putting the house in order in the Dominican Republic and initiating its social and economic progress.

Ambassador QUISQUEYA DAMIRON

DE ALBA,

Consul General of the Dominican Republic, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, U.S.A.

OCTOBER 19, 1971.

BOISE COUPLE MAKES PROBLEMS OF THE ELDERLY A PERSONAL CONCERN

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Mr. and Mrs. Ernest K. Morehouse, of Boise, Idaho, are a remarkable couple. Through their efforts some elderly citizens in Boise will have hours of enjoyment that they might not otherwise have had.

The Morehouses, in working with the elderly, came to realize that many of them had no facilities for entertainment.

Many of the housebound could do nothing, save sit in their homes or apartments with no access to the world around them.

The Morehouses decided that with some effort they could help to solve that problem, and that is exactly what they have done. Making use of repairable or donated television sets, radios, and record players and records, the Morehouses have been placing the items in the homes of elderly persons who are most in need. The response has been fantastic.

Mr. President, this is an example of how people who care about the needs of the elderly can make a great difference in their lives. The Morehouses should be commended for their efforts.

I ask unanimous consent that an article dealing with the efforts of Mr. and Mrs. Morehouse, published in the Idaho Daily Statesman of September 27, 1971, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

NEEDY ELDERLY GIVEN TV SETS AS FRIENDLY ACT BY BOISE PAIR
(By Carrie Ewing)

To Mr. and Mrs. Ernest K. Morehouse, 2823 Innis, happiness is supplying the elderly with used television sets, radios or record players.

In order to be a beneficiary of this non-profit service, recipients must be unable to afford the sets from their source of income and they must have reached the age of 65.

The unique venture by the Morehouses developed as a result of their volunteering to assist the office of El-Ada, Inc. with the distribution of food commodities, furniture and bedding to the needy.

"When we went to the homes of different people, we became aware that the elderly persons were really the ones who needed our help," said Mrs. Morehouse. "The younger ones have a life ahead of them to accomplish many things. But the elderly are the ones who have given us our country as it is, maintained our freedoms.

"In many of the homes of the elderly, even though they lived in the nice apartments, only meager furniture was available. We noticed many of them had no way of entertainment—being housebound—no television, radio or record player. So we decided to limit our volunteer work to providing home entertainment sets for the unfortunate elderly—the people in our own age group."

Designating themselves as Friends to the Elderly in March of 1970, the Morehouses have placed 57 TV sets.

"We go to visit the individuals to determine their needs," Morehouse said. "If their sight is bad and they prefer a radio, we supply a radio. Some prefer a record player. Sometimes both a TV set and radio or record player are placed, depending on the need."

"But the thing that strikes us is the difference in their attitude before and after they receive the sets. When we go the first time to visit them, they open the door in a glum, unresponsive mood, like they're just waiting for their last day here to arrive.

"Then, when we call back in a few weeks to see if the set is working satisfactorily, our knock on the door brings a cheerful, smiling face, making obvious that those people have found contact with the world again.

"In case of the record player, an effort is made to supply the individual's favorite records, including religious ones. We also inquire if the people would like to attend church. If so, and transportation is the problem, we contact the pastor, priest, or bishop and arrangements are made to take them to church on a permanent basis. We are strictly non-denominational in this respect."

With all the effort and good intentions put forth by the Morehouses, problems keep arising, and they realize with his falling health and their semi-retired status, they cannot hope to keep pace with the demand of the products they are distributing.

Of course, the program can only advance as people donate useable or repairable sets, and repairmen donate their time and work. More than 150 persons have donated sets. Many more are needed, as well as all types of records.

Volunteers are needed to assist in picking up and delivering the donated goods. Secretarial help is needed to answer out-of-town letters and keep a record of the requests and the placements. Others could assist by making second visits to check on the operating condition of the sets.

Room for storage of the sets large enough to afford space for repair work is "desperately needed," Morehouse said. "We are hoping someone will be able to donate the use of a room on the ground floor that is at least 500 square feet in area, with utilities. An entrance where a vehicle can back up for loading and unloading is needed."

"We do stipulate that none of the articles is to be sold when the people no longer have need of them," Morehouse said. "They are to be given back for redistribution. When we have storage room, we do accept pieces of furniture and appliances for the needy elderly."

The Friends of the Elderly have one aspiration: That their small beginning "will light a torch and spread nationwide"—that more of "our civic-minded people will take a broader interest in the lives and happiness of these elderly. We trust some organization will get the task really rolling."

GROWING SUPPORT FOR YOUTH CAMP SAFETY

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to my colleagues that support is growing for the bi-partisan youth camp safety amendment—title 19 of the higher education bill, H.R. 7248. During the hearings conducted on camp safety the response has always been overwhelmingly in favor of regulations that would protect the health and safety of our youngsters. This was solicited response. What is elating is the enthusiastic response from hundreds of parents who, unsolicited, have given their sincere and strong endorsement for protective legislation.

A Bethesda woman is quoted in today's Washington Post as saying that we "would not believe the numbers of children" her family has had to rescue from the lake where they spend their summers. The camps in the area provide little or no supervision of water sports. As a result, the children were left on their own. How many would have drowned had it not been for the vigilance of a few private citizens? How many children will risk their lives next summer? If no minimum standards are in effect, 8 million children will be unprotected. We must act now.

Bill Gold's District Line column follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 19, 1971]

THE DISTRICT LINE

(By Bill Gold)

Regular readers of this column may recall that a few days ago I wrote about Mitch Kurman. Mitch is the one-man lobby for setting up federal safety standards for youth camps.

His teen-aged son was drowned when a summer camp counselor took a group of boys into dangerous rapids in canoes. In the years that followed, Mitch worked unceasingly to get the government to adopt safety standards designed to minimize the danger of similar tragedies.

After Mitch's story appeared here, I received a letter from Mrs. David B. Duane of 6202 Wilmet Rd., Bethesda. She told me she wanted to help in Mitch's campaign, and explained why. She wrote:

"I am interested because my family has a summer cottage on a New Hampshire lake where several youth camps are located.

"You wouldn't believe the numbers of children my father, my husband, our neighbors and I have had to rescue. These children are involved in all sorts of water sports without proper training themselves or without proper (read 'any') supervision. The parents of these children, having paid quite a sum to the camps, assume that the children are in competent hands."

Mrs. Duane's letter concluded with the question: "To whom do we write to help push the Daniels-Peyser safety amendment to H.R. 7248 to a vote? Who are the key people involved?"

Before I attempt to formulate an answer for Mrs. Duane and others who want to help, let me put this disclaimer on record: I do not represent myself as having any special skill or knowledge in the field of political maneuvering; what I suggest can therefore be regarded as merely one observer's opinion of proper or effective procedure.

In my view, it is best for each person to communicate with his own senators and representative rather than to seek out "key" members of the Congress.

Those we elect to speak for us are the members most interested in our views. Whether you are for or against federal safety standards for youth camps, your own representative and your own senators are the ones who most want to hear from you, and the ones most likely to be influenced by your support or opposition.

Residents of the District of Columbia have no senator of their own, but at long last they do have their own spokesman in the House. So even District Liners can now make their voices heard.

And "now" is when a message from you will really count. As these lines are written, the House leadership expects the youth camp safety issue to reach the floor "any day now, perhaps this week, perhaps next."

There will be opposition from some camp operators, who will complain of government "interference" in their affairs. There will be support from other camp operators, who see the establishment of federal safety standards as a boon to their entire industry. And there will be opinions in between, with the usual attempts to compromise, amend, water down, and even scuttle the entire camp safety movement.

So it is right now—today—that support for the Daniels-Peyser bipartisan amendment to H.R. 7248 will be most effective. Residents of this area can phone their congressmen, in addition to writing. Even those who retain legal residences in distant states have easy access to their hometown representatives, and I hope they'll make their views known.

Incidentally, those of you who think that the Youth Camp Safety Amendment would indeed constitute unwarranted government "interference" in private business affairs should also make your position known. I hap-

pen to disagree with you on the safety issue, but I am even more opposed to organized pressure groups that don't want contrary opinions to be heard at all.

IBM MONOPOLY PRACTICES

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the Justice Department has filed suit against the IBM Corp., charging them with monopolizing and attempting to monopolize the general purpose field of the computer market. The suit also charges IBM with discriminatory practices in their marketing.

The suit, Mr. Speaker, will have a major impact on the computer industry in this country. For too long now, reliable computer firms which are able to produce equipment to compete with IBM have been forced out of the market by this giant. A recent example is the decision by RCA to leave the commercial computer field.

In order for my colleagues to gain a better understanding of the problem in this particular economic field, I insert the following letter from Gerald H. Larson, president, Unicorn Systems Co. of Los Angeles, in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

UNICORN SYSTEMS Co.,

Los Angeles, Calif., October 5, 1971.

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Two weeks ago RCA (The Radio Corporation of America) publicly announced their decision to leave the commercial computer marketplace. This tragic event eliminates a vital and significant national resource of industrial computer technology. These resources are a fundamental foundation of our present and future social and economic structure.

The purpose of my letter is to place a certain amount of the responsibility for this tragedy squarely upon your shoulders. Having done this, I will then urge you to take immediate and decisive steps to correct the present unfortunate situation as it exists in the computer industry. I will also urge you to take long-range permanent action which will ensure our country of an adequate competitive computer industry built on the principles of free enterprise and conducive to the competitive spirit for which the United States has always acted as a champion. Let me begin by attempting to explain why the present situation is a tragedy of national proportions.

The domestic and international computer industry is completely dominated by IBM (International Business Machines Corporation). This domination is an obvious fact, whether dollar sales, share of market, or simply physical size are used as a measurement criteria. Claims of unfair practices have been charged against IBM by Control Data Corporation. These have formed the basis for a significant lawsuit between the two companies. Since justice is insensitive to time, it will probably be another five to fifteen years before that lawsuit is resolved. It was my good fortune to have spent six years with Control Data Corporation during the period 1960-1966. I am therefore confident of Control Data's position in this lawsuit and their eventual triumph.

Approximately coincident with the Control Data suit against IBM was an announcement by the Justice Department that they would investigate IBM and its practices. Since that time, nothing whatever has been heard from our faithful Justice Department. This silence is in spite of the phenomenal quantity of real evidence within the computer industry of the inability of its constituents to compete with IBM.

Up to now, IBM, in an effort to substantiate its position, could claim that, indeed, their size and popularity was, by and large, accidental. People bought their equipment for data processing because its basic structure and design was one best suited to the requirements of a commercially-oriented computing activity. It would, indeed, be unfortunate for the Justice Department (or anyone else, for that matter) to misconstrue IBM's ability to "build a better mousetrap" with some mysterious overpowering capability on their part to dominate and control the computer industry. Surely, IBM would claim, they are innocent of any and all wrongdoings.

The strange thing about that argument is its compelling superficial merit. In point of fact, many companies who found themselves unable to compete in the data processing industry, such as General Electric, SDS, and even Control Data, could be found, if one closely examined their hardware capabilities, to lack features offered by IBM. This point, while bearing no relationship to the real issue in question, has created a tissue-thin smoke screen but one apparently thick enough so as to cloud the vision of the Justice Department.

But now the real cards are on the table. RCA has, since the inception of IBMs System/360 product line, maintained equipment and software compatibility with IBM's product line to the point where RCA has been accused of being fanatic. As long as RCA could maintain its position in the computer industry, IBM could point to an equivalent mousetrap and a pattern of success for that mousetrap. This is no longer possible! RCA's inability to continue in the computer business with less expensive but identical products to IBM, clearly demonstrates that IBM's strength is not in their product. IBM's strength is in their market dominance and the tactics used by IBM to perpetuate that dominance within its own customer base and within the customer base of other manufacturers.

Many of us in the computer industry recognized this without the need for RCA to slap us in the face with the evidence. The Justice Department did not. Up to now it appears as if you too had not considered this issue significant enough to require the Justice Department to take immediate action. Our nation is the poorer for your failure to act. If you do not act immediately to drastically change the pattern in the computer industry then, one by one, each of the contenders in this industry will slowly die leaving only IBM. IBM's grip is so strong and their dominance so complete that your immediate intervention is completely justified and adequately warranted.

It is a sad comment on the state of American government when our Justice Department allows Control Data's lawsuit to fight the Justice Department's battles. In the end, David slew Goliath because there was no one else with the courage to act. But David and Goliath and the society in which they existed are now, at best, figments of the imagination. Shall we be accorded the same fate?

In your own lifetime, you have been a personal witness to

Japan's complete erosion of the consumer electronics industry in the United States;

Continually increasing dominance of Europe and Japan in the automotive industry; and

Non-profitability of the airframe industry

due to monopolistic practices and government control.

You are now witnessing events which will eliminate the United States as the long-range leader in the world's industrial computer market and will remove any final vestiges of competitive pressures which promote technological progress. This is happening before your very eyes! If you fail to restore competitive practices to our industry immediately and continue to let David fight your battles, then when Goliath is slain, there won't be enough of us around to bury the body.

Very truly yours,

GERALD H. LARSEN,
President.

LIQUID METAL FAST BREEDER REACTOR

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution concerning liquid metal fast breeder reactors was adopted by the Board of Trustees of the South Carolina Electric Cooperative Association, Inc. This is a most timely resolution which I highly commend to my colleagues:

LIQUID METAL FAST BREEDER REACTOR

Whereas, due to fuel shortages, pressure from environmentalists and extremely high construction cost, there is a widespread conviction in, and out, of the electric industry that the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor is sorely needed and that the demonstration plant construction program should be started immediately, and

Whereas, delay in introducing the Breeder Reactor is costing this country far in excess of the funds needed for building demonstration plants, said cost of potential benefits for each year in which the Breeder Reactor is delayed is worth \$1.3 billion according to recent AEC estimates, and

Whereas, the benefits from the Breeder Reactor will inure to all persons in the United States and, therefore, the cost of the demonstration breeder reactor should be a Federal Government function, and not a function of the utility and manufacturing industries and thereby removing from AEC the extreme difficulty of protecting the public interest while accepting large sums of development money from said industries, and

Now therefore be it resolved, that the delegates to the South Carolina Association of Electric Cooperatives, assembled in meeting at Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, the tenth day of September, 1971, hereby, respectfully request the Congress of the United States to enact necessary legislation to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to initiate a crash program to begin construction of sufficient prototype breeder reactors in conjunction with reliable manufacturers (at least two) to develop and perfect said breeder reactor at the earliest possible date, and that sufficient funds be promptly appropriated to cover the full cost of the entire program, and

Be it further resolved, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Member of Congress from South Carolina.

This is to certify that the above is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees of the S.C. Association of Electric Cooperatives at a meeting held at Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, on September 10, 1971, and that same has neither been rescinded nor modified.

R. B. AWBREY,
Secretary.