

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## DRAFT REFORMS

## HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, yesterday I submitted to the Senate Committee on Armed Services a statement focusing on one aspect of the present draft system which urgently needs reform. I refer to the preinduction screening for medical disabilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my statement together with attachments be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

STATEMENT BY U.S. SENATOR ROBERT P. GRIFFIN TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE ARMED SERVICES, FEBRUARY 22, 1971

Mr. Chairman: I appreciate the opportunity to present a statement to this Committee concerning draft reform.

The issues facing this Committee are as important as any that will face the Congress in this session. You are to be commended for holding early and extensive hearings on this subject.

In recent years the draft has been the subject of more criticism than at any time in history, with the possible exception of the time of the 1863 riots in New York and other parts of the country.

The criticism has not been limited to the use of the draft as a method of maintaining sufficient military manpower. The criticism has also been directed at inequities in the operation of the draft system. Such inequities are not less important now because young men over the age of 18 will have a voice in the election of Federal officials who make and administer the draft laws.

We must not gloss over inadequacies and abuses in the draft system merely because there is hope that it may be phased out in a few years. Whether the draft is extended for one or two or more years, every effort should be made to improve the operation of selection and induction procedures.

Mr. Chairman, my statement will be directed to one aspect of the draft which urgently requires improvement. I refer to the pre-induction screening for medical disabilities.

It should be emphasized that Senator Schweiker, a member of this Committee, probably has done more than anyone else in Congress to uncover inequities and deficiencies in these examination procedures. My statement will supplement some of his findings and will focus on specific cases of young men from my own State who have received inadequate medical examinations.

In addition, as a means of improving such examination procedures, I wish to suggest some legislative proposals for the Committee's consideration. One would provide a statutory right of appeal to the Army's Surgeon General for an individual who believes he has not received an adequate physical examination. The other would specifically require the local board, with the assistance of medical advisors, to screen out registrants who have medical disqualifications, to the extent feasible. I shall elaborate on each of these proposals at a later point in my statement.

The most thorough review of Armed Forces medical examinations was conducted by the Comptroller General in 1968 and again in 1970 at the request of Senator Schweiker. These reviews revealed that over a four year period, from 1966-69, some 20,000 men were discharged annually from the Armed Forces for physical conditions which existed at the time of entry. In 1969, the estimated cost to the Defense Department for such cases was \$17.9 million.

Reviews made by the Surgeon, U.S. Army Recruiting Command, indicate that in about 13.2 percent of the discharge cases the defect should have been detected at the examining station. It is important to recognize that the study included enlistees as well as draftees. In the case of the former, needed medical background data is not always supplied by the applicant.

Although the 1970 GAO report noted improvements in examining stations and the training of examining personnel which had been made since the 1968 GAO review, these improvements did not result in a decline in the rate of discharges due to medical conditions existing at the time of induction.

Unfortunately, the experience of my office is similar. Over the course of the last two years, some 47 complaints involving Michigan residents were registered with my office alleging that serious medical conditions were either ignored or discounted by the local board or the examining station.

During 1970, there was actually an increase in the number of such complaints brought to my attention. Out of 29 complaints which I received in 1970, 22 of them (or 76 percent) were found to be valid upon review.

Overall, in 79 percent of the cases submitted to my office during the past two years (in 37 out of 47 cases), a subsequent medical review by the Department of the Army resulted in the medical discharge or disqualification of the inductee.

Mr. Chairman, I have compiled a list of the 37 cases referred to, indicating the date of the complaint, the nature of the medical problem, and whether the problem was acknowledged by Army medical examiners before or after induction. I ask that this list be printed in the record of your hearings at the end of my statement.

A few examples will illustrate some of the problems which were encountered by draftees and brought to our attention.

In one case a young man was declared physically fit and was drafted, despite the fact that he had been rushed to the hospital the day before with severe stomach pains. The stomach pains were caused by a hernia which required immediate surgery. At the examining station the individual was told there was nothing to worry about.

Another case involved a hemophiliac who was in the Army for six months before he was discharged.

In a third case, the draftee had limited use of one foot as the result of a hunting accident. The foot had to be wrapped each night in order to keep down swelling and allow the individual to walk the next day.

In yet a fourth case, a vision defect prevented the young man from seeing at night. Incredibly enough, he actually had to be tied to another man and led around the training course during night exercises.

Still in the process of review is the case of a registrant afflicted with rheumatoid arthritis and a chronically infected pilonidal cyst. Army medical standards specifically state that a documented clinical history of rheumatoid arthritis is cause for rejection.

Despite the fact that the registrant sub-

mitted some 50 pages of medical reports and doctors' letters certifying the existence of these conditions, he was found physically fit for induction. Apparently relying on the results of an examination conducted several months earlier, the Army made this determination without reexamining the registrant.

But what disturbs me even more about this case are the events that transpired during and after a new physical examination which was provided after an inquiry by my office.

During the examination, an initial eye test showed nearly perfect vision in both eyes. However, at the registrant's request, a civilian doctor at the station examined his eyes and found his vision to be 20/200 in the right eye.

Blood pressure was recorded as 160 over 104, certainly not within Army standards which call for disqualification if preponderant blood pressure readings are above 140 over 90. In fact, either a reading of 140 or a reading of 90 is sufficient for rejection.

The registrant's pulse while he was in a sitting position was recorded at 120 beats per minute, also not within normal limits.

At the end of the physical, the Commanding Officer refused to make any medical determination without additional tests and consultation with internal specialists. He specifically did not fill out the "profile" portion of the examination.

However, the physical was sent to Army Headquarters where the "profile" was completed and the registrant found physically fit, despite the fact that no additional tests or consultation was ever undertaken.

Furthermore, I would like to point out that in several instances it took up to six months, and as many as ten months in one case, before individuals having disqualifying conditions at the time of entry were discharged from the Armed Forces.

These incidents are disgraceful and do nothing to engender confidence in the fairness of the selective service process.

But the problems of inadequate medical review are not limited to the examining stations.

In November of 1970, the GAO released a report entitled "Savings Through Increased Screening of Registrants With Medical Conditions at Local Draft Boards".

The Comptroller General concluded, after a study of 30 local boards, that some 37 percent of 126,000 registrants who were rejected at the examining stations might have been screened and rejected by the local boards instead. It was estimated that \$1 billion in transportation and examination costs could have been saved.

The importance of medical advisors is shown by the following figures: In 1969, 52,600 out of 59,809 registrants referred to medical advisors were found not qualified. In 1960, 54,667 out of 61,144 registrants were found not qualified as the result of interviews with medical advisors.

Selective Service regulations specify that registrants shall be sent to a medical advisor whenever it appears that the registrant has a disqualifying medical condition or defect which appears on a list provided by the Surgeon General. The GAO found, however, that local boards have not fully complied with these regulations.

Specifically, it was discovered that the most frequent reason local boards did not send registrants to medical advisors was the difficulty in relating the registrant's conditions or defects to medical terminology used in technical Army medical standards (AR 40-501).

A number of other significant reasons were given. The report states:

"For example, one executive secretary informed us that she had been in the habit of sending registrants to the examining station, and that she had never thought it was important to send registrants to the medical advisor. Other executive secretaries informed us that they were not sure which registrant should be sent to the medical advisors."

Moreover, a number of medical advisors themselves indicated that they had not been fully utilized. One advisor indicated that no cases had been referred to him in the last few years, and another said he had not had a case sent to him in the last six months.

It was not until August of last year that a list of disqualifying physical defects, as required under Selective Service regulations, was sent by the Director to the local boards. The list was limited to "obviously disqualifying" conditions and conditions which can be evaluated by the medical advisor upon receipt of valid documentary evidence.

In an earlier letter to the GAO, the Director of the Selective Service stated: "We believe that Congress intended that all other cases including those which involve a claimed defect, or defects, which are only *potentially* disqualifying should be referred for a regular, armed forces physical examination. . . ."

Whether the distinction between "obviously" and "potentially" disqualifying defects is valid or not, it is apparent that there has been a good deal of confusion as to the responsibilities of the local board and the medical advisor.

A good example of this confusion was evident in a case brought to my attention about a year ago.

In the letter which I received, the registrant informed me that every member of his local board agreed that he should be disqualified, but they indicated that they "did not have any jurisdiction over medical matters".

Instead of sending the registrant to a medical advisor, he was referred by the clerk of the draft board to her personal physician. In fact, the clerk called the doctor and arranged for a complete physical examination—an examination which cost the registrant \$183. Medical advisors, on the other hand, do not receive any compensation from registrants or the Selective Service.

Even though a report by the clerk's own physician concluded that the registrant should be disqualified, the local board maintained that it had no authority to act. Fortunately, upon subsequent review, the registrant's medical condition was acknowledged and he was found to be unacceptable before he was inducted into the service.

In another case which came to my attention just this year the local board not only refused to grant the registrant a medical interview at his request, but also refused to send him for an Army physical examination.

This action was taken, despite the fact that the board had received a doctor's statement indicating the registrant had a disqualifying condition specifically described in Army regulations.

I may not have pat or perfect solutions for such problems, but I would like to discuss briefly two possible legislative proposals to which I alluded earlier in my statement.

First, provision could be made for a right of appeal to the Surgeon General of the Army from the results of any medical examination.

At present a local board's classification may be appealed, but there is no effective review of a medical determination that the registrant is qualified for induction.

The only internal review of such a determination is provided by Army Regulation 601-270, paragraph 4-22b, which provides in part:

"Whenever there is doubt as to whether or not the examinee meets the minimum

medical requirements for military service, determination of acceptability will be made by the United States Army Recruiting Command Surgeon. The Surgeon, U.S. Army Recruiting Command and oversea command surgeons concerned, may refer cases of an unusual or controversial nature to The Surgeon General." (Emphasis added)

This regulation does *not* provide a right of appeal for the individual prior to induction.

Ironically enough, however, a fairly effective appeal process has developed through Congressional offices. In fact, of the 37 cases brought to my attention where an initial determination of medical fitness has been overturned, 24 determinations of disqualification were made prior to induction. A right of appeal to the Surgeon General should accomplish the same results.

In addition, a registrant should be provided with a copy of the report of his physical examination. Thus, a right of appeal and access to Army medical records would be of benefit even if nothing more was accomplished than removal of the cloak of secrecy presently surrounding many medical determinations.

Where a considerable period of time elapses between the physical examination and the notice of induction, say at least 90 days, the registrant could request a new examination. At present, Army regulations provide for a complete reexamination of the registrant if more than one year has elapsed since the previous examination.

Such a provision will assure that the right of appeal is truly effective.

A second suggestion would be to amend the Selective Service Act to require that determinations of medical unacceptability be made by the local board, to the extent feasible. Such a proposal should require that local boards fully utilize the advice of qualified physicians (medical advisors) in the community.

The board should be required to refer all cases to a local physician (or medical advisor), where medical histories indicate that a registrant *might* be disqualified for service. If not enough medical advisors are available in a particular area, then the files could be sent to the examining station. The GAO was informed by the Army that it could review files at the stations prior to, or in place of, an actual physical examination.

I do not recommend conferring any new authority on advisors, such as performing tests. If the advisor has any question as to whether a registrant should be disqualified if he find the registrant to be qualified for induction, the registrant would be sent to an armed forces examining station.

In effect, this proposal would clarify and give statutory effect to existing Selective Service regulations providing for interviews with medical advisors.

Mr. Chairman, if implemented, I believe these suggestions would go a long way toward improving the efficiency and adequacy of military physical determinations. And such reviews in procedures would do much to instill confidence of affected young people in the procedures and decisions.

The revisions I am suggesting would not require a radical change from current procedures. With the end of the draft in sight, it may not be practical to introduce a completely new system to determine physical fitness.

The approach I am suggesting offers immediate benefits without an undue strain on the system.

In order to provide the Committee with a concrete legislative proposal, I would like to have included within the hearing record draft language incorporating my suggestions.

Mr. Chairman, improvements in the pre-induction medical evaluation process are essential if any real draft reform is to be achieved. I hope the Committee will thor-

oughly examine the problems that exist in this process and will consider the need for legislative changes such as I have proposed.

MICHIGAN RESIDENTS DISCHARGED FROM MILITARY SERVICE OR DISQUALIFIED FROM SERVICE PRIOR TO INDUCTION AFTER HAVING BEEN FOUND PHYSICALLY AND MENTALLY FIT

[Date, reason for discharge or disqualification, when rejected]

- 10/21/68, hemophilia, after induction.
- 2/18/69, back and leg injury, prior to induction.
- 3/20/69, bronchial asthma, after induction (2 months).
- 5/11/69, alternating exotropia, after induction (2 months).
- 5/27/69, diabetes mellitus, prior to induction.
- 6/16/69, vision defect (unable to see at night), after induction (6 months).
- 6/21/69, impaired function of both kidneys and loss of one testicle, prior to induction.
- 6/24/69, limited use of one foot due to hunting accident, prior to induction.
- 9/9/69, diabetes, after induction (1 month).
- 9/29/69, aortic stenosis secondary to rheumatic heart disease, after induction (1½ months).
- 10/11/69, epigastric hernia, after induction (2 months).
- 10/17/69, loss of hearing in one ear coupled with serious drainage, prior to induction.
- 10/20/69, ankle injury (traumatic osteochondritis dissecans), prior to induction.
- 10/28/69, shortened leg, prior to induction.
- 11/18/69, trick knee, prior to induction.
- 1/19/70, leg injury, prior to induction.
- 2/16/70, back trouble, prior to induction.
- 5/14/70, hypertension or high blood pressure, after induction (3 months).
- 5/21/70, arthritis, prior to induction.
- 5/26/70, hypertension or high blood pressure, prior to induction.
- 6/3/70, back injury, prior to induction.
- 6/4/70, congenital bilateral weakfoot, prior to induction.
- 6/8/70, ear trouble, prior to induction.
- 7/14/70, active duodenal ulcer, prior to induction.
- 7/14/70, back trouble (paraspinal muscle spasm), after induction (4 months).
- 8/26/70, chronic kidney ailment (bilateral pyelonephritis and urethral stricture), after induction (10 months).
- 8/27/70, hypertension or high blood pressure, prior to induction.
- 8/28/70, back trouble (spondylolysis), after induction (1 month).
- 9/14/70, asthma, after induction (6 months).
- 9/21/70, back trouble (spondylolysis), after induction (2 months).
- 10/15/70, severe schizoid personality, after induction (2 months).
- 11/3/70, traumatic arthritis in left foot, prior to induction.
- 11/5/70, underweight, prior to induction.
- 11/6/70, depressive neurosis (moderately severe), prior to induction.
- 12/4/70, meniere's disease, prior to induction.
- 12/11/70, severe depression, prior to induction.
- 1/4/71, prostate hypertrophy and severe hayfever, prior to induction.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE MILITARY SERVICE ACT OF 1967

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4(a) of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of the third paragraph the following: "After the completion of any medical examination of any registrant performed for the purpose of determining his acceptability for training and service under this Act, such



registrant shall be furnished a copy of the record of such examination as promptly as practicable. A registrant shall have the right to appeal to the Surgeon General of the Army any determination made on the basis of such examination regarding such registrant's acceptability for training and service if such application is filed not more than fifteen days after the day on which he is furnished with a copy of the record of such examinations. If the local board determines that it would be detrimental to the physical or mental well-being of any registrant to furnish him with a copy of the results of any medical examination performed for the purpose of determining his acceptability for training and service under this Act, such record may be withheld from such registrant, but a copy thereof shall be furnished to the parents or guardian of such registrant or, if he has no parent or guardian, to a physician designated by such registrant. Where a period of more than 90 days has elapsed between the date of the most recent medical examination of a registrant and the date on which he is ordered to report for induction, a new medical examination shall be performed on such registrant if he so requests and offers any reasonable grounds to support such request. No order for a registrant to report for induction shall be issued either during the period afforded the registrant to file an appeal with the Surgeon General of the Army or, if the registrant has filed such an appeal, during the period such an appeal is pending. Any order to report for induction during either of such periods shall be ineffective and shall be cancelled by the local board. Each local board shall, to the maximum extent feasible, determine whether any registrant is unacceptable for training and service under this Act because of medical reasons. In making a determination under the foregoing sentence, a local board shall utilize the advice of qualified physicians in the area in which such board is located to the extent that qualified physicians are available in such area."

**WHITE HOUSE BUREAUCRATS  
BLUNDER BY RECOMMENDING  
ABOLITION OF APPALACHIAN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues and citizens from the Appalachian States, I was astounded by the recent White House recommendation that the Appalachian Regional Commission and program be abolished and the remnants stuck in some superagency.

Columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak in a recent article in the Washington Post assess the blame on the bureaucracy that has developed in the White House—on some unnamed functionary.

While I cannot and do not attempt to assess responsibility for this action, I can say that this recommendation is a mistake and a blunder.

The Appalachian Regional Development Commission is a shining example of successful Federal-State-local government cooperation and partnership. This program is working well—it is effective—

it is producing results—and it must be continued.

In this connection I have introduced H.R. 3280 to extend the program for 4 years—to June 30, 1975. It is my prediction that Congress will extend this program.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this important program, I place the article from the Washington Post in the RECORD herewith.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 18, 1971]

**WHITE HOUSE BUREAUCRATS**

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The self-inflicted wounds suffered by President Nixon because of his ill-advised effort to end special regional aid to Appalachia result directly from the White House bureaucracy's expansion in size and power.

To politically attuned presidential aides, Mr. Nixon's proposal to abolish the 6-year-old Appalachian Regional Commission is wholly without political merit. It offends Republican leaders in the 14-state region, puts Mr. Nixon in opposition to the one truly popular Great Society program of Lyndon B. Johnson, and discards a possible alternative to beleaguered revenue sharing. Moreover, it poses an inevitable confrontation for the President in late summer. To sign or veto an extension of the Appalachian Commission certain to be passed by Congress against Mr. Nixon's wishes.

This is precisely what critics inside the administration privately forecast when the President started institutionalizing a White House policymaking bureaucracy. In a White House that communicates through written memoranda, a non-political bureaucracy can obliterate political good sense—as with the Appalachian program.

To understand how Mr. Nixon is making political bad sense here, it is necessary to go back to last July when he conferred with Appalachian governors in Louisville. As scheduled, Mr. Nixon argued for his revenue sharing scheme. As unscheduled, the governors delivered an unsolicited testimonial for the Appalachian program—first and most successful of the regional commissions set up during the Johnson administration.

Given your choice, Mr. Nixon next asked the governors, would you prefer aid through revenue sharing or Appalachian-style regional commissions? To the President's astonishment, the answer was unanimous; Regional commissions. Gov. John Bell Williams of Mississippi, who as a congressman voted against the Appalachian program, testified for the commission with the fervor of a convert.

The governors followed the Louisville meeting with a detailed program for regional commissions covering the entire country. Immediately dubbed "wall-to-wall Appalachias" inside the White House, it was delivered to the President last Sept. 14 by four Republican governors from Appalachia. Mr. Nixon, in turn, responded with several statements, privately and publicly, describing the Appalachian program as regionalism at its best and a cornerstone of his New Federalism.

Thus, it was with disbelief that politicians from both parties read this year's federal budget. Far from being a new model for decentralized government, the Appalachian Commission would be guillotined. Appalachian aid money would be folded into a bloc grant for rural development—part of Mr. Nixon's "special revenue sharing."

The first key Republican politicians heard of this came in telephone calls from Vice President Spiro T. Agnew after the budget went to the press. Sen. Howard Baker of

Tennessee, a Nixon loyalist certain of the President's support for the program, was dumbfounded. Republican Gov. Arch Moore of West Virginia, who heard Mr. Nixon laud the program in a private chat last year, first got the bad news from a West Virginia Democrat—Sen. Jennings Randolph, chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee.

These surprised Republicans were not alone. Presidential assistants concerned with political affairs did not learn the decision until Mr. Nixon made it. Now, they must live with it.

What happened derives from bureaucratization of the White House. The Appalachian question was handled by John Ehrlichman's White House Policy Council with Dr. Edwin L. Harper, a young Ph. D. straight from the Arthur D. Little management firm doing the basic staff work. The Appalachian Commission, successful though it was, did not fit the New Federalism as prescribed by the Ash report on government reorganization. Therefore, off with its head.

This is precisely the result that sagacious administration officials prophesied would emerge from the new staff structure. Mr. Nixon, a President long known to work mainly from staff memoranda, concentrates hard on a few transcendent issues, and therefore, is at the mercy of the policy council staff. Political advisers simply do not get a hearing on such matters.

In the real political world, Congress will pass a two-year extension of the commission that actually doubles present aid (while "special revenue sharing" languishes). A veto would only compound the damage already done throughout Appalachia and, in particular, doom Republican chances for governor of Kentucky this year. A veto, then should be unthinkable. Nevertheless, Republican politicians, eyeing that White House Bureaucracy, no longer are, sure anything is unthinkable.

**U.S. PRISONERS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA**

**HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the fall of this year I gave a speech in Minneapolis on the question of American prisoners in Southeast Asia. I made suggestions which could contribute to a resolution of this grave situation. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts of my remarks, given before the National Association of American POW's in Southeast Asia, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

**EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF  
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY**

Recently the Congress met in joint session on September 22, 1970, to consider a matter vital to all Americans—the treatment of American prisoners of war by the North Vietnamese. Colonel Frank Borman reported on his recent mission to obtain release of the prisoners.

The plight of these men is indeed a serious matter to all Americans. The anguish that the families of these brave men suffer each day is a cruel burden.

North Vietnam has refused to accord the status of prisoners of war to our servicemen who have been captured. Instead these men have been termed "war criminals" and have

been denied their rights under the Geneva Convention of 1949.

The North Vietnamese government has even refused to recognize the International Committee of the Red Cross to function on behalf of the prisoners. Nevertheless, the United States and the South Vietnamese government have designated this power to the Red Cross and have allowed them to regularly inspect the prisoner of war camps in South Vietnam where approximately 36,000 prisoners from North Vietnam are being held.

Consistently, the North Vietnamese government has refused to submit to the Red Cross or any other neutral nation, a list of names of the American prisoners who are being held.

Now how many men are involved in this controversy? There are approximately 1,548 men considered missing in action or prisoners of war. Of this number, 780 men have been lost in North Vietnam, with approximately 376 reported as prisoners through letters received and films. 277 men have been lost in Laos with only three reported as prisoners. 541 have been lost in South Vietnam with 78 prisoners reported, reputedly in Vietcong jungle camps.

The only contacts made between the prisoners and their families have come through private organizations who have visited North Vietnam. One committee, a few months ago, brought back a list of 334 men, confirmed by the Hanoi government as a complete list of all American men now being held. This list was originally compiled by this Committee from letters which were received from prisoners to their families.

The agreement stated that prisoners would be allowed to write one letter of six lines each month and to receive one package every other month. The list of 334 names included prisoners who wrote to their families prior to 1969. However, 40 men who were previously reported as being held prisoner did not appear on this list of names.

What was the fate of these men? How sad and how bitter it is that the North Vietnamese will not honor their obligations under International Law. Information is only communicated to us through private organizations.

Under the provisions of the Geneva Convention of 1949, the number of letters accorded to prisoners of war shall not be less than two letters and four cards monthly. Prisoners who have been without news for a long period must be allowed to send telegrams. Prisoners are also allowed to receive parcels, including foodstuffs, medical supplies and articles of a religious, educational, or recreational character.

This is a far cry from the one six-line letter each month and one package every other month agreed to by a private organization and the North Vietnamese government for men who by every civilized rule of nations should be accorded the rights of prisoners of war.

Since neither the Red Cross or any other country has been allowed to inspect the prisoner of war camps in North Vietnam, what assurances do we have that our men are receiving proper care or medical attention?

International law specifically provides for the return home of the severely wounded prisoners of war and the transfer of sick and wounded to a neutral country not involved in the conflict.

The North Vietnamese have made no effort to keep their obligations under international law.

In 1966, Radio Hanoi announced that the American prisoners of war who were being held at that time were to be tried as "war criminals". There was an international outcry of protest that prevented this. Public opinion was too strong and the trials were never held.

These men—these brave American boys—have been prisoners of war longer than in any previous period in American history. The first American was taken captive by the North Vietnamese in 1964 and that man is still a prisoner today.

Under the rules of international law, there is no limitation imposed on the length of time a prisoner can be held. In the past, prisoners have been released when hostilities ceased. That is one reason why for over two years I have repeatedly called for a *stand-still ceasefire* agreement in Vietnam. A stand-still ceasefire will give us a chance—not a guarantee, but a chance—to bring these men home.

The North Vietnamese government even refuses to acknowledge the existence of their own men as prisoners of war held in South Vietnam.

Under international law there are limits to the suffering that may be inflicted by hostile parties.

Talleyrand, Foreign Minister to Napoleon Bonaparte wrote in November of 1806:

"Three centuries of civilization have given Europe a law of nations for which, according to the expression of an illustrious writer, human nature cannot be sufficiently grateful. This law is founded on the principle that nations ought to do one another in peace, the most good, and in war, *the least evil possible.*"

Humanity itself demands that the suffering of these men and their families be ended.

Thirty-six thousand human beings have not been given legal status as soldiers by the government of North Vietnam. How in the name of humanity can they do this to their own and to the 1,548 American men?

This is a barbarous crime. If the North Vietnamese will not act responsibly under international law for their welfare then the welfare of these Americans must rest with all the nations of the world who seek a rule of law.

Just as all men were diminished by the barbarity of Nazism—so are we all lessened by the inhumanity practised against these men and their lonesome families.

The General Assembly of the United Nations is now in session in New York City.

I urge our Government to place this matter on the Agenda of the General Assembly and bring to the Nations of the world there assembled the history of the cruel fate of these men.

Let the truth ring out in the Court of world opinion. Let all who seek peace exert their efforts for these men. Their rights, guaranteed under international law, must be protected.

All the nations of the world have an obligation and a self interest in seeing that this is done.

No man is an island.

But no nation can stand alone.

#### VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST WINNER IN VIRGINIA

**HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Miss Karen Elys Wark, of Hillsville, Va., a town in the district which I have the honor to represent, has been awarded first place in the Voice of Democracy Contest for the State of Virginia.

This contest sponsored annually by the Veterans of Foreign Wars provides an

opportunity for the many fine young people in this country to step forward and express their views on the American system.

Miss Wark has grasped the essence of America's strength with unusual perception. I compliment Karen on this high achievement and also Hillsville Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 1115, her sponsor.

It is my desire to share with other Members of Congress this outstanding document which I insert in the RECORD:

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

(By Karen Wark)

In this day where few things are stable and a country counts its possessions miserly, one shining bauble remains forever within their group. Of all the possessions a country has, one can never be extracted. It is the mingling emotions and pride in a history filled with mystic tales of explorers, unusual folk and the ponderous growth of a young country that formulates its most cherished and sacred possession—its heritage.

We are men and women who ideally seek those redeeming things far above materialistic value or comparison; items with awing, inspiring titles given to them, such as fraternity, equality, happiness, and most of all, freedom.

What a word, this thing freedom. But what is it? Is it food or drink, comfort or shelter? Just *how* vital is it for our needs, our lives, our very survival? Freedom is nourishment to those who possess it, feeding the mind and spirit. Is it comfort when things get rough or some loss is great. Freedom is shelter to those who flourish beneath its protective wing and grow beyond description in the encouraging atmosphere. In fact, freedom is just as necessary to life itself as the bodily needs; freedom to write, to think, to breathe—yes, freedom to live a life to the fullest that one chooses to live; freedom as our animal ancestors experience freedom.

But freedom is more than all that. Freedom is a tool that we have utilized to unearth our heritage. From the bowels of suppression, it was born to men who were denied their basic rights, privileges, and liberties. Once they regained them, the men finally realized the awesome power of this magnificent tool. Doggedly, they began to cleave and create from scratch, their own heritage with the fine blade of freedom, basing a government upon the precarious perch of "radical" ideas accompanying freedom. Slowly by shaping and molding, this perch was strengthened by a step-by-step process paralleling the wisely sought principles, duties, and restrictions of freedom and its associates.

Yes, we've fought and sweated and strained and died a countless number of times for this immortal thing, this freedom. And the result of those who have given so much is self-evident. Freedom may now be associated with our heritage as a twin brother. This pulsating essence is as much of a part of us as we are of it. Looking back, we see it as it mingles, winds, twists, and flows, ebbing and surging from the life the people feed into it, spurring us onto greater realms of human achievement, giving to those who have little else in life, something to be proud to live for. The carte blanche reflects the blood cast before it in a relentless battle for preservation. We are indeed addicts; one taste and we're hooked.

Nevertheless, for all bloodshed involved, for all the sacrifices involved, we are proud to say that now freedom is our heritage as long as we have an ounce of strength left to preserve it for those behind us who laid the foundation, keeping it to have and to hold, honor, cherish and share for ourselves and our posterity.



FARMERS ENTITLED TO EQUITABLE  
SHARE OF NATION'S INCOME

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, recently I spoke in Grand Rapids before a group of Michigan's agricultural leaders attending an ASCS seminar on rural environmental problems. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from my remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

I was interested to read the other day about Governor Milliken's narrow escape from a group of hog farmers who wanted to present him personally with a 60-pound pig. I hope you have no such surprise in store for me. But if you do, I confess that I understand the purpose. As with hog farmers, all farmers need to find ways to dramatize the fact that the income they receive for what they produce is pitifully inadequate.

The farmer has become a scientist, a technician, a businessman, a market expert, and the manager of a whole complex of skills. As a result, the area of greatest growth in productivity in the American economy, the highest productivity per man-hour, is not in industry, nor in services—but rather in American agriculture. In fact, no segment of the United States labor force even approaches the growth in productivity of the American farmer.

As you already know—and don't really need a Senator to tell you—the American housewife now pays a smaller percentage of her family income for food than ever before. What's more, no housewife in any other country of the world pays out a smaller percentage of the family income for food.

That's said many times—and it's fact—but, unfortunately, you don't see it written up in the newspapers very often.

On top of that, we Americans are the best fed people in the world. Though we still have our hungry—they hunger not because there is a lack of food in the land—but rather because of an inadequate system of distribution.

It was interesting that when President Nixon talked about his fourth great goal: to improve America's health, as outlined in his State of the Union message, his discussion about health did not mention food. Obviously, America's health is not endangered by lack of food. Not many other countries on this earth can make that claim.

So long as you continue to provide the American people with food—at prices which represent a smaller part of their paychecks than ever before in history—smaller than in any other country—you need not apologize to anyone for expecting a more equitable share of the nation's income.

As President Nixon put it, the American farmer:

"Deserves a fair share of the Nation's increasing wealth and its increasing productivity, due to the fact that American agriculture is so productive."

Although I'm not an expert on farm legislation, I want to venture a few comments about the Agricultural Act of 1970. Having been present at the tortured birth of this legislation—having scolded the political opposition for physically blocking the bill at the Senate door, I have a real interest in what may happen under it.

As you realize, I'm sure, that Agricultural Act of 1970 was the product of many compromises (some think too many) and certainly is not the best bill possible in any single man's judgment. I would like to refer in particular to two features of the legislation.

First, the so-called set-aside provision, which returns more decision-making power to the individual farmer. I focus on this because it typifies a new philosophy—hopefully a trend—to reverse the flow of power—to return more decision making power to the people.

As you know, under the set-aside provision, producers can divert part of their acreage and then use the rest of their land, according to their own judgment, so as to bring in the best return.

Farmers will have more freedom to do the kind of farming they are best prepared to do—farming best suited to their land, equipment, and other economic considerations.

Another feature of the new Act is its emphasis on "market orientation," the selling end of the farm business. The aim is to help farmers expand cash markets both here and abroad.

Export markets are continuing to open up for American agricultural producers. Consumers all over the world are demanding better diets. Incomes are rising in other parts of the world so that the people in many countries can now afford better diets.

More people abroad are eating quality meats, for example. And the production of quality meat requires feed grains, which means more demand for American corn and other feed grains if we produce these crops on a competitive basis.

A recent Department of Agriculture report on planting intentions indicates that, nationally, six per cent more corn will be planted this year than last.

Michigan is on the high side of the national average so far as corn planting intentions are concerned. Over 200,000 more Michigan acres will go into corn in 1971, according to the Agriculture Department survey. That's a 12 per cent increase for Michigan, double the increase nationwide.

As a non-farmer, I am told soybeans is another good prospect for export. In 20 years, soybean exports have boomed from 15 million bushels to 430 million bushels—an annual growth rate of 22 per cent. The United States now exports soybeans to 35 countries.

Michigan farmers indicate they intend to increase soybean production in this state by nine per cent this year.

As a new member of the Senate Finance Committee, I'll be taking a close look in this session at one piece of farm legislation—the Sugar Act which expires December 31st. Bills which have to do with tariffs, import quotas and the like go to the Finance Committee rather than the Agriculture Committee.

Michigan has 2,200 sugar beet farms which produced over 1.5 million tons of beets last year—a \$23.5 million crop. So, this state is an important contributor to one aim of the Sugar Act, that is to preserve enough sugar producing capacity in this country to safeguard national security.

In addition to specific goals indicated in the Agricultural Act of 1970, there is great concern these days about making government generally more responsive to all people and their needs.

In his recent State of the Union message, President Nixon called for "better use of our land," and efforts to "encourage a balanced national growth—growth that will revitalize our rural heartland and enhance the quality of life throughout America."

One of the programs to which he referred, and which I strongly support, was the rural development program of the present Department of Agriculture.

Rural development is a vital part of an

overall strategy for growth and development of non-metropolitan America, but it has great significance for metropolitan America.

Its central thrust is to re-direct the growth of the nation—to improve the conditions of rural as well as urban America.

As you know, rural America encompasses about one-third of this nation's population, most of its geography, the forest resources, the minerals and fossil fuels, the rivers, lakes and streams, the fish and wildlife. Until now, at least, rural America has been—in many respects—a stepchild of the government's concern.

Those who reside in rural America have not fully participated in our national economy, partly because we have not had a national policy which really encouraged balanced growth of rural, as well as, urban areas.

The Administration is now moving toward broader policies which are designed to implement balanced growth. I refer to programs which specifically include rural America in the effort to:

1. to provide incentives for business and industry to produce the basic employment opportunities which support new growth.

2. to improve educational and health services, housing, and other community water, sewer and solid-waste-disposal facilities, as well as recreation and cultural activities.

3. to help cities and towns purchase surrounding land areas for residential growth, for open space, for industrial parks, for recreation and the like.

In his State of the Union address, as you will recall, President Nixon also called for a complete reorganization of the Executive branch of the Federal Government.

While all the details are still not available. The broad outline of the proposal is known. If adopted there would no longer be such departments as Agriculture, Labor, or Commerce. New departments would be organized around functions and major objectives rather than groups of constituents.

At the present time, if a county official wants help with the financing of a sewage treatment facility, he could go to three or four different departments and agencies which have related programs.

The President has proposed that seven Cabinet-level departments be consolidated into four: a Department of Economic Development; a Department of Community Development; a Department of Natural Resources; and a Department of Human Resources. This reorganization may not go sailing through the Congress because it would probably mean a major reorganization of the Committees of Congress. That's probably enough to say to justify a comment that it may take a while before such a reorganization can take place.

But there is a drive on to streamline the Federal bureaucracy—to make it more responsive—and to move more decision-making power closer to the people. President Nixon has called it a "New American Revolution."

I believe he understood the mood of the country when he said, the people are fed up with government at all levels. The people are demanding reform—they are finally convinced that all the brains and wisdom are not concentrated on the banks of the Potomac.

In Agriculture—as in other areas—the New American Revolution will focus a renewed reliance on individual initiative—and local control.

Whether you like it or not—you, who make your living in agriculture, cannot sit on the sidelines any longer. Whether you want to be or not, you are now in the front lines of this New American Revolution—and I wish you well. As your Senator in Washington, I'll do everything I can to pass you the ammunition.

## SOVIET CIVIL DEFENSE

## HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, in view of the incident which took place over the weekend concerning the U.S. civil defense system perhaps this is a good time to take another look at the civil defense procedures and doctrine of the Soviet Union. An article in the November-December 1970 issue of *Survive* magazine by Leon Goure, one of America's foremost authorities on civil defense matters who is currently director of Soviet Studies at the University of Miami's Center for Advanced International Studies and a consultant for the Office of Civil Defense, brings us up to date on Soviet efforts in this field.

Particular attention should be called to Mr. Goure's assessment of the Soviet doctrine which calls for preemptive, or sneak attack. The hypothesis that the Soviets were aiming at developing a sure second strike deterrent force and nothing more was simply a figment of someone's imagination which somehow got written into policy and became a basis for our own activities in the field of strategic defense. As Khrushchev said the losing side will always resort to the use of nuclear weapons; meaning that it would be absurd for the side which plans to win not to use them first. The Soviets, of course, plan to be the winning side. If they can induce the United States to continue its lackadaisical approach to the question of national defense there is little doubt that Kremlin objectives will be transformed into a tragic reality for the people of the United States.

The article follows:

## SOVIET CIVIL DEFENSE: CURRENT DOCTRINE

(By Leon Goure)

To discuss Civil Defense is to think about the "unthinkable." Many prominent Americans have said in effect that nuclear war is "unthinkable" because no rational leader would ever resort to it. Thus McGeorge Bundy, former national security adviser to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, wrote in 1969:

"In the real world of real political leaders—whether here or in the Soviet Union—a decision that would bring even one hydrogen bomb on one city of one's own country would be recognized in advance as a catastrophic blunder; ten bombs on ten cities would be a disaster beyond history; and a hundred bombs on a hundred cities are unthinkable."

Unfortunately, such a judgment is not only historically wrong—the Soviet Union suffered the equivalent loss of far more than ten cities in 1941 when the Germans occupied most of European Russia, yet it survived—but may also err in assuming that the Soviet leaders hold similar views. It is indeed one aspect of our psychology that we have tended to endow the Soviet leaders with ever greater measures of rationality (in our meaning of the word) in proportion to the growth of Soviet military power. Unfortunately, the men in the Kremlin, while they are likely to view a war initiated by the United States as a "catastrophe," do not believe war to be "unthinkable." Indeed, they regard the possibility of a war as sufficiently real to require the Soviet Union

to continue to invest its relatively scarce resources not only in a deterrent capability, but more significantly, in what they appear to believe may be a capability to survive and win it. "The defensive might of the Soviet Union," said Kosygin on June 10, 1970, "must be invincible in the full sense of the word."

The Soviet Union has always taken the danger of war seriously, and preparations for it have always been at the forefront of the leadership's concern. History has confirmed that military power was not only essential to Soviet survival, but is also the key factor in the emergence of the Soviet Union as a super-state.

Soviet concern over the possibility of war and with the problem of survival has led to its interest in Civil Defense. This interest dates from the inception of the Soviet State. Only the scale and level of investment in it have varied, and its character and organization have periodically changed in accordance with Soviet perceptions of the changing nature of war and technology. A national Civil Defense system called "Local Anti-Air Defense" (MPVO) was first established in 1932. However, modern Soviet Civil Defense dates from 1961 when it was renamed "Civil Defense of the USSR" and control over it was transferred from the Ministry of Interior to the Ministry of Defense.

The change underscored the importance of an integrated national, as opposed to a local, civil defense system, which is said to be required by the nuclear threat and the character of modern means of weapons delivery. At the same time, the greater importance of Civil Defense was reflected in the appointment of a Marshal of the Soviet Union, V. Chulikov, as Chief of the Civil Defense of the USSR.

More recently the importance of Soviet Civil Defense was further enhanced when Brezhnev called for its further improvement at the 23rd Party Congress in 1966 and again in a speech in 1967. This high-level endorsement by the Chief of the CPSU, the first of its kind since World War II, has resulted in giving Soviet Civil Defense far greater scope and momentum than hitherto, as well as more leverage in asking for increased investments.

There are still many things about the Soviet Civil Defense program which remain unknown to us because of Soviet secrecy. Thus, we do not know the exact size of its organization, its costs, or its degree of readiness. However, there is evidence from Soviet and non-Soviet sources which indicates that it is not a mere paper program, but one that has and continues to receive large investments of resources and manpower on a scale which makes it probably the largest effort of its kind in the world today.

When one examines the Soviet Civil Defense program and its underlying doctrine one may decide at first glance that some aspects of it are obsolete or unrealistic. However, before passing judgment one should be careful to take into account the character of the Soviet system and the state of its economy, as well as the peculiarities of the Soviet views on the nature of modern war and the likely circumstances for its occurrence.

## THE SOVIET VIEW OF THE THREAT

The current Soviet public view of the threat facing the Soviet Union seems to justify its Civil Defense program. One striking aspect of the Soviet treatment of this question is that it in no way reflects the more optimistic views sometimes held in the West. Despite the SALT negotiations and efforts to reduce East-West tensions, Soviet views on peaceful coexistence are far removed from ours. Soviet spokesmen reject the notion that peaceful coexistence signifies any real moderation in East-West relations. For example, an article in the govern-

ment newspaper, *Izvestia*, states that: "the policy of peaceful coexistence is imbued with deep class content and, therefore, has nothing in common with bourgeois and petty bourgeois pacifism." Not only will the struggle continue, but the threat of an armed conflict is said to be intensifying. For example, Brezhnev insists that the danger of war will not only persist as long as imperialism survives, but that the present stage is marked by a specially acute struggle between communism and capitalism in the fields of ideology, politics and economics. Thus, he said on May 27, 1970:

"We live in an age of acute struggle between the two systems in the world arena. Imperialism has not laid down its arms. The international situation requires that we should strengthen the defense potential and combat readiness of the Soviet troops. This is our sacred duty."

The old Stalinist doctrine of capitalist encirclement of the Soviet Union and of the inevitability of war with the capitalist powers, which Khrushchev dropped in 1956, is now being replaced with the still older Leninist doctrine that as socialism is increasingly victorious in the world the desperate capitalists become more irrational and violent in their attempts to save themselves. For example, Marshal of the Soviet Union Grechko, the Minister of Defense, wrote on April 18, 1970:

"The course of modern social development confirms the ideas expressed by Lenin that the more substantial socialism's victories are, the more stubborn the resistance of the imperialist bourgeoisie becomes. Not wishing to reckon with the lessons of history, imperialist reaction seeks a way out in various kinds of adventures and provocations, and in direct use of military force."

These arguments serve to justify increased Soviet defense expenditures and demands on the population to prepare for defense. For example, a member of the ruling Politburo, Shelest, said recently:

"Political vigilance, hatred for the class enemy, and readiness to stand in defense of our socialist Motherland must be increased among our people."

Marshal of the Soviet Union Konev put it in a nutshell when he wrote in *Izvestia*: "An enemy is an enemy. It is essential that every Soviet citizen be hardened and ready for the clash with the class enemy."

The Chinese threat to the Soviet Union is also mentioned. Thus, Chulikov writes in the 1969 edition of his pamphlet *Civil Defense in the Missile Nuclear Age*:

"At this time it is difficult to determine how much nuclear capability China can plan for and how soon the militaristic clique of Mao Tse-tung can accumulate it, but having in hand nuclear weapons and even more so strategic missiles, the Maoists can threaten any country with nuclear attack."

However, references to a Chinese threat are not used to the same extent in Soviet literature to justify the civil defense program as the alleged danger posed by the United States. Of course, the Soviet leaders may find it politically inexpedient to explain their defense preparations in terms of China, especially as they often criticize Peking's militarism. But the scope and character of the Soviet Civil Defense Program are far too comprehensive and intensive to be primarily designed to cope with the threat of a Chinese attack.

Soviet concern with defense, including civil defense, seems also to derive from a view of war which appears to be quite different from that of the United States. Following the loss of U.S. nuclear monopoly, the United States has increasingly concentrated on deterring nuclear war with relatively little attention being paid to what happens if the deterrent fails. The Soviet Union, however, still thinks not only about deterring a sur-



prise attack, but also in terms of war-fighting and war-winning capabilities. While recognizing that in a nuclear war the Soviet Union would suffer grievous damage, the official view rejects the Western notion of a state of mutual terror because this leads to "pacifism" and may hamper Soviet foreign policy. Instead it is argued that "victory" is possible provided that the Armed Forces are in a high state of readiness, the enemy's attack is blunted by a pre-emptive strike, i.e. a Soviet first-strike, and measures are taken to achieve a superior survival capability.

Thus, according to Major-General Sokolov, First Deputy Minister of Defense, Soviet military doctrine states that "sudden massive nuclear strikes can in a very large measure determine the entire subsequent course of the war, result in enormous losses, and place a people and a nation in an extremely difficult situation." The targets of such an attack are said to be:

"The means of nuclear attack of the aggressor, his industrial and administrative-political centers, important communication centers, army and naval bases, and large groupings of troops. The destruction of these targets may exert a decisive influence on the entire course of war."

Even though, according to the Soviet view, the "other side" is by definition the "aggressor," this does not mean that the Soviet Union, like the United States, is going to depend for its defense primarily on a retaliatory strike, especially not in view of the "decisive" character of the first strike. Consequently, Soviet doctrine calls for a "pre-emptive" attack. Thus, Marshal of the Soviet Union Krylov, the Commander in Chief of the Strategic Missile Forces, wrote on February 20, 1970 that "a counter-blow (sic) can exert a determining influence on the whole course of the war." Lieutenant-General Shuyrin, First Deputy Chief of the Civil Defense Staff of the USSR, has described the most optimistic version of what may happen to the Soviet Union:

"One must keep in mind that the aggressors (i.e. the U.S.) will not be able to make full use for their purposes of their strategic means of attack. A portion of their means of weapons delivery will be destroyed or damaged before their launching—while they are still on their launch sites, bases and airfields; another portion will be destroyed or damaged in flight by weapons of the Air Defense . . . ; still another portion of the missiles and aircraft will fail to reach their targets for technical reasons (i.e. malfunctions) . . . (However) some portion of the nuclear, chemical and bacteriological weapons may reach their targets."

We do not know, of course, whether or to what extent such views are actually shared by the Soviet leaders. However, the Soviet deployment of their SS-9's, which appear to have a real counter-force capability, the initial deployment of the Soviet ABM's around Leningrad and Moscow rather than to protect strategic missile sites, and the character of the Soviet Civil Defense system are suggestive in this respect.

#### THE MISSION OF CIVIL DEFENSE

The Soviet view of war is reflected in the Soviet Civil Defense program and its doctrine. This doctrine is based on the assertion that survival and victory in a nuclear war are impossible without assuring the protection of the population, the economy, the administration and sources of food. For example, Civil Defense Chief Marshal Chuikov, wrote in January 1970:

"We stand on the premise that in nuclear warfare the one who will hold out will be he who is able to preserve peoples lives, to insure continuity of management and the survivability of production of the national economy, and to safeguard crops and livestock from destruction . . ."

In brief, it is asserted over and over again that national survival and "victory" in a nuclear war are impossible without an effective Civil Defense, which therefore is an essential element of the overall Soviet defense capability. For this reason, Civil Defense is said to be an important concern of the Communist party and of the Soviet Government, and it is each citizen's "patriotic duty" to participate in it.

Soviet Civil Defense is required to deal with a range of threats, including nuclear, chemical, bacteriological and conventional weapons as well as natural disasters. Soviet concern with defense against CW and BW, which they allege the United States is planning to use in a war, is undiminished to this day and adds considerably to the cost of the program. It is said that these weapons are especially suited for population attacks and may be part of a campaign to paralyze the economy and prevent post-attack recovery.

In conclusion, the main mission of Soviet Civil Defense is:

- (1) Protection of the population,
- (2) Assuring the continuing operation of critical industries and services in wartime,
- (3) Protection of food, crops, livestock and water,
- (4) Training the entire population in Civil Defense, and
- (5) Conducting large-scale rescue, fire-fighting and repair work following an attack.

#### ANNUAL CIRCUS CITY FESTIVAL IN PERU, IND.

#### HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on Saturday, February 27, 1971, NBC television will chronicle one of the most unique events to take place in my State of Indiana. Beginning at 11 a.m. on that day, the network will present "Circus Town," an hour devoted to the story of the amateur Circus City Festival celebrated each year in Peru, Ind.

At a time of extensive criticism of the televised media and its overwhelming effect on Americans, I believe this special program is an indication of people-oriented television at its finest. The NBC program captures the efforts undertaken annually by a small Indiana community in a program designed for viewing by Americans of all ages.

Peru's annual Circus City Festival is one of Indiana's bigger historically based events. Amateur circus stars of this town, once known as the "Circus Capital of the World," stage a huge Circus City show complete with parade, carnival attractions, and authentic circus displays.

Situated near the confluence of the Mississinewa and Wabash Rivers, once used by the Miami Indians as highways, Peru's history is replete with Indian lore. The city is the seat of Miami County, named after the Indian tribe which occupied the area before settlement by the white man. Chief Tecumseh in 1812 made his final attempt to organize the Indians of the Middle West into a confederation and to enlist them with the British against the United States during a special council meeting near Peru. Discouragement led him to leave later that year

for Canada to join the British in the War of 1812.

The Cliffs of the Seven Double Pillars, located above a river bend, is the location of the first white man's trading post in Indiana, or so Indian legend goes. Frances Slocum State Forest in Miami County is the site of the grave of Frances Slocum, the Pennsylvania white girl adopted by the Delaware Indians in 1778.

Ben Wallace laid the foundation for Peru's fame as the winter quarters for a majority of the Nation's leading circuses. In 1883, he bought a defunct traveling show which consisted of a band wagon, a one-eyed lion, a camel, two monkeys, a few dogs, a spotted horse, and an elephant named Diamond. With that show stock, Wallace and a partner, James Anderson, started their entertainment adventure. They trained the elephant in a railroad roundhouse. Their first exhibition was staged in Peru, initiating what later became the famed Hagenbeck-Wallace Circus.

In later years the American Circus Corp. provided in Peru winter quarters for some of the foremost circuses in America. Scores of red sheds housed animals and equipment for Ringling Brothers, Barnum & Bailey and others. Land on both sides of the historic Slocum Trail—an old Indian trail—for about half a mile was used by the corporation as a pasture for the circus animals. Zebra, camels, llamas, and elephants grazed near Indiana cornfields and farmhouses.

The Bears Hotel, which has uninterruptedly served as the town's leading hostelry since 1837, is the home of several retired circus performers.

Each year the residents of Peru, Ind., revive memories of circus pageantry to involve an entire community in the commemoration of a bit of fading American history. NBC's hour-long special will this year allow people across the Nation to join in the festival marking that special era.

#### POPULATION ISSUE STUMPS NEW DELHI

#### HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. CARTER, Mr. Speaker, with the passage of the legislation to provide family planning services and population research activities of the Federal Government, the United States made a great step forward toward population control. It is entirely possible that with the passage of this bill population control in the United States will become a reality. However, an article by an erudite editorialist, Marquis Childs, reveals the almost hopeless plight of India.

In some 20 years, unless the population rate is slowed, the population of India will reach 1 billion. Such assistance and education and expertise as we can give the Indian Government in this fight to improve the quality of life should be forthcoming.

I insert in the RECORD the editorial for perusal of the Members:

[FROM THE WASHINGTON POST, FEB. 22, 1971]

POPULATION ISSUE STUMPS NEW DELHI

(By Marquis Childs)

It was said to be the worst natural disaster in this century. The howling winds, the great surge of the tidal wave swept as many as a half-million people to death from their precarious hold on life in the Ganges Delta of East Pakistan. Headlines bloomed for a few days, the United States rushing aid—a teaspoon to bail out the ocean in terms of actual needs, then back to the old preoccupations.

Pakistan today has more people than it had before the disaster. It took only 35 days to make up the loss—so rapid is the population increase in that watery part of the world where the line between life and death, hunger and a few handfuls of rice, is so slight.

The ticking of the population bomb grows louder despite all the cheery talk about the green revolution and the bigger crops of rice and wheat. The Population Reference Bureau, which does such valuable work in marshalling the facts and showing what they mean, has just come up with a startling projection for the Indian subcontinent.

By 1990 or 1995 India will have a population of one billion. That means a density of peoples 14 times greater than that in the United States. It would be like putting all 205 million Americans in the state of Texas.

If the leaders of India were to conclude tomorrow that their country could support a billion people at tolerable levels of health and civility, but not larger population, they would have to find ways to cut the continuing birth rate of 40 to 45 per thousand by more than half in the next decade or so. This reflects the fact that nearly 45 per cent of the public are under 15 years of age with many reproductive years ahead.

As much as any other government in the world, India has pushed population controls in a variety of ways. An official family planning program is 20 years old, but it was not until 1965 that it was given a forceful impetus. Two activist members of the administration in New Delhi got behind a greatly enlarged effort and in that year a variety of outside organizations, including the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID), chipped in with technical help, advice and money for population control. Clinics were opened throughout the country amidst a great stir of hopeful activity.

Yet as John P. Lewis, who was head of AID in India for four years and is now dean of the Woodrow Wilson school at Princeton, says in a special report to the Population Reference Bureau, all international agencies have agreed during the past year that India is not making it on birth control. The present system can cover at best one-third of the 100 million Indian couples of reproductive age by 1973-74, the end of the current five-year plan doubling the money for controls.

The earnest planners are up against what is in peoples' minds—fears, prejudices, hopes out of ancient traditions and beliefs. Whatever has been learned thus far about the motivation of Indian families, Dean Lewis notes, confirms the common impression that the average Indian couple wants at least two surviving sons. Since daughters are approximately as numerous as sons yet far lower in the scale of desirability (Women's Lib, please note), it is obvious that tradition will keep India's birth rate high as long as there is no fundamental change in motivation.

India has a nationwide election in March. Judging from reports out of New Delhi, the campaign sounds like an American political contest. That is to say, candidates are talking about so-called issues, with personal animosities playing a large part, that have little to do with that vast subcontinent and its myriad of peoples and problems. Only the remarkable woman who is prime minister, Indira Gandhi, the daughter of the great hero

of Indian freedom, Jawaharlal Nehru, seems to be taking a stern line on what her country must do to come through.

The facts, as the Population Reference Bureau makes so clear, are inescapable. India's population passed the 555 million mark in 1970. The growth rate is 14 million a year. Ready or not, here they come, and how to change the pictures in peoples' minds stumps the best of planners.

## HUNGER IN AMERICA

### HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is no question that hunger is a very serious problem in America. The Nixon administration recognized the need for immediate action and has taken affirmative steps toward eliminating this problem.

I invite the attention of Senators to an article published in the New York Times of February 5, 1971, which discusses the gains made by the administration in its fight to combat hunger and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### ADMINISTRATION IS FOUND MAKING SIGNIFICANT GAINS IN FIGHT AGAINST HUNGER

(By Jack Rosenthal)

WASHINGTON.—The Nixon Administration's antihunger program has produced significant often dramatic gains, reports on the program from 10 areas around the country, disclosed today. But the job is only half done, many of the poor people and experts interviewed said, and they now fear a leveling off of Federal efforts.

"Half a loaf is better than none," said one expert. "But it's still half a loaf."

On the eve of the second White House conference on nutrition, both critics and beneficiaries cite gains in the number of needy people receiving food stamps, subsidized school lunches and other Federal food assistance.

In New York City, for example, the number of people benefited has jumped four times since the Nixon Administration took office. It has doubled just since September.

But at the same time, large numbers of needy people still are not reached, reports from the 10 areas indicated. The 750,000 people now receiving foodstamps in New York City are estimated to be only 38 per cent of those eligible.

#### DEPRESSED CONDITIONS

In such places as Seattle and Detroit, depressed economic conditions, appear, even in the face of sharply increased Federal food assistance, to have swollen the number of the needy. And, despite Presidential assertion of "an impressive record indeed," a coalition of antihunger groups insisted today that only half the needy children were being fed.

The Administration's budget for antihunger programs, meanwhile, is leveling off, says Robert B. Chaote, a leading Washington authority on hunger. The Administration deserves recognition for what it has done, he said today, "but the new budget figures seem to be more of an epitaph than a progress report."

The new White House conference is a follow-up to the broad, contentious confer-

ence of 3,000 consumers, industry representatives and poor people that was held in Washington for three days in December, 1969.

#### SURVEY CONFIRMS MANY

By contrast, the one-day meeting tomorrow will be limited to about 200 participants, few if any of them poor, and will be held in distant colonial Williamsburg, Va.

The participants, in their evaluation of progress since the 1969 conference, will hear reports of significant gains from Administration spokesmen.

Many of these gains are confirmed strikingly by the New York Times survey, which covered 10 disparate areas from Maine to Arizona.

In every area surveyed, there have been substantial gains in Federal assistance. In Pennsylvania, for example, the number of subsidized lunches has jumped from 25,000 a month in January, 1969, to almost 2.8 million a month.

In South Carolina, the number of recipients of food stamps has gone from 118,000 to almost 270,000 in the same period. In Maine, the number receiving either stamps or surplus food has increased in a year from 68,000 to 91,000.

In a food stamp line in Collier County, Fla., a mother of 10 said recently: "We never had nothing to eat at all, hardly, until we got stamps. We don't have as much as we like, but it's more than we ever had before in our lives."

Nationally, Administration statistics show that the food stamp program has risen from 3.6 million recipients to 9.3 million in the last year. Spending has increased in three years from \$248-million in 1969 to a projected \$2-billion starting next July.

The number of needy children receiving free or subsidized school lunches, the Administration says, has doubled in two years, and such lunches should now be available to all eligible children.

#### SEVERE PROBLEMS REMAIN

Despite such increases, hunger and malnutrition remain severe problems in several of the areas surveyed.

The number of food stamp recipients in West Virginia has increased almost 50 per cent in two years. Yet authorities believe that more than a fifth of the state's families still exist on poor diets.

Margaret Leishman, a nutritionist who works with welfare families in rural Lincoln County, W. Va., says they don't have hunger pangs, but she adds:

"If they didn't have beans, they would die. That's why you see so many fat people among the poor. But it's not healthy fat."

In Arizona, the authorities estimate that only half of the needy schoolchildren are receiving subsidized school lunches. And, as is true with an estimated 18,000 inter-city schools around the country, those schools with the most needy students often cannot participate.

"They lack cafeteria facilities and can't afford to buy them," says Frances Shenberger, the state's school food services director.

In South Carolina "things are improving," says Paul Matthias, director of the State Human Relations Council, "but too slowly." The number of children in the lunch program has jumped 40,000 in two years, to 182,000. But Mr. Matthias estimates that more than 70,000 other needy children are not served.

Reaching the hard-core poor is only part of the problem, the check discloses. In a number of communities there have been rapid increases among the "newly needy."

In Seattle, unemployment has climbed from almost zero to 15 per cent in 30 months, and the unemployed ironically describe themselves as "inflation fighters."



In the same period, says Mayor Wes Uhlman, the number of food stamp recipients has grown from "next to nothing to 80,000."

#### SOME OBSTACLES

In feeding the hard-core needy as opposed to the newly needy, says Robert Hatch, Indiana director of the National Welfare Rights Organization, "we've slipped backwards, but we don't know how much."

The obstacles to broader participation are by no means limited to Federal spending levels. In many areas, particularly where surplus food continues to be used rather than stamps, some people are too proud to participate. Others do not know how to enroll. Still others are deterred by often complex regulations.

"There are times when they just don't have the \$41 needed to purchase the stamps—and two weeks later they will have to come up with another \$41," says Arthur Schiff, director of the food stamp program in New York City. "Six consecutive misses and they are dropped from the program. It takes a long time to apply."

But in several other areas, the administration is credited with heroic triumphs over red tape. A Detroit official says the subsidized lunch program "is the least cumbersome Federal application I've ever worked with." In South Carolina, remote areas will now get food stamps by mail and from mobile offices.

### THE BLACK 12 AND MR. NIXON

#### HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, in a recent article which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Mr. Gene I. Maeroff recounts the efforts of the black Representatives of the House to meet with the President. Mr. Maeroff supports our efforts and notes that we not only represent the blacks in our own districts but also the millions throughout the entire country whose pleas would go unanswered if not for us. One case in point is the fact that young blacks who wish to attend the military academies must rely on the aid of the black Congressmen to be nominated. Those in a State such as Mississippi would not have a fighting chance to be recommended.

I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues this most informative article. Mr. Maeroff's article follows:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Feb. 20, 1971]

#### THE BLACK 12 AND MR. NIXON

(By Gene I. Maeroff)

When the 12 black members of the U.S. House of Representatives boycotted President Nixon's State of the Union message a month ago there was a great cry of outrage and indignation.

"How could they stoop so low as to insult the President of the United States?" critics demanded. "They are abdicating their responsibility to represent their constituents."

Then last week Cleveland's Louis Stokes, one of the members of Congress' Black Caucus, refused a White House invitation to join several congressmen for breakfast with Mr. Nixon.

Now comes word, following these rebuffs that President Nixon is willing to meet with the Black Caucus. This raises the question of whether the 12 congressmen were justified in snubbing the President.

CXVII—231—Part 3

Judge for yourself. Early in 1970 the Black Caucus asked the White House for a private meeting with Mr. Nixon. Two months passed without a response. When the answer came it was not from the President but from one of his staff members.

Mr. Nixon is very busy right now, the black congressmen were told, and wouldn't have time for such a meeting. We will keep your request in mind, the response continued. What it amounted to was: Don't call us; we'll call you.

As an added fillip, there drifted from the White House word that the President prefers to meet with congressmen in their "congressional" capacity, rather than as representatives of a particular ethnic or racial group.

Needless to say, the call from the President never came. Black Caucus members were further incensed when they picked up a rumor that White House aide John D. Erlichman had said that he didn't think the President ought to be meeting with such radicals as the members of the Black Caucus.

And why shouldn't the President confer with the representatives of some 25 million Americans?

The Black Caucus congressmen represent many more people than those who reside in their districts. Who do you think, for instance, represents the black people in Mississippi?

Certainly not Jamie Whitten nor William Colmer nor either of the other two elected white Mississippi congressmen. Charles Evers, the black mayor of Fayette, Miss., said when he was in Cleveland three weeks ago that when his city needs help it is one of the black congressmen from the North, not a white Mississippi congressman, who gives him aid.

No one complains about white congressmen representing the interests of special groups. Blacks, too, should consolidate their strength to wield greater power. That is what politics is all about.

Anyway, the federal government has tacitly recognized that the black congressmen have a national constituency. It has never before been published, but it is a fact that the government asks the black congressmen to appoint to the service academies young blacks whose own Southern congressmen won't appoint them.

Sometimes there is more to a story than meets the eye.

### REVENUE SHARING

#### HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, WLW radio and television, Cincinnati, Ohio, recently broadcast an editorial in support of the President's revenue-sharing program, which I have supported for some time.

Short, and to the point, I believe the editorial will be of interest to all Senators. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### REVENUE SHARING

In President Nixon's State of the Union message, he talked a great deal about revenue sharing . . . transferring both money and decisionmaking responsibility to state and local governments.

We are enthusiastic about the prospect of this important measure of power being returned closer to the people.

It appears to us that a revenue-sharing plan is necessary to put a halt to the creeping "big-brotherism" of the federal government.

It will, of course, give added power to our local officials. Therefore, we must increase our efforts to see that we elect the best people available.

### LUNAR TRIUMPH

#### HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in the New York Times an editorial entitled "Lunar Triumph." I insert these well-stated comments in the RECORD, and commend the reading of this excellent editorial to my colleagues:

#### LUNAR TRIUMPH

Astronauts Shepard and Mitchell have enacted a brilliant chapter in the history of lunar exploration these past two days. They spent more time traveling over the lunar surface and covered a greater area of the moon than men have ever done before. They set up more scientific instruments, they conducted more experiments than any of their predecessors, and in a region of extraordinary geological interest they gathered far more lunar rocks and soil than the astronauts of Apollo 11 and 12 or the unmanned Soviet Luna 16 device. If they return safely to earth with their precious cargo, man's knowledge and understanding of the moon and of the origin of the solar system are likely to reach a peak well above the present level.

The Soviet press has in recent days been seeking to downgrade the Apollo flights and to argue, implicitly and explicitly, that scientific exploration by means of unmanned probes such as those Moscow has sent to the moon and Venus is adequate for man's desired knowledge of the solar system. Yet it must be recognized that it will be decades before instruments can do on the moon or another planet what Shepard and Mitchell did these past 48 hours. The variety of tasks they performed, the speed with which they worked, and the precise detail of the observation they reported back to earth are far beyond anything machines alone are now able to perform. Remote-controlled instruments are still clumsy, slow and limited means of getting information as compared with astronauts who have highly trained and versatile minds and bodies.

The success of Apollo 14, therefore, should go far to put in perspective the relative merits of manned and unmanned space exploration. The achievements of Soviet unmanned rockets in landing instruments on Venus, in returning three ounces of moon dust to earth and in putting Lunokhod into operation on the lunar surface were in every way remarkable. But now the exploits of Shepard and Mitchell have provided vivid evidence of how much more men can do in space than even the most ingenious instruments now available.

From a long-range point of view there is no real conflict between the two types of space exploration. Both are important, useful and, in fact, essential. It is in planetary exploration that instruments now offer the greatest promise, for they can go to Venus, Mars and more distant planets in the period immediately ahead, while it will be decades before men will be able to make those same journeys. But on the moon, as Apollo 14 has shown so irrefutably, manned visits are the most productive means of exploration.

## INITIAL FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING—NEW HAMPSHIRE'S SHARE

## HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's general revenue sharing proposal, which I cosponsored, provides for an initial distribution of \$5 billion of Federal revenue among the various State and local governments. The Department of the Treasury has today released the anticipated first full-year's allocation of funds to States, counties, cities, and towns. As the following table indicates, the enactment of the first general revenue sharing bill will provide New Hampshire with a significant amount of financial assistance.

The figures in the first column are revenue sharing funds a city, county or town would receive in the first 12 months under the plan. The figures in the second column represent revenue raised by the city, town or county, according to its latest available report filed with the Census Bureau. These are 1966-67 figures. I include the tables as follows:

## STATE, NEW HAMPSHIRE

[Total State amount, \$14,957,928; pass-through percentage, 57.35]

	Local share	General revenues
Total to cities.....	\$5,460,747	\$46,556,000
Belknap County: Laconia City.....	384,490	3,278,000
Cheshire County: Keene City.....	202,332	1,725,000
Coos County: Berlin City.....	183,565	1,565,000
Grafton County: Lebanon City.....	90,903	775,000
Hillsborough County:		
Manchester City.....	1,627,222	13,873,000
Nashua City.....	937,415	7,992,000
Merrimack County:		
City of Concord.....	354,111	3,019,000
Franklin City.....	146,500	1,249,000
Rockingham County: Portsmouth City.....	499,439	4,258,000
Strafford County:		
Dover City.....	480,672	4,098,000
Rochester City.....	279,395	2,382,000
Somersworth City.....	146,500	1,249,000
Sullivan County: Claremont City.....	128,203	1,093,000
Total to counties.....	1,050,135	8,953,009
Belknap County.....	103,923	886,000
Carroll County.....	36,396	312,000
Cheshire County.....	58,647	500,000
Coos County.....	73,661	628,000
Grafton County.....	72,106	700,000
Hillsborough County.....	286,315	2,441,000
Merrimack County.....	128,326	1,077,000
Rockingham County.....	140,870	1,201,000
Strafford County.....	73,543	627,000
Sullivan County.....	68,148	581,000
Total to Townships.....	2,067,427	17,626,000
Carroll County:		
Ctr. Conway Town.....	16,890	144,000
Wolfboro Town.....	20,996	179,000
Cheshire County:		
Jaffrey Town.....	20,878	178,000
Swanzey Town.....	12,550	107,000
Walpole Town.....	20,996	179,000
Coos County:		
Gorham Town.....	30,262	258,000
Lancaster Town.....	20,878	178,000
Northumberland Town.....	26,274	224,000
Grafton County:		
Hanover Town.....	44,103	376,000
Haverhill Town.....	10,908	93,000
Littleton Town.....	61,814	527,000
Plymouth Town.....	31,904	272,000
Hillsborough County:		
Bedford Town.....	16,069	137,000
Goffstown Town.....	36,009	307,000
Hudson Town.....	36,009	307,000
Merrimack Town.....	13,372	114,000
Milford Town.....	16,890	144,000
Pelham Town.....	20,996	179,000
Peterborough Town.....	13,372	114,000

	Local share	General revenues
Merrimack County:		
Hooksett Town.....	\$16,890	\$144,000
Pembroke Town.....	12,902	110,000
Rockingham County:		
Derry Town.....	36,009	307,000
Exeter Town.....	36,009	307,000
Hampton Town.....	93,366	796,000
Newmarket Town.....	20,878	178,000
Plaistow Town.....	13,372	114,000
Rye Town.....	26,626	227,000
Salem Town.....	44,103	376,000
Strafford County:		
Durham Town.....	36,009	307,000
Farmington Town.....	12,902	110,000
Sullivan County:		
Charlestown Town.....	12,081	103,000
Newport Town.....	43,751	373,000
All other townships.....	1,191,357	10,157,000

## RELIEF FOR THOSE WITH PARKINSON'S DISEASE

## HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, recently the Wall Street Journal carried an article announcing a cut of 35 percent in the price of the drug L-dopa used for the relief of symptoms of Parkinson disease and manufactured by Hoffman-La Roche Inc. of Nutley, N.J.

From time to time I have been very pleased to note public interest programs initiated by the very progressive leadership of Hoffman-La Roche. I recall their pioneering program to supply free of cost medicines to any indigent patient whose doctor prescribes a Roche produced medication.

The astonishing results reported in cases of Parkinson's disease treated by L-dopa should offer great hope to thousands who are and will become afflicted with this debilitating disease.

The article follows:

## HOFFMAN-LA ROCHE TO CUT L-DOPA PRICE OVER 35 PERCENT NEXT TUESDAY

NUTLEY, N.J.—Hoffman-La Roche Inc. said it will reduce by more than 35% the price of its Laradopa brand of L-dopa, a new drug for the relief of symptoms of Parkinson's disease. The cuts will be effective next Tuesday.

Laradopa is the only American-produced L-dopa licensed by the Food and Drug Administration. The FDA has also licensed Eaton Laboratories, Norwich, N.Y., a division of Morton-Norwich Products Inc., and International Chemical & Nuclear Corp., Pasadena, Calif., to sell L-dopa imported from Japan. International Chemical's L-dopa is marketed domestically by Smith Kline & French Laboratories, Philadelphia.

Hoffman-La Roche, a Swiss concern, also announced it was producing L-dopa "in quantities sufficient to meet the needs of all patients suffering from Parkinson's disease who can benefit from it." The FDA last year licensed L-dopa, despite several side effects, because of promising results in the treatment of Parkinson's disease, which is marked by muscular rigidity, tremor and shuffling gait.

The new prices Hoffman-La Roche will charge to retailers for both tablets and capsules are: 500 mg. \$8 for a bottle of 100 and \$38.75 for a bottle of 500, and in 250 mg. strength, \$4.50 for 100 and \$21.25 for 500.

## PRESS FREEDOM IN A NONWAR

## HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of yet another round of criticism accusing the Nixon administration of endangering the freedom of the press, I would like to call my colleague's attention to a member of the press' personal assessment of the news embargo on the Laotian maneuvers. Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, of the New York Times, points out that instead of restrictions those members of the press covering the Vietnam war have been given unprecedented freedom of movement and information. He also differentiates between censorship to protect the lives of troops participating in an exercise and actual unwarranted suppression of the news. Knowing that all of us are anxious to be advised of all sides of an issue, I ask you to read this support of the Nixon administration news policy, written not by a member of the President's party but by a member of the very profession in which so many have felt duty bound to be critical.

The article follows:

## PRESS FREEDOM IN A NONWAR

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS.—The argument about the news embargo at the start of Laotian operations has become as ridiculous as it is bitter and distorted. What is wholly forgotten is the fact that American and other reporters in Indochina have been permitted to operate with a freedom, not to say abandon, that would have seemed paradisiacal to their older colleagues of World War II.

Successive United States commanders in Southeast Asia got themselves into a tighter and tighter bind by never daring to impose true military censorship on their area for the usual reasons of security and the saving of lives. The explanation for this was obviously that we drifted gradually into the war, never declared formal hostilities, and presumably didn't recognize any individual event, such as the first sizable arrival of American forces, as justifying this customary precaution.

Consequently the effort simultaneously to control and not to control the news media in Indochina has been self-defeating. Correspondents and photographers from papers, agencies and television have wandered all over the place with ingenuity and audacity, gathering information sometimes remarkably exact, sometimes partial and consequently distorted, and sometimes inexpertly deduced from inaccurate rumor.

The press, thank heavens, tends by nature and professional training to be hostile to authority and skeptical of revealed wisdom. It proudly resents any restrictions it fancies may hamper its work. It disbelieves official briefings by authorities who were not themselves witnesses to what they discuss. And it vigorously fights attempts to guide its conclusions or opinions.

All this having been said the business of fighting history's greatest nonwar is grim for everyone concerned and especially for the troops. It was insane of the U.S. military establishment never to have had the courage to establish reasonable, effective military censorship in the theater.

This is especially true when considering that this is the first televised conflict. Undeliberate distortions of an over- or under-focused camera lens can and do have pro-



found political effect—especially when it is only on our side that both TV cameras and receiving sets exist.

Military censorship is a nasty, cumbersome business and political censorship, except for security purposes, is always inexcusable in a democracy. What I mean by political censorship for security purposes is something like withholding information about the site of coming diplomatic conferences in order to protect the participants.

During World War II there were many violations of the system's principle. For example the United States and Britain immorally and needlessly agreed to ban publication of news that Turkey (then a neutral courted by the Allies) had started to persecute Christian and Jewish minorities, a fact the Turkish Government was easily able to censor at home.

But on the whole military censorship worked fairly. General Eisenhower came to trust correspondents so totally that he confided his plans for the Sicily invasion long before it happened.

Reporters soon learned it would be both foolish and unpatriotic to attempt to smuggle out (by code or other means) news that might jeopardize soldiers' lives. And the public uncomplainingly accepted this, remaining so completely democratic despite necessary press limitations that the British, for example, voted the victorious Churchill out of office before the war with Japan ended.

The latest fuss about an information gap in Indochina is essentially unjustified. It would be idiotic to have movements of troops and supplies disclosed in too much detail ahead of time and to have precise intentions pinpointed to an enemy who might otherwise be thrown off balance. It would be immoral to risk American or South Vietnamese lives simply in order to give a play by play description of impending actions.

The issue of press freedom has often been confused in discussions of the Indochina nonwar. Mass media correspondents should indeed be free to report with total freedom what is going on in a critical episode of history and mass media commentators should be free to comment critically.

But temporary restraints must be placed upon observers when premature disclosure of pending events might endanger their success and swell the casualty list. This seems so obvious that it shouldn't require mention but the half-baked protest occasioned by the Laotian curbs—resulting to a large degree from the half-baked information system prevalent in Southeast Asia—makes clarification necessary.

#### CURE FOR CANCER

### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, there is, I am sure, not a single family nor, indeed, a single individual in this Nation today who is not 100 percent behind the administration's determination to find the cause of and the cure for cancer. To every one of us, in some way, cancer is a curse, mightily feared, whether it be in terms of our own well-being, of those whom we hold near and dear, or of the awful burden it places on all society.

Medical science makes tremendous advances each and every year. I cannot conceive, however, of any greater contribution to the health and well-being of people everywhere than ridding the world of this dread disease.

#### LIBERTY—FROM OUR POINT OF VIEW

### HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, for more than 30 years I have flown aircraft over this great land and have been inspired by what I have seen below. Recently I read a series of messages prepared by the Beech Aircraft Corp., which eloquently tell the story of American greatness from the viewpoint of a pilot.

I believe my colleagues will be interested in these timely messages:

#### LIBERTY—FROM OUR POINT OF VIEW

In the field of general aviation, we are luckier than most. Viewing the lady from up here, she looks even more majestic.

When you see her like this, you begin to fervently hope you are not taking her for granted.

This is the only country throughout civilization that has guaranteed absolute freedom to its people for nearly two whole centuries.

To everyone's surprise, it doesn't breed anarchy. It breeds enterprise.

Free enterprise that built giant industries, and more jobs. Enterprise that planted the plains, and felled the timber and mined the ore and plumbd the oil and forged the steel that built an incredible wealth of commerce shared by a benevolent culture . . . a soft-hearted open-handed people.

It's what makes you American.

And it doesn't hurt you to be proud of it. Remember it now when the going is so very tough and liberty is threatened by violent word and appalling deed.

Remember, Americans must have that one more thing other than air, water and food. Americans must have liberty. They love it and will live or die for that one necessity before all the others. No matter what.

Thank God.

#### GOD'S COUNTRY

In the general aviation business, we enjoy a particularly awesome privilege.

Every day, we see America on the grand scale. With shifting perspectives and changing lights, it's quite a spectacle. Never the same twice.

From where we sit, for example, the small individual farms of the Great Plains sweep big and wide in a magnificent kaleidoscope of line and color.

Just beautiful.

It's quiet up here. We can't help seriously contemplating all of this land. Waving with wheat, crammed with corn, thick with orchards and green pastures where livestock roam.

The promised land. It has fed the whole hungry world for a long, long time. Makes you wonder how we do it. How we even managed this thriving, prosperous phenomenon called America.

The answer always comes out Free Enterprise. The individual taking his freedom and building what he wants of and for himself and his family. Sooner or later, everyone in America benefits from that individual effort. Morally and materially.

For 194 years, we have proved that free enterprise is no experiment. It works. Below us, we see the stunning proof—from the giant cities, small towns and back again to our generous ground that gives and gives yet never gives out.

From up here, it is impossible to be numb and indifferent. We see the one thing that remains constant. This land. This republic. This unassailable freedom. This America.

#### GHOST RIDERS

Look below. Scars on the plain. That's a piece of history hard to see unless you're in general aviation.

Those deep ruts are all that remain of wagon trains that snaked across Kansas on the first leg of the Santa Fe Trail.

We fly that trail in a couple of hours. It took the frontier people a couple of seasons. Sometimes a year. Sometimes never. It all depended on the opposition. On what there was to eat. On the wild weather.

Yet their wagons rolled on—over a strange, hostile terrain as foreign to them as the moon is to us.

What a breed they were. Romantic, inventive, adaptive and stubborn. Remembering our pioneers, we hope to meet their mighty tough standards.

They, too, were faced with frightening changes.

They had to help one another to survive. Barriers of reserve fell away. Indifference never blanketed their hearts.

They took each other in. Protected children not their own. Shared scarce food with strangers. Bent their backs to build another man's cabin.

That same free enterprising streak is born in every American. It's a good thing. Because today we're still blazing trails, and the world watches to see how we'll cope.

We will show the grit and ingenuity of our ancestors.

They went thataway. So will we.

#### WHAT IS A GOOD CITIZEN?

### HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening, February 15, I had the privilege of participating in the "Good Citizenship" program at Hodges Manor Elementary School in Portsmouth. The three winners of the essay contest read their papers to the audience, and I was so impressed by the sincerity of these three boys, and their comprehension of what it means to be a good citizen, that I am today inserting in the RECORD the three winning essays.

In a day when patriotism often seems to be on the wane, I found great inspiration in what these boys had to say, and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to share their remarks with other Americans.

The winners were Brad Moore, of grade 4; Butch Keene, of grade 5; and Timmy Oliver, of grade 6. In addition, I would like to commend the three runners-up: Marcia Adams, grade 4; Teresa Jolly, grade 5; and Dudley Anne Shea, grade 6; and the 250 other boys and girls who entered the contest. As long as we have so many fine young people who care about being a good citizen, I believe our Nation will endure.

#### WHAT IS A GOOD CITIZEN?

(By Timmy Oliver)

A citizen of the United States is a person by birth or choice possessing civic rights, privileges, and certain freedoms.

The characteristics of a good citizen are revealed by the interests, responsibility, and loyalty he shows in public matters in the city or country where he lives.

A good citizen should be concerned about the quality of the schools, law enforcement,

and recreation provided by the city or country. He should also be concerned about the welfare of those who are less fortunate than himself and he should insist that all citizens should enjoy the same rights and privileges as provided by law.

As good citizens we should always be willing to carry out the responsibilities that come with the privileges that are given to us by the Constitution.

Many times these responsibilities require us to leave our families and risk our lives in defense of our country.

Very few people in the world enjoy the freedoms that Americans do.

Today our country is fighting in a war with a communist government that does not believe in giving its citizens very much freedom. This government would also take away our freedom if they could.

Today our country is divided by those who support the war in Vietnam and those who don't support it. Many Americans refuse to serve in the Armed Forces. Many are even willing to go to jail rather than go to countries that do not send them back to our country.

In all this we see many examples of poor citizenship. We should always strive to be a good citizen and we should always do the things to make our city, state, and country a better place to live. Then we will be good citizens.

#### WHAT IS A GOOD CITIZEN?

(By Butch Keene)

A good citizen helps people, all people in many different ways. He is always ready and willing to render assistance any time day or night. He is firm with his fellow man yet at the same time listening with a kind and understanding ear to their problems whether they be personal, social or religious. His kindness is felt by the poor and the needy as well as the rich and stately. Always striving to better the community, city, state and country in which he lives. He stays abreast of the times whether they be local, foreign or domestic. His religion is practiced by him and he respects you for yours whatever it may be. He is a firm believer in justice, fair play and fair mindedness. He upholds the law and is a law abiding citizen and he stands behind the law enforcing agencies providing them with both moral and the mutual support at all times. He believes in his country and is ready to defend his country and the flag regardless of the cost. He defends and supports all his superiors—mayor, senator, congressman and president to the utmost of his ability. He is a member of the PTA if he has children going to school, he is a church member and supports it by his tithes, offerings, and personal attendance. He supports all civic activities and aids them to the best of his knowledge and know how. He is always trying to better his community recreational-wise, either backing or actually doing the work for parks, playgrounds, swimming pools and recreation centers for all children of all age groups. He never forgets those persons who are less fortunate than him. He always has a kind word, a generous greeting and a pleasant smile for everyone. He never down grades or low rates his neighbor, friend or fellow man on purpose. He believes if something good can't be said about someone, then don't say anything at all. He is a good neighbor and also a good parent.

#### WHAT IS A GOOD CITIZEN?

By Brad Moore

A citizen is a person who belongs to a nation, state or community. The government protects its citizens and asks certain things in return from the citizens.

The government of the United States offers its citizens the Constitution with the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights protects

the citizens and gives them freedom. In return, a good citizen must give allegiance to his country, he must obey its laws, pay taxes to help run the country, and serve in the armed forces to protect his country. It is a citizen's responsibility to vote for people to run the country. It is the duty of each citizen to keep informed on what is going on in his country.

There are many things a good citizen can do for his own community. He can serve as a member of a jury, or as a member of the school board, be a volunteer worker at the hospital, give time to work to civic clubs and organizations, help collect money for medical drives, and vote for improvements in the community. A good citizen should try to help his community and neighborhood keep clean by picking up trash and not littering. A good citizen respects other people's property.

A boy or girl can be a good citizen in his school by respecting his principal and teachers, obeying school rules, taking care of books, materials and other school property, listening when others are speaking, and by taking part in school activities.

You can be a good citizen in your church by attending church as often as you can, contribute as much money as you can and volunteer to help with church work.

President John F. Kennedy said, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country." This is what a good citizen does.

#### REVENUE-SHARING URBAN AREAS

##### HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a revenue-sharing bill that will make special provisions for the financial needs of Cleveland and other major urban areas.

Our cities can no longer afford the rising costs of essential health, safety, and welfare services when a shrinking tax base causes a steady decline in revenue.

The need for revenue sharing is best illustrated by the taxpayers revolt that led to the double defeat of the Cleveland city income tax increase twice in the last 4 months, the 42,000 complaints about property tax increases, and the wholesale rejection of suburban school and city money issues over the past 4 years. Further tax increases will only add to the hardship of low- and moderate-income families and persons on fixed incomes.

To help the cities survive this financial crisis, I have introduced a revenue-sharing bill that allocates funds based on the amount local governments spend for noneducational purposes. Since large cities must spend more for such essential services as fire and police, they would receive a greater share of Federal funds. This is the allocation formula recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in 1967.

Cleveland, for example, would receive \$13.5 million in fiscal 1972, enough to restore budget cuts made earlier this month due to the defeat of the city income tax increases. The President's revenue sharing bill would give the city \$11.2 million.

The revenue-sharing bills introduced

by the President, and the Honorable Senator HUMPHREY and my colleague from Wisconsin, the Honorable Mr. REUSS, do not allocate a sufficient share of funds to the cities. This is because their formulas for the distribution of funds are determined by the amount of taxes collected by State and local governments. This kind of allocation does not reflect the real money needs of the cities.

For the cities to take full advantage of this new revenue, there must be incentives to reform State and local governments. Without such reform Federal revenue sharing will only postpone a solution to the cities' financial problems.

As an incentive for reform, my bill requires States to enact a master plan for modernization of State and local governments. Such a plan must be approved during the first year of revenue sharing or second-year funds will be cut off.

These improvements can take many forms, such as reducing the number of local governments too small to provide efficient administration, consolidation of some city-county municipal services, or improving tax administration.

As Cleveland city council president for 6 years, I fought for modernization of local government. I believe this is the best solution to the areawide problems of major cities such as Cleveland.

#### UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

##### HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, this week the Congress of the United States observes the 53d anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Ukrainian National Republic.

At a time when frustration and discontent and other evidence of unease are manufacturing themselves in Eastern Europe, it is particularly important to emphasize the absence of self-deliberation for the over 40 million people of the Ukraine.

The denial of self-determination is morally wrong and we have a moral obligation to make the point in this body, regardless of whether or not it is also politically appropriate.

The Ukrainian people have withstood the hundreds of years of domination during both czarist and Communist rule, yet they have retained their nationality, language, and religion, and a considerable sense of nationalism. As long as they maintain this identity the means of ultimate change are not lost. Therefore, while their short-term prospect for change may be poor, the possibility for change remains alive. As I pointed out in my remarks on the 51st anniversary, "Indeed, the very severity of the rule and the differences in language, religion, and manners will tend to perpetuate the feelings of the oppressed people. If they lose all but the sense of oppression, hope will survive."

It is altogether appropriate that this legislative body, which represents one of



the highest forms of self-determination in history, should identify itself with the current of self-determination which exists in the Ukraine and most of the world. History provides examples of change and under extremely adverse circumstances we should not despair.

#### COTTER SUPPORTS ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS BILL

### HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, today I am announcing my support for the accelerated public works bill that will bring relief to those areas that are hardest hit by unemployment.

There are towns in Connecticut that are experiencing over 13 percent unemployment, and there are sections of the First District that match or exceed this depressing figure.

We cannot wait for the "all healing grace" of the Nixon budget, and the democratically controlled Congress is moving on these problems.

It is patently obvious that the Nation's economy is in dire straits. Unemployment continues unabated. For example, in the Hartford area, comprising 27 towns, unemployment increased from 4.4 percent in December to 5.8 percent in January. State unemployment increased by almost 2 percent since December and is now at an incredible 8.4 percent. Towns like Bristol, 19.8 percent; Ansonia, 14.9 percent; and Torrington, 13.3 percent, are experiencing rampant unemployment and I know that sections of my own First District have areas of unemployment that match or exceed this.

The accelerated public works bill I will introduce is but one facet of this Congress' attack on the slumping economy. The chairmen of the Public Works Committees in the House and the Senate are already committed to working for legislation in this area.

As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I will take part in the deliberations on a bill I introduced to extend Presidential authority to set wage-price guidelines and freeze interest and rent increases. I am optimistic that this bill will be enacted quickly.

Also, the House Education and Labor Committee will take up the issue of public service employees including my bill. I am confident that there will be legislation to provide Federal funds for the hiring of public service employees that will help in relieving some burdens on the local taxpayer while increasing service and helping to relieve the unemployment problem gripping the Nation.

The Committee on Science and Astronautics, of which I am a member, will handle the Economic Reconversion Act of 1971. This bill, which I cosponsored, seeks to ease the transition for defense to domestic production. I am hopeful that this bill will be given early consideration.

#### "ARM" MUCH MORE THAN ACRONYM

### HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the Allied Retired Medicals Group of Greater Miami is composed of many dedicated civic minded citizens serving their community selflessly in their retirement years.

Retired medical experts from this distinguished organization, headed by Dr. Reuben Serben, of Miami Beach, have given medical lectures to elementary, high school, and University of Miami students as one of its numerous worthwhile projects.

So that the good work of "ARM" may be circulated through the RECORD in hope that similar groups will form in other parts of the United States, I insert an article that appeared last December in the New York Journal of Dentistry concerning the activities of the Allied Retired Medicals Group of Greater Miami:

#### THE ALLIED RETIRED MEDICALS GROUP OF GREATER MIAMI

(By Reuben Serben, D.D.S.)

EDITOR'S NOTE: It is not generally known that retired professionals in the health-service field have been organized and functioning since 1968 as "The Allied Retired Medicals Group of Greater Miami" under the leadership of Dr. Reuben Serben, a practicing dentist in New York City for 40 years until his retirement in 1965. For purposes of general information, excerpts are published from a special report prepared by Dr. Serben, who hopes that similar groups will be formed in other parts of the United States.

#### HISTORY AND BACKGROUND OF "ARM"

The Allied Retired Medicals Group of Greater Miami is the *First Unique Group* of retired medics of all the allied adjunct professionals in the annals of medical history. We doctors and our respective spouses, who have retired to live in Miami after hectic economic practicing lives, desire to live out our years in a peaceful, restful, respectful and purposeful life in all imaginable dignity.

When we all came to Miami to retire, we found ourselves the *forgotten people* migrating from our rooted practicing cities becoming veritably buried retired professionals in Miami. But by virtue of the organizer and the charter members of "ARM", we have been uprooted from our retired graves.

We are living a life of greater purposefulness by convivial participation in all our social and civic life. We propose to have our future days happier living days amongst and with our PEERS—and the community senior citizens of all Miami residents.

#### AIM AND OBJECTIVES OF "ARM"

We have aims, principles and purposes. We thusly honor and emulate "ARM" and ourselves. We live the theme of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." We add to that the ideas of equality, decency, humaneness and the desire to help all humanity—regardless of race, color, creed or origin. We endeavor to make everybody happy as we make ourselves happy by thickly spreading happiness to all Mankind.

Our group is a modern liberal club, pursuing a non-profit, non-political non-religious power and non-sectarian Society, consisting of retired doctors and all the adjunct allied health professionals, together with their respective spouses and counter-

parts. We are dedicated to fraternal, social, civic, cultural and medical scientific endeavors in our Miami choice site of retirement.

#### EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

Our doctors have given medical lectures to elementary, high school and University of Miami students. Diet clubs and other civic clubs have received newspaper, radio and TV coverage of our functions in Miami. We have also had many prominent practicing doctors from Miami give our unit lectures on genetic medicine and subjects of general interest.

Doctors from our own group have arranged informative seminars, talks, round table discussions and clinical studies on various aspects of health security of interest to our own elders, concerning modern updated concepts. We do not seek *licensure* to practice our individualized profession, but only to render our human services gratis. We have in our midst doctors from almost every state of the union, and many are well-known and prominent in their respective fields.

#### PUBLIC AND OFFICIAL RECOGNITION

We have become and are pronounced the most unique group of medicals in the history of medical fraternalism. We have been honored by the public and political officials of Metro-Dade County of Miami, Florida, including Mayor Stephen Clark of Dade County, Mayor Jay Dermer of Miami Beach, and other Mayors of the various smaller cities of Miami.

We have been honored by numerous banking presidents, the public school system, the PTA's, civic, cultural and community groups. The latest honor was bestowed upon our organizer the two-term president of "ARM" Dr. Reuben Serben—by former Dade County Mayor Chuck Hall with a gift of the "Key to the City of Miami."

In Our October 1970 *Bulletin*, we record our activities and contributions by members, and indicate the essence of our philosophy and aspirations as follows:

"The time of the happy is now. The place to be happy is in 'ARM'. The way to be happy is to make others happy too. It's a privilege to grow old—not many get that privilege. So grow old in happy ways."

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1971

Mr. RHODES, Mr. Speaker, Independence Day in the United States has always been synonymous with public celebration. We are free to enjoy parades, traditional fireworks displays or the simple joy of relaxation guaranteed in our Nation.

Because of this freedom, it is difficult for most of us to understand an Independence Day void of independence. Yet to more than a million Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent this paradox is all too familiar.

Lithuania has lost its independence and survives only as a captive nation within the Soviet colonial empire. After enjoying only a brief independence the Soviets crushed the young nation. The advancements in land reform, education and the total scope of self-government enacted during the Lithuanian independence were destroyed. There was an esti-

mated loss of 45,000 people, plus arrests too numerous to record during the initial period of occupation.

All of this is almost beyond the comprehension of the self-secure American public. Nevertheless, we must not forget the captive people in Soviet Lithuania. The commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day must stand as a symbol to spiritual and ethnic strength. Acknowledging the independence once enjoyed in Lithuania we must condemn the intolerable Soviet oppression now visited upon that country.

Lithuania should be a daily reminder of the Soviet Union's attempt to gain contemporary respectability despite the extermination and annihilation upon which that Communist regime is based.

#### NEWS SUN NAMED ONE OF TOP THREE OHIO WEEKLIES

#### HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the News Sun of Berea, Ohio, which I have the honor to represent, came away crowned with laurels from the Hooper Newspaper Show, held in conjunction with the recent 38th annual Ohio Newspaper Convention in Columbus.

Rated by judges as one of Ohio's top three weekly newspapers, the News Sun was particularly acclaimed for its "fine picture story layouts, excellent features, fine business page and a most comprehensive voter's guide."

I wish to extend my congratulations to the entire staff of the News Sun and most particularly to its outstanding editor and my good friend, Michael F. McNulty. He and his talented, hard-working crew each week produce a newspaper distinguished for its integrity, fine reporting, and originality, and I am delighted that they have achieved such prestigious recognition.

The story follows of how the News Sun swept the board of prizes:

#### NEWS SUN HONORED FOR NEWS COVERAGE: PAPER WINS TOP AWARDS

The News Sun is one of the top three weekly newspapers in the State of Ohio for excellence in news coverage.

The paper was given the third place in the top circulation class during the Hooper Newspaper Show in Columbus Friday. The News Sun also received a second place, two thirds, and an honorable mention, three of which were in open competition with all newspapers regardless of size.

The awards were made during the 38th annual convention of Ohio Newspaper Association's three-day meeting.

Commenting on the news coverage in The News Sun, judges said: "The paper has fine picture story-layouts, excellent features, fine business page, and a most comprehensive voter's guide."

For community service the paper ranked second in open competition, for its support of the vocational education issue in the Southwest area. Judge of the contest was Prof. W. B. Rogers of the school of Journalism, Ohio State University.

Four judges, with George D. Robey, Jr., as chairman noted: "The News Sun took a highly unpopular issue and by way of both news stories and editorials built support and led public opinion closer to favoring the issues of raising funds to build a vocational school.

"Even though the levy did not pass, the margin of defeat was much less than in previous efforts on the ballot. The judges felt the facts for passing the vocational school issue were presented clearly and solutions to possible problems presented in a fair manner." Stories written for a year previous to Aug. 1 were submitted.

Articles written by Michael F. McNulty, Editor of The News Sun, and News Editor Fran Sandrock were commended by judges in making the award.

The News Sun women's section, edited by Muriel Hardy, also rated kudos and a third place in the state, in its class.

The judges commented: "Attractive and substantial layouts, overall excellent coverage throughout the women's pages with a variety of selective subjects."

Art in The News Sun also came in for recognition and a third place award, in open competition.

"This paper impressed with its sharp front page, sports, and society sections. Photos are bright, cropped for maximum effect, and sized to add interest to the news pages throughout," said the judge.

An editorial cartoon by the late Charles Jicha, News Sun art editor, used in conjunction with a safety column by McNulty, came in for special comment.

Receiving an honorable mention was Fran Sandrock for her column, Scratchin' the Surface, and the piece "Kyping on Campus," concerning shoplifting on college campuses.

The column entry won in competition with all newspapers throughout the state, regardless of classification or size.

A mention was also given Mrs. Sandrock's feature story on "The Bean King," a piece about the late Andrew H. Rosbough of Middleburg Heights. It, too, was in open competition.

#### MONTCLAIR HONORS MAYOR MATTHEW CARTER

#### HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to join the community in honoring Mayor Carter at a testimonial dinner. Mayor Carter is a vital force in the community. I am confident that he will continue to be. I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following recent editorial from the Montclair Times:

#### TRIBUTE AND GRATIFICATION

Mayor Matthew G. Carter must have been deeply gratified on the occasion of the testimonial dinner tendered him on Jan. 30.

Admittedly, the Mayor had a few trying moments. Two of the speakers were college classmates of 30 years ago. College classmates are noted for revealing hitherto little-known anecdotes on such occasions. The two in question, Dr. Samuel Proctor, professor of education at Rutgers University, and the Rev. D. C. Rice, pastor emeritus of Union Baptist Church, each with a deliciously adept sense of humor, proved eminently qualified to do just that.

This was as it should be since both indicated their highest esteem for this long-time friend and helped turn the dinner into a

testimonial for Matthew Carter the Man as well as Matthew Carter the Mayor.

Aside from the respect and affection of his friends, the composition of the dinner committee and the audience must be counted as a tremendous source of satisfaction to Mayor Carter, a lifelong advocate of human ecumenism. On the committee and in the audience were representatives of every facet of our community: Protestants, Catholics, Jews, white people, black people, the wealthy and not-so-wealthy, political leaders, business leaders, educators, lawyers, doctors, young and old.

Esteem for the town's first black Mayor answered the plea, in Montclair, expressed by the little girl with a sign during the 1968 Presidential campaign. It brought us together.

#### SPEECH ON "POVERTY AND POWERLESSNESS"

#### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

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

#### RURAL POVERTY AND POWERLESSNESS

Listen to the voices of rural America. "What we have here is a process of degeneration," a farmer told me as he stood at the edge of his cornfield. "The population of this town consists of dropouts and people who can barely struggle their way through high school. Those who go off to college just don't return. I took my own son to college last week. I don't expect him to come back here to live."

Another rural community leader said, "The greatest difficulty in the development of this area is the shortage of leaders. I'm just spread too thin. I can't do it all and still stay in business."

Another one said to me, "Three days after the high school graduation, all of the high school senior class had gone from the county. There is nothing to keep them here."

The sights of rural America can be depressing, too.

Weathered and empty stores, broken windows, collapsed barns, rusted gas pumps, boarded houses, vacant lots littered with trash, closed movie theaters, schools needing paint and repair, unkempt farms, eroded soil. The economic stagnation of rural America is visible:

—in the shabbiness of small towns

—in the demoralization of much of rural leadership

—in the overriding preoccupation with development in every rural community.

Every poll I have taken of the 16 counties in the southeastern part of the state indicates people are intensely preoccupied with jobs, economic opportunity and the revitalization of their communities.

It is no secret that rural America has been declining for many decades. "Rural Poverty and Powerlessness" are facts of our time.

#### RURAL POWERLESSNESS

#### Powerlessness:

Is if you live in rural areas where there is no hospital, and doctors are hard to find

Where young people spend most of their time "just fooling around" and soon leave the community

Where the meat you buy is not carefully inspected

Where the house is a firetrap

Where the schools are old, overcrowded and delapidated



Where the teachers are underpaid and undereducated

Where you can't find a job or where you can but it doesn't pay enough to support you and your family

Where you can buy a car but if something's wrong with it you can't afford a lawyer to sue  
Where a conviction for burglary is impossible to get

It is when you are not organized and don't know how to get organized, and when you have no spokesman for bringing your plight to the attention of the nation.

Powerlessness is when you think your education was not relevant to what you needed to know and when you think your children go to a school that will prepare them for nothing. It is when you think that the police may not protect you, that industry pollutes your air and water, that your last place to fish is becoming fouled.

Powerlessness is when you are told to vote, but you know that it is a very diluted power. You are told to write your Congressman, but you know that a Congressman cannot really serve a half million people. It is when you are told to go to the employment office but you have already waited there for long hours. Or you are told to complain to public officials, but you know they, too, are harassed. They can't even answer their mail and when they answer it, it is usually in platitudes.

#### RURAL POVERTY

Most of us don't realize the poverty of rural America even exists (the people left behind says one government report), but it affects some 14 million Americans. It is widespread, acute, and a national disgrace. It's consequences have swept into our cities, sometimes with violence. There is more poverty in rural America proportionately than in our cities. In the cities:

One person in eight is poor

In the suburbs, one in fifteen

But in rural America one in every four is poor.

Rural poverty transcends races and ethnic groups. It certainly is not limited to the farm. In fact most of the rural poor do not live on farms, but in the open country and in the small towns.

Rural poverty causes us to confront some unpleasant facts:

1. **Hunger:** Many of the rural poor do not get enough food to sustain life or to maintain health.

Listen to the words of the physicians who toured the South:

"We saw children who are hungry and who are sick, children for whom hunger is a daily fact of life and sickness in many forms an inevitability. We do not want to quibble over words but malnutrition is not quite what we found. The boys and girls we saw were hungry, weak, in pain, sick. Their lives are being shortened."

2. **Disease and premature death** are startlingly high among the rural poor. Infant mortality is far higher than among the urban poor, and medical and dental care often conspicuously absent.

3. **Jobs:** The rate of unemployment in rural areas often exceeds by two and three times the rate in urban areas.

The jobs in rural America pay less than in urban areas. There is also far more underemployment in rural America.

#### 4. Education:

Rural education, by and large, just doesn't measure up to urban education. In a very rough measure, rural residents usually have only about 80% of the school attainments of urban residents. If you include the quality of education in terms of the variety of courses offered, the remedial courses, the use of modern educational techniques, this percentage of disadvantage is even more pronounced. Rural schools often lack libraries, laboratories, language facilities. Rural teachers earn less money. The expenditure per child in rural areas tends to be less.

#### 5. Housing:

The rural poor live in atrocious housing. One in every thirteen houses in rural America is officially classified as unfit to live in.

Surveys have repeatedly shown that the major percentage of substandard housing units in America are in rural America.

#### 6. Communities:

The rural poor often live in chronically depressed communities which have ceased to exist as effective institutions. Their tax bases are inadequate and so are their public services.

Lower bank deposits mean less capital. Fewer taxpayers with relatively low incomes mean rural governments simply cannot furnish public facilities and services. Some 30,000 small communities are without water systems, and about an equal number need a sewer system.

#### 7. Space:

And, alas, even space—which is usually considered a blessing in rural America—often becomes a curse. So often the rural poor live in countryside which is a receptacle for trash, garbage, automobile graveyards, roadside litter, rubbish.

#### What must we do?

What then must we do about rural poverty and powerlessness?

The first step is to understand it better.

#### 1. Population Patterns:

The long-range population growth patterns are not conducive to rural development. If present trends continue, most of the 300 million Americans of the year 2000 will be concentrated on a very small proportion of the land area.

The exodus from rural areas is often by young people, who represent the area's best hope and carry with them a considerable investment by the rural area in education and training.

One of the great paradoxes of our time is that as the sprawling metropolitan areas of our Nation struggle with the miseries of overcrowding, the vast areas of rural America grow more desolate.

This week the Census Bureau reports that the proportion of the nation's population still living in rural areas fell to 26% in 1970, down from 30% in 1960. That comes as no surprise to us who are close to rural America. We know that weary farmers, frustrated town dwellers and educated youth have been fleeing the farms and small towns by the thousands.

More efficient farmers have swallowed up their neighbor's land. Small town residents have sought a better life and a better job in the city. The young heed the excitement and the challenge of the cities.

Moreover, the forces which have been working to create the exodus are still working. There are still too many small farms, too many small towns, too many people in rural America who want the amenities of the city.

This exodus from rural America is part of the urban problem.

Although we only have an average of 58 persons per square mile, it ranges from 5,327 persons per square mile in New York City to one person for each two square miles in Alaska.

This massive maldistribution has occurred only in recent years. In 1920 the nation was roughly divided between rural and urban residents, but today, according to that latest census report, there are 150 million residents of urban America and just over 50 million rural residents.

There are many reasons for the exodus and the maldistribution.

The areas that are losing population are primarily agricultural. The farmer is caught in the clutches of a frightful cost-price squeeze. To survive he must grow bigger and make his profit on volume and efficiency.

As he expands, others must leave the farm.

Some find jobs in nearby towns, some do not, and leave the farm to find work.

The small towns of America find it hard to attract industry. They are sparsely populated, have a thin labor force, and are far away from the raw materials and the markets.

The rising education level of the young people has left too many highly trained for the scant opportunities in rural America.

The restlessness and mobility of Americans has continued to the exodus, and so has the climate. Summer heat and long winter sledges have persuaded many to leave for more comfortable surroundings.

#### 2. Dependency Ratio:

We should also understand about the people of rural America, that the dependency ratio is high. They have a higher proportion of people under 18 and over 65. People will be in the urban areas during their productive and taxpaying years. The non-working ratio is often 20% higher for rural counties than for urban counties.

#### 3. Political Power of Rural America is Weakening:

The political punch of rural America is weakening. The era of the farm bloc in the Congress is simply gone—and probably forever. Of the 435 members of the House of Representatives, only 31 have districts in which at least 1/4 of the population is involved directly in farming.

In Indiana, often considered a rural state, not a single congressman represents a district where 1/4 of the constituents are involved directly in farming.

(And bear in mind these figures are based on the 1960 census. They do not reflect the dwindling farm population.)

As the Congress has become increasingly urbanized, Congressmen from rural areas have a difficult time interesting other members of the Congress in rural concerns. We have about 268 subcommittees in the House, and not a single one of them focuses primarily on the problems of rural development.

Any legislative proposal concerned only with rural areas faces difficulties. A more feasible approach is to design the legislation to apply to both rural and urban areas. This, of course, dilutes its impact on rural areas.

4. **Lack of Attention:** We should observe that rural America suffers from lack of attention.

The nation's attention has been riveted on the problems of the cities.

Frequently I'm visited in my office by men representing the Urban Coalition, the Urban Institute, the Urban League. Where is the rural coalition, the rural institute, or the rural league?

Nobody's organized to speak for small town people in this nation's policy-making council. To be sure farm groups exist but their interest is in the economic interest of farmers as producers and most rural Americans are not farmers but small town and small city dwellers and they are not organized at all.

There has really been very little Presidential leadership on the question of rural development. The major Presidential messages, the State of the Union address, the Economic Report, give no attention to it at all. No Presidential message to the Congress has mentioned it.

Over the last decade I can only name one leading public figure who has made it his mission to sound the alarm on the question of rural development. That was Orville Freeman, the Secretary of Agriculture under President Johnson. He led a personal and lonely crusade for what he called rural-urban balance.

President Johnson gave him moral support and made a speech or two on rural development and sent some minor messages to the Congress, but the subject remained low on his priority list.

We in the Congress haven't done any better.

The nation's academic and intellectual communities have treated rural development with disdain if not hostility.

Even the rural people themselves have not seen fit to become well organized and they have very few spokesmen to bring the nation's attention to their problems.

We have concentrated on farm production—with amazing success, but we have neglected non-farm, rural America.

#### 5. The Urgency:

We must also understand the urgency for action in rural America.

Simple justice demands that we get moving.

The rural poor have suffered enough. They do not understand why they have not shared in the benefits of economic growth.

They do not understand always that their communities, schools, churches, governments have been unable to prepare them to participate in the modern world.

Unorganized and inarticulate, they have been shortchanged in transportation, housing, education, health services, area development, and income maintenance.

They see no real hope of improving their situation, and very few of them feel that Washington or the rest of the nation are interested in their plight.

If we do not act, the rural poor will continue to flood the central cities of America, coming without training, without skill, without housing, but wanting employment. The end will be frustration, despondence, and despair.

#### 6. The complexity:

We should understand that the complexity of the problems of rural poverty preclude the success of a single program or approach.

Some argue for the growth center believing that by concentrating investment growth will occur and spread. Others do not believe concentration of resources is necessary. They say a single plant in a single town may be the most productive way.

Still others contend that many communities must recognize that they cannot expect to grow and to attract industry. The best solution is to improve the communities' services, especially education and training, and give the people the skills they need to migrate out successfully.

These approaches simply illustrate the complexity of even the theory of rural development, let alone the practice.

Along with the complexity of development, we should also observe the competition for development. Every community wants new industry and new jobs. There are only a few hundred new plants built each year, and there are about 14,000 groups seeking to induce them to locate in their area.

The cost to society for dealing with these complex problems will be high. But the cost of not dealing with them will be immeasurably higher.

Our present programs have failed to deal effectively with these problems. For too long we have confused the problems of commercial agriculture with the problems of rural America. Though related the two are not the same.

Just wanting change in rural America will not be enough. The development problems are too tough for that. It will take time, talent, and treasure to get the job done.

#### ENCOURAGING SIGNS

I don't think any man can be truly optimistic about the chances for success. But there are some encouraging signs.

More people are seeing more clearly that the problems of the cities and the problems of rural America are not two problems but one.

That we simply cannot put 70 and 80 percent of our people on 2 or 3 percent of the land space and live comfortably.

That the cities have problems because of the migration from rural areas.

That the solution of urban problems requires the acceleration of rural development.

That it is not in the best interest of the nation to continue indefinitely the depopulation of rural and small town America and the building of ever-bigger metropolitan complexes.

Hopefully, rural and urban interests are converging into an effective coalition, politically and otherwise.

If we approach rural development as a conflict between rural and urban interests then the odds against us are overwhelming.

It is just possible that rural development leadership will come, not only from rural America but also from the cities. As this convergence of interest is increasingly recognized.

There is hope in the findings of recent polls which show that as America urbanizes, the longing for rural life gets stronger. More than half the nation would now rather live in the country. A nation longing for rural life will not let it deteriorate.

There is hope also in the rising tide of concern over man's headlong destruction and fouling of his environment. If people do not generally recognize the interrelationship between rural and urban America with most problems, surely they will see it in the environmental crisis. Rivers don't begin or end at the city limits and air blows willy nilly over the city and the countryside.

Rural America is no "Johnny come lately" to the cause of environment. My observation is that they have been sounding the alarm for years for clean air, clear water, and good stewardship of the soil.

As the nation becomes increasingly concerned with its environment, it will recognize the leadership of rural America in this area and that will be beneficial.

There is hope in the expanding development of new roads, better communication, new water systems, large reservoirs, and the spirit and vitality of some communities.

There is hope for rural development because the problems of the cities are so great that rural areas look good by comparison. Increased costs in the city have made rural areas more attractive for some industries—e.g. textiles and furniture.

There is hope in the progress that has been made. We are concentrating today on the problems, but we should pause long enough to see the prosperous farmers, progressive communities; the growing rural centers and sections in the nation.

The wholesome aspects of rural living are becoming increasingly recognized.

The climate then for rural development has some favorable winds and we must assure that they blow gently and steadily and ever more forceably.

#### LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK

We can do so by working for a proper legislative framework to encourage and accelerate the rate of growth in rural America. Our present programs must be greatly improved in their potency.

#### JOBS

We must find better job opportunities for rural Americans.

The task is formidable, but it is the indispensable element to development.

Thirty percent fewer man hours of work in agriculture will be needed in 1980. This means that 40 percent of the people now working on farms should move elsewhere.

To create full employment in rural America several things must be considered:

Unemployment and underemployment must be reported systematically. Accurate employment information can often guide people to jobs, for example by advising them where to move for their economic benefit.

Training and manpower programs must be enlarged with emphasis on such fields as conservation, recreation, health and edu-

cation. We have had some success here with Operation Mainstream and Green Thumb—these programs have pointed up the need and effectiveness of manpower programs.

Temporary federal payments for rural families to cover the costs of relocation and to provide adequate training to help them make the transition from farm to city.

Equal protection for rural workers in workmen's and unemployment compensation, social security, collective bargaining, and minimum wages.

And in those cases where it is not possible for persons to find useful and productive roles, the federal government might serve as the residual employer.

#### Education

We must improve educational opportunities in rural America.

It is in the national interest to improve the educational opportunities of low income rural areas. Since there is little likelihood rural areas will be able to finance significantly better education, increased federal and state assistance will be necessary. This assistance should not be given to schools too small to provide high quality education at a reasonable cost per pupil.

Special emphasis must be given to vocational training centers designed especially for the school dropout and the adult.

#### Communities

Rural communities present special problems. We are really confronted with the necessity of reorganization and reorientation of a rural community, and that does not come about easily. Even with the best of success, progress will be slow.

Public investment is needed in roads, hospitals, health care, vocational training, water lines and sewer systems, family planning, education, and all the infrastructure necessary to strengthen communities.

Every device must be used to encourage private investment: tax incentives, grants, loans, guarantees, subsidies, and industrial parks.

A Rural Development Credit Bank should be considered to provide capital for rural housing, water systems and other projects. It would attract funds from outside rural areas, and might spark economic growth.

These communities need the active concern of churches, service clubs, foundations, and individuals, working at countless tasks and projects.

#### Organization

If rural development is to succeed we must bring greater sanity to its organizational structure.

The organizational problems of rural development have been a lack of coordination, too much duplication, lack of professional staff, and local leadership spread too thin.

We need multi-county and multi-community organizational groupings. Tiny jurisdictions lack expertise and professional skills. They are deficient in their capacity to conceive, plan, design and expedite.

Only a larger grouping can marshal the resources and the professional skills needed.

Single multi-county agencies should be responsible for planning, promotion, and implementation of development.

#### CONCLUSION

Let me conclude simply by observing that there are many obstacles along the path of rural poverty and powerlessness to rural development.

Behind is a decade or two of experimentation. I hope we have learned from it, and that we will get on with the job of seeing that rural America develops its natural environment, harvests its fertile fields, makes its economy vital and vibrant, and gives each of its citizens an opportunity to become the best that's in them.



DEMOCRACY: CASUALTY OF WAR  
AND OH—WHAT A LOVELY WAR

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, many have commented upon the Nation's reaction to the invasion of Laos. Apathy, unconcern, tolerance of the status quo, and other moods have been ascribed to the country.

Two of the most perceptive statements describing what the war is doing, has done, and may do to the country were recently printed on the editorial pages of the New York Times. Friday, February 19 a letter from Richard W. Lyman, newly chosen president, Stanford University, made the point that:

It is no cause for surprise that eight years of war abroad have produced a marked deterioration in the political life of our own country. This deterioration is nowhere more marked than on the leading campuses, where the argument that only force counts is heard from young people whose cynicism in this regard is a deadly threat to the future of a democratic polity.

A week earlier, on Friday, February 12, from London, Anthony Lewis, wrote:

The relative silence that has greeted this latest non-expansion of the war is not a silence of approval. It is the silence of despair, if one does not believe in revolution, when peaceful assembly and the democratic process and protest and polls showing an overwhelming public desire to get out of Indochina unconditionally produce no political result?

These two distinguished observers of American society, one the president of one of our most distinguished universities and a respected historian of modern British history, the other a journalist and noted commentator on our Supreme Court, have described a principal danger of continuing our involvement in the war in Southeast Asia: the ineradicable wounds to our own society.

I include the articles as follows:

DEMOCRACY: CASUALTY OF WAR

To the Editor:

If the war in Southeast Asia could be ended by the anguished cries of university presidents it would no doubt have been over long ago.

Most of us are neither Southeast Asia experts nor skilled global strategists nor (whatever might be wished of us by many of our students and faculty) full-time members of the movement. But we do know something, by hard experience, of what this faraway conflict is costing in terms of democratic values and the capacity for rational discourse on the campuses of this country.

In any war, a democratic polity incurs certain inescapable damage. War by its nature requires secrecy; democracy thrives on full disclosure. War causes people in authority not only to withhold the truth upon occasion; it tempts them to twist and distort it.

Democracy requires that disagreements be thrashed out in argument and resolved by voting. War requires that disagreements be minimized or obscured in the face of the enemy at the gates (no matter how far away those gates may be) and encourages appeals to emotion and to brute force.

It is therefore no cause for surprise that

eight years of war abroad have produced a marked deterioration in the political life of our own country. This deterioration is nowhere more marked than on the leading campuses, where the argument that only force counts is heard from young people whose cynicism in this regard is a deadly threat to the future of a democratic polity.

In particular, students today are either disgusted by or themselves infected with the disease of prevarication and contempt for honest dealings. Ever since they became old enough for political consciousness, they have experienced an unending spate of misinformation and false prophecy with regard to Vietnam. The tortured elaborations of Pentagonese have brought palpably closer the notorious era of doublethink foreseen by George Orwell in "1984."

This comes about, not because of a unique villainy on the part of the protagonists in this particular war, but because war itself is antithetical to democratic values.

We have survived previous wars with democracy largely intact. But major involvement in war has often been followed by a political aftermath of reaction and repressiveness, from the Alien and Sedition Acts of the 1790's through the Mitchell Palmer raids following World War I, to the era of Joe McCarthy after World War II.

The Vietnam war has doubtless been a limited one, for Americans if not for Vietnamese. But its duration now threatens us in deadly fashion.

If the growth of cynicism and doubt continues through another period of years, we will suffer further subtle but ineradicable wounds here at home that will make American democracy in the twentieth century as much a casualty of prolonged warfare as was Athenian democracy in the fifth century B.C.

That is part of the reason why slogans like "Vietnamization" mean so little on the campus today, and why hope is so rare a commodity there.

RICHARD W. LYMAN,  
President, Stanford University.

OH—WHAT A LOVELY WAR

(By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON, Feb. 12.—Stuart Hampshire, the English philosopher, wrote recently of the impact of Freud's demonstration that human behavior is governed less by conscious than by unconscious thoughts and feelings. It was a Copernican revelation for men who understood, he said; it destroyed the "comfortable feeling that we are easily in control of our own thoughts and purposes."

The significance of that understanding is of course not only for neurotics; the most normal man is moved by forces of which he may be unaware. And that, Hampshire seemed to say, has necessary implications for our whole effort to govern society by rational means. He wrote: "The species is more likely to be destroyed by the agency of men who know that they are normal, and who misunderstand their own minds, than by the mentally disturbed."

We must rely on some such view of man to help explain war. In any high school history course, students perceive that wars are fought for territory or ideas bearing no rational connection with the cost in blood. Yet still men fight.

It is always easier to see these things historically. Thus World War I is now a subject for fantasy treatment. We can no longer bear to take seriously the rationalizations of those who directed that carnage. Yet at the time, most people believed them. Only a poet here or there pointed out what was really happening.

At Ypres and the Somme and other battlefields, hundreds of thousands of men died to move the Allied lines forward 1,000 yards. But men like Haig and Kitchener—unbelievable figures in history—could only think to

ask for more. And young men continued to volunteer for useless death, destroying the best part of a generation on a baseless faith in their leaders.

No one laughed when Lord Carson said: "The necessary supply of heroes must be maintained at all costs."

Some day men will read about the Indochina war with the same disbelief that we feel about World War I. The Haigs and the Kitcheners will all be there, the pointless savagery, the jingo commentators glorying in other people's bloodshed, the self-deception.

"This limited operation is not an enlargement of the war," the State Department's spokesman said as the South Vietnamese-American ground and air assault into Laos began. Oh never: more or less.

The American invasion of Cambodia last spring was a "limited operation," too. Now Vietnamese of both persuasions are fighting all over the poor country. The Communists, abandoning their established border sanctuaries, have set up bases in the heart of Cambodia. American bombing and American military aid are accelerating. The Cambodians are being offered the same visions of "victory" that have laid Vietnam waste and that sent innocents charging out of their trenches at Ypres.

No wonder that most careful and professional of British journals, The Financial Times, greeted the Laos invasion with the comment that the professed limits on the operation were "liable to arouse skepticism." It is only a few days later, and already we have South Vietnamese leaders talking about making the invasion an annual affair. Naturally, this will require American air support, if not covert ground participation. All in the name of peace and withdrawal.

The great difference between now and 1914-18, so far as the illusions of war are concerned, is that so many fewer people believe them now. Certainly the American soldiers in Indochina do not, nor the draft-age men waiting the call to replace them. Nor do most ordinary Americans believe, any more, that any stated political purpose justifies our staying in Indochina and continuing the destruction.

The relative silence that has greeted this latest non-expansion of the war is not a silence of approval. It is the silence of despair. What else is there to do but despair, if one does not believe in revolution, when peaceful assembly and the democratic process and protest and polls showing an overwhelming public desire to get out of Indochina unconditionally produce no political result?

Creatures from another world, learning the history of the Indochinese war, would conclude that our leaders were mad. But the truth is worse: they are what passes, on earth, for sane.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—  
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

## NIXON SHOWS COURAGE IN LAOTIAN OPERATION

### HON. JOHN Y. McCOLLISTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. McCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, political courage is a characteristic we all hope will be attributed to us at one time or another. I think it is an appropriate term with which to describe the President's Laotian operation. As evidence of support I attach a column by Roscoe Drummond. Mr. Drummond has gone to the core of the Laotian maneuvers, analyzing the risk—military and political—and his article discusses what is really at issue in Indochina—how to most effectively end American participation. He has cut away the rhetoric, and what is left is logic and fact. I recommend it to my colleagues.

The item follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Feb. 17, 1971]

#### NIXON SHOWS COURAGE IN LAOTIAN OPERATION (By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON. — The South Vietnamese ground and U.S. air thrust into Laos proves that President Nixon is not playing politics with the Vietnamese war.

He is ignoring domestic political considerations in order to continue a policy which he believes will enable him to wind down the war in a way which will leave South Vietnam strong enough to survive.

He is doing this at great political risk to himself because he believes this course will serve the United States far better than a quick withdrawal, that it will enhance the prospects of peace throughout Indochina and that it will prove that America is a reliable ally.

There are at least a dozen powerful reasons which caused Mr. Nixon to approve the operation against the North Vietnamese sanctuaries inside Laos and only one powerful reason which might have caused him to set back.

The one argument against it was that it would be bad politics, that the Fulbrights, the McGoverns, the Hatfields and the other extreme Senate Doves would jump all over him and accuse him of widening the war and of deserting his commitment to withdrawal. And he could reasonably expect new outbreaks of public protest as after Cambodia.

Mr. Nixon could be an instant political hero by choosing the politically easy course but he is convinced it is better to take the time and the domestic political risks to leave South Vietnam gradually rather than the alternative his critics urge.

Undoubtedly many believe that it is the President who is mistaken. Be that as it may, he is spurning political timidity. He is knowingly imperiling his reelection to do what he believes is right and necessary. This is something which takes courage and class.

This is what a President of the United States is elected to do. The Constitution—assigning to him and to him alone the duty of Commander in Chief—requires him to do what he thinks best for the nation.

He is doing it for the same reason he approved the intervention into Cambodia nine months ago. This operation radically cut the flow of Communist troops and supplies to where they could be brought to bear against South Vietnam. It set back enemy offensive from that direction many months.

The present move to cut the Ho Chi Minh Trail is doubly profitable because it is the

only important remaining route which Hanoi can use. If this operation is as successful as the Cambodia operation, it could well be nearly a year before the Communists could mount a major offensive.

The extreme Senate Doves see this all as a great mistake. They suggest that Nixon is trying to seize victory from the jaws of withdrawal.

No. He is seeking to leave a secure South Vietnam through the process of withdrawal. The evidence that he will be able to do so is increasingly promising.

President Nixon is convinced that he is ending the American role in Vietnam in the right way at the right time at the right pace. I believe the verdict of most Americans in the end will be "well done."

## THE STATE OF THE MEXICAN ECONOMY

### HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, our good friend and neighbor to the south—Mexico—is presently confronted with a number of varied and challenging economic problems. As U.S. investments presently stand at approximately \$2 billion, we have a very real interest in these factors and the efforts being made by Mexico to resolve them.

The recently inaugurated President of this growing and progressive nation has undertaken some innovative and, hopefully successful, steps to remedy the current plight of the Mexican economy. The alternatives available to President Echeverria are limited but he is taking bold measures to maintain the integrity of the peso, to resolve his nation's inflation problem and to continue industrial growth and economic development.

The New York Times of last Sunday carried a perceptive and timely article which is of particular interest and importance to us because of the comparisons made with our standard of living and the challenges Mexico feels it presents. I commend this article to our colleagues' attention and insert it herewith for inclusion in the RECORD.

#### MEXICO: FIGHTING A GIANT

STANDARD OF LIVING IN U.S. A CHALLENGE

(By H. J. Maldenberg)

MEXICO CITY—"So far from God and so close to the United States" has long been the lament of Mexican officials striving to cope with the social and economic shadows cast by the "giant of the North" upon their country.

For President Luis Echeverria Alvarez, who began his six-year term last Dec. 1, the biggest shadows are inflation and the gap between the standard of living here and that in the United States.

To cope with these potentially dangerous conditions, the 49-year-old President has ordered two measures that are radically contrary to remedies being used elsewhere in Latin America. He wants to slow the economic growth rate and to shift development emphasis from urban industrialization to agriculture and related industry.

According to Government economists interviewed here recently, both steps are expected to cause problems for domestic industry as well as the estimated \$2-billion of direct United States investment in Mexico.

Basically, the new plans are aimed at the following goals this year:

The slowing of Mexico's economic growth rate, the fastest in Latin America during the last decade, from about 7.5 percent to 6 percent, to reduce imports.

Raising taxes, reducing subsidies and restoring balance-of-payments equilibrium to afford the Government the means to improve life in rural areas.

Foreign investors will be encouraged to concentrate on goods for export and to locate new plants near ports and provincial centers, rather than in major cities.

Because wages and prices in Mexico have long been either controlled or heavily influenced by the Government, the President's policies carry unusual weight here.

Thus far the Government has increased taxes on what are considered luxury items by at least 10 percent to raise state investment capital. Price ceilings are being maintained on basic items and luxury goods to reduce inflation.

Foreign borrowings are being curbed despite softening interest rates abroad because the Government economists believe that much of these funds were not entering basic development sectors.

Moreover, Mexico's foreign debt stands at \$3.5-billion, compared with the Federal budget of \$6.4-billion this year. To service this debt will require a quarter of Mexico's foreign exchange earnings this year.

To slow consumer consumption of all but essential items, central bank reserve requirements are being raised from about 35 to 50 percent at a time when interest rates paid by financing groups are falling under pressure by the Government as well as by international market conditions.

#### MEXICO: COPING WITH A GIANT NEIGHBOR

The economists concede that Mexico's inflation rate—officially put at 6 per cent last year, a figure widely questioned by the public—would have led to a grave monetary problem had the inflation rate in the United States not been a point or so higher.

As it is, some foreign lenders have begun questioning the value of the peso, which is 12.5 to the dollar, because of the trade deficit of nearly \$900-million last year. This trade deficit, together with smaller but equally serious internal budgetary deficits and inflation, could lower the peso in the eyes of international lenders, private bankers also have warned.

But President Echeverria has repeatedly promised to maintain the peso parity to the dollar. He has also rejected any rumor of foreign exchange controls as being not only "out of the question" but also unfeasible technically because of Mexico's closeness to the United States.

In past years, Mexico's trade imbalances, considered normal for a developing country, were covered by receipts from tourism and from foreign investment.

Today the expanding middle and upper classes among the population of 50 million are traveling in ever increasing numbers and reducing the gains from foreign tourism, which is growing at a slower rate because of the reduced fares from the United States to Europe.

The recession in the United States has also reduced investments here. Furthermore, the Mexican Government's price controls have inhibited some foreign investors.

Attempts to hold the cost of living from rising further contributed to the closing of some 40 textile plants last year and placed the automobile industry in financial trouble for the first time last year.

As far as foreign investments are concerned, President Echeverria's economic advisers want more to go into manufactures for export and not for local consumption.

Some 15 years ago, they note, there was about \$650-million of direct United States investment in Mexico. Today, United States



direct investments stands at nearly \$2-billion. Unless these investments produce more foreign exchange, the profits and other remittances will keep rising and adding to the burden on Mexico's treasury, the economists fear.

One reason for this fear is that the 20-year-old policy of "import substitution" is considered about over. This policy created tens of thousands of new jobs, new skills and domestic production of a wide range of goods that were formerly imported.

However, the lament today is that the tariff barriers erected by the Government to protect these fledgling industries have led to shoddy goods and unusually high prices. The Government is presently studying ways to lower these barriers and spur competition to reduce prices and improve quality.

Moreover, many of these goods produced here still contain imported parts or raw material, particularly from the United States, where prices are rising each year.

The energetic new President and his team of young economic advisers, meantime, must also face the problem of the exploding cities and their attendant troubles.

To make life on the farm attractive, President Echeverría's hopes to finance the consolidation of uneconomic plots and provide basic services such as irrigation, technical education and machinery.

But to prevent those leaving the farm from coming to the swollen cities, he hopes to create rural industries such as food processing and tourism. Exports also have a high priority on the President's economic list.

Thus far, spending on urban projects, such as Mexico City's new and expensive subway has been ruled out for the future. After putting some \$360-million into sugar subsidies in recent years to keep costs down, the President has recently agreed to a 48 per cent rise in sugar prices, rather than continued underwriting that industry's losses.

However, the President, a father of eight, has rejected any plans for curbing the birth rate here. At present birth rates, Mexico is expected to have 100 million people in about 19 years.

"Basically," one prominent businessman said here the other day, "a country like ours, situated near a rich one like yours, has three major options. One is to ignore the problem. The second is to print money and the third is to tax sufficiently to eliminate the extremes of wealth and poverty.

"To choose the first is to invite revolution. Printing money would only fool the people a little before they realize that they are being cheated. So would devaluation be a temporary palliative. So we are going to go the taxation way, and we hope we have the time to put the money raised by taxes to good use."

#### SATCHEL PAIGE ENTERS THE HALL OF FAME

### HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by virtue of a very wise decision on behalf of the powers that be, the venerable Satchel Paige is going to be enshrined in baseball's Hall of Fame.

This is an honor and recognition that is deserved by Paige as much as any man, perhaps, who has been voted into the ranks of the game's immortals.

But for the fact that Satchel Paige was born many years before the eradication of the "color line," he might well have etched his name across many, many pages in the game's book of records for he was, by his own admission and by testimony of those major leaguers who did face him through the years, "quite a pitcher."

No one knows just how many games Satchel Paige won or how many phenomenal games he hurled. But he estimates he won some 500 to 600 games, perhaps 30 of them no-hitters, over a career that spanned 30, or was it 40, perhaps 50 years; Paige is never quite certain just how long it was.

His major league record was a deceptive 28 won and 31 lost. But even this less than .500 average is somewhat astonishing when one stops to consider that it was compiled by a man who was over 40 years of age. Paige admits to being at least 65 and his major league career began in 1948. Thus by his own admission he was at least 42 when his major league career commenced. Many observers believe he was actually older.

Regardless of age, a much deserved honor has finally been bestowed on Leroy Satchel Paige. And baseball, for its part, is a greater game for taking this step which will lead to due recognition of other Negro ballplayers who never made the majors because of the color line.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC GOALS

### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, traditionally, Presidents have been understandably reluctant to make exact predictions on the economy. But in his economic report to the Congress, President Nixon has set specific goals and outlines in detail his plan for reaching those goals, which are an unemployment rate in the 4½-percent zone and an inflation rate in the 3-percent range.

This is a helpful policy, not only for economists but also for the public. The American citizen and taxpayer ought to be told just what the administration intends to achieve and how it intends to achieve it.

In addition to high marks for credibility, the President's economic report is notable for its realistic assessment of our economic problems and the path the administration has chosen to correct these problems.

The President said:

The key to economic policy in 1971 is orderly expansion. While continuing to reduce the rate of inflation, total spending and total output should rise as rapidly as possible to lift the economy to full employment and full production.

This expansionary policy is an effective blueprint for action. With the full cooperation of business and labor, the Nation stands an excellent chance of reaching or exceeding the specific economic goals the President has set.

#### CONGRESSMAN DELLUMS CALLS FOR END TO DRAFT, WHILE CONGRESSMAN MITCHELL HITS "NOBLESSE OBLIGE" OF THOSE WHO OPPOSE VOLUNTEER FORCE

### HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee, along with Congressmen RONALD V. DELLUMS and PARRENS J. MITCHELL on the subject of the All Volunteer Armed Force. My colleagues provided a wealth of data which conclusively demonstrated that an end to the draft will not lead to an army of the poor and the black, as the skeptics have charged.

The critics should take note of Mr. MITCHELL's remarks that he believes it to be significant that:

The great majority of Black leaders have spoken out in support of the Volunteer Army. It is personally irritating to me that there are those who would oppose this Volunteer Army on the basis of what it does to Black people without consulting the very people about whom they are speaking. We are past the stage of noblesse oblige.

Mr. DELLUMS argued that:

If the draft is repealed taxpayers will pay the costs of military defense rather than the young and poor draftees who earn less than the Federal minimum wage. Those who enlist in the military should receive a fair income. Opposition to pay increases on the grounds of inflation or increased government spending merely continues the exploitation of first-term servicemen by the taxpayers.

I commend the full testimony of my colleagues to your attention.

I include the material as follows:

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE PARREN J. MITCHELL (D-7TH DISTRICT, BALTIMORE, MD.) BEFORE THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you for the chance to testify this afternoon. It is my understanding that you conducted additional hearings so that everyone who desired to speak would have the opportunity to do so. Certainly, our military conscription system merits this sort of free and public scrutiny, and I commend you for bringing this about.

In the interest of brevity, I will not rehash once again the arguments for a volunteer Army. I am sure that you are as familiar, if not more so, with these arguments as I am. The Gates Commission presents its case quite persuasively, and I, for one, am convinced. Forceable military conscription is antithetical to the rights of citizens as guaranteed in the Constitution. The concept of the free society does not permit a slave soldier. For this is what the draftee is, comprising unwillingly, the lowest echelon of the American military structure. He is the unwilling lubricant upon which the military machine grinds. He, unwillingly, is the classic expendable. He makes more than ¾ of our rifemen in Indo-China, and, unwillingly, has comprised more than half our deaths and casualties.

The Gates Commission destroyed the economic shibboleths thrown up to protect the draft. The implementation of a Volunteer Army would necessitate only a minimal increase in costs. The Commission even went

so far as to suggest that a Volunteer Army might actually be cheaper in real costs. (1) by reducing the costs of personnel turnover (in terms of reduced needs for training programs, and the discharge bureaucracy), (2) by reducing the human costs of those whose lives are arbitrarily interrupted, (3) by eliminating the necessity of the government involving itself in such socially controversial and disruptive issues as Conscientious Objection and Selective Conscientious Objection.

The arguments against the present military conscription system are substantive and varied. The Gates Commission dealt with them in full and made responsible recommendations for improvement. Most of us here in this room agree that some changes must occur. The Gates Commission states clearly that the transition to a Volunteer Army could begin tomorrow, even given the unfavorable situation in Indo-China. And yet there is hesitation.

I would easily dismiss these doubts if they did not arise from some of the most progressive voices in the nation, men who are comfortable with change if it means improvement. Nevertheless, the charges that are made against a Volunteer Army appear to me to be without substance.

First, let us consider the argument that a Volunteer Army will somehow increase the militarism in our Armed Forces. It is difficult to understand how ending conscription would lead to this outcome. After all, our military is overwhelmingly professional already. Ending the draft will bring about no changes in our officer class, composed almost entirely of true volunteers (i.e. that is those who are not in the service because they fear the draft). Draftees only appear in significant numbers in the most dangerous areas of the war zones. Obviously, the draftee is not in a policy making position in today's military. Moreover, the Volunteer Army has often been a part of American History. And on no occasion were the fears being voiced in opposition to the Volunteer Army realized. In fact, the lesson of history is just the opposite. It is on the backs of conscripted armies that the great militarists of history have built their successes.

The problem of maintaining the accountability of a Volunteer Army to civilian authority is simply the problem of maintaining a responsible officer corps. Certainly, the problem cannot be dealt with by injecting cannon fodder into the military structure.

Only through constant cooperation and interaction with civilian authority can the problem of an isolated military be solved. In dealing with the draftee, this is a red herring argument indeed.

But there is another argument thrown up against the adoption of a Volunteer Army that particularly troubles me. This is the contention that a Volunteer Army will become an Army of the poor and the Black. This argument makes me a little angry. David Clarke, Acting Director, Washington Bureau, SCLC said in his testimony before you on Feb. 10th, and I quote, "Such condescending *noblesse oblige* is not only unappreciated, it is downright repugnant from the point of view of the Black soldier who is ordered to die to preserve a "freedom" that he has never known."

According to the Gates Commission, Blacks now compose 9.5% of total American military forces. Of that part of the Army which is volunteer, Blacks represent just about 13% of the total. As the Indo-China conflict grew into War, one of the statistics that received a great deal of publicity was the re-enlistment figure for Black soldiers. And yet from 1965 to 1969, that figure dropped by almost half. In 1965, 22.3% of the men re-enlisting in the Army were Black. By 1969, the figure had declined to 11.4%. Within the last decade, there has been a change in the attitude of Blacks and Black soldiers in

this nation. We have come to view the military not as a haven from racism of the total society, but rather as an extension of that society. We have achieved an outlook which declared that the War in Vietnam cannot be relevant to Black people until there is gained additional meaningful change at home.

But assuming that the proposed pay raise for first-term soldiers is approved by Congress it is argued that an all Volunteer Army will have greater attraction to Black Youth. This specious argument claims that only the Black and the poor would be attracted by the increased wage scales of the military. Fortunately, this argument falls at several points.

The increased pay scale of the military would only appeal to those Blacks who are precisely the ones unable to qualify for the service. Certainly, the pay scale of the military is above the earning of the poor Black today. Nor are his prospects for earning a living in the general society very good. Nevertheless, there is no great rush to enter the military. And of those who do attempt to do so, current military standards, reject the great majority. Certainly, enough has been written about the rejection rate of the poor and the Black by the military. It should be emphasized that this is a result of poverty, of under-education, of poor health services, and the pattern of neglect that affects our nations ghettos. Nevertheless, it is a fact that these youths will not qualify for military service.

If a pay raise should be appropriated, its appeal would be rather to the middle income youth. The youngster who is dissuaded from joining the military because he can earn more as a civilian would be motivated to reconsider his decision. Given a complete turnabout on the falling rate of Black re-enlistment, given the adoption of a pay raise, even given an increase in the acceptance rate of the poor and the Black by the military, the Gates Commission estimates that Blacks would only comprise 15% of the Armed Services by 1980.

I believe it to be significant that the great majority of Black leaders have spoken out in support of the Volunteer Army. It is personally irritating to me that there are those who would oppose this Volunteer Army on the basis of what it does to Black people without consulting the very people about whom they are speaking. We are past the stage of *noblesse oblige*.

I wish to state as strongly as possible my support for an end to conscription and the adoption of a Volunteer Army. Gentlemen, we stand at a crossroads, and immediate positive actions must be taken. It is for this reason that I will introduce in the House tomorrow a bill to end the Selective Service System on December 31, 1971.

Gentlemen, I thank you for your time.

STATEMENT OF REP. RONALD V. DELUMS TO SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

One hundred and six years ago the 13th Amendment to the Constitution ended tyranny of the plantation system, abolishing slavery and involuntary servitude except as punishment for crime. Today, young men are subject to a new tyranny, that of the war machine, and they are forced to serve involuntarily in an illegal, immoral, insane war thousands of miles from home. The time has come to end this 20th Century involuntary servitude by refusing to give the President authority to induct any more young men after June 30, 1971. Indeed, the time has come to repeal the entire Selective Service Act under which conscription is authorized.

We have had some experience in recognizing discriminatory institutions. Yet, the draft discriminates at every level. It discriminates against young men who haven't the information or money to seek counselling or hire a lawyer. It discriminates against those who haven't the education or opportunity to

obtain a college or occupational deferment. It discriminates against those who haven't had adequate advice from sympathetic personal physicians about possible physical disqualifications. It discriminates through draft boards on which minority groups are not fairly represented. It discriminates by putting minority group soldiers in an army under a predominantly white officer corps.

Some here may argue that the draft should be thoroughly reformed. I disagree. Gen. Hershey once said, "You can't make the draft fair." And where there is an inherently inequitable system, a minority man in America is likely to find himself on the bottom, no matter how hard men of goodwill attempt to write in procedural safeguards.

If the draft is repealed, taxpayers will pay costs of military defense rather than young and poor draftees who earn less than the Federal minimum wage. Those who enlist in the military should receive a fair income. Opposition to pay increases on the grounds of inflation or increased government spending merely continues the exploitation of first-term servicemen by the taxpayers.

If the draft is repealed, the armed forces will be required to make sure their policies and opportunities are equitable in order to encourage enlistment by minority group members. Our national goal should be to abolish poverty, discrimination and exploitation within the military and in society as a whole so that there is no necessity to try to find sanctuary in certain institutions.

I appreciate the concern of those who worry that a volunteer army would be predominantly black. But I believe this fear to be groundless. Pay is only one of many factors determining enlistments. Reenlistments of blacks in the Army nosedived from 22.3% in 1965 to 11.8% in 1969, though pay increased substantially. Blacks now account for 9.5% of all servicemen, though blacks are 12.5% of total population.

Critics of a volunteer army rely heavily upon an argument that such an army will be a threat to freedom and liberty, that it might rise up and take control "if certain things continue". I strongly disagree. The issue of control over the military—whether it be a volunteer or a conscription army—is separate from the issue of the composition of the military. Events of the past few years are overly convincing that control over the military rests in the confines of a small group of professional soldiers and their friends in government, business, labor and the educational infrastructures. Congress must exert its constitutional powers over the military at any rate, but the issue of such control must not be confused with the question of a draft versus volunteer army.

I find it unthinkable that the Congress should make a four year appropriation of funds to the Pentagon. Yet, for 20 years, Congress has been making regular four-year unlimited appropriations of manpower funds to the Defense Department. This blank check enabled the Johnson Administration to put more than a half million men in Vietnam without a declaration of war or reactivation of the draft. In days when declarations of war have gone out of style—though war itself is as much in vogue as ever—Congressional control over military manpower is imperative. The draft should be ended now so that any President is required to return to Congress for authority to reinstitute it.

I understand the argument that the existence of the draft creates an awareness of the horrors of our adventurism in Southeast Asia among draftees and their families. It is sometimes said that the draft thus provides some measure of civilian control. But it is obvious we became involved in Vietnam under conscription—not a volunteer army. And it should be apparent that any system which hopes to control the military from the bottom up or to prevent further adventurism by fomenting opposition two years or more after the adventure begins, is doomed to fail.



Responsibility for civilian control of the military must rest with the Congress and the President. We cannot rely on draftees for this task. And the first action we in Congress must take is to end the draft in 1971 and require the President to come back to Congress for authority to reactivate it.

#### COMPARES REVENUE SHARING WITH CATEGORICAL AID PROGRAMS

### HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, while the Nixon administration concentrates on selling solutions, the problems remain unsolved. The Nixon solutions seem more oriented toward public interest, than directed toward solving the problems.

Such is the story of Mr. Nixon's super-salesmanship project—Federal revenue sharing.

Douglass Cater, who was President Johnson's Special Assistant dealing with aid to education, eloquently and convincingly argues in favor of taking a closer look at just what Mr. Nixon's proposal for revenue sharing really means. Writing in the February 7, 1971, edition of the Washington Post, Mr. Cater compares revenue sharing with categorical aid programs in terms of education.

Mr. Cater rationally questions how the diverse needs of 50 States and literally thousands of independent school systems are to be accommodated under revenue sharing when the problems even cut across the traditional Federal departments, hence Mr. Nixon's efforts at reorganization.

I believe the article is of vital interest to all and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

#### A KIND WORD FOR CATEGORICAL AID PROGRAMS (By Douglass Cater)

During the struggle to pass the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, one close friend of mine, a member of the Cleveland, Ohio, School Board, visited me in the White House to voice grave reservations. He was fearful that Title I of that Act, earmarking federal funds for disadvantaged children, would make the job of hard pressed school officials more difficult. A year or so later, he reported that he had reversed his position. Title I funds, he said, had made it possible to tackle critical and expensive needs which could not be justified if paid from locally raised revenues.

Recently, he enumerated for me two political facts of life. The first: local governments tend to deal well with needs that are general in the community; they tend to deal less well with needs which are special, or which serve interests going beyond the community. A second political fact of life: the lion's share of any general aid for education will be claimed for higher salaries in a community where there is strong teacher organization. At best, only a small fraction can be preserved for innovative programs.

Both these facts of life need to be kept in mind as we consider President Nixon's proposal for revenue sharing. It is tempting to succumb to the cry of "more power to the people" uttered by the apostles of the New Revolution. Why not join Joe Alsop in beating the federal bureaucracy for the red

tapery of categorical aid programs? Why not join Vice President Agnew in making a whipping boy of Wilbur Mills for demanding federal responsibility for federal spending? (At last Mr. Agnew has found himself a nattering nabob of nepotism!)

But a little perspective is in order: categorical aid programs did not emerge out of fiendish mistrust of the people by their elected leaders in Washington. On the contrary, those programs have been adopted by Congress in order to serve public needs not being met by state and local government. They have represented national priorities to be paid for by tax revenues raised by the federal government.

Admittedly, some of these priorities are markedly different from those of state and local governments. For example, Congress passed, on President Eisenhower's urging, an act to create a national highway system. Local officials might have preferred to spend the money on more farm-to-market roads.

Similarly, with President Johnson's urging, Congress established a wide range of categorical programs to meet desperate needs of the disadvantaged. Congress set new priorities for the nation.

No impartial observer could claim that these priorities have been met. Most of the categorical programs have been funded at only a fraction of their authorizations. Lacking adequate dollars to make a measurable impact, they have spawned too much bureaucratic foot shuffling at federal, state and local levels. It is easy to curse the bureaucrats for the shortfall of great expectations.

But the more relevant task is to decide where we go from here. I am persuaded that it will be a cop out for the federal government to remove itself from the business of setting national priorities. And it will be a grand illusion to believe that those priorities can be attained by passing out funds with no strings attached. Given their present strained financial situation, even the best intentioned governors and mayors will be forced to bail out their most pressing debts and their most persistent creditors. New and hard won social programs, lacking a powerful constituency, will be the first to suffer.

It is a beguiling notion that the people share great intimacy with their state and local governments. We no longer live in a nation of New England town meetings. Most people learn about government from their press and they influence government through their organizations. I wonder how many believe that state capitol or city hall is better reported than the U.S. Congress? Or that Washington is less responsive to public interest lobbies?

Our problems today—health, education, environment, urban crisis—cut across the traditional boundaries of state and municipal government. They even cut across the traditional federal departments, hence Mr. Nixon's efforts at reorganization. We will not meet our problems by pouring new funds into old containers. Probably the most difficult challenge we face is to create new institutions adequate to cope with our problems.

This does not mean blind commitment to the categorical programs launched in the past decade. There must be continual efforts at consolidation, especially of the programs which are too small to justify separate existence. Congress needs to study the proper balance between "earmarked" funds and "general support" funds. The matching fund formula has provided a highly effective device for asserting a federal priority while allowing discretion to state and local government.

But it will be bad policy and bad politics for Congress to cast aside the experience of the past decade in a rush to espouse the creed of revenue sharing. The slogan "more power to the people" could lead to abdicating the vital role which the people elected Congress to serve.

#### SACAJAWEA'S PAPOOSE

### HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, any history of the American West would be incomplete without considerable reference to the 1804-06 Pacific Northwest expedition of Capt. Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, and their famed Shoshone Indian guide, Sacajawea. Few are familiar, however, with the youngest member of that trip. Jean Baptiste Charbonneau was born during the expedition's 1805 winter camp to Toussaint Charbonneau, a French-Canadian Indian interpreter, and his wife, Sacajawea. Carried on his mother's back and, sometimes, in Clark's canoe, the infant completed the 20-month adventure of nearly 5,000 miles.

The odyssey of Jean Baptiste Charbonneau and his oftentimes diverse adult life is the subject of a recent article in the Bureau of Land Management's quarterly, *Our Public Lands*. In it, Irving W. Anderson tells the remarkable story of Charbonneau, ranging from his early formal education and frontier existence, to his tragic death in the high desert of southeastern Oregon. I recommend the article as a fascinating saga of the exploration and settlement of the American West.

I include the article as follows:

#### SACAJAWEA'S PAPOOSE

American history's youngest explorer, a member of the most famous expedition in the annals of the West, incredibly has remained a mystery man for 165 years. He was Jean Baptiste Charbonneau, son of Toussaint Charbonneau, interpreter, and his Shoshone Indian wife, Sacajawea, unofficial guide for the Lewis and Clark expedition of 1804-06.

Baptiste was born on February 11, 1805, when his mother was about 17 years old. His birthplace was at the Fort Mandan site near the confluence of the Knife and Missouri Rivers, about 50 miles upstream from the present city of Bismarck, N. Dak.

Sacajawea had been kidnapped by the Minnataree tribe about 1800 when only 12 years old. She was taken by her captors from the mountain homeland of her own Shoshone tribe in the Snake River country to the plains country of the Missouri. There she was sold as a slave to Toussaint Charbonneau, a French-Canadian Indian.

The Lewis and Clark "Corps of Discovery" arrived at the Mandan site on October 26, 1804, where they established Fort Mandan as their winter headquarters. During the course of the winter, the expedition leaders contracted with Toussaint to serve as an interpreter for the duration of the trek. They must also have reasoned that Sacajawea's Shoshone nationality would be a helpful advantage in dealing with Indians they would encounter to the west, especially in obtaining horses for transporting the expedition over the mountains. Accordingly, it was agreed that Sacajawea and her infant son would accompany the westward-bound explorers. Ultimately this proved to be a master-stroke of diplomacy. Scores of potentially hostile Indian groups encountered throughout the journey befriended the strange assembly of explorers upon sighting the engaging Sacajawea and her papoose. To the Indians, their presence meant this

was no traveling war party. In addition, Sacajawea's knowledge of her homeland contributed important guiding service to the expedition.

#### INFANT EXPLORER

Baptiste was only 55 days old when the expedition broke winter camp and headed for the Pacific. Carried mostly on the back of his mother, but also in Clark's canoe, the infant made the 20-month round trip of nearly 5,000 miles with only one major illness. As reported by both Clark and Lewis in separate journal entries, Baptiste suffered a very serious infection of the jaw and throat during the return trip east. Responding favorably to the remarkable medical talents of the expedition leaders, especially their unusual pharmaceutical preparations, he recovered within 2½ weeks. Among the treatments, given him were polices of wild onion, and a " \* \* \* plaster of sarve (salve) made of the rozen (resin) of the long leaf pine, Beaswax and Bears oil mixed \* \* \*" (Journal entry of June 5, 1806. Thwait's edition.)

Knicknamed "Pomp," a Shoshone term which describes the first born male child, the happy alert youngster became the favorite of Captain William Clark. "Pompey's Pillar," a historic landmark 28 miles east of Billings, Mont., was named for Baptiste by Clark when he carved his (Clark's) name in the rock of the pillar during the return trip in 1806. When Fort Mandan was reached by the returning party on August 15, Toussaint Charbonneau was paid "500\$ 33½ cents" for his services (Sacajawea received no monetary payment) and the Charbonneau family re-entered the routine of frontier life.

Enroute to St. Louis shortly after departing Fort Mandan, Clark's fondness for his "little dancing boy" compelled him to write to Toussaint, suggesting that the Charbonneau family come to St. Louis where Clark would see to Baptiste's education. This they eventually did, and according to fragmentary records of the period, Baptiste was educated in both protestant and Catholic parochial schools in St. Louis.

#### TRAVELS ABROAD

When he was 18 years old, Baptiste's unusual combination of cultural attainment and frontiersman skills interested Prince Paul Wilhelm of Wurtenburg, Germany, who was on a scientific mission to America. In 1823, Baptiste accompanied the Prince to Germany where the youngster was exposed to the sophisticated, aristocratic environment of the court. This sharpened and polished his social graces. Baptiste and Paul were inseparable companions for a period of 6 years, during which the two traveled extensively in Europe and even to Africa. It was in this important period of his life that Baptiste, now fluent in four languages, received a background that in later years would mark him as a cultural anomaly on the American frontier.

Baptiste returned to his homeland from Europe in 1829. By this time the Louisiana Purchase Territory was entering the transition between the fur trade and agricultural settlement. Vigorous exploration of the far West was in progress. The call of the western wilds was irresistible, and Baptiste set aside his classical life style and fell into the rough and tumble existence of the mountain man. He ranged the length and breadth of the American West—hunting, trapping, guiding, exploring. The journals of many important personalities involved in the exploration and settlement of the West record this remarkable man, and consistently testify to his "urbane, graceful, fluent" manner. Famous frontier figures with whom he shared associations included Joe Meek, Jim Bridget, Capt. Nathaniel J. Wyeth, T. J. Farnum, Lieut. John C. Fremont, William Clark Kennerly (nephew of Capt. William Clark), Col. Phillip St. George Cooke, Jim Beckwourth, Kit Carson, and many others.

The last important guiding service performed by Baptiste was that of scouting the route West for the march of the Mormon Battalion from New Mexico to California in 1846-1847. Under the command of Col. Phillip St. George Cooke, this expedition was significant not only for putting down the Mexican uprisings but also because, for the first time, wheeled vehicles traversed the Southwest desert. Baptiste's role in the success of this mission was vital, as the route through had to be thoroughly scouted in advance for food and water for the large party of men and animals. In addition, he had to be sure that the rugged country could be negotiated by the vehicles.

#### APPOINTED ALCALDE

Mustered out of the Mormon Battalion at San Diego in 1847, Baptiste was appointed Alcalde of San Luis Rey Mission, Calif., an office comparable to that of magistrate. Because of his concern, however, for human dignity in the treatment of certain Indians as virtual slaves, he resigned his official duties. Historians, in previously reporting this incident, interpreted the cause of Baptiste's resignation as "white dissatisfaction over his policy of treating Indians too kindly." In researching Baptiste's activities as Alcalde, however, it was found that a deeper reason must have motivated Baptiste to resign.

Father Zephyrin Engelhardt, in his Missions and Missionaries series in 1921, published an order written by Baptiste as Alcalde which reveals the cause of his moral concern for Indians. The order provided for: (1) " \* \* \* a fair settlement \* \* \*" of an account owed by an Indian to a proprietor of a general store and dram shop at the Mission; and (2) the sentencing of the Indian into the service of the proprietor until the debt of \$61 and 37½ cents had been worked off at the rate of 12½ cents per day.

As interpreted by Father Engelhardt: " \* \* \* We can now very well understand why Charbonneau wanted to resign the office of the Justice of Peace. It was distasteful for a decent man to sentence helpless Indians to slavery in order that they might pay for the liquor received in excess of the 12½ cents, their day's wages for labor. If the Indian had a family, what of the wife and children? \* \* \* The poor Indian is held in slavery until he pays the balance, \$51.37½, by laboring at one real or 12½ cents per day! Meanwhile, he will want other goods from the store of Pico and so he will never emerge from debt and from slavery \* \* \*"

Ironically, Father Engelhardt apparently did not know the background of this remarkable man Charbonneau about whom he wrote, as this is the only reference to Baptiste cited in his Missions and Missionaries series.

Upon leaving San Luis Rey Mission, historical coincidences of time and events placed Baptiste in center stage of the California gold rush. John Marshall discovered gold at Sutter's Mill on January 19, 1848, and Baptiste was upon the scene in the earliest days of the frantic gold-fever stampede. Although it is recorded that Baptiste shared mining associations with old cronies Jim Beckwourth and Tom Buckner during the late 40's and early 50's, he evidently did not strike it rich. At least it is assumed that he made no important find, as he was listed as a clerk in the Orleans Hotel, Auburn, Calif., in 1861.

#### SEARCH FOR GOLD

Even at age 61, the compelling lure of the wilderness pulled strongly within him. Yielding to this urge, Baptiste, in the spring of 1866, joined a party heading for a new gold field in Montana. Traveling northeasterly from California their party reached the Owyhee River in Oregon the second week of May 1866. Spring is a transitional season in the Oregon desert, with alternating periods of precipitation, freezing, thawing, and clear-

ing, accompanied by blustery wind conditions. Also at this time of year, the Owyhee runs a heavy volume of snow melt, with consequent frigid temperatures.

Baptiste crossed the river at a ford immediately below where Jordan Creek empties into the Owyhee. Reconstructing the scene, Baptiste swam his horse across the swollen river, and then had difficulty in drying his clothing and gear due to cool spring weather. At his advanced age of 61 years, his system apparently could not combat the excess strains. He contracted pneumonia, was helped by his two partners to the nearest shelter, Inskip's Station, 25 miles northeast of the Owyhee River. He failed to rally and died a short time later. Obituaries of the period place his date of death as May 16, 1866. He was buried a few hundred feet north of the station in what later became a burial plot containing Baptiste, two soldiers, and two children.

The burial site at Inskip Station is near the confluence of Jordan and Cow Creeks, presently identified as Danner, Ore. Located on private land within BLM's 4.6 million-acre Vale District, this tiny rural settlement still holds remains of the stagecoach era. It is situated 3 miles north of U.S. Highway 95, and approximately 15 miles west of the community of Jordan Valley, Malheur County, Ore. Presently standing structures in the community which were in use at the time of Baptiste's death include substantial in-place ruins of the Inskip Station fortification, stagecoach stables, rock corrals, a rock-cased well, and other relics of that frontier era which possess important historical values.

Residents in the area, Oregon State and Malheur County officials, the Oregon Historical Society, BLM, and other interested organizations and persons are cooperating in giving an appropriate identity to the site. As a beginning, the Oregon State Highway Commission will erect in 1971 a rustic, historic sign to mark and interpret the gravesite of the man who, as an infant, traveled the American wilderness with Lewis and Clark.

#### COMMEMORATION OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

#### HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1971

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, last week marked the 53d anniversary of the establishment of Lithuania's Independence Day. But this day is not a day of joy for this captive nation, and I would like to express my continuing concern for these people who are being denied the freedom to exist as an independent nation. Recent attempts to escape that Communist tyranny by men like Simas Kudirka who was involved in the Coast Guard tragedy and the men who failed in their attempt to hijack a Russian jetliner give us some idea of the desperate plight of the lives of these people.

In northeast Europe in the Baltics, some 3 million Lithuanians live in an area a little larger than 20,000 square miles. There, through most of the middle ages and part of modern times, they have been the upholders and defenders of western Christian civilization against pressure from Asia. Scholars consider Lithuanian to be the most beautiful, as



well as one of the oldest, languages in the world, being related to ancient Sanskrit. In the course of their turbulent history, they have managed to hold their own and safeguard their freedom, even in the face of some formidable foes. By the end of the 18th century, however, the powerful Russian advance overwhelmed them. Their country was then overrun and incorporated into the Russian empire. In 1918 when the czarist regime collapsed in Russia, the Lithuanians took advantage of the resulting situation and proclaimed their national independence on February 16 of that year. Unfortunately, the independence thus gained was taken away from them in 1940 when the Soviets invaded and occupied Lithuania.

I join in commemorating the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania, and urge the implementation of legislation to bring the question of the liberation of the Baltic States before the United Nations. I ardently hope that these deserving people will soon regain their freedom and be able to live in peace in their beloved homeland.

#### ON LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, the 53d anniversary of the independence of modern-day Lithuania which we observed on February 16 is a significant occasion not only to the people of Lithuania and those of Lithuanian ancestry who live in the United States, but also to all people who value freedom and independence.

Lithuania established its national identity in the year 1215, and although during much of its history it has been dominated by the large and powerful nations which are its near neighbors, its people have maintained their language, their culture, and their desire for independence.

Lithuania enjoyed 21 years as an independent state following the proclamation of its independence after the First World War. It is one of the great tragedies of history that the nations which were able to restore freedom and independence to a number of nations after World War I did not succeed in developing a structure or in maintaining the power to defend the freedom of these peoples.

The experience of Lithuania is a lesson to us all. The stronger nations that enjoy the privilege of democracy have an obligation to the weaker nations that also have a desire and a right to freedom.

Until a way has been found to establish and maintain the freedom of such nations, the world cannot enjoy a real peace, and the United States, together with other democracies, is confronted with a problem that urgently demands a solution.

#### REVENUE SHARING

### HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion about the President's proposal for revenue sharing and even more written comment. Among the latter is a column published in the AFL-CIO News which has recently been called to my attention written by John P. Roche.

He offers some thoughts that certainly should be germane to the issue and should be studied by all of us and I include them in the RECORD at this point:

#### REVENUE-SEEKING STATES SHOULD PUT OWN HOUSE IN ORDER FIRST

(By John P. Roche)

Pres. Nixon is pushing hard for a program of revenue sharing, going "far beyond anything we have suggested to date." The key aspect of his policy is that "no strings" would be attached; that is, the states could use the money as they see fit.

Already about \$25 billion in federal aid is going to state and local governments, but the states complain that these funds are earmarked for specific programs, that their operation is enmeshed in red tape, that they are characterized by remote control rather than by that sense of intimacy that exists between the citizen and his state government.

There are a number of problems with the Nixon program, but first of all let us try to sort out the various arguments that are mixed together in the pot. Admittedly, state and local governments are having financial troubles—there is an employment freeze in Boston, except for police, Philadelphia is letting employes go, and, of course, New York's Mayor John Lindsay virtually has threatened to take the city formally into bankruptcy. State governments are having similar problems.

But there is a difference between the travail of the mayors and that of the governors. Every time the tax rate in Boston, New York, or Philadelphia goes up, a new wave of refugees to the suburbs is created. The cities are trapped in a downward cycle, services decline, and there exists a real possibility that in 25 years metropolitan areas will be enclaves of the poor—black and white. On my home in Weston, Mass., for example, I pay about \$2,000-a-year property tax, have first-rate services and excellent public schools. An acquaintance who just moved here from New York was paying almost \$5,000 a year there for private schools. His kids will now go to public schools, and I predict, in a couple of years he will be complaining about the local property tax!

In short, the cities are helpless, but what about the states? State behavior, by and large, has been utterly irresponsible and before we rush to fill a governor's pocket with federal coin it might be pointed out that nine states have no income tax at all, four more have a very narrow base, and five apply what is, in effect, an excise on income, a flat tax applied to all hands (4 percent in Massachusetts). And we are not talking about rural states; in the three categories above are included the states of Pennsylvania, Texas, Ohio, New Jersey, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Massachusetts.

The first rule of equity is that one must come into court with clean hands. In this spirit, it seems clear that a significant number of states simply do not have the right to

complain. They have failed miserably to put their own financial houses in order. The governors can often reply that they have tried, but the sovereign electorate has rejected their proposals (a number of Democratic gubernatorial victories last November were reactions to the efforts of Republican governors to up taxes). We liberals have been trying for years to get a progressive income tax in Massachusetts, with some progress: we lost 8-1 in 1962; the last time it was on the ballot, we got about 1 vote in 3.

But doesn't this, in turn, tell us something? The last time revenue sharing was front and center, I pointed out that the average citizen "relates" (as they say) to the national government and to his local government, city, county, town or village. State governments are a vestigial remnant of pre-Civil War federalism—who knows what goes on at the state house? The notion of handling \$400 million in unearmarked federal money to the average state legislature is enough to terrify the most idealistic states-rights advocate.

Whatever merits it may have in Indochina, the "Vietnamization" of American public finances is an appalling scheme. What we really need are higher, more progressive taxes and direct, functional cooperation between the federal government and local agencies. The states should be retired to the Smithsonian Institution.

#### LAKE COUNTY, IND., LITHUANIAN FREEDOM RESOLUTION

### HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday afternoon, February 21, the Lithuanian Americans of Lake County, Ind., at a banquet given by the American Lithuanian Council, unanimously adopted the following resolution pertaining to the restoration of independence for the 700-year-old nation of Lithuania:

#### RESOLUTION

We, the Lithuanian-Americans of Lake County, assembled this 21 day of February, 1971, at St. Casimir Hall, Gary, Indiana to commemorate the restoration of Lithuania's independence, do hereby state as follows:

Whereas, the 16th of February, 1971, marks the 53rd Anniversary of the restoration of independence to the more than 700 year old Lithuanian State, and

Whereas, on June 15, 1940, the Soviet Union forcibly occupied and illegally annexed the independent Republic of Lithuania, which fact had been officially confirmed by the findings of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives, 83rd Congress of the United States, and

Whereas, the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation, and

Whereas, the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continue in its efforts to change the ethnic character of the population of Lithuania and the other Baltic States, thereby committing the offense of genocide, and

Whereas, the Soviet invaders are unable to suppress the aspirations of the Lithuanian

people for freedom and the exercise of their human rights, as most recently demonstrated by the dramatic hijacking of a Soviet aircraft to Turkey by Pranas and Algirdas Brazinskas, the heroic attempt of defection by Simas Kudirka and the unsuccessful attempt of escape to Sweden by Vytautas Simokaitis and his wife.

Now; therefore be it resolved  
That we again demand that the Soviet Union shall withdraw its armed forces, administrative apparatus, and the imported Russian colonists from Lithuania, thus permitting the Lithuanian people to freely exercise their sovereign rights.

That we again express our gratitude to the United States Government for the firm and unwavering position of non-recognition of the Soviet occupation and annexation of Lithuania.

That we respectfully request President Nixon to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums on behalf of the restoration of sovereign rights to the Baltic peoples, which policy was recommended to the President of the United States by the House Concurrent Resolution 416 of the 89th Congress.

That we urgently request our Government to make all possible efforts to have Simas Kudirka returned to this country with his family, if he is still alive, and that the death penalty imposed upon Vytautas Simokaitis by a Soviet tribunal shall be commuted, and

That the copies of this Resolution be mailed to President Richard M. Nixon, Secretary of State William P. Rogers, to both Senators and all the Members of Congress from our State, and to the Press.

## MAJOR PUBLIC WORKS MEASURE INTRODUCED TODAY

### HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I announced the introduction of a major new bill, H.R. 4810, to help meet our Nation's increasingly serious unemployment crisis.

H.R. 4810 is described briefly in a press release issued today, which lists the names of its present sponsors. The text of the release is provided here for the information of the Members, along with the text of the bill:

#### JOINT PRESS RELEASE

Twelve Democratic members of the House of Representatives today introduced a bill to extend for two years the Economic Development Administration, the Appalachian and other regional development programs, and to renew the Accelerated Public Works program with an authorization of \$1,850,000,000 over the next two fiscal years.

Introducing the bill were Rep. John Blatnik of Minnesota, Chairman of the House Committee on Public Works, for himself and House Majority Leader Hale Boggs, (D-La.), and Representatives Bob Jones (D-Ala.), Harold Johnson (D-Calif.), Ed Edmondson (D-Okla.), Jim Wright (D-Texas), Frank Clark (D-Pa.), Wm. Jennings Bryan Dorn (D-S.C.), James Kee (D-W. Va.), David Henderson (D-N.C.), Robert Roe (D-N.J.) and John McFall (D-Calif.).

The Accelerated Public Works program authorized by the bill provides federal grants to aid in construction of hospitals, water and sewer systems, streets and roads and

other public facilities in areas of exceptionally high unemployment. The bill introduced today authorizes \$900,000,000 in fiscal 1971-72 and \$950,000,000 in fiscal 1972-73.

Sponsors of the legislation point to two immediate benefits. It provides a means of providing jobs for the jobless and helps communities without adequate local resources make badly needed improvements—improvements which provide the public services necessary for further economic development.

The Economic Development Administration conducts both a loan and grant program providing for improvements which will produce long-term stable employment. The Appalachian, Ozarka and other regional commissions join states with common problems in efforts aimed at providing public services and economic development.

In a statement, the sponsors said today: "All these are successful programs which have historically produced the results they were written to produce. The Accelerated Public Works program, EDA and regional commissions provide a proven vehicle for putting federal dollars into communities where help is needed most. Local needs can be met and employment bolstered at the same time that firm foundations for community growth are being built. We hope Congress will agree both on the wisdom of this approach, and the need to activate the Accelerated Public Works program and guarantee extension of the other programs at the earliest possible time."

#### H.R. 4810

A bill to provide both short term and long term assistance to areas of high unemployment through the extension of certain provisions of law

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### TITLE I—PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION ACT

SECTION 101. This title may be cited as the "Public Works Acceleration Act Amendments of 1971".

SEC. 102. The Public Works Acceleration Act (42 U.S.C. 2641 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking out "President" wherever it appears in the first four sections of such Act and inserting in lieu thereof at each such place the following: "Secretary of Commerce (acting through the Economic Development Administration)".

(2) Clause (1) of section 2(a) is amended to read as follows: "(1) certain communities and areas in the Nation are presently burdened by substantial unemployment and underemployment resulting from the economic decline of 1970, and".

(3) Subsection (b) of section 2 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Congress further finds that Federal assistance to stimulate public works investment in order to increase employment opportunities is most urgently needed in those redevelopment areas, both urban and rural, suffering persistent and chronic unemployment and economic underdevelopment."

(4) Subsection (a) of section 3 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) For the purposes of this section, the term 'eligible area' means—

"(1) those areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce as 'redevelopment areas' for the purpose of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 in which the Secretary of Labor finds that the annual average rate of unemployment has been at least 150 per centum of the national average for the preceding calendar year, and

"(2) those standard metropolitan statistical areas in which the Secretary of Labor finds that, for at least three consecutive months of the calendar year in which such findings are made, the average rate of unem-

ployment has been at least 150 per centum of the national average for the preceding calendar year, and

"(3) such other areas designated by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with criteria which he shall prescribe, in which the Secretary determines from available data and in his judgment that for at least three consecutive months of the calendar year in which such determination is made, the rate of unemployment has been at least 150 per centum of the national average for the preceding calendar year."

(5) The last sentence of subsection (c) of section 3 is amended to read as follows: "Notwithstanding any provision of such law requiring the Federal contribution to the State or local government involved to be less than a fixed portion of the cost of a project, grants-in-aid may be made under authority of this section which bring the total of all Federal contributions to such project up to 80 per centum of the cost of such project."

(6) Subsection (d) of section 3 is amended to read as follows:

"(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, not to exceed \$900,000,000 and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, not to exceed \$950,000,000, to be allocated by the Secretary of Commerce in accordance with subsection (b) of this section."

(7) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 3 are hereby repealed.

(8) Section 4 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. No part of any allocation made by the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Economic Development Administration, under this Act shall be made available during any fiscal year to any State or local government for any public works project if the proposed or planned total expenditure (exclusive of Federal funds) of such State or local government during such fiscal year for all its capital improvement projects is decreased."

(9) By adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 7. An eligible area under this Act shall retain such designation for so long as it continues to meet the unemployment criteria applicable to it but in no event shall such designation be terminated prior to one year after the date of designation.

"Sec. 8. As used in this Act, the term 'standard metropolitan statistical area' means an area designated in accordance with the criteria developed by the Office of Management and Budget for use by Federal departments, agencies, and instrumentalities.

"Sec. 9. Federal financial assistance under this Act shall be in addition to, and not in lieu of, Federal financial assistance authorized by any other provision of law."

SEC. 103. (a) Clause (ii) of the last sentence of paragraph (4) of subsection (b) of section 202 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out "by the President under section 9" and inserting in lieu thereof "under section 3".

(b) Section 202(e) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out "by the President under section 9" and inserting in lieu thereof "under section 3", and by striking out "50 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "80 per centum".

(c) Subsection (g) of section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by striking out "by the President".

#### TITLE II—THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1971".

SEC. 202. Section 105 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3135) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1973".



SEC. 203. Subsection (c) of section 201 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3141) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1973".

SEC. 204. Section 302 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3152) is amended by striking out "and June 30, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1971, June 30, 1972, and June 30, 1973".

SEC. 205. Subsection (g) of section 403 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3171) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1973".

SEC. 206. Subsection (d) of section 509 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3188a) is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973, to be available until expended, not to exceed \$255,000,000."

SEC. 207. Section 512 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3191) is amended by inserting immediately after "1971," the following: "and \$500,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973."

#### TITLE III—APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1971

SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the "Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1971".

SEC. 302. The second sentence of subsection (b) of section 105 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 105) is amended to read as follows: "To carry out this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission, to be available until expended, not to exceed \$1,900,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973. Not to exceed \$475,000 of the authorization for any such two-year period shall be available for the expenses of the Federal Cochairman, his alternate, and his staff."

SEC. 303. Paragraph (7) of section 106 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 106) is amended by striking out "1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "1973".

SEC. 304. Subsection (g) of section 201 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 201) is amended by striking out "and \$170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973." and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "\$175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; \$175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and \$175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975."

SEC. 305. Section 205(b) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 205) is amended by striking out "and 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "1971, 1972, and 1973".

SEC. 306. Section 401 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 401) is amended by striking out "and not to exceed \$268,500,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971, to carry out this Act, of which amount" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "not to exceed \$268,500,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971, and not to exceed \$268,500,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973, to carry out this Act, of which amount for any such two-fiscal-year period".

SEC. 307. Section 405 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 405) is amended by striking out "1971." and inserting in lieu thereof "1973."

#### FASCELL INTRODUCES RESOLUTION ON SOVIET RESTRICTION OF EMIGRATION

### HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing a resolution calling on the President to use his good offices to prevail upon the Soviet leadership on behalf of Soviet citizens desiring to reunite with their brethren outside the U.S.S.R.

In response to a commitment made by Premier Kosygin in December of 1966 to permit Russian families separated by the ravages of war to be reunited with relatives outside Soviet borders, more than 50,000 Soviet citizens have filed applications for emigration.

As yet, none of these applications have been acted upon. However, the citizens who filed them have been systematically persecuted, fired from jobs, and given bad character ratings by the Soviet Government.

One of the basic principles of humanitarian thought is the sanctity of the family unit. It is unconscionable that the government of one of the world's major powers would, as a matter of public policy, prevent its citizens from joining their brethren outside its borders.

The most prominent group affected by this cruel and restrictive policy has been Russian Jews who wish to emigrate to Israel. A recent result of Soviet intransigence was the trial of the hijackers, who were driven to a desperate act because they were not allowed to emigrate.

More encouraging has been the positive effect of world opinion culminating in the recent release of Leonid Rigerman. As one who sought the aid of the State Department in certifying U.S. citizenship status for Mr. Rigerman, I was very pleased with this happy outcome.

In reintroducing this resolution, I draw on Mr. Rigerman's personal testimony that the Soviet Government is becoming increasingly sensitive to the pressure of world opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the attention of our colleagues to the text of the resolution and urge that they join in bringing the moral force of this representative assembly to bear on this intolerable situation.

The resolution follows:

H. RES. 245

Whereas the people of the United States, by its Representatives in the Congress, implore the Soviet Union to fulfill a commitment made on December 3, 1966, by Premier Aleksai Kosygin to permit Russian families separated by the ravages of war to be reunited with relatives outside the Soviet borders, and

Whereas it is known that since 1966 there have been more than fifty thousand applications filed with the Soviet Government for family reunions which have not been acted upon, and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of New York has duly memorialized the Government of the United States and the Con-

gress of the United States to promote the emigration of Russian Jews for the purpose of family reunion: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives considers family reunions to be consistent with public policy, with the conscience of its citizens and with the humanitarian hopes and dreams of mankind, and that as a result this body urgently requests the President of the United States to immediately use his good offices to prevail upon the Soviet Government to process the past and current requests for family reunions of Soviet citizens with their brethren outside the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the RECORD a resolution adopted by Lithuanian Americans of Greater Detroit commemorating the restoration of Lithuanian Independence and pledging themselves to continue their efforts for Lithuanian freedom and self-determination.

I wholeheartedly endorse the content of this resolution and insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

#### RESOLUTION

We, Lithuanian Americans of Greater Detroit assembled this 14th day of February, 1971, at Mercy College, Detroit, Michigan to commemorate the restoration of Lithuania's independence and to pledge ourselves for continuous fight for Lithuania's freedom from Soviet Union's occupation, do hereby state as follows:

Whereas, the 16th of February, 1971, marks the 53rd Anniversary of the restoration of independence to the more than 700 year old Lithuanian State, and

Whereas, on June 15, 1940, the Soviet Union forcibly occupied and illegally annexed the independent Republic of Lithuania, which fact had been officially confirmed by the findings of the Select Committee on Communism Aggression of the House of Representatives, 83rd Congress of the United States, and

Whereas, the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation, and

Whereas, the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its efforts to change the ethnic character of the population of Lithuania and the other Baltic States, thereby committing the offense of genocide, and

Whereas, the Soviet invaders are unable to suppress the aspirations of the Lithuanian people for freedom and the exercise of their human rights, as most recently demonstrated by the dramatic hijacking of a Soviet aircraft to Turkey by Pranas and Algirdas Brazinskas, the heroic attempt of defection by Simas Kudirka and the unsuccessful attempt of escape to Sweden by Vytautas Simokaitis and his wife.

Now, therefore be it resolved, That we demand that the Soviet Union shall withdraw its armed forces, administrative apparatus,

and the imported Russian colonists from Lithuania, thus permitting the Lithuanian people to freely exercise their sovereign rights.

That we respectfully request President Nixon to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums on behalf of the restoration of sovereign rights to the Baltic peoples, which policy was recommended to the President of the United States by the House Concurrent Resolution 416 of the 89th Congress.

That we protest the opinions of some officials in the State Department that to raise the Baltic States question at the United Nations is now deleterious, because it would be impossible to gather enough votes for passage of resolution for freedom to Baltic States, and that we deem that to be only an appeasement to Soviet imperialism, for if at one time this resolution may fail it may pass at another time as for example is witnessed by untiring actions of the Communist bloc for admission of Communist China to the United Nations.

That there would be re-established the Baltic Desk in the State Department.

That Lithuanian Jews would not be persecuted by Soviet Union in Lithuania and be allowed the right to leave the country if they want to do so.

That the copies of this Resolution be mailed to President Richard M. Nixon, Secretary of State William P. Rogers, to both Senators and all the Members of Congress from our State and also requesting the legislators to include it in the Congressional Record.

#### NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE STANDARDS ACT

### HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the President has taken a bold step forward in his proposed National Health Insurance Standards Act. It would insure that no American family will be prevented from obtaining basic medical care by inability to pay. The plan would join the public and private sectors in a new partnership to provide adequate health insurance for the American people.

This new partnership is designed to build upon and to improve our present insurance system. Currently, 87 percent of our population own health insurance, and 60 percent of their medical bills are paid by insurance. In spite of this broad coverage, there are still serious gaps and problems.

Included among these problems, of course, are the remaining 13 percent of our people who have no health insurance at all. But most significantly, the present emphasis of too many insurance policies is upon hospital and surgical costs. There is no incentive to the health system to develop more fully and to utilize more economically outpatient facilities and services. The result is an unnecessary and expensive overutilization of acute care facilities. The President's program is designed to overcome these shortcomings. He is to be commended for developing these proposals and submitting them to the Congress.

#### MARIAN CZARNECKI ANALYZES PARADOX OF LATIN AMERICAN POVERTY

### HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Marian A. Czarnecki, the able senior consultant to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, perceptively outlined some of the related economic and political problems of Latin America in an article in the Milwaukee Journal of February 21, 1971:

#### REVOLUTION RACES WITH LATIN MISERY

(By Marian A. Czarnecki)

Anyone traveling in Latin America cannot help but be impressed by the sharp contrast between its tremendous resources and the depressing misery of its masses.

It is a paradox how a continent which matches our own in size, can feature so much natural beauty, architectural grace and stylish living side by side with abject poverty and human degradation.

Some find an explanation of this paradox in the Hispanic traditions of Latin America's ruling classes; others in the exploitation of her resources by foreign capital; still others in the passivity and resistance to change of her Indian populations.

Each of those factors undoubtedly has contributed to the reality which is Latin America today. No single one of them, however, provides a convincing answer to the riddle why after 450 years of Western domination, these disturbing facts are true of the southern half of our hemisphere:

It remains surprisingly undeveloped and backward, with its interior largely unopened and its vast resources barely tapped.

It fails to afford meaningful participation in its political, economic and social life to an estimated 60% of its population.

It stands by helplessly as its cities are being overwhelmed by an invasion from the countryside which, together with high birth rates, doubles the size of the urban centers every 10 years.

Its relatively narrow tax base, deteriorating terms of trade with the developed world, high level of external debt and the little understood policies of multinational companies, do not leave it with sufficient resources to change the situation.

The last factor—the inability of the Latin American governments to marshal sufficient resources to advance their countries into the second half of the 20th century—lies at the heart of the growing frustration and sensation of gloom which are becoming noticeable in many parts of the hemisphere.

#### RUMBLING IN THE ANDES

Three cases involving countries of the Andean group illustrate the consequences, actual and potential, of this rising level of frustration and attendant tension between the elites and the masses of Latin America:

In Peru, in 1968, a military coup ousted the democratically elected government of President Fernando Belaunde Terry for allegedly sacrificing the national interest in settling a long standing dispute with the International Petroleum Co., an affiliate of Standard Oil of New Jersey. The Peruvian military dealers immediately nationalized the IPC's facilities and launched a sweeping program of structural changes in agriculture, industry, mining, banking—and the press.

The declared objectives of the reform decrees handed down by General Juan Velasco Alvarado's government included preservation of Peru's national sovereignty, redistribution

of power, opening up of the economy and bringing the masses to participate in the mainstream of Peru's national life.

In Colombia, in 1970, a 70 year old former president, Gen. Rojas Pinilla, came within less than 100,000 votes of defeating the candidate of the National Front coalition which had ruled the country for a dozen years. There were two interesting aspects to that development:

First, Gen. Rojas Pinilla, a military "strongman" was generally credited with nearly wrecking Colombia economically before the National Front took over in 1958.

Second, Colombia's governments of the 1960s were widely acclaimed as examples of what enlightened and dedicated presidential leadership could accomplish in rapid economic and social change.

Obviously, the nearly two million Colombians who voted for Gen. Rojas Pinilla—most of whom came from the lower income sector of Colombia's population—were not impressed by the pace of change or by their own advancement.

Finally, in Chile, the election last fall of a Marxist Socialist, Salvador Allende, revealed not only that the electorate was deeply divided but also that the majority of the Chilean voters favored radical change. Nearly two-thirds of them voted for Allende and Radomiro Tomic, a Christian Democrat with a left of center public image.

This was particularly surprising to many observers because that election followed the six year term of President Eduardo Frei Montalva whose social and economic reforms in Chile were considered to be pace setters for nonviolent change in Latin America.

The issue which towers above all others in Latin America today, and which helps to explain the continent's drift toward radicalism, is the desire of the masses to better their life and to become integrated into their national societies.

In some Latin American countries, more than one-half of the people live at the edge of subsistence, virtually cut off from any direct involvement in the money economy.

According to the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America, this majority receives 13.4% of Latin America's total personal income. In absolute terms, it averages \$110 per person per year.

Awakened by the revolution in communications and stimulated by the transistorized sounds and pictures of life in the city, the masses of Latin America have been marching on her urban centers in numbers too large to be accommodated by local and national governments.

They have surrounded most of the continent's industrial and government centers with belts of slums, variously called favelas, ranchitas or "mushroom towns."

Currently, over 50% of the total population of South America lives in cities, compared to 25% for all the low-income regions of the world. Because of Latin America's high birth rates and continuing internal migration, 80% of her population is expected to be urbanized by the end of the century.

#### "EXPLOSIVE" UNEMPLOYMENT

The US President's Commission which recently analyzed the causes of our urban disorders drew attention to the fact that nearly 15 million Americans moved into the cities after World War II. That mass migration placed tremendous burdens upon our urban governments and is believed to have contributed significantly to the pressures which erupted in the riots of the late 1960s.

The disruptive potential of the Latin American urban migration derives not only from its size but also from the limited capacity of the Latin American cities to absorb it—particularly to provide the new arrivals with an opportunity for making a living.



According to many thoughtful observers, unemployment is Latin America's most pressing, pervasive and explosive problem. It complicates all of the tasks of the Latin American governments.

Although precise statistics are not available for the entire hemisphere, it is estimated that 11% of Latin America's labor force is unemployed.

The UN Economic Commission for Latin America informs us, however, that an additional 40% of the economically active labor force is only partially employed, or underemployed.

Are Latin America's governments and power elites doing anything to resolve those problems and to advance the social and economic goals of the Alliance for Progress?

Opinions on this issue vary sharply; but it seems that a fair appraisal would have to acknowledge that all of them have tried—some, perhaps, with more determination and skill than others.

Congressman Dante B. Fascell (D-Fla.), chairman of the House Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee, is a level headed realist. He feels that the Alliance for Progress was instrumental in opening the doors to basic change in Latin America and helped to create the base of human and institutional resources necessary for development.

#### "REVOLUTIONARY" REGIMES WEIGHED

The answers to those questions will be debated for a long time. The point remains that the pace of reform in Latin America will not be determined solely by the elites' willingness to accept change. The roots of the present systems and their inadequacies reach deep into history. They will not be altered easily.

What of the new "revolutionary" governments of South America? Are they the precursors of Soviet type Communist regimes or of right wing military juntas?

Thus far, outside of Cuba, the governments that have been attempting to restructure Latin America's societies are still in their formative stages and appear to owe less to the Soviet model than to their own perceptions of their national interests and necessities.

They have included such varied types as the Christian Democratic government of former President Eduardo Frei of Chile; the National Front (Liberal) government of President Carlos Lleras Restrepo of Colombia, and the populist military government of President Velasco in Peru.

Rep. Clement J. Zablocki (D-Wis.), senior member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, recently produced some interesting revelations about possible side effects of US military training programs in Latin America.

Zablocki's hearings on national security policy for the 1970s suggested that the acquisition of military skill may provide some people—under certain conditions—with a desire to attempt a government overthrow. Apparently, however, the same military training can also serve to sharpen the recipient's social consciousness.

In this respect, it is interesting to note that the conservative military governments of Argentina and Brazil, and the populist military government of Peru, have something more in common than their apparent disdain for political parties and elections; they are strongly nationalistic and profess dedication to the social justice and economic reform concepts of the Charter of Punta del Este.

Both Congressman Fascell and his Senate counterpart in the field of US-Latin American relations, Sen. Frank Church (D-Idaho) have expressed the conviction that the new economic, social and political organizations which are likely to prevail in Latin America will probably be the products of Latin American traditions and ingenuity.

The next few years should test the accuracy of those expectations.

Where does the United States stand in relation to the change and revolution unfolding in Latin America?

For the past two years, the US government has pursued President Nixon's goal of a "low profile" policy for the hemisphere. In the process, the Alliance for Progress has been quietly moved to a rear burner; US aid program reduced; US military advisory groups slashed in half, and direct US involvement in Latin America's development planning severely curtailed.

#### A CHALLENGE TO WASHINGTON

Many of our neighbors to the south have welcomed these changes; but they also have waited, anxiously, for the emergence of the new US policy for the hemisphere: a policy embodied in new laws and policies on trade, aid and investments.

Thus far, such a policy has not materialized in definite form.

Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau of Canada has said that the challenge of working out a modus vivendi with the United States was akin to trying to sleep in bed with an elephant.

In the view of many Latin Americans, summed up recently by Rodrigo Botero of Colombia, the problem is not only to avoid getting crushed but also of surviving if the beast decides to go away.

Latin America's dependence on the United States is in some respects overwhelming. A minor US decision on trade in coffee, bananas, sugar, meat, oil or textile can virtually mean to some of our Latin neighbors the difference between being solvent or broke.

In the next two years, the President and the Congress will be faced with the challenge of implementing a policy for Latin America. The direction of South America's internal revolution, its pace and its success, are likely to depend on how they face that challenge.

#### UNHAPPY ARMENIA

### HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday was the 50th anniversary of the Armenian revolution against the Soviet Union. It was on February 18, 1921, that the people of Armenia made a brave but futile attempt to free themselves from Soviet rule. Half a century of Communist tyranny followed.

The Armenians are an ancient people, their conversion to Christianity having taken place in 301. Throughout the centuries, various peoples, such as Arabs, Egyptians, Mongols, Persians, Russians, and Turks, have ruled over Armenia. Today the land is divided between Turkey and the Soviet empire.

On of the most frightening modern examples of man's inhumanity to man is the policy of extermination which Turkey put into effect during World War I, when over a million Armenians lost their lives. Many who escaped began lives anew in the United States, where they became loyal and industrious citizens.

Mr. Speaker, during the quarter century that has followed World War II, over 60 new nations have emerged as former empires disappeared from the map. Let us hope and pray that the day is not too far distant when free Armenia will resume its rightful place among the independent nations of the world.

#### FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

### HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith an excellent essay entitled "Freedom—Our Heritage" which was the winning speech of Mr. Dennis M. Smith, Route 1, Glasgow, Ky., in the Voice of Democracy Contest sponsored annually in each State by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Dennis Smith is a high school student at the Park City High School and I believe that his views will impress each Member of Congress.

The essay is as follows:

#### FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

(By Dennis M. Smith)

I see Washington at Valley Forge, Jackson at New Orleans, Jim Bowie at the Alamo, they all had a common dream—these lines come from a song by Tommy Cash called, "The Tears on Lincoln's Face." General Planter and President George Washington were one of many who fought for original freedom. Jackson at New Orleans, could represent involvements we have engaged in in order to maintain that freedom. Jim Bowie at the Alamo, signifies involvements we have entered in order to help others to secure the same privilege. These three men all had a common dream: For a man to have the authority to speak against his government without being executed. Or the privilege for a citizen to elect who he wishes to represent him, not who someone in another class desires to elect for him.

Freedom is an intangible commodity, one that can be maintained only as long as those who possess it, are willing to sacrifice for it. The World Book Dictionary defines freedom as "the power to do or say as one pleases" according to this, Freedom would be the power to legally commit robbery, murder, treason or similar acts.

The first amendment to the Constitution spells out just what freedom means. Generally, it is the right to do or say as one pleases until our rights began to interfere with those of others.

Americans have given billions of dollars in food, tools, seed, and medicine to foreign countries. Helping them to survive the pressures of those who wish to destroy our liberty, change our religions, or even rule our lives as a dictator.

Benjamin Franklin once said, "they that can give up essential liberty for a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." Thousands of men have died to give us the freedom we possess and to grant us the opportunity to help make this world a better place for all concerned. I am willing to give for my liberty and the liberty of those who will follow after I am long since departed.

Americans have defended freedom for themselves and others as well. Freedom to operate a private business, to choose your religion and free to be proud of what an individual may accomplish for himself not necessarily for his government. Freedom is something we must constantly strive to maintain, for if we lose it for a second we shall lose it forever.

Americans and their allies have fought many wars but all were at least partly for the belief that people should rule themselves. The Revolution, the Civil War, World War I and II, Korea and now Viet Nam. We fight not for land, gold, oil, diamonds, or food but for something of much more value, the intangible commodity of freedom. It's the pride in operating your own business, it's worship-

ping in the church of your choice, freedom is a thousand things. In turn for each one we must all pay a price—sometimes our lives.

Hundreds of men have died for me and if necessary I shall die for the three basic qualities of a democracy: Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—otherwise known as freedom.

#### THE AGE OF EDISON

### HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a very good friend and constituent of mine, Mr. George E. Stringfellow of Arlington, Va., is one of the few people who were privileged to know well, from close association, America's greatest inventor, Thomas A. Edison.

Mr. Stringfellow recently recalled his long association with Thomas Edison in an address before the Bethesda, Md., Kiwanis Club. As I believe his remarks will be of interest to all who admire this great man for his lasting contribution to the well-being of mankind, I insert Mr. Stringfellow's remarks, in full, at this point in the RECORD:

#### THE AGE OF EDISON

(Address by George E. Stringfellow)

I am privileged to speak to you today about Thomas Alva Edison, who selected me in 1922 to manage one of his largest businesses. I was therefore in daily contact with him from that date until he passed on to his rich reward in 1931.

Historians agree that Edison was the greatest inventor in history. He had only three months of formal schooling, yet he changed the lives of millions of people with his inventions. Edison patented more than eleven hundred inventions in sixty years. Henry Ford suggested that because of the inventor's great contribution to mankind the period of Edison's life should be called "The Age of Edison."

#### EARLY LIFE

Edison was born in Milan, Ohio on February 11, 1847, one hundred and twenty-four years ago. He passed on to his rich reward in West Orange, New Jersey on October 18, 1931, forty years ago.

Thomas Alva Edison was the seventh and youngest child of Samuel and Nancy Elliott Edison. His father had become a prosperous shingle manufacturer, after fleeing from Canada, during the Revolution of 1837 and 1838. As a youngster, Edison's curiosity led him to ask questions constantly, such as:

1. "How does a hen hatch chickens?"
2. "What makes birds fly?"
3. "Why does water put out fires?"

His mother had been a school teacher, but even she could not answer all of his questions. The youngster would try to get answer by experiment. For example, he noticed that a hen hatched chickens by sitting on eggs. So the boy collected some eggs and sat on them! Edison learned that balloons fly when filled with gas. He persuaded another boy to take a triple dose of Selditz powder. Edison felt that this would fill the boy's stomach with gas, and he would fly. Instead, Edison's friend lay ill on the ground, while the world seemed to whirl around him.

Edison irritated his school teacher by asking so many questions. Edison heard the school master tell his district school inspector that the Edison boy was "addled." He told his mother about the remark, who told the school master in no uncertain terms that her son "had more sense in his little finger" than

the school master had in his whole body, and that she was taking him out of school. Thus young Edison's formal education lasted only three months.

At the age of twelve Edison took a job as the "news butcher" on the Grand Trunk Railway that ran from Port Huron to Detroit. He sold newspapers, candy, sandwiches, and peanuts. In his spare time he even printed a newspaper "Weekly Herald", in the baggage car, the first newspaper to be published on a moving train. He later sold newspapers at the Grand Trunk Railway Station in Mount Clements, Michigan, where he noticed a freight car rolling toward the station agent's son. Edison rescued the boy. The grateful station agent taught him how to tap out messages on a telegraph key. Edison's first telegraph assignment was on the Grand Trunk Railway in Ontario, Canada when he was sixteen. On this job, he had to report to Toronto every hour by telegraph signal. He thought this reporting a waste of time. As the result, he rigged up a gadget attached to a clock that set the signal if he was asleep. This was Edison's first invention. It almost cost him his job when the superintendent found him asleep.

In the fall of 1863 he returned to the United States and during the Civil War roamed from city to city as a telegraph operator. In 1868, Edison worked as a telegraph operator in Boston. There he perfected the first invention that he tried to sell. It was an electric vote recording machine, much like those now used in several state legislatures. The machine recorded the votes of legislators on a big board. Edison took his invention to Washington, D.C. and tried to sell it to the United States Congress. A committee gave him a hearing, but the Chairman explained that such a device was the last thing that the Congressmen wanted. "It takes forty-five minutes for a roll call," the Chairman explained to the young inventor. "In that time we can trade votes. Your machine would make that impossible," concluded the Chairman. Edison was annoyed by this treatment. "I will never again invent anything which nobody wants," he said. And he kept his word. From that time on he devoted himself to what he called the "desperate needs" of the world.

Edison drifted from Boston to New York City in 1869. He arrived nearly penniless, and persuaded an employee of the Gold Indicator Company, the stock ticker firm, to let him sleep in the office. Edison spent much of his time studying the stock ticker, the device the company used to report the price of gold to stock brokers. When the stock ticker broke down, Edison astounded the management by fixing it after other persons had failed. The manager at once offered Edison a job as supervisor at \$300.00 a month, a large salary at that time.

Edison's busy mind kept him experimenting on the stock ticker. He made improvements that interested the head of the business who sent for Edison and asked him how much he wanted for his various patents on the stock ticker.

Edison decided he might dare ask \$5,000 but would accept \$3,000. Hesitating between the two figures, he said, "Well, suppose you make me an offer." The manager thought for a while and then asked, "How does \$40,000 strike you?" For a moment Edison had trouble getting control of himself. He seized the table to steady himself, and said slowly, "Yes, I think that will be fair."

Edison used this \$40,000, which in buying power of that date probably equaled several millions now, to set up a research laboratory and to engage personnel to help him in his research, and it was from perfection of the telegraph instrument that made it possible for Edison to multiply himself a thousandfold. He believed in and applied the four basic principles of management: (1) Plan, (2) organize, (3) delegate, (4) supervise.

Great industries, employing many millions

of persons, followed in the wake of Edison's discoveries. There came from his laboratory a supreme gift—a higher standard of life and a higher living standard for the world.

His contributions were so great no one can yet entirely estimate his place in history, but it can at least, be said of Edison, as it was said of Lincoln and can be said of few others, "Now he belongs to the ages."

Three years before Edison passed on to his rich reward, a special Congressional Medal of Honor was given to him for development and application of inventions that revolutionized civilization. Few men have received, or receiving, deserved, such a compliment from the United States Congress.

May I give you Edison's last public utterance which, in my opinion, remains the best advice that could be given to a perturbed world. It was:

"Be courageous. I have lived a long time. I have seen history repeat itself again and again. I have seen many depressions in business. America always had come out stronger and more prosperous. Be as brave as your fathers before you. Have faith. Go forward."

I shall now be glad to answer questions about one of mankind's greatest benefactors, Thomas Alva Edison.

#### TO CONTROL ILLEGAL DRUGS

### HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I introduced two measures directed against the illegal international traffic in drugs.

House Concurrent Resolution 129, which I introduced on February 4, expresses congressional support for strengthening the power of the United Nations to suppress illegal production and traffic in narcotics and dangerous drugs. The bill further directs the President, in furnishing assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to take into account the contribution each country is making to the achievement of the objectives of the resolution. H.R. 4146, which I introduced on February 10, amends section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize the President to suspend in whole or in part, foreign aid to any country which failed to cooperate with the United States in reducing illegal drug traffic. Under the terms of H.R. 4146 the President would have the power to impose economic sanctions on those countries which would not control the illegal production and export of narcotics.

An excellent editorial in support of my approach to control illegal traffic in drugs appeared in the February 17 edition of the Naugatuck Daily News, and I am inserting the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

#### TO CONTROL ILLEGAL DRUGS

Naugatuck citizens can hardly be unaware of the fact that this community, like thousands of others, has a drug problem.

In this respect, we must acknowledge that we are far from being alone.

Nor are we alone in our efforts, however meager, to combat the problem.

We should, therefore, take the time to consider the drug abuse problem not solely from the angle of local concern, but in the broader scope.



That's why we think that Naugatuck people should go on record as giving their staunch support to the proposal of U.S. Rep. John S. Monagan (D-Conn.) offered in a concurrent resolution, which expresses congressional support for strengthening the ability of the United Nations to curb illegal production and illegal international traffic in narcotics and dangerous drugs.

Rep. Monagan has detailed, in the first part of his resolution, the various steps which can be considered necessary to the eventual suppression of the illegal drug traffic, steps which need not be detailed here. The full information is available from the congressman's office, if anyone should want it.

But the "teeth" in the resolution, it seems to us, are to be found in a second bill offered by Rep. Monagan, which elaborates on Point 4 of the original resolution.

It would amend Section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to empower the President of the United States to suspend, in whole or in part, U.S. foreign aid to any nation which failed to cooperate with the United States in reducing the illegal international drug traffic. The President would thus have the power to impose economic sanctions on those nations which would not control their illegal production and export of narcotics.

If you want to make a man pay attention, hit him where it hurts—in the pockbook!

That is what the United States would be doing under such conditions.

They may call him Uncle Sam behind his back, or even to his face, but they still like the dollars he hands out with such a lavish hand.

If you like what the congressman is proposing, let him know about it.

#### THE U.S. NAVY SUPPLY CORPS— 176 YEARS

### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, today is the 176th anniversary of the U.S. Navy Supply Corps. I would like to mark this occasion by including the following article in the RECORD to summarize the history and the work of the corps for my colleagues. My hearty congratulations and warm thanks go to all the members of this organization for the efficient and dedicated service they have performed for almost two centuries:

#### THE U.S. NAVY SUPPLY CORPS—176 YEARS

Having progressed from supplying cannon balls to guided missiles, from provisioning wooden frigates to nuclear-powered vessels, the United States Navy Supply Corps will celebrate 176 years of "Service to the Fleet" on February 23, 1971.

The Navy Supply Corps, "Business Managers of the Navy," trace their history back to 1795, in the early years of our democracy, when Congress created the post of Purveyor of Public Supplies. Tench Francis, the first appointee to that position and the prototype of the Supply Corps officer, was responsible for providing material support to the six wooden frigates that comprised our infant Navy.

The federal legislation that had authorized the building of those ships had specified that "there shall be one purser of warrant officer rank aboard each ship." The purser's task was to maintain adequate supplies aboard ship, supported by purchases from vendors ashore. Thus the ashore and afloat support responsibilities, combined in today's Supply Corps officers, were created.

In the past 176 years, the Corps has pioneered in developing techniques which have permitted our Navy to sustain operations ever since the beginning of the 19th Century. They have insured that our naval presence can be felt whenever and wherever it may be needed.

One of the earliest of these innovations was the first resupply of a Navy vessel at sea during the Blockade of Tripoli in 1804. Fresh provisions for the blockading squadron were transported by the ketch Intrepid. This was the forerunner of today's sophisticated transfer-at-sea methods of the service forces which sustain our Nation's warships at sea.

Since that time the Supply Corps has played a leading role in establishing the general stores and central messing systems, in modernizing the Navy's accounting methods and operations, and publishing the first standard stock catalogs. The past fifteen years have seen the Corps take the lead in adapting computers and advanced business management techniques to military support problems. Today, Inventory Control Points, Stock Points Ashore, and ships at sea are linked together by a computer network, providing an integrated supply system to meet the demands of supporting the sophisticated weapons systems employed by our naval forces.

Throughout our naval history, the Supply Corps has proved itself a vital part of the Navy's operations. During the World Wars, the Corps drew heavily on business and industry for reserve officers to meet the wartime demands of supply and logistics which supported combat operations around the globe.

During and after World War II, the Navy Supply Corps felt the impact of newly developed electronic equipment, highly advanced ships and jet aircraft. The Supply Corps has kept pace with the tremendous technological developments in science, industry and management. New specialist demands have broadened the horizon of supply operations and put new emphasis on experience and knowledge of the diverse functions of the Corps.

Today, the Supply Corps officer is one of a team of 5700 specialists with a wealth of training, experience, and expertise in financial management, inventory control, data processing, resale system management, procurement, transportation, petroleum management or in any of the several other business management areas that spell out "Service to the Fleet." Most Corps officers are college graduates, all are graduates of the Navy Supply Corps School at Athens, Georgia, and almost twenty percent of the Corps hold advanced degrees as well.

The Supply Corps officer may be stationed anywhere in the world, for there is hardly a command of consequence where his services are not utilized—from the Antarctic Support Forces to the Pacific Missile Range. Heavily involved in broad logistical planning, he serves on Joint Staffs, at the Office of Chief of Naval Operations, at the Office of Chief of Naval Material and in all major fleet commands.

Navy Supply Corps officers command large and small shore installations in the United States and overseas—from Inventory Control Points and Supply Centers to small finance offices and commissary stores.

Regardless of where he serves, the Supply Corps officer's basic responsibility is to ensure the logistical support of the operating forces—to meet what Admiral Alfred Mahan called "... the urgent necessity of possessing tools wholly fit for the work which warships are called upon to do."

With the motto of "Ready for Sea," the United States Navy Supply Corps, a vital force in the management of a world-girdling logistics network supporting our fighting fleets, looks forward to many more years of dedicated service to the Navy and the Nation.

#### ECOLOGY—OF CONCERN TO US ALL

### HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, one of the more distinguished newspapers of my 12th Congressional District of New Jersey, the Courier-News of Plainfield, recently published a special supplement entitled "1971 Business, Review and Forecast." One section of this supplement was devoted to a discussion of the environment, and I was privileged, along with selected area business and community leaders, to contribute to this feature section. Following are my remarks as they appeared in the Courier-News on January 26, 1971:

#### NOT A FAD

(By Representative FLORENCE P. DWYER)

Two or three years ago, when the boom in environmental protection first gathered steam, skeptics were quick to predict that this would be just another short-lived fad.

It should be obvious today that this cynical view seriously underestimated our people's concern for their own safety and their regard for the well-being of our country. This is an issue involving the fundamentals of survival.

Public concern about air, water, land and noise pollution must be viewed henceforth as a permanent factor in our public and political life. Despite the unprecedented fight we have launched against all forms of pollution, this generation has inherited so much abuse and neglect of natural resources that it will not suffice merely to abate the levels of pollution. They must be eliminated entirely or reduced to an absolute minimum, and this effort must be coupled with the restoration of our air, land and water to levels of purity which few of us have ever seen.

Progress this year has been encouraging, as these illustrations demonstrate:

The Clean Air Act, the Water Pollution Control Act, and the Solid Waste disposal Act have all been strengthened with added authority and additional funds.

The Environmental Protection Agency was established to lead and coordinate the federal effort against pollution. The product of a reorganization plan which was approved by my Government Operations Committee, the EPA has already made an encouraging beginning including preparation of the National Industrial Wastes Inventory, which should vastly improve enforcement of the pollution control laws and regulations.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration was also established as a result of a reorganization plan approved by our Committee. Among other things, this new agency will focus on the protection of the vast resources of the oceans and the atmosphere from further pollution.

The United States Army Corps of Engineers has issued extensively revised regulations which will require that future river and harbor development schemes meet strict new ecological criteria before being approved.

The 1899 Refuse Act, potentially the most effective statutory means of preventing pollution of streams and waterways, was rediscovered as an anti-pollution weapon by our Committee and was given potential new effectiveness by the President in his executive order of last month. This executive order will implement the law which prohibits the dumping of any kind of refuse in any significant waterway without a permit from the Corps of Engineers.

Environmental protection will not be

cheap or easy. Reclaiming our resources and protecting our eco-system will cost a great deal—in money, in persistent determination, and in the need to change comfortable habits and patterns of consumption, land use, and disposal practices. Major polluters will balk at some of these costs. Efforts will be made to weaken or delay enforcement of anti-pollution regulations. And our own determination to see the job through will be subject to many temptations to relax our efforts.

I am personally, confident that the American people will not let this happen.

My own agenda for environmental protection in the future will include these steps:

1. Strengthen oversight activities in Congress to assure that congressional mandates are carried out.

2. Provide for easy governmental action to prevent pollution before it happens rather than react to it after it has done its damage.

3. Assure appropriations adequate to implement effectively the requirements of the law.

4. Increase our efforts to reach school-age children with the environmental message and encourage and educate them to accept the responsibilities which will soon be theirs—an objective for which I hope to offer a specific plan shortly.

5. Emphasis on the environmental needs of older urban and suburban areas where the quality of life has suffered so demonstrably.

Our environment belongs to each of us individually and to all of us collectively. In our individual lives, therefore, as well as through the organizations to which we belong, our stewardship of the air, water and land we use imposes obligations we cannot shirk.

## YOU HAVE GOT TO PAY THE PRICE

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, when Vince Lombardi of the Washington Redskins died last September, this Nation lost a great Italian American. He was a man of honor and dignity and dedication to doing things well.

In an effort to commemorate his great contribution to American society, I have urged the Postmaster General to issue a stamp in his honor.

Today, I share with my colleagues a few of Vince Lombardi's thoughts on winning:

YOU HAVE GOT TO PAY THE PRICE

(By Vince Lombardi)

Winning is not a sometime thing; it's an all-the-time thing. You don't win once in a while, you don't do things right once in a while, you do them right all the time. Winning is a habit. Unfortunately, so is losing.

There is no room for second place. There is only one place in my game and that is first place. I have finished second twice in my time at Green Bay and I don't ever want to finish second again. There is a second place bowl game, but it is a game for losers played by losers. It is and always has been an American zeal to be first in anything we do and to win and to win and to win.

Every time a football player goes out to ply his trade he's got to play from the ground up—from the soles of his feet right up to his head. Every inch of him has to play. Some guys play with their heads. That's O.K. You've got to be smart to be No. 1 in any business. But more important, you've got to play with your heart—with every fiber of your body. If you're lucky enough to find

a guy with a lot of head and a lot of heart, he's never going to come off the field second.

Running a football team is no different from running any other kind of organization—an army, a political party, a business. The principles are the same. The object is to win—to beat the other guy. Maybe that sounds hard or cruel. I don't think it is.

It's a reality of life that men are competitive and the most competitive games draw the most competitive men. That's why they're there—to compete. They know the rules and the objectives when they get in the game. The objective is to win—fairly, squarely, decently, by the rules—but to win.

And in truth, I've never known a man worth his salt who in the long run, deep down in his heart, didn't appreciate the grind, the discipline. There is something in good men that really yearns for, needs, discipline and the harsh reality of head-to-head-combat.

I don't say these things because I believe in the "brute" nature of man or that men must be brutalized to be combative. I believe in God, and I believe in human decency. But I firmly believe that any man's finest hour—his greatest fulfillment to all he holds dear—is that moment when he has worked his heart out in a good cause and lies exhausted on the field of battle—victorious.

## CONVERTING BUREAUCRATS INTO BUSINESSMEN

### HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, not too many months ago the Congress, after much deliberation, took an historic step in the direction of true governmental reform by authorizing the conversion of the Post Office Department into a semi-independent, Government corporation to be known as the U.S. Postal Service.

The new postal service will swing into action on July 1, next, in its reorganized, semi-independent status charged, among other responsibilities, with the duty of putting its operations on a sound financial basis. The Postal Reorganization Act—as we may recall—requires the service to cover all its costs of operation, including a reasonable provision for contingencies, through revenues from mail services and specified appropriation from Congress. The act provided that all postal revenues would—after July 1—be permanently available to the service, which was also given authority to borrow up to \$10 billion, to be used, with certain limitations, for both capital investments and operating expenses. As I understand it, this \$10 billion appears as a one time increase in budget authority in 1971—by virtue of enactment of the Postal Reorganization Act.

It would appear from the 1972 budget estimates that the new service intends to use some \$250 million of its borrowing authority, during the upcoming fiscal year, and expects to supplement its revenues—as the same as augmented by the currently proposed and pending postal rate increases announced a few days ago—through an appropriation of \$1,472 million, which figure includes \$934 million for the public service subsidy called for under the act, \$481 million for "revenue foregone" on free and reduced-rate mail,

and \$56 million for liabilities incurred by the former Post Office Department for payments to the Employees Compensation Fund. The actual size of the required appropriation depends in part, however, on both approval of the suggested rate increases, as now before the Postal Rate Commission, and the outcome of wage and pay negotiations between the service and its employees and their organizations.

This is the first time around the track for all of us—the service, the completely independent Rate Commission, and of course the Congress, including the newly named Treasury-Post Office-General Government Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, on which I am privileged to serve. All will have to accommodate themselves to the realities of the reorganized service setup, and the revised budget and appropriation procedures as we move along.

In the meantime, however, the transition from a Post Office Department to the new U.S. Postal Service goes forward and, by and large, I think is going well; as evidence of which I submit the following story from today's Wall Street Journal.

I include the article as follows:

NEW POSTAL CORPORATION SEEKS TO BECOME A BUSINESS RATHER THAN A BUREAUCRACY

(By Kenneth H. Bacon)

BALTIMORE.—Warren M. Bloomberg doesn't call himself a businessman.

But his employer considers him a businessman, and is working hard to make Mr. Bloomberg and his colleagues better businessmen. Which is probably a good idea, because Mr. Bloomberg's employer is operating at a \$2.3 billion annual deficit and selling a service that many customers deem unreliable—the U.S. mails.

Many efforts by the new government postal corporation to improve mail service focus on Mr. Bloomberg, the postmaster of Baltimore, and on the men like him who run the nation's 110 largest post offices. These facilities handle about 62% of the mail, with the rest divided among some 31,900 other post offices.

"I would define a postmaster as the general manager of a subsidiary of a large corporation," says Frank J. Nunlist, assistant postmaster general in charge of operations. In keeping with this concept, postmasters have recently been given more freedom to spend money, adjust local service and deal with their employees.

This is a dramatic change from the past, when postmasters were regarded as political operatives. Until a February 1969 presidential order ended the political-appointment practices, a man needed congressional backing to become a postmaster.

#### ABILITY NOT POLITICS

Last November, for the first time in more than a century, the Post Office started appointing postmasters on the basis of ability rather than politics. Now postmasters are receiving training in management and business techniques to prepare them for an increasingly larger role in running the mail service. The hope is that with a better background in budgeting, decision-making, and problem-solving, they will help the postal service cut its costs and improve mail service.

The old political-appointment process often meant that outsiders got the postmaster jobs. While most appointees performed competently, Mr. Nunlist explains charitably, some postmasterships went to "planter-philosophers"—men whose main aim was to "sit back and take a broad view of things."

As a result, a highly centralized management system developed. Rules for running



post offices were laid down in a giant manual that tried to deal with every contingency from flying the flag at half staff to tracing missing mail.

"Decisions were made at the national level, mainly because of political considerations," says Carl C. Ulsaker, director of the Washington postal region, which includes the District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia and West Virginia.

In 1968 a White House commission told President Johnson that the "Post Office's principal failure is one of management." The commission, headed by Frederick R. Kappel, retired chairman of American Telephone & Telegraph Co., recommended that the Post Office be dropped from the Cabinet and run as a business.

#### WILL A PROMISE BE DELIVERED?

In line with these recommendations, Congress voted last summer to remove the Post Office from congressional control and turn it over to a semi-independent corporation, the U.S. Postal Service. Now officials must deliver on their promise to make the mail service more efficient.

The new business stance of the Postal Service involves more than reshaping the job of postmaster, of course. Through a combination of boosting its rates by \$1.45 billion a year and reducing costs, the service hopes to operate on a break-even basis. In addition, it's reviewing its building programs, revising its mail-processing system to channel more mail through offices with automated handling equipment, and studying a number of new mail services to meet the needs of business mailers willing to pay for premium service.

To diffuse the highly centralized management system, the Postal Service is delegating more responsibility to local postmasters. "What we are doing little by little is to give a postmaster a broad guidance reference along with resources in terms of manpower and dollar allocation then let him operate within that so that he won't have to refer every problem up to the regional level," explains Mr. Ulsaker, the regional director.

Postmaster Bloomberg sees the difference. "We don't have to call the region on a hell of a lot of things we had to call on before," he says. Washington officials now realize, he says, that "we know Baltimore better than anyone else and that we know where we have to expand service and otherwise adjust it." Until recently, he adds, "I had responsibility but no authority."

#### ELIMINATING PAPER WORK

The newly delegated powers have helped "eliminate the paper work and the time" previously required to secure regional approval of any change, says William A. Colbert, the assistant director of operations in Baltimore. Now, for example, he can institute mail service to recently constructed office buildings and extend service to new housing developments without regional approval.

The new authority also makes it easier to deal with the private truckers who carry mail in and out of Baltimore. The post office can contract with the carriers without the regional approval previously required, and it can discipline those who provide irregular or inadequate service.

"Before," Mr. Colbert says, "we had to say 'John Smith's truck leaks and the mail is getting wet' and wait for a reply" from Washington. Now the Baltimore office just tells the contractor either he gets the truck fixed immediately or another carrier will be substituted until it is fixed.

Until a year ago the Baltimore office couldn't pay its own utility bills either. The bills had to be certified and forwarded to a center in Atlanta for payment. Baltimore and other major post offices have also recently received authority to open small branch offices without higher approval and to make repairs and improvements costing up to \$2,000.

Other recently delegated authority makes it easier for Postmaster Bloomberg to promote subordinates and adjust pickup and delivery service.

#### SHADES OF BEN FRANKLIN

Taken together, Mr. Bloomberg says, the changes make it easier to operate the Baltimore post office, the nation's 13th largest. Housed in a 40-year-old federal building in the center of Baltimore, the post office often seems to run on little more than patience and persistence.

As in most post offices, clerks still sort most of the mail by hand, throwing it into pigeon-holed cases similar to those used in the time of Benjamin Franklin, the nation's first Postmaster General. The processing area is too small to handle the daily volume of four million pieces, so some of the 5,800 employees work at makeshift facilities in the hallways.

But next fall the Baltimore office will move into a spacious new building filled with modern mail-processing equipment. The budgeting basis will be different, too. For the fiscal year beginning July 1, Postmaster Bloomberg is asking for a budget of about \$60 million. Previously postmasters in big cities had no budget; everything was decided by regional bosses.

The new budget system has "made everybody more cognizant of the need to watch his expenditures," says Mr. Bloomberg, who frequently jokes with his workers about the cost-watching. "It costs me 13 cents each time one of you guys rides this thing," he tells a group of employees in an exasperatingly slow elevator.

But the cost-slashing effort is a serious matter for the new Postal Service. The Kappel commission estimated that more efficient management could cut about 20% from postal operating costs, which will run about \$10 billion this fiscal year.

The campaign has already begun. "We've actually established goals in all our post offices to realize savings by contacting all the big mailers and working out mutually beneficial ways to get mail into the system," Mr. Ulsaker explains.

#### EXCEEDING A GOAL

The savings target for the Baltimore post office in the fiscal year ending June 30 is \$168,000, and Mr. Bloomberg says he will do even better. Savings are realized by inducing big mailers to sort and bundle their mail in ways that will save processing in the post office. In return, the post office promises faster delivery and may send postal employees to the company to help get out the mail.

"There's a lot of money to be saved through good customer-relations representatives doing their jobs," observes the 56-year-old Mr. Bloomberg, who started as a clerk in 1931. He says his emissaries now are trying to work with businesses to eliminate Saturday delivery to firms open only five days a week.

In addition, Mr. Bloomberg and his men have been successful in getting banks, utilities and other big mailers to arrange local mail in such a way that it goes directly to the letter carrier who will deliver it, thus bypassing most processing steps.

To help convert postmasters from bureaucrats to businessmen, the Postal Service has more than doubled training outlays over the past two years. It's spending \$41.9 million this fiscal year, up from \$37.3 million last year and \$18.4 million in the year ended June 30, 1969, with a large part of the boost going for postmaster training.

Postmasters now are given a two-week course in general management principles "from the point of view of a businessman," according to Harry D. Kolb, who runs the Postal Service management institute in Bethesda, Md. In addition, postmasters attend courses given by the American Management Association, and the Postmaster Service is also setting up courses for postmasters at such well-known business schools as Columbia and Stanford.

The training program aims to build a level of skilled managers that wasn't achievable in the past because of a rigid seniority system and the political appointment of postmasters.

"When I came into this business (29 years ago) there was an unwritten law that unless you had 20 years in the postal service you didn't even apply for a supervisor's job," recalls Boston Postmaster George K. Walker. "And by the time you'd been in 20 years, you didn't care anymore."

But even after years with the post office a qualified person wasn't likely to become a postmaster. The Kappel commission estimated that two-thirds of the postmasters appointed in the last decade were brought in from outside for political reasons.

Last November when the post office made its first postmaster appointments on the basis of merit, Boston's Mr. Walker won promotion into one of the 5,000 vacant postmaster positions around the country. "By my promotion, six other promotions ensued down the line. Never in my career has the opportunity been greater" for postal employees, Mr. Walker asserts. "Morale has increased tremendously."

#### ALBERT H. RUWET RECEIVES ELOY ALFARO GRAND CROSS

#### HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to learn recently that Mr. Albert H. Ruwet of New Haven, Conn., has been awarded the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma, the highest award of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama.

Mr. Ruwet has spent his life in the service of his fellow man through religious, fraternal, and civic organizations. He became a Mason in 1920 and served as the master of Olive Branch Lodge 84, A.F. & A.M. in New Haven in 1929 and as grand master of Connecticut in 1958 and 1959. He was executive director of the Masonic home and hospital in Wallingford and was active in the construction of three Shriners' hospitals. He is presently involved in cerebral palsy research at Gaylord Hospital, Wallingford.

It is a pleasure to recognize the accomplishments of Albert H. Ruwet, Mr. Speaker, and to congratulate him for receiving the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross. I wish to place in the RECORD at this point statements by Mr. Samuel Mann, worshipful master of Olive Branch Lodge 84, A.F. & A.M., and Dr. Domenick Ierardo, American deputy provost of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation:

OLIVE BRANCH LODGE NO. 84, A.F. & A.M.,  
NEW HAVEN, CONN.

If a prize were to be awarded the hardest working individual in any group, it would not take long for the judges to determine where it should go—to the Most Worshipful Past Grand Master Albert H. Ruwet, 33°. "Uncle Al," as we affectionately identify him, was taken completely off guard by the Worshipful Master of Olive Branch Lodge, when he was unexpectedly summoned to the lectern, but he rallied to make a brief, yet moving, response.

By unanimous vote of the Board of Dignitaries of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama, the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma—the foun-

ation's Highest Honor—was bestowed upon Albert H. Ruwet 33°, Most Worshipful Past Grand Master of the State of Connecticut, 1958-1959.

Mr. Samuel Mann, read a citation which paid tribute to Brother Ruwet, in recognition of his outstanding service to mankind, to Masonry and to his country, particularly for his efforts in the building of the three special Shriner's Hospitals for burns. Brother Ruwet's outstanding activities in behalf of humanitarian causes through religious, fraternal, civic and patriotic organizations are in keeping with the aims, ideals, principles and purposes of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama.

Brother Ruwet is a native New Havener, and attended school in the City of Elms. He is the former Manager of Sealtest Food Division, and a retired Executive Director of the Masonic Home and Hospital in Wallingford, Connecticut.

He served Masonry in so many assignments that a complete list is almost impossible to compile. "Awards descended upon him, in such profusion as to be almost an embarrassment", a biographer relates. Through it all "Uncle Al" retained his characteristic modesty. He was made a Mason in Olive Branch Lodge No. 84, A.F. & A.M., in 1920—over fifty years ago. He served as its Master in 1929. Coronated a thirty-third in the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, he served as Illustrious Potentate of Pyramid Temple, Bridgeport and held office in Royal Arch Masonry as well as New Haven Commandery, Knights Templar, and Order of the Eastern Star. He is a Past Governor of Rotary International. Presently he is the Monarch of Hejaz Grotto, M.O.V.P.E.R., and is involved in Cerebral Palsy research at Gaylord Hospital, Wallingford.

A few of the other recipients of this award were: the late John F. Kennedy, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Everett Dirksen 33°, General Douglas MacArthur 33°, J. Edgar Hoover 33°, Past Grand Master of Connecticut William F. Booth 33°—a brother of the late Yale immortal Albie Booth, and many others.

SAMUEL MANN,

Worshipful Master, Olive Branch Lodge  
No. 84, A.F. & A.M.

ELOY ALFARO INTERNATIONAL FOUNDATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA,

New York, N.Y.

We are assembled here in New Haven to honor an outstanding and distinguished brother of reknown, Albert H. Ruwet, Past Grand Master of Masons of the State of Connecticut, with the top honor of this Foundation—The Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma.

We are here, this evening, to honour you in testimony; first of our faith in the ideals of American Democracy; secondly, in our devotion to the cause of universal brotherhood as the follower of these ideals; and thirdly, because of our confidence in the cooperation of all the peoples of the Western Hemisphere in the preservation of human freedom and peace of all the peoples of the world.

Such was the pattern and life of our standard bearer, the immortal Eloy Alfaro, the greatest Democrat of Ecuador.

The Eloy Alfaro International Foundation has neither political or lucrative purposes. The finality is to pay tribute to the memory of Eloy Alfaro, and make available all knowledge of his life and works, as a statesman and liberator. What Alfaro undertook and accomplished in half a century, constitutes the essential transformation of normal people.

It is most fitting, therefore, for us this evening, that we of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, have selected to present this highest award to a great American and Humanitarian. None can doubt the limitless faith of Albert H. Ruwet the ideals of

democracy and in the belief of our guest of honor that it was not from human hands, but from the Great Creator that every man, woman and child inherits the inherent right of life, human liberty, happiness, and equal opportunity for learning, which has been the lifework of Brother Booth, and with such opportunity the priceless possession of truth, which alone can make man free.

You know, my dear Brother Ruwet that you now join a very select and elite group of Americans who have been similarly honored in the past. They include former Presidents, John F. Kennedy, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Herbert Hoover, Dwight David Eisenhower, Harry S. Truman, President Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, and other dignitaries such as F.B.I. Director Edgar J. Hoover, former Governor Averell Harriman, the late General of the Armies Douglas MacArthur, Senators Mansfield, Dirksen and Pastore, Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller, President Richard M. Nixon, H. E. Adlai Stevenson, Congressmen Celler and Ford, Senators of the State of New York, Bridges and Zaretzki, Assembly speaker Anthony J. Travia, the Hon. Charles J. Tobin, Jr., the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe, the Hon. George E. Bushnell, and the Hon. Albert Conway, former Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, who typify the caliber of men who have been theretofore honored.

"The Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, recognizing the special value of the services rendered by Albert H. Ruwet, in support of the objectives of this Institution, he has been awarded the Cross of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation. In witness whereof, this Diploma, with the seal of the Foundation, is presented in the city of Panama, Republic of Panama, on the 25th of June 1970.

Congratulations Brother Ruwet, and may you enjoy this honor for many years to come!

DR. DOMENICK IERARDO,

American Deputy Provost,

E.A.I.E. of the Republic of Panama.

#### SECTION 920 OF THE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1970

### HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I should like to supplement the remarks made on February 18 by my distinguished colleague and good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA). The material relative to the legislative history of section 920 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 submitted by Mr. HANNA is of great interest. It indicates the complete consensus which existed between the Congress and Chairman Martin as to the meaning of the provision at the time of its enactment. The letter penned by Chairman Martin leaves no question of the remedial effect of section 920. I am pleased that the legislative history on section 920 of the act is now complete. I trust that the materials provided by Mr. HANNA will, when read with floor debates and the text of the amendment, enable industry leaders to understand and those who administer the new provision to faithfully implement the purpose and intent of the new law. When this provision is so implemented, substantial progress to the national housing goal will be furthered.

#### KIDNAPING AND TERRORISM

### HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, recently I had occasion to meet Ambassador Roque J. Avila of Paraguay who represents his government herein Washington. My conversation with him was so informative in terms of developments in Latin America, that I wish to call it to the attention of my colleagues in Congress.

Recently there was a meeting here in Washington of the 23-member nations of the Organization of American States, to consider a resolution against political kidnaping and terrorism in Latin America. The Republic of Paraguay delegation was headed by Foreign Minister Raul Sapena Pastor who has served in that capacity for 14 years and is the second most senior Minister of Foreign Relations in the world today. I read the text of his speech in connection with terrorism in the Western Hemisphere and I strongly compliment him for his forthright position.

I think it is regrettable that all of the members of the OAS would not agree upon a strong resolution condemning terrorism. I think Americans will admire the courage and leadership of Paraguay, Brazil, Argentina, Ecuador, Guatemala, and Haiti in withdrawing from the meeting in protest against the weak and inadequate resolution proposed by the eight-nation group willing to settle for a watered down version. In my judgment, it is in the interests of the United States to join Paraguay in strongly condemning terrorism and kidnaping in the most forthright terms. This can be done without infringing on the concern among Latin American governments for the right of political asylum.

I represent a district in the State of Georgia not too far removed from the danger of missiles with nuclear warheads now believed to be based in Cuba under the sponsorship of Soviet Russia. I view with alarm the fact that the Government of the United States is vigorously defending freedom in Southeast Asia and the Mideast but seems to be more or less asleep when it comes to the spread of communism in Cuba, the increasing danger of atomic weapons and Russian submarines operating from Cuban bases, the Marxist-Communist takeover in Chile, and the intensification of terrorist and guerrilla activities and similar evidences of Communist expansion in the Western Hemisphere.

President Alfredo Stroessner of Paraguay has been one of the strongest opponents of the spread of communism in Latin America. Paraguay was the only government that offered to send troops to support the action of President Johnson in the Caribbean in repelling the advance of communism there a few years ago. President Stroessner and the people of Paraguay are perhaps the best friends the United States has left in Latin America today, and I think the speech of Dr. Sapena Pastor, Paraguay's Foreign Min-



ister, in dealing with terrorism at the recent meeting of the OAS is a document worthy of the study of all interested Americans. When Paraguay takes leadership in this area, it speaks for the best interests of all nations in the Western Hemisphere who believe in freedom and who oppose communism.

**DON'T CUT SPACE BUDGET  
FURTHER**

**HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the aerospace team that placed man on the moon is in danger of being completely disassembled. The aerospace team has received much well-deserved acclaim, but, now, some people seem to forget the achievements that have accrued to our society from the space program.

The Los Angeles Times has taken issue with those who might favor drastic cutbacks in the space program and I have found two recent articles to be especially timely.

First, I would like to insert in the RECORD the editorial from January 31, 1971, entitled "Don't Cut the Space Budget Further," and, secondly, "Space Cutbacks Appear Economic Only to Those Who Can't Look Ahead."

The articles follow:

**DON'T CUT SPACE BUDGET FURTHER**

One eminent scientist, pondering what this country's program for space exploration should be in the decade ahead, likened our situation to that of the Pilgrims standing on Plymouth Rock, trying to decide what to do next:

"Should we strike inland and determine the outline of a new continent? Reboard ship and go to some other distant and unknown place? Or go home?"

In theory, the fog of uncertainty should have been largely dispelled last autumn when the national space agency came up with a revised program of space launchings—manned and unmanned—for the 1970s.

Unfortunately, however, uncertainty persists because a lot of Americans—too many, we think—have decided that having beaten the Russians to the moon, the United States should climb down off Plymouth Rock, go home and forget the whole thing.

As a result, there is serious danger that this country is going to pursue penny-wise and pound-foolish policies that will in fact be wasteful of money and scientific resources.

Even as the countdown for the Apollo 14 moon launch was proceeding this past week at Cape Kennedy, congressional critics were sharpening their knives for an assault on the space budget submitted by President Nixon—a budget which is itself austere.

The Times does not believe that any further cutbacks in space spending would be in the national interest.

In this era of heightened concern over national priorities, it would of course be ludicrous to argue that space spending should have been kept at the \$5.9 billion level of two years ago. And we make no such argument.

What needs to be recognized by the congressional economizers, however, is that massive cuts have already been made. The space budget is not \$5.9 billion; it is \$3.3 billion

this year and will be a little lower next year, even if no further cuts are made by Congress.

Expensive proposals for a man-on-Mars program have been rejected. The Apollo moon landing program itself has been rather drastically cut back. In fact, after three more Apollos this year and next, there will be no more manned exploration of the moon until the 1980s.

The space agency's schedule calls for the launching in 1972 and 1973 of three-man "Skylab" vehicles which will orbit the earth for 28 to 56 days. In the mid-1970s there will be no manned space missions at all; in 1977 or 1978, however, the United States hopes to begin test flights of a reusable space shuttle designed to transport personnel to and from a large, earth-orbital space laboratory.

Plans for unmanned space shots have been cut way back, too. But the space agency's austerity schedule still calls for landing scientific packages on Mars, putting earth resource satellites and an astronomical observatory into orbit, and, perhaps most exciting of all, taking a so-called Grand Tour of the planets late in this decade.

The Grand Tour involves dispatching unmanned, heavily instrumented spacecraft on eight-year-long voyages for the study of Jupiter, Uranus, Neptune, Saturn and Pluto. The planets will be in a rare alignment in the 1977-80 time period; if they are not studied then, the chance will not recur for well over a century.

This is a bare-bones program, if we are to make anything like the most productive use of our scientific resources.

Mr. Nixon's space budget of \$3.1 billion skates on the thin edge of sufficiency. It involves a slippage in the schedule for the space shuttle, and there is some nervousness in scientific circles about the Grand Tour.

If Congress wants to be truly responsible about our national priorities, it will avoid making further cuts which would damage the space program out of proportion to the savings involved.

The space program promises, too, to vociferous critics may say, does not represent money just fired off into the air. In addition to advancing the frontiers of knowledge, about the origins of the earth and the nature of the universe, it promises to pay off in much more concrete ways.

We already are reaping huge benefits from weather and communications satellites, as well as from the development of compact, high-speed computers, new metals and fabrics, microminiature circuits and many other technological advances.

The space program also promises to make possible far more efficient use of the earth's resources, and to help in the planning of global attacks on environmental pollution. There is also believed to be a good chance that spaceborn instruments will make possible the prediction of earthquakes. There is even hope that ingredients found in lunar soil may make agriculture on earth more productive.

The line between true and false economy is hard to draw. But the space program is one area where the time has come to draw it.

**SPACE CUTBACKS APPEAR ECONOMIC ONLY TO  
THOSE WHO CAN'T LOOK AHEAD**

(By Robert S. Elegant)

My son is wholly a child of the Space Age. Simon was born just two months before President John F. Kennedy promised a man on the moon before the close of the decade.

He prizes a glass commemorating Apollo 11's fulfilling that promise. Since Simon is also a child of this earth, he muses each time he drinks his milk on the enormous financial value the glass will possess after a few more decades. Like most of us, he is an amalgam of unselfish aspiration and material ambition.

But familiarity has not deprived Simon

of a sense of wonder. When Apollo 14 lifted ponderously, he was enthralled by the television image conveyed by satellite. As the rocket accelerated within minutes to five miles a second, he exclaimed in exultation: "Incredible! Fantastic!"

He has transmitted his indignation at cutbacks in the American space program. Almost as awe-struck as he is by space-flights and moon-landings, I wonder whether the practical counsel, largely determined by economics, is either practical or economic. Perhaps the romantic view, for once incongruously allied with the scientific view, is more practical and more economic.

Concerned primarily with events abroad, I should hate to see a reduced space program strengthen the foreign image that views America as a wholly materialistic, profit-grubbing society. Little we have done recently has evoked as much admiration as our achievements in space. It would be unfortunate if curtailing our space objectives made it appear that we strive almost exclusively for immediate gain.

Despite our present economic difficulties, most of mankind yearns—with little prospect of fulfillment—toward the material and even social accomplishments of the United States. The contention that we must forego further achievements in space to put our society in order therefore rings hollow in most men's ears.

Besides, the argument is false. Two fundamental realities unite apparently opposing views, the practical, economic approach and the romantic, scientific approach: Reality No. 1—after two landings, our knowledge of the moon's nature and origin is still slight. We have learned just enough from rock samples and other research to know how much more we must know before we begin comprehending fundamental questions of the universe. The answers lie just beyond our fingertips.

Reality No. 2—Even conservative economists and politicians now believe government intervention essential to maintain and vivify the mixed public-private economy we have developed. The President's latest budget demonstrates that belief. Along with medical research, urban renewal and intelligent foreign aid, space provides channels for directing money to stimulate fundamental economic activity.

Although they do not directly produce new washing-machines, automobiles, television sets or plumbing, such activities are hardly nonproductive economically. The American economy's chief problem is not production, but distribution. Our manufacturing and service industries could easily turn out a vastly enlarged gross national product if increased demand existed. Demand means ability to buy, which means possessing funds to buy.

The pump cannot prime itself. Transition from a semi-wartime economy to a semi-peacetime economy cannot be accelerated chiefly by the private sector. As the President has reluctantly and implicitly acknowledged, the government must stimulate the flow of money (call it demand) which drives the economic machinery.

Ever expanding production of ever more complex and ever less useful goods is self-defeating. We cannot depend upon constant proliferation of new products or upon constantly expanding population to create new demand. What we must do is stimulate capital production by giving consumers money.

Enter space program. The quest for knowledge in both space and the vast oceans is a noble endeavor, highly productive in the broadest social, intellectual sense and the narrower practical, economic sense.

The technological and psychological spin-off of such endeavors could provide means to improve not only our own society, but the lot of all mankind. Although we and other fa-

vored nations cannot endure as islands of prosperity amid seas of misery, no economic or technical tools now available can transform the economies of the depressed two-thirds of mankind. Only wholly new techniques can enable the depressed to make better material and intellectual lives by their own efforts.

There is no certainty, since no one can read the future clearly. For the same reason, despair is as arrogant as absolute confidence.

Since Simon's eyesight is not perfect, I am encouraging his other enthusiasm—oceanography. Like space, oceanography provides opportunities for service, knowledge—and practical economic advantages for all.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM

### HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, over the past year it has become somewhat commonplace to equate "environmental crisis" with "pollution." This is understandable, if only because air and water pollution are the easiest aspects of the crisis for the press to explain and the public to understand. Certainly, the two are the most dramatic indicators we have of the challenge facing us in the decade of the seventies.

But it is a serious error, I believe, to regard our environmental problem solely as a matter of pollution. By doing so, we overlook a whole series of abuses which continue to disrupt our natural surroundings—and a number of measures that could make those surroundings just a little more livable.

The three administration bills I have introduced today deal in just these areas: specifically, open-space utilization, mining regulations, and a national land-use policy. They have neither dramatic impact nor emotional appeal, and I expect they will draw little, if any, publicity. Still, I believe them to be of critical importance to our environmental program for the 92d Congress, and I urge my colleagues to give them every reasonable consideration.

With the increasing demand of industry for minerals and the dramatic development in their ability to recover them, we have seen a widespread growth of mining operations all across the Nation. Over 3.2 million acres of land had been disturbed in the last 5 years by surface mining, with approximately 150,000 acres being added annually. By 1980, if this trend continues unchecked, 5 million acres will have been affected by mining activity, an area roughly the size of the State of New Jersey.

Unregulated surface mining, for example, not only scars the face of our earth, but encourages erosion and landslides as well. Underground mining can produce unsightly spoil heaps and can contribute significantly to water pollution.

Clearly, we must require future mining activities to take account of their environmental impact. We need regulations built into these operations.

At present, 22 States have recognized this need and imposed standards of their own. Unfortunately, their effort has not been met by the remainder of the States. The bill I offer today would require all States to submit to the Secretary of the Interior programs regulating mining operations within their borders.

These programs, which will receive 80 percent Federal funding at their inception, must meet certain established criteria—the minimum controls needed to protect the environment. In this way, we can insure that the effort will be uniform and that industry will understand the basic requirements they must adopt.

At the same time, the bill offers States the flexibility to develop standards stronger than the Federal criteria would demand. This is an important consideration when we realize that many States, including my own, have passed environmental legislation stronger than national laws, only to find that these will be superceded by their Federal counterparts. This can and should be avoided in the future.

The second and third of my bills would also deal with the preservation of our land.

At present, our land-use policy is thwarted by the inability of the many competing and overlapping units of Government to control the development of areas critical to our natural environment. Only the States are uniquely qualified to deal with land-use issues which spill over local boundaries, for they are closer to the local problems than the Federal Government, yet removed enough from local tax pressures to represent the broader regional interests of the public.

The bill I propose to "establish a national land-use policy" would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make \$5 million in grants to those States which develop and administer programs to protect these critical areas—coastal zones and estuaries—and areas which have a more than local impact—airports and highway interchanges.

The States would be required only to follow minimum guidelines established by the Secretary of the Interior. These include: methods for inventorying critical areas under their control, policies for influencing the location of new communities, and means to control large-scale developments of more than local impact.

An important aspect of any land-use policy must be the preservation of recreation areas for our citizens. Too often in the past, these have been sacrificed to the broad expansion of industry and housing developments.

The bill I have introduced, "to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965," would finally recognize the need for open space near heavily populated urban centers. For the first time the formula for Federal assistance to the States would be altered to give increased emphasis to these urban demands.

Moreover, this bill would allow the States to use up to 25 percent of their grants for indoor recreational facilities,

when land or climatic conditions provide no other feasible alternative. This is, I am certain, a step in the right direction.

All three of the bills I have introduced recognize, in the words of President Nixon, that—

The use of our land not only affects the natural environment but shapes the patterns of our daily lives.

While we fight for survival against the twin threats of air and water pollution, I believe the President's words should be kept in mind. Our land, too, must be protected, if we are ever to improve the quality of American life.

#### RACE DESTROYERS ARE THE TRUE RACISTS

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, these liberals who seek to homogenize the races, excluding themselves and their children, apparently believe that racial equality can only be attained through amalgamation of the races and this cannot be achieved until pride of white people in their culture is destroyed.

In order to tear down racial pride of the white people, an almost continuous propaganda barrage using weighted editorials and biased panels is being carried on via the press, and television, and reamplified by churches and schools to instill in whites a guilt feeling as if they must be apologetic for the present actions and status of blacks. Narcotics addiction, drunkenness, poverty, crime, ignorance—all are said to stem from root causes resulting from an unresponsive environment for which whites are led to believe they are responsible.

Government administrators through equal employment opportunity seminars, as well as teachers and police officers in federally financed programs, are being induced and even required to undergo sensitivity training sessions conducted by "change agents" who seek to sensitize them to acceptance of the idea that the white race has for centuries oppressed the minority black race.

A scheme to bring about self-guilt within the white race and to promote amalgamation of the races was promulgated in 1912 in a book entitled "A Racial Program for the 20th Century" by a member of a different minority group, Communist Israel Cohen, who wrote as follows:

We must realize that our party's most powerful weapon is racial tension. By pounding into the consciousness of the dark races that for centuries they have been oppressed by the whites, we can mold them to the program of the Communist Party. In America we will aim for subtle victory. While inflaming the Negro minority against the whites, we will endeavor to instill in the Whites a guilt complex for their exploitation of the Negroes. We will aid the Negroes to rise in prominence in every walk of life, in the professions and in the world of sports and entertainment. With this prestige, the Negro will be able to intermarry with the whites



and begin a process which will deliver America to our cause. (See Congressional Record 1957 page 8557.)

The following lines need to be reiterated because they describe so well the brainwashing movement being promoted today in government, education, and religion:

We will endeavor to instill in the Whites a guilt complex for their exploitation of the Negroes.

The outcome of this ongoing effort to sensitize the white people as a group, if successful, will do much to destroy all racial pride and to bring about the universal brown man who, according to many U.N. advocates, will live with other U.N. men in an era of peace, love, and brotherhood.

To preserve the past traditions, heritages, and achievements of the various races, our young people must know the truth about racial differences, cultures, the history and achievements of the races, and to respect race.

America is a diverse country with a multiplicity of races, religions, and national origins. It is only natural for a person to take pride not only in his race, but in his nationality, religion, and cultural birthright.

Our schools and our churches should be permissive enough to allow the teaching of mutual respect for persons of all races, religions, and national descents; and all individual Americans should enjoy complete freedom of association in social life without intermeddling by the bureaucratic elite of government.

The obvious goal of those so quick to label others as bigots and racists is to destroy one race at the expense of another race.

Several newscippings and articles follow my remarks:

GENETIC RACE DIFFERENCES—THE FINDINGS OF DR. WILLIAM SHOCKLEY  
(By Carleton Putnam)

Dr. William Shockley, Nobel laureate and co-inventor of the transistor, made a statement two years ago which appears on the jacket of *Race and Reality*. Since that time his observations and experiences constitute an important addition to the thesis of this book.

Dr. Shockley is personally one of the most distinguished members of our scientific establishment. The fact that he is a physical or "hard" scientist rather than a "life" scientist gives him a detachment of approach which in itself, under current conditions, has value. As a scholar of exemplary scientific training, yet as one who comes to the subject of race with a fresh viewpoint unbiased by the turmoil of past debate, his qualifications for testifying to what he finds are unique.

Besides the Nobel prize, he holds the Medal for Merit for his work as Director of Research of the Anti-submarine Warfare Operations Research Group of the United States Navy during World War II. He also holds the Holley medal of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, the O. E. Buckley prize of the American Physics Society, the Comstock prize of the National Academy of Sciences and the Morris Liebmann prize of the Institute of Radio Engineers. He received his doctorate from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He became the Director of the Transistor Physics Department of the Bell Telephone Laboratories in 1953 and, in addition to this work,

is presently Poniatoff Professor Engineering Science at Stanford University.

In other words he is not only an expert in the evaluation of scientific data but he has a broad acquaintance throughout the highest echelons of our scientific hierarchy. What he has found and reported in regard to the suppression of the existing evidence on genetic race differences, as well as to the discouragement of further research, is of more than passing interest.

Early in the fall of 1966 Dr. Shockley started his appeals to the National Academy of Sciences to sponsor its own race studies. In a speech on October 17 of that year, he urged the establishment of a summer study group to seek new approaches to the "environment-heredity" uncertainty, stating that "I evaluate the marrow of the city slum problem to be our uncertainty about its genetic aspects and our fear to admit ignorance and to search openly for relevant facts." When the National Academy was unresponsive, he began to talk about "entrenched dogmatism". In April of 1967, in another speech to the Academy, he stated: "Results I obtained in a few days of research convinced me it must be a thinking-block rather than a difficulty of doing research that has kept such research from being done." He added that he estimated that at a cost of less than ten million dollars, and in less than a decade of time, reliable answers could be obtained.

His pleas to the Academy finally reached the point where its Council apparently felt some action on their part was required. As the magazine *Science* put it, "Shockley's vigorous advocacy has been a matter of some discomfort to the Academy, which finds itself situated between its traditional belief in free inquiry and its realization that the formulation of heredity versus environment adds up to a loaded question that might be destructively exploited by racists if the Academy even ratified it as the right question." So the Council appointed a committee which on October 17, 1967, at Ann Arbor, Michigan, rendered a report remarkable in two particulars.

First, the report asserted that "there is no scientific basis for a statement that there are or that there are not [emphasis mine] substantial hereditary differences in intelligence between Negro and white populations." For a group officially designated as the scientific advisory agency of the United States government—a group which, since the beginning of the Boaz era in anthropology some forty years ago, has been consistently condoning the saturation of the American public in the no-genetic-differences dogma—to come forward now with a statement that there is no scientific basis for such a dogma, is startling to say the least.

But even more surprisingly, the report recommended the rejection of Dr. Shockley's pleas for further research on the grounds that "none of the current methods can produce unambiguous results. To shy away from seeking the truth is one thing; to refrain from collecting still more data that would be of uncertain meaning but would invite misuse is another." I leave the evaluation of this statement to the reader. And I would venture the remark that if such excuses had been adopted by scientists in the past no scientist would ever have discovered anything. One can see why Shockley found himself that autumn "in profound disagreement with the position endorsed by the Council."

Nor is it difficult to understand the frame of mind in which he made his most recent speech to the Academy on April 24, 1968. This speech is noteworthy in that in addition to his continuing appeals for Academy-sponsored research and his protest at their rejection, he now records the results of his own investigations into the *presently existing* evidence. He says in part:

"During the past two years of my part-time investigations I have come to accept as

facts, not yet perhaps facts at the level of pure mathematics or physics, but nonetheless facts that I now consider so unassailable that I present them before fellow members of the National Academy of Sciences with a clear scientific conscience. The basic facts are these: Man is a mammal and subject to the same biological laws as other animals. All animals, including man, have inheritable behavioral traits. *The concept of complete environmental plasticity of human intelligence is a nonsensical, wishful-thinking illusion.* . . .

"The most dangerous illusion . . . facing humanity today is the belief [which] most scientists lack the courage to doubt, at least for the record, typified by the expressions of our government through its Department of Labor and echoed by the Office of Education. I quote: 'There is absolutely no question of any genetic differential: Intelligence potential is distributed among Negro infants in the same proportion and pattern as among Icelanders or Chinese or any other group.'<sup>1</sup> The only reason that I do not characterize this statement as a lie, and in my opinion a damnably evil lie, is that I have no way to appraise the intellectual acumen of its authors. They may actually believe it."

Dr. Shockley then goes on to what is perhaps the most trenchant sentence in this speech: "An objective examination of relevant data leads me inescapably to the opinion that the major deficit in Negro intellectual performance must be primarily of hereditary origin and thus relatively irremediable by practical improvements in environment." Such has been the impact upon a trained scientist and Nobel laureate of experiences and observations similar to those recorded by the author in Chapters II and III of *Race and Reality*. The difference is that the first are reported by an expert within the Anglo-American scientific hierarchy, the others by a layman on the outside.

I believe I speak for Shockley as well as everyone else on the side of the realities in this debate when I say that there is no intent to deny the existence of injustice in our society nor the need to correct it.<sup>2</sup> The Negro has been done injustice, in the United States and elsewhere, throughout history. So have other races and individuals, here and abroad. The error lies in preaching that these injustices have been the primary cause of poverty and inequality when the truth is that poverty and inequality are primarily the result of genetic variability in human capacity. If every social injustice on earth were removed tomorrow there would still be many people who would be relatively poor and there would still be widespread differences in status.

The most serious result of the denial of this truth, as events since the publication of *Race and Reality* have continued to prove, has been that it has given the Negro the idea that he has a grudge against the White man and the White man the notion that he should feel guilty about the Negro far beyond anything that can be relieved by the practicable correction of existing injustices. The grudge incites the Negro to riots and crime, and the guilt leads the White man to a policy of perpetual permissiveness and appeasement. Thus is created an adult society which is bewildering and disillusioning to the young, both white and black. Nothing is less to be respected, or more certain to be disobeyed, than an adult world wailing and fawning in an orgy of misconceived guilt. It will lack all force, all leadership, all credibility and all authority. Hence comes the current epidemic of juvenile delinquency from the home to the campus to the courts.

Meanwhile, and for identical reasons, we witness the steady erosion of the principles underlying our constitutional, representative republic, always in the name of "justice" and always in the direction of a "pure" democracy, the latter being a fatal corruption of

our heritage. The one-man-one-vote principle, for example, or the increasing taxation of success to support failure (which not always, but more often than not, means the punishment of excellence to reward its opposite), will undermine any stable, free society, but especially one which is racially mixed and which pits politicians against each other in bidding for the votes of the least qualified segments of our population. The behavior of the leaders of our liberal-minority group coalition, both Republicans and Democrats, is characteristic, along with the redundant references to "justice" as the blanket excuse for each descending step.

The only sickness in our nation today is a public attitude of mind conditioned and nourished by a fallacy spawned by a small but powerful group in our scientific hierarchy forty years ago and promoted by an equally powerful mass and educational media ever since. Our politicians of all parties have lacked the courage to examine it, and our courts have hastened to enshrine it in our Constitution. But beyond anything else at the moment one must deplore the performance of the National Academy of Sciences. The irresponsibility and the timidity which have led these men to stumble over their own feet in pronouncements like the one from Ann Arbor in 1967 will someday, I hope, become obvious even to them.

The fundamental scientific point is this: the overwhelming preponderance of the existing evidence indicates that one American Negro out of six surpasses the average White man, while five out of six fall below him, in those qualities of mind and temperament on which our Western civilization depends. The same evidence also indicates that the difference is primarily due, not to injustice, but to genetic limitations inherent in the Negro race. These, in turn, appear to be related to a difference in evolutionary grade. Dr. Coon has estimated the gap at perhaps 200,000 years. No contradictory evidence is of record.

The question therefore arises whether the American people are entitled to know what the available evidence discloses so that it may be considered in the forming of public policy. Changes in laws and customs which have as their purpose, or will produce as a result, the infusion into our White gene pool of perceptible amounts of Negro genes, or the alteration of White standards and traditions to accommodate those of Negroes, will in all probability in the long run have a profound and adverse effect upon our society. If our people as a whole want to take this risk, let them take it, but let them at least know what is going on.

And above all let them examine their guilt complex in the light of the known facts. The threat of genetic alteration is bad enough. The danger of a falsely inspired attitude of permissiveness and appeasement toward crime and disorder is equally serious and more immediate.

#### HEREDITY BASIS OF RACE DIFFERENCES

The race investigations of two American scientists has resulted in a storm of controversy in the academic world. They are educational psychologist Arthur Jensen and physicist William Shockley. (The latter being the Nobel Prize winning inventor of the transistor.)

Challenged by their findings is the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling requiring forced integration of the races. The present policy of our federal government is to integrate the races solely to uplift the education of the Black race.

Liberals base their belief in racial amalgamation on the premises that the backwardness of the Negroes is due to his poor environmental background. Dr. Jensen and Dr. Shockley have proven that it is genetic hered-

ity which causes the differences between the races.

Dr. Jensen often quotes a scientific I. Q. testing comparison taken by Wallace A. Kennedy of Florida State University. It was a study of 1,800 Black children in schools in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Tennessee and South Carolina.

His study found that the average Negro I. Q. to be 80.7 and the average White 101.8, a staggering difference of 21.1 points. Other tests made of Black and White children in California and New York states consistently shows a difference of at least one standard difference (15 points).

Educators say that this is too much of a difference for the races to attend school together. The Blacks feel inferior because they cannot keep up with the White children, this causes them to rebel and disrupt the entire classroom. The White child is held back from his normal educational development because class progress is always being held up while the teacher tries to help the Blacks catch up.

The differences between the races are biological and took thousands of generations to develop. No Supreme Court ruling is going to overturn them. Dr. Carlton Coon states that the Black man is 200,000 years behind the White race in mental development.

How ultra liberals can expect us to sacrifice the education of our White children in such a hopeless experiment is totally absurd. The time has come for common sense to reassess itself and bring back the normal and natural separation of the races which was best for all when we lived under freedom of choice. Like species will always migrate into close surroundings with their own kind. The time has come to return to sanity in providing our children with a competent education.

[From the South African Observer, December 1970]

#### ARCHBISHOP MORALLY WRONG

(By Prof. H. F. Sampson, Grahamstown)

The mission of the Archbishop of Canterbury against Apartheid must fall for want of a true confrontation in principle. The lines of spiritual and worldly values run parallel and never meet in argument—because the equality of man's relationship with God always remains consistent with the inequality of his relationship with his fellow man.

Thus, as St. Paul wrote to the Galatians, "In Christ Jesus" (meaning the spiritual state) "there is neither male nor female" (meaning an absence of all physical relationship). Christ himself recognised this often stressed difference between the spiritual and the material in his familiar distinction of the things that are Caesar's from the things that are God's. And again in the Parable of the Talents, he distinguished the value of the tasks that should be given to "everyone according to his several ability", with the object of obtaining a spiritual equality in achievement.

The material inequality in question (i.e. difference) is no less evident between ethnic groups than between families and individuals. Hence the argument for the spiritual equality of all men before God (assuming a likeness between the souls of a Christian martyr and his atheist executioner) is no answer to the merit of apartheid as a basis of peaceful racial co-existence.

#### ARCHBISHOP SHOULD VISIT UNITED STATES

The policies of integration and separation are both aimed at the same result, the elimination of friction due to race prejudice. (The Archbishop might conveniently be reminded of his Church's approval of the legal separation of those whom God has joined together, for their better welfare.) And when he leaves this country he should at once visit America—to see what the attempt at integration has meant to it.

He may well find what Stephen Mulholland reported in the Johannesburg "Sunday Times" on October 11, and reprinted in the November, 1970 issue of the "S.A. Observer", an issue or an inspiration for many Blacks", critic of apartheid. "The U.S. is a nation racked by conflict", "Residential and educational integration has ceased to be either an issue or an inspiration for many Blacks" etc.

The Archbishop is both morally and politically wrong in urging this country to abandon a policy having such obviously peaceful results, for another that has left Americans "depressed, puzzled and even frightened by what is happening to their society".

#### IMPORTANCE OF HEREDITY

(By Dr. J. Derek Latham)

(Letter in London Sunday Telegraph October 10, 1970.)

Prof. A. R. Jensen's thesis that intelligence is inherited is hard to refute. Intelligence cannot be dissociated from the brain, which is as physical as any other part of the body. (If anyone doubts it, let him reflect how personality and thought processes can be changed by drugs, surgery, or disease.)

Physical characteristics are inherited, as can be clearly seen in family likenesses and as was demonstrated by Mendel in the last century. Certainly environment and training can develop potential of any kind, but if the physical potential is absent what can we develop?

There is no doubt that environment can modify heredity, but let us think in terms of human lifetimes and not millennia. As a Christian I believe that respect for the individual is what matters, not vain attempts, in the face of genetic facts, to look for doubtful theories.

The muddled thinking is not, I think, the product of Professor Jensen's mind, but of that of his critics who, like so many educationists, probably have a vested interest in peddling fashionable ideological, but unscientific, concepts.

#### APARTHEID BY CHOICE IN BRITAIN

(Book review in London Sunday Telegraph, Sept. 13, 1970.)

We must integrate our coloured immigrants. So say the loud-speakers of our race relations industry. But what if the immigrants don't want to be integrated?

This shocking question bubbles up from the new book "The Un-Melting Pot", by John Brown (Macmillan, 65s.). It is a study of Bedford. That town has become Britain's Tower of Babel. One in five of its 70,000 inhabitants hails from overseas.

Some are Europeans; Italians, Poles, Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Yugoslavs, Hungarians. About 2,500 are from India, most Punjabi Sikhs. About 1,000 are Pakistanis. About 2,000 are West Indians. Between them, the represent nearly 50 nationalities, including Chinese.

What brings them here? Bedford's brick industry. It is booming, because of the demand for houses. But full employment enables British workers to stay out of it—and they do.

Hence, capitalism has sent for the immigrants. They have arrived in waves, ever since 1945. John Brown, warden at a technology institute near Bedford, studied each group in detail in this book.

Every one of them, he finds, lives its own life in its own way. All of them, from Poles to Pakistanis, keep themselves to themselves. They all opt for *apartheid*. They all say: "Co-existence, yes; integration, no." And the natives of Bedford say ditto.

#### REJECTS LIBERAL ASSUMPTION

Bedford, in fact, is unanimous. It rejects with one voice the facile liberal assumption that people of different races, languages,



colours, cultures, can be mixed together in the brotherhood of man. After 25 years on the boil, its melting-pot still fails to fuse.

Why? Mr. Brown probes that question. Each group, he shows, strives to keep its identity. It cherishes its traditions, its beliefs, its habits and customs. It insists on behaving as Britons have always behaved when they settle overseas. It sticks to its own equivalents of cricket, and cold baths, and haggis.

The Pakistanis of Bedford walk the streets in single file, as they did back home in their rice fields. The brickyard Sikhs keep a firm grip on their caste system. They will not marry outside it. Nor will they allow their wives and daughters to imitate the shameless females of our permissive society.

Dislike for that society is about the only issue on which Bedford's immigrants see eye to eye. Papist Poles and Italians share with Sikhs and Moslems a common abhorrence for our go-as-you-please sex patterns. Girls, they agree, should be good girls; virgins before marriage, monogamously faithful afterwards.

Our permissiveness reinforces their resistance to integration. The more our moral standards change, the less they like us. Those of them who remember us as we were during the war shake their heads when they look at us today. The Britain of 1970, they say, is a sad contrast to the Britain of 1940.

"The Un-Melting Pot" presents our race relations problem from a new angle. It substitutes realism for rhetoric. It contains a moral for our liberal patter-mongers. The moral is: instead of preaching racial integration, they had better come to terms with racial diversity. For that is what they must accept—like it or not.

#### WHAT IS THE ANSWER?

(By Henry E. Garrett, Ph. D., Professor Emeritus, Psychology, Columbia University Past President, American Psychological Association)

Question: Dr. Garrett, I have seen reference to The Armed Forces Tests. What are these tests and what do they try to prove?

Answer: The Armed Forces Tests are those tests given inductees to determine where best each person will fit in the military scheme of things. Chiefly, they test the abstract intelligence of the test taker, his degree of aptitude in dealing with ideas, symbols, numbers, etc. The tests don't "try to prove" anything but understandably certain results have been tabulated. More than 22 million young people have taken these tests and the results to 1966 (the latest figures I have) show that, nationwide, 19 per cent of white adults failed to pass. Sixty-eight per cent of Negroes failed.

[From the South African Observer, February 1971]

#### IMPORTANT LESSON OF BRAZIL: MISCEGENATION AND RACIAL INTEGRATION

(By R. Gayre of Gayre)

(Excerpt reprinted with acknowledgements to The Mankind Quarterly, Edinburgh, Scotland, Oct.-Dec., 1970.)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following is a further excerpt from the article by Dr. R. Gayre of Gayre, entitled "Miscegenation And Racial Improvement—With Special Reference to the Negroid Races", which appeared in the October-December 1970 issue of "The Mankind Quarterly".)

(Excerpts from the same article appeared in the January issue of the S.A. Observer.)

Brazil was recently proclaimed by a British Broadcasting Corporation announcer as an outstanding example of not merely racial integration but racial mixture leading to beneficial results.

Footnotes at end of article.

Similar instances are cited, usually also from South America, by other propagandists for miscegenation from time to time. Therefore, it might be as well to discuss Brazil briefly in this connection.

After the Portuguese settlement a hybrid Caucasoid-Amerindian population was created. To this was added a Negroid, brought in as slaves. The White element was not large, and there existed a substantial cross-bred group, besides the pure-blooded Amerindians and Negroids.

Then with a differential birth-rate and death-rate in favour of Caucasoid survival, the position changed, and, supplemented by White immigration, the situation is now entirely different. Over 60 percent of the population is now classified as White, less than 27 percent as mixed (that is Caucasoid x Amerindian x Negroid in varying mixtures), and 11 percent is Negroid. There is a small remainder considered Yellow, which is made up of Japanese, other Mongoloids and Amerindians.

#### REFUSED TO MELT DOWN

The first thing which should be observed is that the melting pot has refused to melt down its ingredients. The primary stocks remain, and large segments of them in a non-mixed condition, so that it is possible to say that there are six White to one Black element, and somewhere about three consisting of mixtures of various kinds, Mongoloids and Amerindians.

Again, it is a fact that in this, and other Central and South American peoples, there is a horizontal stratification which has strong racial relationships. It can be broadly stated that the Negroes are at the base as they are everywhere else, and the Europeans at the top of the social structure.

This is due to differences of ability associated with each racial stock which, in the milieu of a European civilisation, means that the Caucasoids occupy the upper ranks of society. It may also be pointed out that so far as the ancient Portuguese aristocratic families are concerned they tend to intermarry among themselves. This is true also of the Spanish throughout the Caribbean, Central and South America. The necessity for producing proofs of nobility (the simplest being four noble grandparents) tends to perpetuate socially the inherent tendency to assortative mating. It is both an expression of this trait and a reinforcement of it.

In addition, it may also be pointed out that the composition of the population varies geographically. Some areas, where the former plantations worked by slave labour involved the importation of Negroes, still have a larger element of Negroids than elsewhere, whereas, in the southern states of Brazil there are whole areas largely White. In the Amazon Basin the Indian type becomes much more evident.

Although there is absolute racial equality before the law, even the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* admits there is some degree of prejudice against those of darker skin colour. When people are segregated largely by class (and where the class differences tend strongly to be racial ones, as they invariably do where the Caucasoids and the Negroids are involved) conscious racial segregation as such hardly arises, as the economic, social, and cultural differences serve to distinguish, and to protect, the position of the White upper and middle classes.

This is particularly so where, as in this case, the majority of the population is clearly White. The position changes, however, where the White element is in a minority. Mere assortative mating instincts alone will not serve to protect the social, cultural, and intellectually more advanced minority, and so they invoke other sanctions to this end as a consequence.

#### SEGREGATION RATHER THAN MIXING

The case of Brazil does not support, as is so often alleged, the advocates of racial mixture, since segregation rather than mixing is taking place (which we would expect on the basis of ethnogenetics in any case). Nevertheless, there is no doubt that if we were to arrive at some method of making an average of Brazilian intellectual and technological achievement there is every *a priori* reason to believe that due to the inclusion of a large minority of non-Caucasoid and non-Mongoloid elements in the population, the overall average of ability of the Brazilian population must be reduced. This is an inevitable conclusion when we consider the overwhelming evidence which Dr. Audrey Shuey, Professor Henry E. Garrett, Professor Porteus, and others have produced on the study of intelligence testing, where the Negroids have, with monotonous regularity, fallen lower than the Caucasoids in these tests.

That such a *a priori* conclusion are undoubtedly justified is in fact supported from the world position of Brazil. Despite its large natural resources and big population (66 millions), it has made a mark on the world which is much less than that of its much smaller parent country of Portugal. This can only be explained on the basis that the average level of ability is lower than that of the Portuguese in their heyday.

#### INESCAPABLE CONCLUSION

When we consider such facts as those produced by intelligence testing, and by obvious examples provided by countries with large non-Caucasoid and non-Mongoloid populations, and the White-Black and other cross-breeds within them, we can arrive at only one conclusion which seems to be inescapable. That is that cross-breeding between the White and Yellow stocks on the one hand and the Negroid on the other, produces a lower average of ability, when tested by the needs of our culture, than that which is found in the advanced stocks which have contributed to the admixture. There is, as one constantly has to emphasise, overlap in comparing the intelligence, or other traits, of different racial types, but this does not invalidate, for all that, these conclusions.

From this we can deduce the law that where two such stocks cross, then the average ability in the cross-breed is lower than that of the advanced strain entering into the mixed type. This means that if the present pressure of propagandists for racial crossing were able to have its way it would lower the ability of the advanced nationalities which are being asked to give up their individual characters.

Conversely, of course, we find from these very facts that a strain which in a particular milieu is inferior or retarded may be benefited by cross-breeding with the advanced strain, and this is certainly the case where such stocks as the Negroids are concerned. The evidence for this is overwhelming. Apart from this conclusion following from the evidence of the intelligence testing results, where the cross-breeds on average score higher than the Negroids, it is also seen in allegedly "Negroid" leadership in White countries.

#### NEGROES IN THE UNITED STATES

In the United States we have seen in recent years alleged "Negroes" coming to prominence, some entering Congress, one the Senate, and others going into the state legislatures. We note such well-publicised "Negroes" as Dr. Ralph Bunche, connected with the United Nations Organisation, the Rev. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., and so on.

Invariably, however, when we investigate these cases we find in all too many instances, that these are not Negroes at all. Almost all without exception are some form of cross-breed or another—most of them quite evi-

dently from their appearance having more Caucasoid genes than Negroid.

The Congressman Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., is a clear example of this sort of thing; his mother was an Italian and his father was far from a pure bred Negro. In the present climate of opinion, in which so much patronage, sympathy, and political favour is shown to the Negro within the White civilisation, it is obviously profitable to identify oneself with the Negroes rather than with the European element within the population.

Furthermore, since the White people tend to reject instinctively, and always have done, those of non-White ancestry even when predominantly Caucasoid, this means that the near-White crossbreeds are, for all that, classified as Negroes in any culture which does not discriminate between the Mulatto and his variants (quadroon, octroon, and so on) and the Negro. This is certainly the case in the United States and the United Kingdom.

#### OVERWHELMING EVIDENCE

The fact remains that the overwhelming evidence indicates that leadership and ability (within the terms of our type of civilisation and structure of society, industry, commerce, and organisation of life) among Negroes in the United States, United Kingdom and other countries with Negro minorities, is in a very large measure in relation to the White genes they have, and not otherwise.

Never have I met or seen a single prominent "Negro" who was typically Negroid. That is, I have yet to find one having all the traits typical of that stock, namely, long legs and arms, short trunk projecting jaw, coal-black skin, woolly hair, flat nose, projecting heel, and the numerous other traits which distinguish the Negroid from the other stocks. Invariably they have characters which are derived from either the Caucasoid or Mongoloid, or both strains. Indeed, a large proportion of Negro students who come to European and American universities have some non-Negroid genes.

It might be mentioned that it would seem true to suggest that where the Negroid and Mongoloid are crossed much the same phenomena arise as where the crosses are Black and White.

For instance, the Belgians brought Chinese coolies into the Congo. These were not from the more intelligent, and certainly not from the socially best, layers of Chinese society. Yet, everywhere where we find them in equatorial Africa, we find them in conditions, speaking in general terms, of substantial advancement, being building contractors, and other people of similar type well on the way to making money and establishing themselves above the common social level.

It was, perhaps, not by chance that Kasavubu became president of the Congo after the withdrawal of Belgium, when we remember that he had a Chinese grandparent.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> The Mankind Quarterly, 1 Darnaway Street, Edinburgh 3, Scotland. Annual subscription R2.50, £1-5-0, \$5.00.

<sup>2</sup> Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1964 edition, Vol. IV, article on Brazil, page 120. An illustrative instance of this Brazilian social-racial stratification occurred at a London hotel in 1966. The normal residents were annoyed to find an invasion by a Black Brazilian sports team. The manager assured his European guests, when some of them protested to him, that he had no idea this team would be Negroid as the arrangements were made with him by the officials of the Brazilian Embassy—all of whom were White. The fact of the matter is that each racial type excels in certain fields. It is noticeable that in some sporting activities, of which boxing is an outstanding example, the Negro clearly excels. Any study of American baseball impresses one by the

number of Mulattoes and Negroes involved who are quite out of proportion to their numbers in the country as a whole.

[From the South African Observer,  
February 1971]

#### RELIGION AND THE RACIAL CONTROVERSY

(By H. B. Isherwood, author of  
"Racial Contours")

(The following is an excerpt from a new booklet by H. B. Isherwood, entitled "Religion and the Racial Controversy".<sup>1</sup> The booklet discredits the widely held belief that race mixing is a Christian virtue.)

In the world of reality men are not born equal, nor is each mind at birth an undifferentiated tabula rasa, uniform with every other mind, as was once supposed. All human beings are distinguishable by innate diversity.

Some are born more sensitive and with bigger minds than others; some are extroverts, others introverts; some by nature are generous, others mean, all such inner qualities predetermining the tone of behaviour in the individual and the character of his race.

As a condition imposed by natural law one man differs from another in inherited constitution, disposition and temperament, in reasoning powers, imagination, genius and aptitudes. And all such fundamental differences can be viewed and compared on a racial basis.

#### DEVICE OF POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY

Moral equality there could be, but for its validity such a concept does not require any assumption of natural equality. Nor does uniformity of treatment under law confer equality of being.

The human and racial equality as professed by the Church is no more than a device of political expediency invented to enable men of all races to be treated and ruled as pawns of equal value.

In the Church this socially disruptive doctrine of egalitarianism, which in its modern Marxist form springs from the insurrectionary impulses that gave rise to the French Revolution and later the Bolshevik Revolution, has now assumed the character of dogma.

The concept of equal opportunity, useful as a formula for freedom implying the moral right to discriminate, has the effect in practice of proving that one man is superior to another. This also has racial significance.

#### UNDER THE NATURAL ORDER

Under the natural order of Creation human qualities and potentialities vary considerably from man to man and from race to race, and there is no way of eliminating or altering such intrinsic variety by upbringing or education.

It will thus be realized that the teaching of equality between persons and between races unrelated to reality inevitably tends to inculcate envy, discontent and rebelliousness. Frustration results in loss of respect for traditional values, tried conventions and authority.

Were the emphasis placed on quality rather than equality how much more civilised humanity would become.

#### RARELY PREACH SELF-RESPECT

The Church rarely if ever preaches the need for racial or national self-respect or the patriotism that stands on loyalty to one's own family and kinsmen under natural and divine law. On the contrary, the Church, as only too plainly revealed by the utterances of bishops of the Church of England acting in their temporal capacity in the House of

<sup>1</sup> "Religion and the Racial Controversy" is obtainable from the Racial Preservation Society, 14 Kingsley Road, Brighton, Sussex, England. Price 1/- (10c) per copy.

Lords, has shown a pronounced bias towards communal licence and latitude.

"We are all children of God, all created after His image, and are therefore all alike and equal" is perhaps the most common of the fallacies now bedevilling the thinking of the Church when for purposes more political than religious the claim is made that men of all races are born equal and that inherited racial differences do not exist except in prejudiced minds.

How successful the Church has been in propagating this Communist concept may be illustrated by quoting a letter from Malcolm Muggeridge, published without rebuttal in *The Times*, London, on July 19, 1970, in which this well-known publicist stated in connexion with immigration and racial integration: "As children of God, one human family, there cannot be any intrinsic difference between man and man. To suppose otherwise is the vilest blasphemy."

#### AT VARIANCE WITH THE TRUTH

Not all theologians, however, have been ready to endorse a theory which offends commonsense and which is at variance with the truths of nature as revealed by science.

For instance, Ralph Inge, who was for a time professor of divinity at Cambridge and who later became famous as Dean of St. Pauls, observed: "The ridiculous dogma that men are born equal is dead if not buried." And in explaining what is meant by Divine Judgement, did not a former Archbishop of Canterbury assert: "In the sight of God all men are not equal"?

And it may be interesting to recall that the orthodox Christian and devout scholar, Dr. Samuel Johnson, shrewdly remarked: "Mankind are happier in a state of inequality and subordination. Were they to be in this pretty state of equality, they would degenerate into brutes—their tails would grow."

The learned Doctor was of course inveighing against the false revolutionary doctrine of human equality which was gaining currency in his day and which has now become an integral part of Church and Marxist teaching.

[From U.S. News & World Report]

#### DISCRIMINATION IN REVERSE

(By David Lawrence)

Complaints are coming in not only to management but to labor unions about a "discrimination in reverse" that is developing in the hiring or firing or promotion of employees.

This has arisen because the federal government has assumed the power to grant or withhold contracts to companies on the basis of their record with respect to "racial discrimination"—sometimes construed as a failure by a company to employ a large enough number of Negroes.

Various commissions in states and cities have been trying to encourage industrial companies to hire more Negro employees. Often this is difficult because there are not many qualified persons available from the Negro residents in a given area.

But the biggest protests are heard in the discussions among members of labor unions who feel that a particular job or promotion was given to a Negro primarily to enhance the company's position rather than on merit. This has produced a fear among white employees that, if an economic recession occurs, employers will hesitate to lay off Negroes, as this might lead to a loss of government contracts.

Perhaps one of the most perplexing of the controversies has developed in the public-school systems, where demands are being made that more and more Negro teachers be employed.

This raises the question whether the quality of education will be maintained if the



faculty of a school has to be selected on the basis of race.

Lawyers in many communities are struggling now with legal aspects of the problem, and school boards are puzzled as to how they should choose teachers. This "discrimination in reverse" has led to sharp dissent from teachers' unions.

#### WHAT IS THE ANSWER?

(By Henry E. Garrett, Ph. D., professor emeritus, psychology, Columbia University; past president, American Psychological Association)

Question: Dr. Garrett, I have a quotation from a Dr. Ashley Montagu. He says, "great kingdoms were in Africa while many white men were still savages". How about that?

Answer: There were, to be sure, three African kingdoms—savage kingdoms—in West Africa in the middle ages. They left no real art or music, no literature and no science. There is no history of early Africa written by an African for the good reason that there was no literacy in Africa; they couldn't write. They had only spoken dialects. What was written about the area was written by Arabs or by Europeans who came to trade, mostly in slaves. "Great kingdoms", these!

#### CONSUMER ABUSE

### HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, the American consumer has been a victim of corporate disregard for far too long. In recent years he has been growing more and more aware of the abuse he suffers at the impersonal hand of the corporate marketplace, and as a result, is organizing his own pressure groups to combat the enormous power of his exploiters.

Too often, however, the consumer movement has been an unwitting victim of the corporate system which has been his despair, and his solutions have merely acquiesced in an intolerable system.

The Honorable Nicholas Johnson, a member of the Federal Communications Commission who has battled effectively and eloquently for consumers of our broadcasting and communications systems, has made a most reasoned and convincing appeal to consumers to rethink the lifestyle of America which plays into the hands of the marketing manipulators.

Commissioner Johnson addressed the Fifth Consumer Assembly, here in Washington, sponsored by the Consumer Federation of America, a young and battling voice of the consumer which will be heard with increasing frequency in our Nation's Capital. His remarks deserve attention by all consumers. They follow:

#### THE NEW CONSUMERISM

(By Hon. Nicholas Johnson)

#### I

The sounds of the Indochina War again grow louder.

The official indicators of the nation's economic activity register the first significant over-all decline since the 1950s.

A New York Times national survey of public opinion characterizes the nation's mood as "discouragement but not desperation."<sup>1</sup>

The new bumper sticker sums it up: "All The World Is Watching The U.S. And The U.S. Is Watching Television." As Nicholas von Hoffman reports: "The preachers and the hawkers forecast the apocalypse, yet the premonitions that come from our daily life experiences—waiting in the supermarket check-out line, calling a policeman, getting automobile insurance—these all tell us that what's building up isn't the Grand Revolution but the Great Disintegration."<sup>2</sup>

The public has become alienated from its government. Theologian Paul Tillich writes: "There is a tendency in the average citizen, even if he has a high standing in his profession, to consider the decisions relating to the life of the society to which he belongs as a matter of fate on which he has no influence—like the Roman subjects all over the world in the period of the Roman empire, a mood favorable for the resurgence of religion but unfavorable for the preservation of a living democracy."<sup>3</sup>

In this era of do-nothing government when, as one wag put it, "The majority isn't silent—the government is deaf," the consumer movement is harkening to Tillich's counsel.

#### II

You are showing people, with your tangible achievements, that the individual does count. You are providing something that people can do. You are proving that you can fight City Hall. You are pouring turpentine on the blisters of the corporate state—bringing in its fits of wakefulness, making possible its reform.

And you are being joined by an increasing number of responsible and respectable establishment dropouts who understand the urgency of adopting your alternatives to widespread revolution and alienation. There are former Cabinet officers like Ramsey Clark, John Gardner and Walter Hickel; former Congressmen like Dick Ottinger, even former industry representatives, like the new head of the National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting, Warren Braren, who left in disgust from the National Association of Broadcasters' Code of Good Practice.

You have proven, in short, that you are onto a good thing very much worth pursuing. There is hope. There is a point to it.

But don't think for a moment that the leaders of the corporate state have got religion, or that they are about to voluntarily turn over to you, the people, the strings that control your government. You have a long, hard struggle ahead.

The corporations can no more ultimately win a guerrilla war against the people of this country than they can win a guerrilla war against the peoples of Southeast Asia. But they can take an awful lot of lives in both countries before they are willing to acknowledge defeat.

The automobile industry is still killing—needlessly—some 60,000 Americans every year—more than we have lost in all the years of the Southeast Asian War.

Cigarettes are still contributing to 300,000 deaths a year.

James M. Roche, the President of General Motors, is still responsible for 35% of all the air pollution by tonnage in the United States.

Unfit foods and drugs, unsafe toys and fabrics, insecticides and chemical additives—the evidence of corporate disregard for human life and welfare is seemingly endless. (Needless to say, any system with so little respect for the "life, liberty and pursuit of happiness" of its resident humans has even less for the whole earth networks of plant and animal life.)

Of course, we must fight for our lives. Of course, we must try to eliminate the death and injury caused by the headless dinosaur of corporate statism tromping about on our children and countryside in the pursuit of

a profit and loss statement from which nobody gains.

But the day is coming, I would hope, in which the consumer movement could turn its energies from the elimination of death to the creation of life. The redirection of an Economy of Death (to borrow Dick Barnett's title) may contribute to the necessary prerequisite of the perpetuation of life; it does not, however, ensure the quality of life.

#### III

Central to the quality of life is the reevaluation of consumerism itself. Haven't you very nearly lost the war in the name you've assumed for the battle? Why should you so willingly agree to be "consumers" for the corporations?

People used to need products to survive. Now the products need the people to survive. The corporate state needs you to work for it as "consumers." It needs you to worship at the altar of conspicuous consumption on your way to the heaven of hedonism. It needs you to drive yourselves to earn more money in jobs you hate, to spend more money on possessions you don't need, to sell off bits and pieces of your lives to be lived by corporations, and then to fill the emptiness with their pills, and alcohol, and the drug of television.

"We're like a race horse shot full of speed to make us run harder than is good for us, to win for the owners and lose for ourselves, to win the race for only the price of the chance to run."—Mason Williams, *Flavors*.

Do you understand that? Do you really understand that? Because until you do the consumer movement is destined to play but a supporting role in the corporation's drama.

I think *Consumers Reports* is a marvelous publication. I was first introduced to the magazine as a child in the 1930's and 1940's, and have kept up with it ever since. It has saved me a good deal of money over the years.

But I think we'll have to admit that it is, in large measure, just the intelligent man's TV commercial. It is attempting to make the market place work as Adam Smith intended.

If consumers are intelligently informed, they can choose between products based upon performance characteristics and price. The most efficient manufacturer of the best product prospers; others go out of business. One of the most revealing postures of some of the major consumer merchandisers is their *opposition* to giving consumers such information, their opposition to the application of the theories of an unregulated market that they extoll to such heights in Rotary Club speeches. Why would a supporter of American free private enterprise competition oppose full disclosure of interest rates, the ingredients of packaged products, or the performance characteristics of equipment? Because I support marketplace competition I support efforts to give consumers the information necessary to make it work. But that is just doing the corporations' work for them. That is just making lifestyles of consumption more rational and economically viable.

The more fundamental question is whether consumption, the role of "consumer," makes sense for us as people—any kind of sense: physical, economic, psychological, religious, aesthetic, or what have you.

If you have headaches and intend to take over-the-counter medication for relief, you can approach the bewildering array of variously priced remedies more intelligently if you know (1) that few are going to give you any more relief than aspirin, and (2) that aspirin is a chemical that can give you as much relief at 1,000 tablets for \$1.00 as at 100 tablets for 57 cents.

But it may also be that your real problem is tension in the back of your neck that can be more easily and pleasantly relieved by massaging it, lying down for a

Footnotes at end of article.

few moments to relax—and avoiding dumping more chemicals into your body.

It may be that the very lifestyle of consumption is bringing on the headaches—the tension associated with waiting for automobile repairs that never seem to be done correctly, running exhausting trips to stores, and then worrying about the bills.

What can be said for medications applies equally to other products.

Of course, small cars may get better gas mileage, pollute less, and depreciate less rapidly than the Detroit tanks. Of course, you're better off to learn as much as you can about automobiles' performance before you invest in one. But you might also consider whether you wouldn't be better off doing less driving generally, and relying more on walking, bicycling and public transportation.

Once you get a kitchen full of pots and pans, plates and silverware, and all the small appliances advertised in the Sears Catalog and evaluated in the *Consumer Reports Annual Buying Guide*, you very nearly "need" an automatic dishwasher to keep them clean. And once you get the dishwasher you "need" a special soap to avoid its sudsing all over the floor. And you're to be commended for trying to find a biodegradable detergent to cut back a bit on pollution. But did you ever stop to wonder whether all that stuff in the kitchen added to or subtracted from the total joy and fulfillment in your life as a human being?

Once we are fully informed about alternative lifestyles, we ought to be able to choose whichever we please. Nobody ought to be forced—by Big Government or Big Business—to live someone else's life.

But there is a growing number of Americans who would rather invest emotions in people who can respond than in possessions that cannot; who get more fulfillment from participating in simplicity than from purchasing complexity; who would rather use "imperfect" handmade objects from fellow craftsmen than perfect plastic ones from corporations. These people—of all ages—have a great deal to contribute to the "consumer movement," and I anticipate their voices will become louder, more clearly heard, and more persuasive to more of you as the decade unfolds.

#### IV

Meanwhile, as you address the more conventional issues of current consumerism, I think you will do well to give the same kind of attention to cost effectiveness techniques as your opponents.

It is so easy to get caught up in the enthusiasm surrounding a particularly outrageous corporate abuse. It's immoral; it's disgusting; it ought to be corrected. But it may also be an unwise area for you to be investing your limited resources.

Think in terms of return on your investment. Where can you have the greatest impact upon our society for your efforts?

And when you ask that question I think you will have to at least consider two major areas: campaign spending reform and mass communications reform.

As long as the government is so predominantly influenced by Big Business, so long as 90% of the campaign contributions are coming from 1% of the people, so long as the costs of elective politics are rising, there is little hope that the 99% of the people who don't pay for it will get full representation of their interests—on any issue—from their elected officials. Unless we can solve that one, most of the attempts to try to use government to effect consumer reforms will be like pushing water uphill.

Mass communications are equally important—and, of course, heavily implicated in the campaign expense problem. Before our nation can act on any issue it must be moved to act, it must be informed. The mass

media, especially television, not only educate our children, influence our moral values and aesthetic taste, they also set our national priorities. Whatever your concern—whether it be the war in Southeast Asia, chemical insecticides, or corporate incursion on our parks and forests—unless you can get television to deal with it you might as well forget it.

#### V

In that spirit, and because I am most familiar with the FCC experience, let's examine the state of consumerism at the regulatory commissions these days.

It has been scarcely two years since Nader's Raiders, and then the American Bar Association, did their slashing studies of the FTC, detailing the corporate collusion, corruption, incompetence, and sloth.

Consumers across the land cried out for something to be done. The two studies concluded that the Trade Commission should be wholly reformed or, if not, abolished.

Today the improvements appear to be well underway under the steady hand of a new chairman, Philadelphia lawyer Miles W. Kirkpatrick, following the reform-minded Casper Weinberger. Now the "Little Old Lady of Pennsylvania Avenue," as the FTC is nicknamed, is showing some new kick. Chairman Kirkpatrick told advertising executives earlier this month that most advertising "quite frankly, repels me as insulting to good judgment and taste." This no-nonsense talk followed a series of attacks the FTC has launched on ads used by some well-known firms, including Coca-Cola, Du Pont, Firestone, and Standard Oil of California.

This new regard for the consumer's wrath also extends to my own agency, the Federal Communications Commission.

Even the telephone company, in some parts of the nation, appears to be placing a new emphasis on product quality. Just after Christmas the New York Telephone Company ran ads in Manhattan newspapers apologizing for the poor telephone service that has annoyed its customers the past several years, and promised the consumer "the service you want and deserve." Whether the cost of such corporate advertising should properly be passed on to telephone subscribers is a question before the FCC and state commissions. But it at least shows that we've attracted the attention of one of America's very largest corporations.

I detect at the Federal Communications Commission a new regard for the consumer that has a chance of taking root. Indeed, the FCC has just completed its most intensive decade of activity in the commission's history, and much of the most recent decision making shows every sign of having been distinctly prodded by public representation.

Like Chairman Kirkpatrick of the FTC, Chairman Dean Burch of the FCC has been increasingly disposed to allow citizens to at least plead their own cases against the corporations that have so long dominated agency decision making. To be heard is not to prevail, but it at least feels better than being kicked out the door; it's a radical change at the FCC, and Dean Burch is entitled to considerable credit for it.

As early as last September, Chairman Burch warned broadcasters of the "new mood of skepticism at the FCC about broadcaster performance." Since then the Chairman has taken tough stands on children's television, some racial issues, and the elimination of cigarette ads from television. The trade press, obviously disturbed, says Chairman Burch is showing "some signs of being a consumer's man, of all things." I'd prefer to hold such judgments until the "proposed rule makings" have been finally disposed of, but at least the consumer tide is making waves, even if small, at my own commission.

Footnotes at end of article.

Long defiant of calls for reform in such important areas as selling cigarettes in the face of health warnings, overcommercialization, treating children as consumers, usurping prime time for mass tastes, and refusing to program to minority interests, the reactionary, profit-hungry minority in the broadcasting establishment is finally beginning to reap its own "harvest of shame" from the sterile seeds it has been sowing. Some recent examples:

1. When reports began to circulate that cigarette makers intended to skirt the law banning radio-TV advertising of cigarettes, which became effective January 2, Chairman Burch summoned the tobacco industry to his office and extracted the industry's promise to obey "the spirit as well as the letter of the law." The meeting was called after the FCC got wind of cigarette manufacturers reported plans to advertise pipe tobacco in packages similar to cigarette packages, and to promote huge sporting events named after prominent cigarette brands.

2. The Commission recently voted 4 to 3 to take a detailed look at children's television programming to see if it is "satisfactory in relation to the high public considerations involved." The FCC action was prompted by a petition from Action for Children's Television, a Boston-based citizens committee, which urged the FCC to adopt rules prohibiting advertising on children's television, and requiring stations to air at least 14 hours of children's shows weekly.

3. Agreements giving citizen committees in local communities a voice in broadcast programming, until recently nonexistent, is now becoming commonplace. Earlier this month Capital Cities Broadcasting Corp. agreed with the Citizens Communications Center, a Washington public interest law firm, to commit \$1 million over the next three years to minority programming in Philadelphia, New Haven, Connecticut, and Fresno, California, where Capital Cities hopes to acquire stations in a complex \$110 million transfer of control from Triangle Publications, Inc. This pattern of negotiation with broadcasters for improved programming and minority hiring has been followed in Texarkana, Rochester, Atlanta, Nashville, Memphis, Mobile, Youngstown, Chicago—and is extending throughout the country.

4. The FCC is now in the midst of a lengthy study of specialized common carriers—the public need for it, the benefits for the public, and the need for expeditious action. This is new. It represents the first large-scale attempt to consider competition for the national telephone monopoly, the Bell System. The FCC's task is to evaluate these proposals in ways that consider the best interest of all parties—including the phone company. The issues are complex. But what Microwave Communications, Inc., and others are attempting to do is to offer specialized data communications users low cost, reliable, flexible, and individually tailored communications on a point-to-point basis among the customers' own individual offices, plants, campuses, and so forth.

5. The FCC just last week launched a full-scale investigation into charges that AT&T discriminates against Negroes, women, and Spanish-surnamed Americans. This is one of the first times a federal regulatory agency has scrutinized the employment practices of an industry whose rates it regulates.

This is only a sampling of some of the important recent trends that have surfaced at my own agency in response to citizen outrage and corporate abuse.

#### VI

But tangible progress, and hope for more, are just reasons to put on more pressure, not to let up.

Last July I had the opportunity to do a survey of the anti-consumer actions of the FCC. Since that survey, the list of abuses



has continued to grow, notwithstanding the signs of improvement I mentioned earlier:

1. The Commission has refused to approve an agreement that would have allowed a Texas television station to reimburse the United Church of Christ for expenses the church incurred in helping Negroes oppose the station's license renewal. The church dropped the costly fight after the station grudgingly promised to improve black hiring and programming. If the Commission had chosen to approve the \$15,000 reimbursement, it could have set a powerful precedent to encourage local public-interest groups to fight as "private attorney generals" in forcing stations to do what the FCC is unable or unwilling to do: upgrade their performance.

2. The Commission has rejected a petition by Friends of the Earth, a New York City-based ecology committee, that wanted spot advertisements aired to point up the less glamorous polluting effect of America's "automotive life-style." There is ample legal precedent for the Commission to encourage American television to put its automotive fantasies aside, pull its head out of the smog, and put the most potent merchandising tool yet developed by man—the spot ad—to work in curing instead of creating, in addressing rather than avoiding, one of America's greatest social ills: pollution.

3. Though cigarette commercials have been off the air since the Congressional approved January 2 cut-off date, the Commission has not done all that it might to insure that Americans continue to receive adequate alerts on the smoking perils. In a recent order the Commission suggested broadcasters may have a general public interest duty to continue airing the spot announcements. In fact, leading court precedent would have allowed the Commission to be much tougher in requiring that the broadcaster continue to get vital health messages to the American public.

4. And, of course, my Commission has a long and undistinguished history of finding the public interest served, and renewal of licenses warranted, for stations with the most undistinguished programming records imaginable, with dozens of technical violations, or even, in one instance a station charged with bilking advertisers of \$41,000 through fraud.

With government agencies performing this way, no wonder the people are beginning to demand new consumer protectors, private and governmental, to restrain the agency-corporate interest alliance—what Mason Williams calls "The U.S. Government, Inc."

From swindles in the computer dating industry to lagging smoke abatement programs in the airline industry, the evidence is that you in the consumer movement have a monumental task ahead. Only last week the latest report from Nader's Raiders, this one a sweeping 378-page book titled *The Water Lords*, detailed how the largest producer of paper bags in the world is also an "outlaw" polluter guilty of poisoning the Savannah River in Georgia.<sup>9</sup>

Often American industry seems so slow-footed and unimaginative that our great technological nation may suffer the humiliation of seeing foreign countries solve our problems for us.

Virginia H. Knauer, the President's special assistant for consumer affairs, believes the Japanese will be the first nation to develop a nonpolluting car engine. The Germans, she says, will be the first on the market with an effective bumper.

The American marketplace is the scene of countless smaller crimes every day. Estimates are that consumer losses on just home repair rackets may be in the billions of dollars annually. The Food and Drug Administration indicates that about \$1 billion a year, as a

conservative estimate, is spent on worthless or extravagantly misrepresented quack devices, drugs, food, and cosmetics.

The latest oil slick off one of our coasts somehow symbolizes the sticky, frustrating, nearly impossible job the nation's citizens have in bringing the corporations to account.

## VII

Hanging over the battlefield like a fog is the mounting evidence of manufacturer pressure on the newspapers and broadcast media.

Congressman Leonard K. Farbstein of New York has uncovered more than 20 case histories of supermarkets and food manufacturers attempting to use their advertising to eliminate critical news stories or place favorable publicity under the guise of news. The news media receive some \$2 billion a year in revenue from food advertising alone. Some examples of abuse involve the withdrawal of advertising altogether. Others involve boycotting subject areas that food advertisers don't like. Still others involve the outright killing of consumer stories as a result of food advertiser objection. *Variety* regularly reports on such pressures on commercial (and educational) broadcasters. The latest expose involves Coca Cola's pressure on NBC because of its documentary on migrant workers critical of the company, CBS' softer comment, and the switch of Coke's advertising to CBS.<sup>10</sup>

Congressman Farbstein concludes: "The result of this type of pressure is that the public cannot look to the news media for full and balanced coverage of consumer questions."<sup>11</sup>

The Congressman sought an FCC investigation of the broadcast aspects of the complaints, so far with no results at all.

Robert J. Choate, a nutritionist, appeared before a Senate subcommittee to complain about the "junk cereals" television merchandises to the nation everyday. For years the FCC has ignored this problem, too.

Just how far will we allow the commercial exploitation of television to go?

Today there is still little sign of a cutback on the advertising of products and services whose honesty has been called into question. This poses a harsh moral question for the broadcaster and the merchandiser. Tooth-paste, mouthwashes, cereals, pain relievers, sleeping pills, tranquilizers, lawn mowers, canned soup, sunburn lotions, tires, razor blades, automobiles, instant breakfasts—all these, says an Alfred I. duPont-Columbia University have been accused of being "useless, misrepresented, or worse."<sup>12</sup>

This is especially true with respect to drugs.

Not only has the individual effectiveness of many pills advertised on television been challenged; the overall impact of the nearly \$300 million worth of annual drug advertising on television is becoming a subject of grave concern. In asking Congress for a study of the effects of this flood of advertising on the nation's youth, Senator Frank Moss of Utah has said:

"The drug culture finds its fullest flowering in the portrait of American society which can be pieced together out of hundreds of thousands of advertisements and commercials. It is advertising which mounts so graphically the message that pills turn rain to sunshine, gloom to joy, depression to euphoria, solve problems, dispel doubt.

"Not just pills; cigarette and cigar ads; soft drink, coffee, tea and beer ads—all portray the key to happiness as things to swallow, inhale, chew, drink and eat."<sup>13</sup>

Congressman Paul G. Rogers of Florida wants drug manufacturers and networks to voluntarily phase out commercials promoting mood changing drugs.

## VII

Consumer advocacy may be coming into its own.

To date the "test" case has been the consumer revolution's most important strategy. There are some very recent indications that the test case will become an even more useful tool than it has already been. Let me read to you just one exciting sentence from a very recent consumer case.

On January 7, 1971, the U.S. Court of Appeals (D.C. Circuit) decided *Environmental Defense Fund v. Ruckelshaus*, giving the opponents of DDT at least a partial victory over the Department of Agriculture. In the course of his opinion, Chief Judge Bazelon wrote: "We stand on the threshold of a new era in the history of the long and fruitful collaboration of administrative agency and reviewing courts."<sup>14</sup>

The Chief Judge went on to serve notice that there is a new attitude quickly developing in our high Federal courts: Reviewing judges will no longer defer to so-called "administrative expertise" where important consumer and ecology questions are involved. This amounts to a substantial spur for all administrative agencies to get about the long-neglected business of policing our corporations and prosecuting the public—rather than the private—interest on behalf of the general commonweal.

I find this heartening, indeed; and I do not think it is overly optimistic to say that the Federal courts stand on the threshold of delivering more and bigger breakthroughs on behalf of the consumer.

The problem for you now becomes one of putting the pressure on with increasing diligence.

Here is where broad-based citizens lobbies could become an incisive cutting edge for social change.

Consider just three suggestions:

1. What our regulatory process sorely needs now are strong, independent public interest law firms, along the lines outlined by Ralph Nader and others, so the law's vaunted adversary process can be balanced in fact—instead of gruesomely dominated, as it now is, by the law's corporate elite. Here is one place the citizens' lobbies could begin watching the watchdogs on behalf of the people. Common Cause and the Consumer Federation could use part of their resources to fund talented young citizens' lawyers, in effect private attorney generals, to participate in the adversary process. What the nation needs is a thousand Naders, not just one, with hundreds of thousands of dollars, so our rusty legal machinery can begin humming again.

2. As another starter, a prestigious citizens' committee, like Common Cause, or an alliance of national consumer groups, could begin keeping and publicizing lists of recommended commissioners for the various Federal regulatory agencies much in the way the organized bar now screens judicial appointments for the President and Congress. In this way, the public can begin to see to it that commissioners and commissions are more responsive to and representative of America, representative enough to include black commissioners, women commissioners, academics, the poor, more youth, and the numerous other elements of contemporary society—including the consumer element—that are now wholly shut out of the regulatory process.

3. It is clear that the Consumer Revolution will somehow have to come to grips with the great task of shunting the special interests aside in order to get accurate and truthful information on products and their disastrous side effects.

A variety of new techniques will have to emerge.

Ralph Nader and his raiders have successfully made the jump into television with a new consumer series on a Boston television station; the series is being distributed to non-commercial stations across the nation, and it explored such topics as public interest law,

Footnotes at end of article.

the pollution in Savannah, Georgia, and the effects of advertising.

But we need many more such new ideas. Perhaps someone in the consumer movement will help pioneer the "truth spot" on commercial television, the logical and legal extensions of the anti-commercial as it was first applied to the cigarette manufacturers. We need the video equivalent of the health warnings now seen on cigarette packages applied across a whole range of dangerous consumer products.

We need new devices all the way from street theatre to new magazines like the *Washington Monthly*—helping the nation recognize that the American system is in trouble and that there are things you can do about it.

The consumer revolution might even turn its attention to a revitalized American radio, which this year begins its second half century. Radio seems to have suddenly come of age since television took over its hackneyed situation comedy routines, its stand-up comics, its weekly musicals. "What was worst in radio has deserted for the glamour of the picture tube," Richard L. Tobin writes in *Saturday Review*. "What is left is often the very best in music at many levels, news coverage unparalleled in any other medium including TV and print, some of the most rewarding talk, sober or gay, available anywhere."<sup>15</sup>

IX

You've done a lot.

There's much more to be done.

These are exciting times, dangerous times, for democracy. Whether it can work, whether it will work, turns on the commitment, the imagination, the energy, the generosity of people like yourselves.

I am heartened by the progress I see, and appreciate your invitation to come here to share some of these thoughts with you.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Naughton, *Mood Across the Nation: Discouragement but Not Desperation*, N.Y. Times, Jan. 22, 1971, at 14, col. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Washington Post, Aug. 28, 1970, at B-15, col. 2.

<sup>3</sup> P. Tillich, *The Future of Religions*, quoted in J. Updike, *Couples 6* (1968).

<sup>4</sup> Address by Miles W. Kirkpatrick, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Before the International Newspaper Advertising Executives, New York City, Jan. 8, 1971.

<sup>5</sup> See, Cox, *The Federal Communications Commission*, 11 Boston College Indus. & Commer'l. L. Rev. 595 (1970).

<sup>6</sup> Washington Post, Sept. 30, 1970, at A-2, col. 3.

<sup>7</sup> *Many-sided Man*, Broadcasting, Aug. 31, 1970, at 5.

<sup>8</sup> Testimony of FCC Commissioner Nicholas Johnson Before the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, Senate Judiciary Committee, on S. 3434 and S. 2544, July 21, 1970.

<sup>9</sup> Carter, *Nader Charges Ga. Paper Plant Is Outlaw Polluter of Savannah*, Washington Post, January 22, 1971, at A-2, col. 1.

<sup>10</sup> *Coke Goes Better With CBS*, Variety, January 20, 1971, at 27.

<sup>11</sup> 116 Cong. Rec. H7477 (daily ed., July 30, 1970).

<sup>12</sup> *Year of Challenge, Year of Crisis*, The duPont-Columbia University Survey of Broadcast Journalism 1969-1970, at 87. Compare my exchange with CBS News President Richard Salant, "Is There a Salant in TV News?" 115 Congressional Record (Dec. 1, 1969, daily edition) pp. E10178-E10182.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* at 88.

<sup>14</sup> *Environmental Defense Fund, Inc. v. Ruckelshaus*, No. 23, 813 (D.C. Cir., Jan. 7, 1971).

<sup>15</sup> Tobin, *The Second Half Century of Radio*, Saturday Review, Jan. 9, 1971, at 39.

## OTTO OTEPKA AND THE NEW YORK TIMES

## HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in August of last year the Pulitzer Prize winning author, Allen Drury, reviewed the book, "The Ordeal of Otto Otepka" by William Gill and concluded his summary with these words:

Read it and weap for patriotism, which sometimes has tough going along the banks of the Potomac.

Although the case seemed resolved several years ago when Mr. Otepka joined the Subversive Activities Control Board, inaccuracies and possibly worse distortions continue to make the rounds regarding the facts of the case. For example, recently I had to call to the attention of one Federal agency the inadequacy of a form reply which the State Department was disseminating to inquirers on the Otepka case.

Now we find that Mr. Otepka feels compelled to initiate a libel suit against the New York Times and a free lance writer, Robert Sherrill, for defamatory statements for which they were responsible. In his suit Mr. Otepka also charges that "the article of March 15, 1970, was the culmination of the New York Times Co.'s malicious program, evidenced by previous publications, calculated to discredit and defame plaintiff, Otto F. Otepka."

The latest developments in the Otepka case were outlined in an excellent column by veteran newsman, William Edwards, writing in the February 6 issue of the Chicago Tribune. Together with the text of the complaint which appeared in the February 20 issue of *Tactics*, the Edwards' column provides recent background on the case at the present time, and for this reason, I insert both items in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 6, 1971]

## OTEPKA REAFFIRMS BELIEF IN JUSTICE

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, February 5.—Otto Otepka, who fought two administrations for eight years to clear his name, has precipitated another legal battle which, he hopes, will forever end the continued circulation of false charges about his controversy with the State Department.

Last Tuesday, in the United States District Court in Baltimore, Otepka filed suit for \$4 million in compensatory and punitive damages against the New York Times, charging malicious libel in a campaign to discredit and defame him.

His purpose, he said, is to obtain a verdict before judge and jury which will constitute a legal barrier to repetition of allegations that he was fired by the State Department for criminal conduct.

The Times, in an article published Feb. 15, 1970, stated that Otepka "was charged with, and on Nov. 5, 1963, dismissed for, violating three regulations concerning the release, declassification and mutilation of government documents." Mutilation of such papers is a felony.

A month later, the newspaper published

Otepka's complaint that this statement was untrue but did not give him a retraction.

The uncontradicted facts in the case: Otepka, security chief in the State Department, first came into conflict with his superiors when the incoming Kennedy administration in December, 1960, asked him to waive security investigations for a number of contemplated appointees. He refused.

In the next two years he was demoted and isolated, and his telephone was tapped. Finally, Secretary of State Dean Rusk ordered his dismissal for conduct unbecoming a State Department officer. Otepka's long battle for vindication resulted in cancellation of the dismissal and dropping of the charges against him. He was reprimanded but stayed on the payroll.

Otepka was not satisfied. He was on the point of appealing to the courts for a reinstatement which would make clear that he had been falsely accused when President Nixon nominated him to membership on the Subversive Activities Control Board. The President thus kept a campaign pledge to accord "justice to this man who has served his country so long and so well."

With some reluctance, Otepka accepted the assurances of advisers that a Presidential nomination, Senate hearings, and Senate confirmation would be the equivalent of a court opinion clearing him of all charges alleging misconduct.

It didn't work out that way. Attacks on his record continued after the Senate approved the nomination on June 24, 1969. The State Department, which employs many holdovers still resentful of Otepka's defiance of authority, only recently was forced by White House orders to revise a circular sent out in response to routine inquiries about the case. The Civil Service Commission agreed that it conveyed "misleading" inferences.

Otepka's altercation with the New York Times convinced him that he would never be free of harassment until he secured a legal determination that he was the victim of false charges. He says he owes it to his family to clear the record.

The suit was filed at a time when Otepka, while still a board member, is awaiting reappointment to a five-year term. The reappointment, submitted by President Nixon, was allowed to die in the 1970 lame duck session and must be submitted again to the new Congress.

Under these circumstances, some of his friends questioned the advisability of suing a newspaper which has unquestioned influence in Washington. Otepka, who never has hesitated to challenge bureaucratic powers, maintained he had no alternative.

He is, as often noted before, a stubborn man with an unalterable faith in the justice of the American system.

[From *Tactics*, Feb. 20, 1971]

## FALSELY AND MALICIOUSLY PRINTED

Now comes Otto F. Otepka, Plaintiff, by his counsel, Paul G. Kachulis, Kachulis & Copestas, of Pittsburgh, Pa., and Joseph I. Huesman, Lerch & Huesman, of Baltimore, Md., and makes a complaint against the N.Y. Times Co. and Robert Sherrill, Defendants, of which the following is a statement:

1. This Honorable Court has jurisdiction of the subject matter of this action by reason of the diversity of the citizenship of the parties litigant, by virtue of the fact that acts forming the basis of the suit occurred in the State of Maryland and by the fact that the relief sought by Plaintiff herein against Defendants exceeds the sum of \$10,000 exclusive of interest and costs.

2. The Plaintiff is Otto F. Otepka. He is an individual residing at Wheaton, Montgomery County, Md., and is a citizen of the State of Maryland.



3. The Defendant, the N.Y. Times Co., is incorporated in the State of New York and has its principal place of business at New York, N.Y.

4. The Defendant, Robert Sherrill, is an individual residing at Washington, D.C., and is a citizen of the District of Columbia.

5. Otto F. Otepka is a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, Washington, D.C. 20445, duly appointed thereto by the President of the U.S. and subsequently confirmed by the Senate of the U.S.

6. Robert Sherrill, is and was, at all times relevant hereto, an agent, servant and/or employe of the N.Y. Times Co.

7. The N.Y. Times is a newspaper of general circulation, published each day by the N.Y. Times Co. in New York City, and distributed throughout the United States and the major capitals of the world.

8. The N.Y. Times Co. did publish, on March 15, 1970, an edition of its newspaper which was widely circulated throughout the U.S., and more particularly, within the State of Maryland, including the communities of Wheaton and Baltimore.

9. On the above date, The N.Y. Times Co. falsely and maliciously printed in the N.Y. Times Magazine section of said publication certain defamatory words and statements by the Defendant, Robert Sherrill, concerning the Plaintiff, Otto F. Otepka, a copy of which is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "A" and made a part hereof; the said defamatory words and statements being:

"Otepka was charged with, and on Nov. 5, 1963, dismissed for, violating three regulations governing the release, declassification and mutilation of Government documents."

10. The aforesaid words and statements of Defendants charge the Plaintiff with conduct necessitating his dismissal from the State Department of the U.S.A. and the commission of certain felonies. These publications defamed the Plaintiff and held him up to public scorn, hatred, contempt and ridicule. The Defendants intended by these words and statements to imply that plaintiff was guilty of criminal conduct and acts against the U.S.A. and its State Department and violation of regulations of said State Department which brought about his dismissal.

11. The aforesaid words and statements of the Defendants were absolutely false, for the truth is that the State Department of the U.S. did not dismiss Plaintiff for the release, declassification and mutilation of Government documents or for any reason whatsoever.

#### SERVED WITH HONOR

12. The Plaintiff, Otto F. Otepka, was employed by the U.S. Government as Chief of the Evaluation Division of the State Department's Office of Security. Mr. Otepka served in this position with honor and received meritorious certification from the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles.

13. The defamatory statements were published by The New York Times Co., same having been written by their agent, servant, and/or employe, Robert Sherrill, with actual malice, as evidenced by the following facts:

(a) The purpose and tenor of said publication of Mar. 15, 1970 was to defame and discredit the Plaintiff and to subject him to public scorn, hatred and ridicule.

(b) The malice was based on an attempt by The N.Y. Times Co., through its agents, servants and/or employes, to discredit and defame Otto F. Otepka because the Federal Government policies, rules, regulations and laws which Otto F. Otepka was sworn to uphold went contrary to the editorial policy of The N.Y. Times Co.

(c) The charges were false.

(d) The N.Y. Times Co. and Robert Sherrill knew the charges were false.

(e) The Defendants' publication, as afore-

said, was made in bad faith and with a reckless disregard of the truth.

(f) The article of Mar. 15, 1970 was the culmination of the N.Y. Times Co.'s malicious program, evidenced by previous publications, calculated to discredit and defame Plaintiff, Otto F. Otepka.

(g) Defendants, in the Mar. 15, 1970, publication as above set forth, misrepresented and deluded the reading public into believing that "The Congressional Quarterly" was an authoritative government journal, when in fact it was not.

14. The Plaintiff has been injured in his reputation and good standing in his community where he lives, to his damage, in the amount of One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000).

15. That because of said willful and malicious publication by the Defendants, Plaintiff is entitled to recover exemplary and punitive damages in the sum of Three Million Dollars (\$3,000,000.00).

Wherefore, Plaintiff respectfully prays that judgment be entered against the Defendants for One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000.00) compensatory damages, and Three Million Dollars (\$3,000,000.00) punitive damages, plus interest and cost.

#### ANOTHER VIEW OF VA CARE

#### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, all of us receive letters on care of our veterans. Usually, we hear the gripes, the complaints.

Veterans' Administration medical care, of course, is not all that bad. It has lapses because it involves human beings. But considering the shortage of personnel today, care generally is good.

I am very much concerned with the problems in our VA hospitals, including those of the general VA hospital in Buffalo. I have given special attention to hospital care as a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs since I came to Congress in 1959.

With this background, I was pleased the other day to receive the following letter from a recent patient at the VA hospital in Buffalo, N.Y.:

Having recently been a patient in the V.A. Hospital, Buffalo, N.Y., I can truthfully say it was almost a pleasure except for the first 8 weeks when I was on the critical list.

Other than that, I thought the place was well run and the veterans were used right except for the troublemakers, so I take this opportunity to write you and express my appreciation, Mr. Dulski.

I am sure most of the time when you receive a letter re the V.A. it is nothing but a big gripe. I have a pretty good idea about which I write, as I spent almost 4 months as a patient.

The doctors, nurses, aides, and charwomen and men were all well trained and did their utmost to aid the veterans. I am sure you are responsible for some of this appreciation I am trying to express. I also had the opportunity to do a little work for the older boys such as shaving, etc.

I was amazed at the number of the older people we have in the V.A.—some of them with no place to go. Then I started to do some thinking.

Wouldn't it be a grand place at Batavia for

us older people when the time comes and leave the V.A. Buffalo general hospital for the sick who need that kind of treatment. Leave Batavia for the old and senile with plenty of volunteers. Sounds easy.

All we have to do is feed them, help them around, and massage their backs. That's what I was doing and I didn't mind it at all. I am 59 yrs. young. The volunteers I ran across and talked with all seemed quite happy trying to make themselves useful.

You might keep this thought in mind, as some day soon it will be a sleeping giant who will soon be awakened. "Aid for the elderly" has got to come via the Government—rooms and homes for the single and the married ones. Let us not be too late.

#### STRONG ENDORSEMENT OF NATIONAL SERVICE ACT

#### HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, entitled "A Practicable Alternative to the Draft," appeared in the Sunday Star on February 14, 1971. Since hearings on the draft got underway in the House Armed Services Committee today, I feel that it would be a most timely editorial to insert in the RECORD at this point:

#### A PRACTICABLE ALTERNATIVE TO THE DRAFT

No one loves the draft.

It is imposed by a reluctant government and accepted by a resentful majority of the population as an evil necessity. To a growing number of American youths, involuntary service in the armed forces does not appear as a reasonable obligation for the privilege of American citizenship. Today approximately half of those called up fail to pass the physical exam—roughly triple the failure rate of World War II draftees—a figure that is more reflective of a determination not to serve than of a deterioration in the nation's health. A growing number of draft-age youths is willing to risk losing the privileges of citizenship altogether, to choose prison over induction or to leave the country when the draft call arrives.

The immediate impetus in this flight from service—the war in Indochina—is being brought to an end. But even assuming that the American ground combat role will be ended by 1972, it cannot be assumed that the problem of draft resistance will end with it. The prolonged application of selective service to provide the manpower for a growingly unpopular war has given all Americans the chance to see the draft for what it is: An inherently inequitable and unjust system that penalizes the poor and the uneducated. The sour taste will persist long after the last American combat soldier has left Vietnam, and no amount of inspirational haranguing will sweeten it.

The military draft has historically been sold to the public on the ground that there is no realistic alternative. More recently, a partial alternative has been actively promoted by President Nixon in his drive for an all-volunteer army. It is entirely possible that, as the fighting in Vietnam nears the zero point, the inducements of higher pay, relaxed discipline and beefed-up fringe benefits will produce enough volunteers to meet the country's military manpower requirements. But no one seriously believes that if a future crisis increases those requirements the volunteers will take up the slack. In fact, the only realistic assumption must be

that in the event of a new hot confrontation similar to Korea or Vietnam, the rate of voluntary enlistment would drop off precipitously. As a result, the selective service machinery as presently constituted would have to be retained on a standby basis, ready for instant reactivation when needed.

Within the framework of the military draft, Mr. Nixon's goal of a zero call is a worthy one. There is, however, a true alternative to the draft, an alternative that is in use today in other democratic countries. There is universal service.

The concept of universal service, the system whereby all citizens—men and women—are called on to donate a set period of their youth to the society, answers the problem of the unfairness of the military draft. The fact of its universality removes the inevitable inequities of selective service.

But even if one accepts the principle that a citizen owes a debt of labor in return for his citizenship—a thesis that is a logical but radical departure from the traditional American concepts of freedom—formidable practical obstacles remain. In the United States, universal service would mean the registration, the processing and the assignment of up to 30 million people, a bureaucratic undertaking of staggering proportions. The expense of such an operation might well eclipse the present military budget. There is the lively possibility that, if the youths were given a free choice between military and civilian service, the military ranks would be dangerously understaffed while the civilian agencies would be desperate to find work for millions of hands.

Even if all these possible difficulties could be overcome, one major stumbling block would remain: The U.S. Constitution. It is generally conceded that the present selective service law narrowly skirts the line of the 13th Amendment's ban on involuntary servitude. Universal service, in the opinion of many constitutional authorities, would cross that imprecise border into unconstitutionality.

True universal service, then, may be impossible in the framework of American constitutional democracy. But might it not be possible to adapt the universal service concept to the special circumstances of a nation as vast, as powerful and as secure as the United States? Might not a form of selective service be evolved that would be constitutional, that would meet present and foreseeable military manpower requirements, that would retain the necessary features of the draft and yet would be clearly superior to the present Selective Service Act?

The answer is that it is possible. It has, in fact, already been proposed.

The proposal was called the National Service Act of 1970. This year, it will be called the National Service Act of 1971. And this year, Congress should give the bill the attention it deserves.

The bill is described by its author, Representative Jonathan Bingham of New York, as "a distinctly limited national service system." It would be limited, at least at the outset, to men, a restriction that might improve its chances of passing the constitutional test and that would bring the bureaucracy and the expenses within the outer limits of possibility.

Essentially, the bill would give a young man three choices. He could volunteer for the military. He could volunteer for civilian service, selecting between such programs as VISTA and the Peace Corps (or activities such as day care of children and the elderly, education and hospital services), or he could join a specially created Civilian Service Corps which would focus on inner-city improvements and conservation. The third alternative would be to volunteer for neither military nor civilian service, and to take his chances with a draft lottery that would remain in effect to fill out the military requirements not met voluntarily.

As an added inducement for military volunteers, the bill would peg the pay for civilian service at the subsistence level, and would make the term of service longer than the military hitch. In addition, a declaration of war by Congress would mean that those who had chosen civilian service would be liable for the military draft, while those who completed a term in the armed forces in most circumstances would not.

Under the act, the conscientious objector status would be abandoned. This would solve the problem created by the Supreme Court decision of last July 15, in which the court ruled that no religious belief is required for a claim of conscientious objector status, that the applicant's objections need only be "sincere" and "deeply held." That ruling, flawless in its logic, imposed impossible demands of subjective judgment on local draft boards, and materially improved the chances of the wealthy, the well-educated and the articulate to avoid the draft.

There are indications of impressive public support of the Bingham bill. Congressmen who co-sponsored the bill last year reported heavy mail running 10-to-1 in its favor. Last spring, a special national opinion poll showed 71 percent in favor of the idea; in the 21-to-29 age bracket—the group most directly involved—the response was 80 percent favorable. Another sampling showed only 52 percent of the population in favor of an all-volunteer army.

The measure's chances of survival in Congress must, on the basis of past performance, be assessed as doubtful. Last time out, the bill died quietly in the House Armed Services Committee.

But this year, surrender to the advocates of the selective service status quo must not come easily. The Selective Service Act expires next June 30, and the debate over renewal will provide an opening for major reform. Anyone in either house of Congress who tosses the National Service Act aside without a careful reading will be doing himself and his country a serious disservice.

## LINCOLN WAS WHAT HE READ

### HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, every year I get requests to speak on Abraham Lincoln and each year I try to make a contribution by exploring aspects of Lincoln that I think are worthwhile as we wrestle with the important problems of our time.

This year my talk dealt with "Lincoln Was What He Read" and relates to his role as a public figure and especially to the important and difficult decisions he had to make for his country in a very critical time.

So that others may benefit from this study, I am offering this herewith for the RECORD:

#### LINCOLN WAS WHAT HE READ

(By Fred Schwengel)

History, said an American sage (Emerson), is the shadow cast by great men. In the same manner, the lives of great men tend to reflect the great books which they have read—not in some merely literary or academic sense, but in the more vital sense in which great literature, nourishing the soul, enlarging the mind, and firing the imagination, is translated into the very stuff of life itself. Such books, filled with all the richness and depth of humanity, grasped and

transformed by the power of the imagination, constitute a genuine school of life for those who, in the words of an ancient prayer, "read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest."\*

Of no one was this more true than Abe Lincoln. Born in a log cabin, he had little opportunity for a formal education. In less than twelve months of schooling, he learned to read. He learned to love to read—nothing was to influence him or his nation more than what he read. Besides that, he benefitted from a loving home where learning was honored and transmitted to the young. From his real Mother, Nancy, the child Lincoln first heard the majestic cadences of the King James Bible. At age 10, from his sister and, then, from his step-mother, he received encouragement to read, to learn, and further his remarkable program of self-education. The books he read apart from the King James version of the Bible, an ever-present companion, were among those works which the considered judgment of centuries has canonized: *Pilgrim's Progress* (whose echoes were to be heard in the Second Inaugural), *Robinson Crusoe* with its moving portrayal of heroism in adversity, and Aesop's *Fables*—an influence upon Lincoln second only to Scripture itself. "The classic literature," wrote Bulwer-Lytton, "is always modern." It was Lincoln's good fortune to begin his intellectual life with works which, however, old, are always new—the greatest and best of the past.

Though there were few book owners in the Southern Indiana of Lincoln's time, he is said to have found, borrowed, and read most of the volumes to be found within a wide radius of his home. Such works as Parson Weems' *Life of Washington*, though fairly unsophisticated by contemporary standards, inspired in him a reverence for the state papers and the actions of the colonial leaders, and the ideals of liberty and justice which they established and extended. That fired his imagination as he prepared to lead and direct. In his own words, "I recollect thinking then, boy even though I was, that there must have been something more than common that these men struggled for." Having no doubt read John Adams' appraisal on the Constitution, "The greatest single effort of national deliberation and perhaps the greatest exertion of human understanding the world has ever seen," his convictions were deepened. Having met and know John Quincy Adams and the depth of his convictions, gave him a feeling and belief of basic truths in government that were destined to govern his whole life.

Other histories, exercises in rhetoric and elocution, the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, the great speeches of the giants of his time, such as Webster and Clay—all helped form his mind during these early days. Gradually he built up a library of his own until, in later years, he had acquired over 300 volumes, a not insignificant number for that time and place. As he matured, his reading reflected a greater range of interest and view: during his first years at New Salem, for example, he read Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, Thomas Paine's *Age of Reason*, and numerous other works. It was at Salem that he developed his love for and mastery of Shakespeare, Burns, and Byron, committing vast stretches to memory. Like Washington, he delighted to make reverent use of Shakespeare for common needs. We have the testimony of his many friends that he hungered for both the written and the spoken word, perceived the characteristics peculiar to each, and came to excel in both.

In Springfield, he turned to the study of Milton, while continuing to read his Shakespeare, Burns, and Byron. His partnership and deep friendship with William Herndon, an omnivorous buyer and reader of books, opened new vistas. It was here Lincoln came upon the writings of Emerson, Theodore

\*The Book of Common Prayer (1662)



Parker, William Ellery Channing, and the works of law (including Blackstone), etymology, and scientific interest. Novels and biographies were not usually among his preferred selections as compared to his avid taste for poetry, drama, constitutional law, and humor, the last in a tradition of earthy wit at least Shakesperian, if not Chaucerian, in spirit! Yet it was as wartime President that he appears first to have read one of the greatest of all novels, Cervantes' *Don Quixote*, a work whose haunting melancholy has found fresh life in every age, including our own, with the renewed appeal of the knight who would "dream the impossible dream." Truly, in the words of one authority, (Rufus Lincoln in *What Lincoln Read*), Lincoln, though "not a man of the schools", enjoyed an education "which began with the Bible, Aesop, and Bunyan, was enriched by Shakespeare, Bacon, and Milton, and had ripe culmination in Plutarch, Homer, and Cervantes". His Weems' *Life of Washington* and the state papers gave him convictions on the soundness of the American system. In such an education "there was depth and breadth and right training for great affairs." The words of Sydney Smith apply so well to Lincoln: "Let us see the result of good food in a strong body, and the result of great reading in a full and powerful mind."

The extent to which Lincoln's reading—and his reflection and meditation thereon—inspired both his writing and his actions provides a striking evidence of the role which great books can play in a mind both "full and powerful." Thus, in counseling a deep respect for law he avoided mere adjuration of "law and order"; rather, he penetrated to the heart of the issue. "—It will be much safer for all, both in official and private station," he wrote, "to abide by all those acts (of Congress) which stand to be repealed than to violate any of them, trusting to find immunity in having them held unconstitutional." Again, he declared, "Let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his fathers and to tear the charter of his own and his children's liberty." In like manner, Lincoln's basic political philosophy was shaped by his reading in terms of a profound conviction that moral right must be the base for public policy. "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it." The virtue of moderation in the attainment of political goals would be best to serve the common good. His eventual adherence to the new Republican Party represented his response to what he perceived as the moral challenge of slavery and its extension, a challenge which neither the Whig nor Democrat Parties had met adequately. Thus, on the very eve of his great "house divided" speech in 1858, he declared to the hesitant and negative leaders of his party that the time had come for bringing the plain facts before the people and that if he should be defeated for telling the truth, he was willing to pay the price. In speaking forth what he believed to be right, irrespective of political consequences, he dealt a blow to expediency characteristic of his whole career.

He agreed fully with Washington that "religion and morality are indispensable to political prosperity", (a paraphrase), and that nothing can be politically right which is morally wrong. Behind this belief lay Lincoln's own deeply personal religious faith. Never a churchman in any formal sense, never actually affiliating himself with any particular denomination, he respected church-membership in others and himself turned for counsel and guidance to many churches and preachers. His religion, in the words of William Wolf (The Religion of Abraham Lincoln) "was not static, but dynamic in its development." As a kind of "Christian without a Creed", Lincoln "won his way to ever deeper levels of faith in response to family suffering and national

tragedy." His prophetic, Biblical interpretation of American history is aptly symbolized in such phrases as "this Nation under God" and "the almost chosen people", phrases reflecting his sense of humility before the mysterious providence of God. He wanted and struggled to be on God's side, rather than claiming that God was on his side.

He had learned moderation from many sources, including Scripture. Though the word itself is used only once (by St. Paul) in the Epistle to the Philippians—"Let your moderation be known unto all men", the theme of temperance and restraint is sounded again and again throughout the Pauline letters joining with the ancient admonition of Aristotle against all excess. "In grave emergencies", wrote Lincoln, "moderation is generally safer than radicalism"; and again, "We will grow strong by calmness and moderation." This spirit of moderation did not satisfy the abolitionists or the cessationists and while it was hard to explain, was to serve his final goals of preserving the Union and freeing the slaves so well and effectively. It may have been this spirit that led him, in a letter to a friend, to describe the kind of church he would join: "When any church will inscribe over its altar, as its sole qualification for membership, the Savior's condensed statement of the substance of both law and Gospel, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and thy neighbor as thyself', that church will I join with all my heart and all my soul." Fanaticism and extremism—whether political or religious—was always abhorrent to Lincoln.

Together with his address at Gettysburg, the First and Second Inaugurals are representative of the heights to which Lincoln could attain. In the first, he spoke not only for his own troubled time, but for all time in his appeal to contending forces to hold fast "the bonds of affection" strained by the passions of the moment. His faith in the people and in "the better angles of our nature" is as pertinent today as in 1861.

In the second, 72 words express the greatest need of his and our day: the reconciling work of charity. The simple dignity of this address (in which 59 of the words are monosyllables) clearly reflects the ripe background of reading which has shaped Lincoln's mind, giving strength and clarity, as well as beauty and grace, to his style. "With malice toward none: with charity for all", may we in our day "do all which may achieve and cherish a just, and a lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations."

#### OUTSTANDING YOUNG AMERICAN

### HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, Tammy Marcinuk of 402 Kimball Street, Fitchburg, Mass., has returned home from the International World Games for the Deaf in Adelboden, Switzerland, with three Olympic gold medals and a silver one.

The 22-year-old student at Mount Wachusett Community College in Gardner, Mass., won first places in the giant slalom, the downhill, and the combined qualifying. She took a second place in another event as well.

Tammy is a perfect example of American youth bound with determination. Born with nerve deafness, Tammy has never let this interfere with her competition. Only 1 year ago, she suffered an-

other setback by sustaining a broken leg while skiing in Aspen, Colo. Just as soon as the cast was removed, however, Tammy was back on the slopes attending a ski racing school in California.

Five years ago, Tammy won two gold medals in another international competition, so winning is a way of life for this fine athlete. I congratulate Tammy on her outstanding achievements, and wish her many more years of success.

#### REVENUE-SHARING—A PHILOSOPHY AS WELL AS A FISCAL POLICY

### HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, the debate we will witness over the coming months concerning the advisability—or lack thereof—of President Nixon's revenue-sharing proposal is bound to be lengthy and, at times, complex and confusing as well. Debates on fiscal policy are often made incomprehensible by sophisticated statistical data—and perhaps, as a result, it is easy to forget the major, underlying issues behind such policy questions. In the case of revenue sharing, only part of the debate should center around the monetary theories and fiscal data of the economists. What we must also thoroughly discuss is the central philosophical thesis of the President's bold plan—a thesis I interpret as meaning that we should enact a "peaceful revolution" by redirecting the decisionmaking emphasis from Washington and to States and local governments. "Power," in Mr. Nixon's words, must be "turned back to the people."

Last night, I had the privilege of addressing the Binghamton, N.Y., chapter of the National Secretaries Association, at which time I tried to explain why I was strongly in support of the President on this critical issue of the new decade. With the thought that it might be of interest, the full text of my remarks follow:

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE HOWARD W. ROBISON AT "EMPLOYER'S NIGHT" DINNER MEETING OF BINGHAMTON CHAPTER, NATIONAL SECRETARIES ASSOC., SHERATON INN, BINGHAMTON, FEBRUARY 22, 1971.

I think it was Euripides (himself possessed of one of those names that are fun to say: "Eu-rip-i-des") who first suggested to us that, "Man's best possession is a sympathetic wife."

That's a sentiment with which I would not wish to quarrel—having been blest, myself, with a wife who, by and large, has been a most-sympathetic one; but, at the risk of brooking her temporary misunderstanding, let me be so bold as to suggest an amendment to old "Rip's" literary contribution, thusly, that, "Man's second best possession is a sympathetic secretary."

Will you accept that?

I'm fairly certain that all the men here—as well as those not here—who have ever risen to that prestigious point of being able to have a secretary (God bless them!) would readily do so.

For, I'm using "sympathetic" in the sense (as I'm sure Euripides did) of meaning

mutual understanding—not pity, though I suspect there are those secretaries who pity their bosses, for one reason or another.

But if that boss—forgive the word; what do you call *yours*?—has working *with*, and not just *for*, him someone like you out there who is "sympathetic" to him along these dictionary-taken meanings of "sympathy": "... 1. Fitting or agreeable correspondence in qualities, properties, etc.; harmony. 2. Reciprocal liking and understanding arising from a community of interests, aims, etc. and compatibility of temperaments. 3. The act or capacity of entering into and sharing the feelings, interests, etc., of another . . .", then, indeed, he is a lucky fellow!

His success is not assured, by virtue of your presence; but, at least, his chances for success are immeasurably enhanced thereby—and, if *you're* that kind of a secretary, I hope whoever it is you work for appreciates your work.

Now, I'm going to duck the National Secretaries Association theme for this year—"The Law—Scales of Justice"—with your forbearance, in favor of making an attempt, in the balance of my remarks, at soliciting your "sympathetic" consideration, in the same sense of that word as we have been using it, of what I believe is the major problem—among all the many problems—facing our Nation, today.

That problem—towering high above all others—is how to end the gathering *crisis of confidence* we (most of us, anyway) have come to share in our institutions, including the institutions of government, in our very way of functioning as a society and, even, in ourselves:

Insofar as the institutions of government are concerned, unless we can find the proper way to renew and restore our confidence therein, the whole idea of participatory democracy—as we have known and enjoyed it here in America—may well be in danger.

Certain it is that we have been living through a long period of continuing turmoil—or through "... a long, dark night of the American spirit," as the President put it in this year's State of the Union Message. And, yet, the current national dis-temper reflects more than just the sum total of that turmoil—and considerably more than just the gross weight of the burden of discouragement arising out of the challenges that have gone unmet during this period.

Instead, it reflects the attitude of thousands upon thousands of Americans—and not merely young Americans or those who are members of some minority group—who somehow feel that they no longer know their country; who somehow feel that it has changed while they have remained the same, and who somehow sense of vacuum of leadership—political, cultural and moral—around them.

In turn, the mail I receive from people such as you reflects—and now on a daily basis—the frustration, the skepticism, the cynicism and, yes, the deep suspicion that has grown in people such as you, as a result of all this, towards your government, and towards the people who try to serve you therein.

Indeed, it is true—as John Gardner, former head of the Federal Department of Health, Education & Welfare, states—that: "The American people, who once seemed endlessly tolerant of official bumbling, are losing their patience, not just with Congress but with the quality of our public life generally. They are fed to the teeth with power-hungry politicians. They are weary of self-serving administrators. They are sick of being bilked and manipulated. They are tired of the sense of powerlessness that afflicts them. They want to have their say. They resent the unresponsiveness of their governmental institutions."

And, capitalizing on the general public unhappiness growing out of all this—as well

as hoping to turn the same to some good end—Mr. Gardner, now as head of a citizens' lobby known as "Common Cause," has, in just five months, raised a stunning \$1.6 million from some 90,000 contributors—which is as many contributors as both national political parties generally enjoy.

Gardner is not alone. Many other observers believe and suggest to you that "the people" have grown powerless before the great interlocking machinery of our society—that they have lost whatever capacity they once may have had to influence the course of events—that, as I suggested in my own last, monthly newsletter, they have been "... relegated to the task of filing the appropriate papers at the appropriate time and, on election day, to pressing little levers in a booth."

But we have touched, so far, upon only the more-general sources of our national dis-temper, and can add to the burden thereof such more-specific items to be fed up with as this listing recently compiled by Jack Germond, head of Gannett News Service's Washington Bureau: "... dirty water, crowded highways, higher taxes, muggers and pursesnatchers, smelly air, collapsing transit systems, rising prices, teachers' strikes, auto insurance premiums, Vietnam, bombings, dirty streets, hospital bills, rats, the Mafia, marijuana, the postal service, tainted fish, oil spills, power-shortages, dirty movies and stock swindles—in short, everything from green beer to cancer."

Did Germond miss *your* pet peeve?

If he did, write me a letter about it—because people are doing that every day, the general thrust of their demand being that I "do something" about whatever it is that is bothering them:

I'd like to, believe me, for I'm probably as frustrated—if not more so—than many of the people who so write me.

But the point we all really need to consider—and just as objectively and "sympathetically" as possible, for we are all *truly* in the same boat—is *where*, exactly, is all this emotion and commotion going to lead us?

Is it leading us to a revolution of some sort?

And, if it is—as may well be the case—is that going to be a "peaceful" revolution, or one of another and far more unfortunate kind?

Well, perhaps in a sort of visceral reaction to the obvious frustration that grips the electorate, President Nixon—as you know—has placed before a skeptical Congress his version of a peaceful revolution; one in which (his words) "... power was turned back to the people . . ." (so that) government at all levels was refreshed and renewed, and made truly responsive."

At the heart of the Nixon idea lies the concept of a "new Federalism" based—as I'm sure you have heard—on the thought that it is time to reverse the flow of power and resources from the States and communities to Washington and, through a process called "revenue-sharing" to start the flow of power and resources *back* thereto:

The Nixon plan for trying to take some of the centrifugal force out of contemporary Federalism—under which our central government in Washington has grown so huge while remaining as remote as ever—is simple and direct enough.

First, in recognition of the fiscal crisis faced by most State and local governments—and I am sure you are well aware of the problem here in New York!—he proposes an annual Federal contribution of \$5 billion a year, to begin with, to be divided among the 50 States with "no strings" attached on the basis of their population, with a small bonus going to those States already having "revenue-sharing" plans of their own. New York has such a plan, as you know—that we call "State-aid"—but, to make sure that, in those States which do not, a fair share of this fund will go on to the aid of *local* govern-

ment (cities, towns and counties), the President's plan provides that 48 percent of each State's share will automatically "pass through" its Governor's hands and on into the hands of those heading the lesser municipal entities therein.

For purposes of local interest, you should know that New York's share of this beginning \$5 billion would be \$543 million—while out of that amount Broome County would receive \$858,000, and the City of Binghamton \$906,000, just by way of example; all of this being "no strings" money, remember, which the Board of Supervisors or City Council could apply to whatever general government purpose they saw fit.

Now, should this come about—which is by no means certain, since the Nixon plan now seems to be in deep trouble in Congress—it would probably *not* mean any reduction for you in your share of the State or local tax burden; no one should mislead you in that regard. But it *ought* to mean, quite clearly, a slowing of the rate by which that already-heavy burden has been steadily getting heavier.

I sense a question developing in your minds—reminding me of the story of the women's club meeting where the Treasurer gave her report, saying, "I am happy to announce that we have a deficit of only \$610.00." Whereupon, a voice from the rear said, "I move we give it to the Salvation Army!"

For, surely, with Uncle Sam awash in his own sea of red ink, one has to face up to the question of whether or not he should go deeper into the red, now, to bail out the State and local taxpayers—especially since, as many of you have already written to ask me, *all* tax dollars come eventually out of the same pocket, don't they?

The answer is, of course they do. But, even if you can buy only a portion of the rationale behind the "full-employment budget"—as now espoused by Mr. Nixon, and to explain which would take me the rest of the night—I think you will have to agree that, looked at from a nationwide fiscal standpoint, it is more sensible now to use the pre-emptive Federal income-tax structure for purposes of this rescue operation than it is to ask or expect State and local governments, with their slow-growth and generally regressive tax bases, to somehow come up with the money needed to avert their own bankruptcy.

It goes without saying that New York, for instance, is already a "high-tax" State. The current public furor over our Governor's new budget is ample evidence of your awareness of that fact. Politically difficult though it will be, we can—one supposes—go on widening the gap that already exists between the tax-effort we make and that made by the citizens of the so-called "low-tax" States. But we could begin to even up the situation—and I say we should, now—by *plugging ourselves in* to the fast-growth Federal income-tax system whose revenues increased 1.5 percent every time there is a 1 percent increase in the Gross National Product!

Of course, there are alternatives to what Mr. Nixon has suggested. Some argue, in pushing such alternatives, that the people who *spend* the taxpayers' money ought to bear the onus of *raising* it—on the theory, evidently, that if they don't they will be careless in spending it.

Perhaps—and more than a few of you have already warned me against sending any "no-string" Federal money up to Albany for the "big-spender" there (as you call him) to use as he sees fit! If you feel that way, I can't do much about it. But do you *really* believe you would have less control over how Federal moneys returned to Albany—or to your City Hall—are to be spent than you now have over how *Congress* might spend the same? I can't believe you do, for that would mean you no longer believe that "government closest to the people" has any meaning as



a tool for making participatory democracy work.

The Governor—and your mayor—are going to be fully accountable for how shared revenues are spent. But, if you still want to go the other route, even ignoring the fact that Federal revenues have already been reduced by nearly \$7 billion as a result of income-tax cuts directed in the so-called "Tax Reform Act of 1969" (something you may not even have noticed!), I suppose I could be asked to work for a further \$5 billion Federal tax cut.

But if a high income-tax State like New York then moved to try to capture those "freed" Federal dollars, probabilities are it would do so mainly through increases in those regressive sales, user and property taxes which already nearly wipe out the progressive nature of the Federal income-tax, thus letting the overall burden of taxation fall about as heavily on the poor—or lower middle-income—taxpayer as on the affluent; and that would be wrong.

Still other voices are heard: Some demanding that spending at all levels—Federal, State and local—be cut back sharply, and budgets balanced. Then we would need neither State nor local tax increase, or revenue-sharing either, for that matter!

Sure—and why didn't I think of that?

But, as one who has wrestled with this problem for 13 years now, I know full well that, outside of a common desire to clean up the "welfare-mess" (for which I believe the Nixon "welfare-workfare" plan is the only solution), there is not even a consensus in this room as to where we should even begin to cut back on governmental spending-programs!

But, there is still more to the President's "revolutionary" plan—and let me get to that for I see it as the more-important part, if it is the overall, and not just the fiscal, health of our Nation that concerns us.

For, besides the \$5 billion in "general" revenue-sharing we have been talking about, Mr. Nixon is asking Congress to establish an annual \$11 billion (again, to begin with) "special" revenue-sharing kitty, into which he asks us to put \$1 billion in "new" money along with \$10 billion-worth of Federal-aid dollars scheduled to go out during the coming fiscal year to our States and cities, etc., anyway, under about 105 programs already existing to serve purposes ranging from anti-poverty efforts to urban-renewal projects. Specifics as to exactly which narrowly-focused, categorical grant-in-aid programs (of which we have over a thousand!), are to go into this kitty, and how the funds therefrom are to be divided are still lacking, but the idea is that State and local governmental heads could take their shares therefrom to spend virtually as they see fit, deciding their own priorities, and shaping their own programs to meet their own needs, without a host of Federal bureaucrats looking over their shoulders!

I see this as the most-exciting feature in the President's whole proposal. So trying to give some of the spending power Congress has acquired over a generation back to the people, amounts to an act of faith in them! The sophisticates, and those who have grown used to such power and are loath to give it up, now express in opposition to this idea their skepticism concerning the people's ability to deal with their own affairs. They point to the imperfections admittedly existing in State and local governmental set-ups—and, without directly saying so, question the competence and the vision of those who head them. Was it not, they say, a default in responsibility at State and local levels—a vacuum of leadership there—that first led the Federal government to move into so many of these areas? Did not the people, they ask, have to turn to the Federal government out of necessity, and not out of choice?

These are not easy questions to answer. The arguments thus raised against now reversing our course are, for the most part, founded in historical fact.

But, even so, one must ask—in return—whether the Federal government has succeeded, or failed, to find solutions to the problems that plague us, and whether it has been effectively able to apply those solutions to the areas of need.

The record is, of necessity, a mixed one. In some cases, the answer is "Yes"; in others, the answer is "No," or "Not yet."

But, please note, that Mr. Nixon is by no means trying to turn the clock all the way backwards; nor is he proposing a wholesale dismantling of the entire Federal-aid structure.

We now spend, through that top-heavy, overlapping, jerry-built structure that has taken past Congresses a generation to erect, about \$30 billion a year in aid of one need or another of State and local governments. As I view what the President is attempting, it is to take out of that complex maze—through which confused Governors, mayors and school administrators now wander, hats in hand—only those program functions which are most susceptible, given the needed flexibility, to being shaped to meet a particular local problem. The rest—and the \$20 billion or so to be spent thereon—serving, as they do, some purpose more clearly national in scope, will remain about as they are.

That makes sense, doesn't it? The Gallup Poll finds it does, evidently, to people such as you—to 77 percent of you, anyway, according to a recent finding. But if you are an educator—or a member of an association of educators—for instance, and have worked years to get funds from somewhere earmarked for remedial-reading courses or special classes for the retarded students in our schools (just to cite a couple of examples), you would worry now, wouldn't you, over the chance that if such moneys go into a common pot your school board would choose to spend them, instead, on teachers' salaries or maybe, even, school construction?

Of course, you would—but what is so wrong, I ask, in thus shifting the battle-priorities away from Congress, where it now centers on things such as this, and back to the local school-board level whose meetings—if they were attended as they ought to be and not allowed any longer to fall into disrepair as an instrument of citizen-power—could display the same genius for making democracy work as did the old New England "town meeting!"

Here in this example—as in a nutshell—do I believe we have the basic elements of the choice facing us.

We can go on as we have been—adopting the attitude of the powerful AFL-CIO, as just enunciated, that "the critical needs . . . (of our people) . . . will be by-passed" unless these specific aid programs are continued by Congress and fully-funded; or we can go, by whatever path, in the general direction Mr. Nixon points out, to see whether or not something constructive can be done to help State and local governments meet their proper responsibilities, with the help, and interest, and participation of their citizens.

I see these as our only two choices, for I simply do not believe that a Federal "take-over" of the welfare system and all its costs—now being highly touted by some as a third choice—is either politically feasible or desirable. Oh, from the strictly dollar standpoint it might be desirable for New York for our State, as you might guess, would get a lion's share of that type of "revenue-sharing"—if it can be called that; which is the main reason I don't think Congress will ever go for it, and that those who now promote the idea are engaged in political shadow-boxing.

But, even if I am wrong, and Congress did adopt this idea, the center of power—you

see—would become even more-rigidly fixed than now in Washington, the instruments of State and local governments would remain in a state of disrepair, and the average citizen would be left adrift, with an even deeper sense of isolation, in his own remote sea of frustrations.

So, I suggest that what all this boils down to is: Just how much of a chance do we want to take on ourselves, as citizens worthy of the name; and how much of a chance do we want to take on our capacity to restore that sense-of-community, now almost totally lost, which was once the undergirding strength of what we have called the American way-of-life.

Each of you, in your own way, must answer the first part of that two-part question. But we will have to put our heads further together on the second part, for all the centralization measures we have adopted this past half century—from municipal to school-district consolidation—have tended to destroy that essential community spirit.

If, therefore, we decide to go the revenue-sharing route—as I hope we do—let us remember it is no answer to anything, in and of itself. But that it opens up the possibility for us to provide some answers—both from within ourselves and, by working together, to find ways and means, even in our larger cities, for what I would call "political decentralization" through the organization of community and neighborhood political units capable of exercising genuine, well-defined governmental powers vis-a-vis local matters.

Here is no political gimmickery—not just another political scheme designed to distract the Nation's attention from the ills that afflict it.

Here, instead, is a great issue—perhaps the greatest of our time—and one upon whose proper and wise resolution may well depend the kind of America—and the kind of Americans—we shall have in the years to come.

I encourage your "sympathetic" understanding of it, as such, and earnestly solicit your help in arriving at the proper and wise resolution thereof.

#### INHERITANCE TAX REFORM

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to reform the Federal inheritance tax system as it pertains to small farming, ranching, and business.

In simplest terms my bill would permit the executor of an estate to establish its value for inheritance tax purposes by resorting to one of two methods: either the earning power of the estate as evidenced by a taxable income measure; or, the established fair market value of the estate.

According to present Internal Revenue Code provisions, estate taxes are computed on the basis of the fair market value of a decedent's assets at the time of his death. In terms of assets such as real property, value is normally determined by comparing estate property with other area property or properties that have acquired an established value by virtue of a recent sale between a willing buyer and a willing seller.

While in theory, this method of asset valuation has the merit of simplicity, in practice it often creates financial and social havoc among those who are sub-

ject to it. This is true especially in the case of farms, ranches, and businesses. I say this for two chief reasons. First, land speculators often pay premium prices for property used for development purposes and/or for tax avoidance. While this clearly benefits the property seller, it completely dislocates the valuation of property for inheritance tax assessment purposes. Just because a few parcels of land in an area are sold to speculators for say \$350 an acre, a neighboring farmer would still only receive the going market price say of \$100 an acre should he attempt to sell his holdings to another farmer. Yet, when property is being valued for inheritance taxes, so-called government experts all too often value a decedent's property on the basis of the higher speculative land values, rather than by the lower real market value common to the local farming or business community. While this is not an official policy, this is what happens in the field all too regularly, as government appraisers often consider their job to be centered on revenue raising—thus the higher the established land value, the greater the tax consequences. In my judgment, this is not right. This practice gives rise to inequities that are unjustifiable in justice or in conscience.

The fair market valuation method also creates unjust situations because the fair market value of fixed assets such as property is often quite different than the earning power of the assets. As a consequence, an individual with little personal income who is left with a substantial inheritance in terms of its fair market value may discover that the earning power of these assets is substantially less. Accordingly, he would have to either sell his holdings or borrow whatever amounts he needed to pay Federal inheritance taxes.

To illustrate the problem I am talking about in graphic terms: Suppose a father died and left a ranch to his only son, a young man fresh out of the service and looking forward to making a career out of ranching. At the time of his death the father had no personal debts and his real and personal property was worth \$450,000. Under present law, \$60,000 basic tax exemption is applicable. This would reduce the size of the estate to \$390,000 for tax purposes. On an estate of this size, Federal inheritance taxes would amount to a staggering \$110,500 or 28 percent of the taxable estate.

This sizeable tax burden would be bearable if the son had independent sources of income sufficient to defray his tax expenses. But suppose he did not. Suppose his chief means of meeting the tax levy would be to either sell his father's estate, or mortgage it heavily to raise the needed cash. Well, if he sold the ranch and all that went with it, he would have the money to pay his inheritance taxes. But should the Federal Government, as a matter of public policy, structure its tax system in such a way that it promotes the dissolution of family farms and ranches? It should not, but it has.

But one might say, the son does not have to sell the ranch, he could borrow on it, thereby raising the money needed for inheritance tax purposes. Then he could operate the ranch and pay back the mortgage out of profits. Yes, this is a

possibility, but \$110,500 is a lot of money to borrow and the interest on a loan of this size is quite substantial. The magnitude of this financial undertaking is demonstrated by adding an additional fact to the example. Assume that in the last few years of his life, the father working on a fulltime basis earned an average of \$7,500 a year; a situation, by the way, I have often seen during my lifetime association with farming and ranching. Given these circumstances, if the son borrowed the necessary funds, the son would be literally indentured to his money lender, for at least as long as he wanted to stay and try to make a living on his father's ranch. In dollar terms, if the son borrowed the \$110,500 for a 30-year period at 7-percent interest, his annual payments would amount to \$8,900; his interest costs would total \$156,643 over the life of the loan. Given his annual expected income of \$7,500, repaying this loan would obviously be an impossibility. To discharge a loan of this size the young man would have to find a friendly banker willing to lend \$110,500 at 5½-percent interest, a patent impossibility in today's credit markets.

Mr. Speaker, the hypothetical situation I have just described is a fair statement of reality for thousands upon thousands of individuals who have inherited small ranches, farms, and businesses. For the Federal Government to force individuals to make the drastic choices I have detailed under peril of losing much of what their fathers and mothers have labored so hard to obtain is unconscionable. In cases such as this, instead of being a helpmate, the Federal Government becomes a cannibal.

I have searched my mind in the hopes of finding a rational explanation for this sorry state of affairs. The conclusion I have reached is that the sole use of the fair market value method is an outdated growth affixed to the body of Federal inheritance laws passed in 1916. Moreover, my studies in this area have revealed that the impetus for presently excessive inheritance taxes occurred during the depression years. During the same period when businessmen were selling apples on streetcorners and bankers were jumping to their deaths out of Wall Street windows, a few wealthy individuals and families flaunted their opulence before the more unfortunate. This caused such a hue and cry to be raised that Congress enacted stricter inheritance laws designed to disassemble and redistribute inherited wealth.

Unfortunately, the operations of the inheritance laws, while aimed at the estates of the wealthy, have created many problems affecting middle and lower income families more than the well-to-do. The rich have learned to use foundations, charitable trusts, and other tax loopholes to escape the full weight of the inheritance laws, leaving heavy tax burdens on those of more modest means, such as families with small farms, ranches, or businesses. Even more destructive is the effect excessive inheritance laws have on individual initiative. Why should a man spend his productive years toiling to build an estate in any business for his family and children when he knows the Federal Government,

as a matter of public policy, will make every attempt to dilute his inheritance and dissolve his interests?

I believe a solution to this problem is long overdue. And I hope that all those who are interested in promoting tax justice will agree. While a wholesale revision of Federal inheritance laws would be clearly desirable, I have confined my reform proposal to the tax regulations affecting families of small farmers, ranchers, and businessmen. Perhaps in addition to effecting significant changes in clearly inequitable Federal tax laws, the bill will spark congressional interest in a more comprehensive revision.

As I stated earlier, my measure would permit the executor of an estate to establish the estate's value for inheritance tax purposes on the basis of either the earning power of the estate as evidenced by a taxable income measure, or the fair market value of the estate's assets. By the earning power method of valuation, an executor of a small farm, ranch, or business could avoid the inequities I detailed in my not-so-hypothetical example. Specifically, taking the \$7,500 annual ranch income as evidenced by examining the father's income tax returns over a say 10-year period and coupling it with a capitalization factor of 4.5 percent representing the ranch's yearly increase in value, means the capitalized estate's earning power would equal \$165,000. Reducing this by the standard \$60,000 exemption, leaves a taxable estate of \$105,000 burdened by an inheritance tax of \$22,500.

A tax liability of this amount is not crippling. It does not force individuals to break up family holdings. Small farms, ranches, and businesses can be kept in the family, if so desired. A way of life can be preserved for thousands of individuals who under present laws fall prey to the ravages of excessive and unjustifiable inheritance tax laws. And individuals will be given new incentive to work, to be productive, and to save.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support my bill establishing alternate methods of estate valuation. It is a reasonable proposal calculated to bring desperately needed tax relief to families having inheritance interests in small farms, ranches, and businesses.

#### STANFORD UNIVERSITY ANTIWAR DISTURBANCES

#### HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 10, following a day of antiwar disturbances on the Stanford University campus, a group of young men was fired upon by an unknown assailant.

I believe everyone should know what is happening at one of the country's greatest universities, and am submitting for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD material which will describe events surrounding this recent tragedy.

There follows an eyewitness account provided me by a Stanford student, to-



gether with two newspaper articles concerning the situation:

#### EYEWITNESS ACCOUNT BY STANFORD STUDENT

At approximately 11:00 P.M. on Wednesday, February 10, the campus of Stanford University experienced the most violent act in the memory of many in that community. Thirteen young men in the vicinity of the Free Market (headquarters of the anti-radical Free Campus Movement) were fired upon by a sniper, shooting a .45 caliber automatic pistol. In the attack two were wounded, one seriously, and one of those present went into shock. Of the group of thirteen, four were not Stanford students, and several had no connection with the Free Campus Movement (FCM). Among these was young John Dawson, 16, a Palo Alto high school student and son of Stanford Associate Professor Phillip Dawson.

The shooting was preceded by a day of violent radical activity on campus. In the early afternoon radicals had staged a brief takeover of the University Computation Center, causing \$1000 in damage. At a rally beginning at 8:00 P.M. Stanford English Professor H. Bruce Franklin had urged that radicals begin "the people's war" on campus, beginning immediately. As soon as the rally had ended, about 10:00 P.M., the FCM group was attacked from behind as it left the scene. Five of its members were attacked in the ensuing riot, to which Santa Clara County Sheriff's deputies were unable to respond for nearly thirty minutes, due to the hesitancy of the University administration.

Reaction in the Stanford community was minimal, much to the surprise of those who had been fired upon. As a *Stanford Daily* commentator noted, writing two days after the incident:

"Even after the blood of two shootings and three beatings spilled onto the white 'Beat SC' slogans in White Plaza on Wednesday night, there was neither a strong show of protest over the actions nor a rallying cry for support of the movement. President Lyman only urged students to stay in their dorms one more night."

Finally, however, on the afternoon of Friday, February 12, California Superior Court Judge Homer B. Thompson granted the University's request for a Temporary Restraining Order against 17 radical leaders (including Professor Franklin) and Venceremos, a radical organization. At the same time, the defendants were ordered to appear at a hearing on February 18 to show cause why the University should not be granted an injunction which would bar them from the campus altogether.

Articles which appeared on Thursday, February 11 in the *Palo Alto Times* and the *San Francisco Examiner* serve to further illuminate the facts surrounding the attempted murder of the night before.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Feb. 11, 1971]

(By Don West)

STANFORD.—The 16 year old son of a Stanford professor was shot in the thigh last night in the course of continuing disturbances fomented by anti-war demonstrators.

John Dawson, whose father, J. Phillip Dawson, teaches history, was reported in satisfactory condition after treatment. Police said they had no clue to his assailant.

The shooting occurred toward the end of a hectic day in which demonstrators occupied a building, caused relatively minor damage to a \$5 million computer, and roamed the campus into the early morning hours smashing windows and turning in false fire alarms.

#### NINETEEN ARRESTED

A total of seven adults and 12 juveniles were arrested and, in addition to Dawson, four others suffered minor injuries, presumably from rocks and other projectiles.

Dawson, a Palo Alto High School student, was standing with a group of friends in a parking lot next to the Free Campus Movement Building—a target of radicals because the "conservative-libertarian" group has been photographing their activities.

Witnesses said they heard several explosions which they first thought were firecrackers. Then Dawson screamed that he had been hit, and fell.

One person—witnesses were not even sure of the sex—did the shooting, loosing a fusillade of shots in the direction of the building. Police counted six impacts on the wall. The assailant escaped on foot despite a chase.

#### "INEXCUSABLE"

Members of the four-man Council of Student Body Presidents called the attack "destructive . . . criminal and inexcusable."

"The actions of a malicious few, many of them nonstudents or high school students, have hurt not only Stanford but also the legitimate non-violent anti-war movement," they declared.

One of those struck by rocks during the evening, graduate student Claude Long of Menlo Park, was hurt severely enough to be taken by ambulance to a hospital. He, too, was reported in satisfactory condition.

The juveniles arrested, nine boys and three girls, were charged with disturbing the peace and violating a 10 p.m. curfew. All were booked into Juvenile Hall.

Acting Assistant Professor James Little, 28, four females and two males were booked on assorted charges of failure to disperse, unlawful assembly, resisting arrest, and disturbing the peace.

The troubles began yesterday after some 200 persons marched on the Computer Center as an offshoot of a noon rally at which about 2000 protested the invasion of Laos.

The rally was organized and led by a radical group headed by Associate English Professor H. Bruce Franklin and students Jeff Youdelman and Janet Weiss, all of whom had been charged with blocking the speech of Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge on Jan. 11.

#### CENTER CLOSED

Their plea to "shut down the university" was met by a counter proposal from a moderate group led by Bob Grant. Grant's proposal to organize a community movement aimed at influencing congressmen met with the broadest support from the crowd.

Only about 10 percent of the crowd joined the march to the computer center, which had been closed by the administration in anticipation of the move.

A side door entrance was found open and this was used by the group to take over. Campus police, who had been guarding the front door, left the scene.

The strikers were allowed to wander around the building, climb on the roof and set up a small Viet Cong flag over a three hour period before being ordered down.

#### TAC SQUADS

Undersheriff Tom Rosa informed the strikers they would be arrested if they remained and called in tactical squads, causing a quick evacuation of the computer center. Strikers caused an estimated \$1000 damage to machinery, officials said.

A small band of about 30 led by Franklin returned to taunt police. When rocks were thrown from the back of the crowd, officers from Palo Alto and the sheriff's office charged the group, apprehending five persons. Included in those arrested was Theresa Ramirez and Mike Holman, who were among those accused of disrupting Lodge's talk.

The moderate group had Congressman Paul N. McCloskey (R-Portola Valley) as a speaker before its session last night, which called for a communitywide effort in trying to influence congressmen in a renewed effort to pass the McGovern-Hatfield proposal

to end the Indochina war by the end of this year.

McCloskey, who said President Nixon's Vietnam policy had failed, urged students to rally fellow students in Southern California, the Midwest and the South to persuade "hawkish" congressmen to change their stand on the war.

[From the Palo Alto Times, Calif., Feb. 11, 1971]

An antiwar rally triggered a wild night of violence on the Stanford University campus Wednesday. Two youths were shot, at least 10 injured and 18 persons were arrested.

Violent outbreaks included a three-hour takeover of the university's \$5-million computation center, bomb threats, the beating of three students, and repeated clashes between police and an estimated 200 demonstrators.

John Dawson, 16, a Gunn High School student who is the son of J. Phillip Dawson, associate professor of history at Stanford, was shot in the right thigh while he stood in a parking lot about 11 p.m. talking to friends who are members of the conservative Free Campus Movement (FCM).

Dawson was reported making a satisfactory recovery today at Stanford University Hospital.

A Stanford student, Doug Lempereur, also reported he was shot, but he received only a graze in one thigh and was treated and released at Stanford Hospital. He said the shooting was at about 8 o'clock.

Lempereur said he was also standing with an FCM group when he was shot.

Police did not release any information on suspects in the shootings.

At least three FCM members were beaten by demonstrators when they attempted to take pictures of possibly illegal actions.

An estimated 100 law enforcement officers from Stanford, San Jose, Palo Alto and Santa Clara County were on hand during the afternoon and night.

The disruptions started with a noon rally at White Plaza and didn't end until about 1 a.m. today.

Most of the early afternoon activity was relatively peaceful. About 600 demonstrators marched from the White Plaza rally to the computation center with the avowed purpose of shutting down in protest to the invasion of Laos.

#### COMPUTERS

About 100 entered the building at 1:25 p.m. Most remained for three hours, but did not damage the two expensive computers or the 15 computer terminals.

They were driven out at 4:20 by about 60 men from the Santa Clara County Sheriff's department and the Palo Alto and San Jose police departments.

When police attempted to clear the lawn outside the center at 4:30, a scuffle broke out involving H. Bruce Franklin, associated professor of English and a long-time leader of radical activities at Stanford.

Franklin, had been yelling at police. When an officer attempted to arrest him, two demonstrators began scuffling with the officer. About 30 officers then charged into the crowd and the demonstrators including Franklin, scattered.

After dark, roving gangs of demonstrators tossed rocks through dormitory windows and clashed with officers.

The rock-tossing followed another rally, this one in the courtyard of the Old Union building.

Here is the chronology of the demonstrations at Stanford starting at noon Wednesday:

At noon about 600 persons gathered in White Plaza to discuss how to implement the strike which was voted Tuesday night by the Coalition Against the War in Indochina.

Janet Weiss, a graduate student and a

radical, said Stanford University is a key part of the war in Southeast Asia.

"A shut down at Stanford University is a concrete blow against the war," she said, suggesting that students close down buildings one by one.

Jean Hobson of the Palo Alto Tenants Union said that if needed, the community would go to the computation center to shut it down.

#### EXHORTS CROWD

H. Bruce Franklin, associate professor of English, urged the crowd to shut buildings down, and said workers and street people would be student allies. "I think the computation center would be a good target," he said.

There was no mention of violence.

At 1 p.m., 300 persons marched to the computation center in Jordan Quad across campus. They clapped and chanted, "On strike. Shut it down."

They arrived at the one story glass and wood structure to find it had been closed, and only two campus policemen stood before the front door. They moved a rear gate, broke in through a glass door and opened other doors. A Viet Cong flag was hoisted over the building.

About 150 persons swarmed into the building and toyed with the computer which had been shut down by technicians. They punched keys, sprinkled computer cards on the floor and scrawled antiwar slogans on the legions of red and black computer banks.

#### MINOR DAMAGE

"Which key do you punch to get a date," one student asked an employee.

There was no major damage to the computer. Minor damage was estimated at \$1,000 plus \$600 for every hour the computer was shut down.

Tactical squads from Santa Clara County, San Jose and Palo Alto were summoned immediately, but did not arrive until 4:20 p.m. Observers said they allowed a "cooling off" period for demonstrators and gave police time to plan for the safety of the computer.

Students decided who would remain in the building and formed affinity groups. Others guarded the entries to block access by the police.

"Computer centers aren't monsters, and a lot of people had a chance to find that out. Most students and employees were open and inquisitive," said Pete Nycum, manager of user services at the center.

Robert Rosenzweig, associate provost, and John Schwartz, university prosecutor, walked through the computation center and conferred with police officials.

#### TRESPASSING

At 3:25 p.m., Bruce Wiggins, university safety director, entered the building and announced that occupants were unauthorized and trespassing.

He was shouted down, and about 100 persons in the center began shouting, "Power to the people."

Not until 3:45 p.m. did any police enter the building. At that time C. D. Marron, field enforcement supervisor for the Santa Clara County sheriff's department, Sgt. Donald Tamm, community relations officer for the sheriff's department, and Undersheriff Thomas Rosa entered the building to confer with the occupiers.

Rosa said the computers were used to help treat patients at Stanford University Hospital and urged the demonstrators to leave the building and let the computers go back into operation "unless you want those poor people (at the hospital) to suffer."

The demonstrators replied that they weren't damaging the equipment in the computation center and wouldn't vacate the building until Lyman agreed not to use the computers there to aid the Indochina war effort.

#### CONTRACT CANCELED

At 3:53 they re-entered the building and told the demonstrators that the computation center's contract with Stanford Research Institute had been canceled Monday and that no more war research was being done in the building. Rosa again urged the students to leave.

The demonstrators would not believe that the center's contract with SRI had been canceled. One called out, "If that's true, why didn't (President Richard) Lyman announce it two days ago when it happened and avoid this whole thing?"

Twenty minutes later Marron announced over a bullhorn in front of the computation center that Schwartz, an assistant to Lyman, had ordered the building closed and that anyone remaining inside would be subject to arrest.

The demonstrators made no attempt to leave and five minutes later, at 4:20, about 60 men from the Santa Clara County sheriff's department and the Palo Alto and San Jose police departments charged through the crowd outside the center and into the building, which they cleared in a matter of seconds.

No arrests were made and nobody was injured while the building was being cleared.

The people who had been chased out of the building then joined with those on the lawn outside the center, to bring the size of the crowd on the lawn to about 300.

#### UNLAWFUL ASSEMBLY

At 4:23 Marron announced that the area from the lawn in front of the computation center to Jordan Way was "an area of unlawful assembly" and that anyone who refused to leave would be subject to arrest.

At 4:30 as Franklin, now at the head of the crowd, started telling the police that the crowd had a right to remain where it was, a scuffle involving an officer and two demonstrators broke out when the officer attempted to arrest Franklin and about 30 charged into the crowd with batons poised.

The demonstrators scattered in the face of the police charge, most of them running toward Jordan Way. Five were arrested, including:

Leslie Kay Nassan, 20, 1030 Fife St., Palo Alto, a waitress, charged with disturbing the peace;

Sharon E. Winslow, 19, 4075 Laguna Way, Palo Alto, a student at Stanford, charged with failure to disperse and remaining present at a place of riot;

Toni Sharon Gray, 21, 950 Iris St., Redwood City, an unemployed telephone operator, charged with failure to disperse and remaining present at a place of riot;

Theresa C. Ramirez, 20, Roble Hall, Stanford, failure to disperse and remaining present at a place of riot, and

James G. Little Jr., 29, 862 Coleman Ave., Menlo Park, an assistant professor at Stanford, charged with failure to disperse and remaining present at a place of riot.

No injuries were reported during the melee.

#### FENCE REPLACED

By 4:35 p.m., the section of fence at the rear of the computation center which the crowd had removed to get into the building had been put back in place and the building cordoned off by officers.

At 5 p.m., the crowd began moving over to reassemble outside of President Lyman's office and the police from outside the campus left. The crowd dispersed half an hour later.

A two-hour long "rally" of the "The Movement" began at 8 p.m. It was peaceful as several speakers addressed the crowd of about 400 in the Old Union courtyard.

Shortly after 10 p.m., when the rally had ended, some of the crowd vowed to "get the pigs (police) off campus," and there was action.

Out in White Plaza, groups of rally-goers spotted photographers of the Free Campus

Movement (FCM), a conservative-liberation group.

At least three of the camera-shooters were surrounded and given a good pummeling.

#### PEACEFUL

For the next hour things were comparatively peaceful.

Squads of police remained out of the way as some of the crowd, ranging up to about 200 persons, crossed in disorganized fashion past the Undergraduate Library.

At times there were chants of "Off Pigs." Several young men were equipped with walkie-talkie sets, trying to keep the mob headed for the dormitory areas.

The crowd marched around and about the Stern Hall and Wilbur Hall dormitory complexes. There was some good-natured bantering between the walkers and on-lookers from dormitory buildings.

#### CROWD HALTS

After a walk around the dormitory complexes, the crowd halted at Galves Street and Escondido Road.

During the evening some cherry bombs had been set off as well as firecrackers.

Now, there was a shatter of glass. A street lamp had been broken.

Some rocks were hurled.

At this moment squads of police moved into action and broke up circles of people.

Some of the rally participants were even chased into hallways of dormitories.

One youth was doubled over on the Escondido Road side of the intersection when he received a shot of mace.

#### SHOTS HEARD

About 100 yards away, young Dawson was standing talking with personal friends who are FCM members. Suddenly several shots rang out.

C. W. "Moose" Marron, field supervisor of the sheriff's department, was not far away.

A spent cartridge was found at the scene but Marron refused to give the ballistic result.

Six students were treated at Cowell Health Center and released. Two were hit with rocks thrown during the afternoon demonstration outside the Computation Center and four were injured at night.

Five people were arrested during the night disturbances, including one young woman who had been arrested in the afternoon near the Computation Center and been released on bail.

Those arrested at night included:

Ian Holes Fraser, 16, 3429 Kenneth Drive, Palo Alto, who was charged with curfew violation and assault on a police officer after he threw a rock at Sheriff's Deputy Phillip Kaspar and Sgt. Robert McDiarmid, according to the officers who were on crowd control in front of Jordan Hall at 10:50 p.m.

The rock missed the two officers, who chased Fraser into a room in a nearby dormitory and arrested him.

Duncan Goodfellow Fraser, 18, 3429 Kenneth Drive, Palo Alto, a student at the Mayfield Continuation School, Palo Alto, who was arrested at 11:50 p.m. by San Jose police at Manzanita Park and Campus Drive and charged with assault with a deadly weapon after he threw a metal rod 36 inches long and a half inch in diameter at a car containing four officers, according to Deputy Robert Pulling, an occupant of the car.

Michael Alexander Holman, 18, 747 Dolores St., Stanford, was charged with interfering with police officers by sheriff's deputies at Cubberley Auditorium at 11:15 p.m.

Leslie Kay Nassan, 20, 1030 Fife St., Palo Alto, a waitress, and James Alexander Wrigley, 20, 401 6th Ave., Menlo Park, unemployed, were arrested at 11:30 p.m. after a disturbance at the Stanford library.

#### FIRE ALARM

Deputy Gary Medlin said he and other deputies went to the library to investigate



a fire alarm and some people at the library pointed to three people in the parking lot, whom they said had purposely broken a fire alarm box.

Medlin said he and the other deputies chased the three to Galvez Street where two people grabbed Wrigley and Miss Nassan. Medlin said that the two demonstrators struggled violently with their captors before the deputies arrived and arrested them. The two were charged with disturbing the peace and obstructing an officer from the performance of his duty.

Santa Clara County juvenile authorities in San Jose said that three males, all 17 years old, had been referred to them on curfew charges. Two are from Redwood City and one is from Menlo Park.

At 12:30 a.m., a telephoned bomb threat was received at the North Santa Clara County jail in Palo Alto, where five persons had been booked.

"Free all political prisoners or we'll blow you up," the caller said.

There was no explosion.

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. During this decade numerous incidents of suppression of a people or a race have and will come before the public eyes of the world.

We have witnessed flare ups in Northern Ireland by Irish Catholics fighting for their right of self-determination. We have witnessed the attempted flight of Soviet Jews, systematically persecuted by their faithless oppressors. And we have witnessed the continued struggles of Israel and the free nations of Southeast Asia to maintain their independence.

But let us not forget those nations and peoples who have fallen under the yoke of oppression in years past. The people of Lithuania celebrate the 53d anniversary of their declaration of independence this month. Yet for half of those years they have been under the domination of the Soviet Union, which ruthlessly laid claim to their land during the Second World War.

Some have said that Lithuania is better off under Soviet domination than as a struggling independent state. But the facts belie that statement. We have seen continued efforts on the part of Lithuanian citizens to escape the clutches of the Soviet Union. The most recent act is the attempted defection of Simas Kudirka to the Coast Guard cutter *Vigilant*.

The action of representatives of this nation in not aiding his defector at that time forever remain a blot on our history of dedication to the principles of freedom and the right of self-determination.

We Americans must help keep alive the voices of the Lithuanian people still held prisoner in their homeland. We must speak for them in the free world. We must tell of their desire for independence.

The vice grip the Soviets have had on the people of Eastern Europe is weakening. The valiant effort of the Czechoslovakians to make their own way is a sign of the continued quest for independence.

The Soviet Union cannot long maintain its oppression. The spirit of America's Patrick Henry certainly lives in the hearts of the Lithuanians and other captive nation citizens. In the midst of this country's struggle for its own independence he spoke the words of world truth, still valid today:

Give me liberty or give me death.

#### OKLAHOMANS DEDICATE TULSA PORT OF CATOOSA

### HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, northeastern Oklahoma has been a busy place since the first of the year. The McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system was opened to barge traffic on December 31, 1970. Last month an enthusiastic crowd dedicated the port of Muskogee, and this past weekend another crowd gathered by the river to dedicate the Tulsa port of Catoosa.

The principal address at the Catoosa dedication was delivered by a man who has displayed his belief in the navigation project and the future of northeastern Oklahoma in the strongest way—by investing in the area.

This man is Mr. William Verity, president and chief executive officer of Armco Steel Corp. The extent of his investment in our green country is described in his address, which I would like to have appear in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact of life that many times an outsider can get a clearer and broader view of a situation than can a man who lives with the situation every day. Those of us who live in northeastern Oklahoma strongly feel a spirit of progress and hope for the future. Mr. Verity has captured these feelings in words.

The United States has made a tremendous investment in the Arkansas River Basin, and in our area. I hope those who read Mr. Verity's address will realize, as we do, that this investment is going to pay itself back in a very big way.

I include the address as follows:

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM VERITY AT TULSA PORT OF CATOOSA DEDICATION, FEBRUARY 20, 1971

On January 2 of this year, the motor vessel "John K" passed through the W. D. Mayo Lock, just a few miles upriver from the Oklahoma-Arkansas state line, carrying a load of steel line pipe for Cities Service Pipe Line Company of Tulsa. The significance of this particular tow was that it was the first commercial shipment on the Oklahoma portion of the Arkansas River Navigation System.

Today, just seven weeks later, we are dedicating the Tulsa Port of Catoosa, the terminus of a \$1.2 billion waterway which is the most expensive and courageous public works project ever undertaken in this country.

In the grand tradition of bringing the mountain to Mohammed, the Corps of Engineers has brought the ocean to Oklahoma, creating the nation's newest and most unique sea-port.

It's been widely reported that today's dedication marks the completion of a 25-year effort, inasmuch as the Arkansas River Navigation System was authorized by Congress in the River and Harbor Act of 24 July 1946. That does suggest a birth date of sorts, but

it isn't too difficult to trace the origins of this project even further back than 1946.

There are those who will tell you that it got its start in 1943 when the Arkansas River left its banks in a catastrophic flood which caused some \$150 million in damages. Robert S. Kerr, who was then Governor of Oklahoma and later a distinguished U.S. Senator, reacted immediately by putting his energies and talents behind a scheme to control and harness the river, a scheme that had been discussed and debated for perhaps half a century.

Or we might find the roots of the project going all the way back to 1832... when Congress made its first appropriation for the Arkansas River—the princely sum of \$4,300, which was to be used for dredging up dead trees from the river bottom. It's a matter of record that at a cost of about 87 cents apiece, 4,927 snags were removed.

These historical excursions are interesting enough, but what I'd really like to explore with you today is the future... and what this engineering and political marvel can mean to this entire area.

Although the Gulf of Mexico is about 450 miles south of us as the crow flies... or about a thousand miles as the fish swims... a great deal has been written about the Waterway bringing the ocean to Oklahoma. What these writers have missed is the fact that this is nothing new; the ocean's been here before!

Back in the Cambrian period of geological history, a vast ocean covered this area. When these waters finally receded, about halfway through the Ordovician period, they left huge amounts of sediment... and this sediment eventually formed the geological structure which enabled oil to collect here. And I don't need to tell Tulsans what oil has meant to Oklahoma's economy over the years.

Now... on the downhill side of the 20th Century... the ocean is returning to Oklahoma, and as it did those ages ago, it promises to make a profound impact on Oklahoma's economy.

It's been suggested that the Arkansas River Navigation System could be viewed as a huge funnel, with the Tulsa Port of Catoosa at one end, and the mouth of the Mississippi at the other. Personally, I prefer to think of it as a giant cornucopia—the goat's horn of Greek mythology that was supposed to be filled with whatever its possessor wished for—because this Waterway will certainly prove to be a horn of plenty for the people of the Arkansas Basin.

Official estimates are that 13 million tons of freight a year will pass along the Waterway's 440 miles, and through its 17 locks. However, I understand that Tulsans—with their characteristic confidence—are predicting that Catoosa alone will handle 12.5 million tons a year by the end of the Seventies. I'll side with the Tulsans if they run into any argument... partly because I know something about what they can do once they make up their minds to do it... and partly because of the weight of the statistical evidence.

For instance, in the first year the lower end of the System was in operation, it was predicted that it would handle in the vicinity of a million tons. The actual tonnage figure turned out to be about two and a half times the estimate!

The experience of the Gulf Intercoastal Waterway, which runs from Texas to Florida, gives us another reason to be optimistic. It's carrying 64 million tons of freight—thirteen times its predicted potential. As a matter of fact, commerce on all of our inland waterways has increased five-fold since World War II.

Oklahoma has a great deal going for it besides oil. The state is incredibly rich in natural resources. The U.S. Bureau of Mines estimates that there are more than 60 commercially producible minerals in the Lower

Arkansas, White and Red River basins . . . and I understand that 30 of these are on the government's list of 38 "critical" minerals which must be imported.

What's been needed, of course, is an economically-feasible way of transporting these resources from where Mother Nature put them, to wherever it is that Man needs them. That's one of the things the Arkansas River Waterway is going to do for us.

Today it's possible to move a ton of freight 333 miles per dollar by waterway, compared to 66.7 miles by rail, and 15.4 miles by truck. Where it's possible to ship by water, there are great economies, particularly in transporting heavy and bulky products and materials. I read a few days ago that the Arkansas River Navigation System will save as much as \$75 million just in lower shipping costs. That's obviously going to create a whole new economic equation for the Arkansas River Basin.

Let's take coal as an example of this. Oklahoma's coal reserves are estimated to be about 3.3 billion tons. These are proven reserves; we know where this tonnage is. The problem has been that the economics of mining and shipping it have not been favorable for Oklahoma up till now. The Waterway is going to change all that.

Armco's Evans Coal Company operates an open pit mining operation over near McCurtain. We've been shipping substantial tonnage of excellent metallurgical Oklahoma coal to our Houston plant by rail, but this open pit mine is just about exhausted . . . We know there is a tremendous amount of excellent coal deeper down which we'll have to get at through underground mines. There are some difficult mining problems which we have to solve first, but once we do, we foresee the possibility of quadrupling our coal shipments. Some of this will continue to go to Houston, some of it will replace Appalachian coal at our northern plants, and some of it will go into the export markets. And this possibility will become a probability because of the availability of low-cost water transportation.

And coal is just as important in the generation of electricity as it is in the generation of steel. The availability of large quantities of coal, shipped at low cost, is making possible the operation of generating stations up and down the Waterway. I've been told that by 1973, there will be ten such generating stations on this river system, serving at least half a million households.

Another economic benefit which the Waterway will provide is the elimination, or substantial reduction, of the heavy costs which are a part of every flood. A few minutes ago I mentioned that the flood of 1943 carried a \$150 million price tag, but that covered only the direct damage. It didn't include the hidden, but very real, costs involved in lost wages and production, and in accidents and sickness which can be found in the wake of every flood.

To give you some idea of what dollar magnitude we're talking about, the Corps of Engineers flood control program in the Ohio River Basin has prevented an estimated billion and a half dollars in flood damage over a period of the last 20 years . . . thanks to structures which cost only some two-thirds of that amount.

But trying to describe the potential impact of the Arkansas River Navigation System in purely monetary terms would be a mistake because this tends to put a damper on our imaginations. I think we can get a much more accurate appreciation of what this Waterway is going to mean to the future of the Arkansas River Basin from the following testimony, presented before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees by a spokesman for the Ohio Valley Improvement Association:

"The benefits of this vital artery of commerce through the center of America extend far inland from the river's edge. Low-cost

electric power, generated on the river bank from coal delivered by barge, is transmitted for ever-increasing distances at high voltages to distant inland communities. The expanding power-based and water-based industries—steel, aluminum, chemicals, petroleum and others—provide an abundance of low-cost basic materials for the expansion of innumerable fabricating and consumer goods industries, both near and far, creating jobs and incomes. Industrial expansion raises the taxation base of the river valley states, with which to provide schools, hospitals and roads throughout the state areas. Progressive improvement of highways permits workers in localities remote from the riverbank to commute daily to jobs in the water-based industries. Water-based industrial growth generates rail and truck traffic in high-value products, components and supplies. The benefits are broadly-based."

While this statement refers specifically to the Ohio River Waterway, a navigation project that over the last 20 years has returned \$13 for every dollar of federal investment, it provides a realistic forecast of what we can expect from the Arkansas River Navigation System.

But all the benefits we can predict won't have to be preceded by dollar signs. Take the matter of recreation. As we find ways to do more and more in less and less time, the resulting increase in leisure time poses both an opportunity and a problem.

Increasing numbers of Americans are demanding facilities to satisfy their desire for wholesome recreation. In 1969, more than a million visitors made use of the 14 recreation sites near the Dardenelle Reservoir. In the same year, the number of users of the Corps of Engineers recreational projects in the Ohio River Basin climbed to 56 million, three times what it had been just ten years earlier.

As additional recreational facilities are developed around the various reservoirs in this System, it is a foregone conclusion that Oklahoma is going to find a boom in tourism. You are going to attract so many vacationers from other states that you will completely destroy the erroneous image of Oklahoma that Will Rogers had in mind when he responded to someone needling him about the number of "Okies" who migrated to California during the depression. As I recall the story, Will admitted that this was true, but pointed out that they'd raised the IQ of both states in the process. I understand Will had some things to say about this project too. He claimed it would be cheaper to pave the river than to try to make it navigable; he also said that if you took all the bootleg moonshine made in Rascal Flats (the old nickname for Catoosa) and poured it into the river, you'd make it navigable right now!

And while I'm on the subject of Oklahomans, let me pay tribute to several who've made quite an impression on those of us in Armco's management—the Three B's from the world of music: Dewey Bartlett; Henry Bellmon; and Page Belcher.

This identification may surprise those of you who thought the Three B's of the world of music were Beethoven, Brahms and Bach . . . but the fact is that for the last six years these gentlemen have been serenading us, and the two tunes they've kept singing over and over are the title song from "Oklahoma", and the Beatles number, "With a Little Help From My Friends."

About three years ago we started to pay close attention to a catchy tune they were singing, called "The Arkansas River Navigation System Stomp." We particularly liked the part about the lower shipping costs for heavy tonnage items. We liked it so much, in fact, that we bought some land along the river and decided to double the melting capacity of our Sand Springs plant, not only to meet our need for increased tons right here, but also to allow us to ship billets over the Waterway to some of our other operations. It's no coincidence that both the

Corps of Engineers and Armco finished up their projects at almost the identical time. Our second new electric furnace is on line and living up to expectations; we still have about 2 weeks of final installation before our fume collector will be in operation, after which the manufacturer assures us they will be doing such an effective job of getting rid of the red smoke around these parts that we'll be known as your friendly neighborhood hood invisible steel company.

Another group of Oklahomans who've left their stamp on us are those who are responsible for conceiving, planning and carrying out this entire project. When I first saw the various printed materials describing the Port, I was much impressed with the planning for its physical development. When that initial impression passed, what came through loud and clear was a realization of the qualities in a people which made the Port of Catoosa possible. As I looked again at the plans for development, what I saw was not just channels, and moorings, and docks, and warehouses . . . what I saw was vision, and courage, and determination, and an extraordinary degree of cooperation. It dawned on me that Catoosa isn't just a town and a seaport; it's a state of mind!

About a century ago the English philosopher, John Stuart Mill, made this observation:

"A state which dwarfs its men . . . will find that no great things can be accomplished." How fortunate we are that Oklahoma has never dwarfed its men, but rather, has encouraged them to greatness . . . for what we dedicate here today is indeed a great thing which they have accomplished.

We would do well to recognize that today marks the end of one dream, and the beginning of another. In a sense, then, my remarks today are a kind of commencement address . . . which according to tradition entitles me to offer one word of caution.

With all of the various advantages which I've tried to document, the outlook for the physical and economic development of the Arkansas River Basin, the State of Oklahoma, and the Tulsa area just has to be outstanding by any yardstick. In fact, when I think of what you have in the way of natural resources, energy fuels, geographic location, transportation facilities, available land, proximity to markets, and that most precious of all commodities, people . . . it's impossible for me not to be downright bullish about your future!

It may be a poor figure of speech to use this far south, but I'll take that chance and say that I look for the development of this part of the country to snowball. As a matter of fact, I'm convinced that your problem will be one of abundance . . . like Manager Sparky Anderson of the Cincinnati Reds having nine Johnny Benches. Your need won't be to generate growth, or to sustain growth; your need will be to channel, direct and control it.

As King Midas found out, it's possible to get too much of a good thing. I would hope that the physical growth which Catoosa is sure to bring will not be achieved at the expense of the quality of life hereabouts. If that growth serves only Society's economic needs, then it will not serve Society well.

On every hand we see evidence that many of the more highly developed cities and areas of the country have some pretty highly developed problems, too: urban sprawl and decay; overage senile business districts; inadequate transportation systems; substandard housing and schools . . . in fact, most of our major cities don't need mayors . . . they need magicians!

But what a contrast there is in what you have here, and in this unparalleled opportunity you have to prove that Man can be master of his fate . . . that he can live in a place without hopelessly fouling it . . . and that he can control Nature, by first learning to control himself.

As Catoosa provides the key to unlock the



door to this area's future, I would hope that it will be possible to learn from the mistakes of others, and to profit by avoiding them.

With this hope in mind, I would urge that challenging objectives be set for this area's growth, objectives which balance idealism with realism. I would also urge that the temptation to push for dramatic surges in physical and economic growth-rates be resisted, and that the development of this area be balanced on the foundation of prudence and consideration of all of Society's needs.

It has been a great privilege for me to be here today, and to have this opportunity to share in such an historic occasion. I'd like to extend my sincere congratulations to everyone who helped make this marvelous achievement possible—the Corps of Engineers; the City of Tulsa-Rogers County Port Authority; the very memorable late Senator Robert S. Kerr; the Honorable Ed Edmondson, in whose district this magnificent project is located; the Honorable Page Belcher; the entire Oklahoma Congressional delegation; officials of the City of Tulsa and Rogers County, both past and present; and to those thousands and thousands of people who have backed their confidence in this area with the investment of many millions of dollars in public and private funds.

In fact, I'm so delighted to be here, and so impressed by what I've seen, that if I weren't a hopeless monotone, I'd sing you those wonderful, exuberant words from Rogers and Hammerstein's hit musical,

"You're doin' fine, Oklahoma . . . Oklahoma, O.K.!"

A TRIBUTE TO JAMES B.  
MCDONALD

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, 1971, the many friends and acquaintances of Jim McDonald were saddened to hear of his passing. Those who knew Jim can tell you of his heartfelt compassion and deep concern for the welfare of his fellow man.

Jim cared and expressed his concern through his activity in the political arena wherein the little man could look to a Jim McDonald for help.

Many of his friends gathered together in a special memorial program in his honor. The press of congressional business prevented my attendance. But I would like to include in the RECORD the remarks which were delivered for me by a member of my staff:

A TRIBUTE TO JAMES B. MCDONALD

How does one pay tribute to a man like Jim McDonald? You can start where he started, remembering that he was born on May 10, 1892, in the cool northern climate of Nova Scotia, Canada.

You can tell how he met and married Doris James in Alberta, Canada, and later moved to Wilmington with her in 1923 to make their home. But those are the private thoughts—the memories best left to the family.

You can talk about his work—how he devoted 31 years of service to the Texaco Refinery in Wilmington. Throughout his years with Texaco, he was both a loyal, dedicated worker at the plant; and a loyal, dedicated member of the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers Union. But that is only to tell how he earned his living, not to tell how he lived his life.

It might be closer to revealing the heart of the man to tell how he served faithfully as an active member of Saints Peter and Paul Church, and of the Knights of Columbus for 53 years. But there are others here today who know that part of his life better than I.

You can repeat the title—"Mr. Democrat"—that he earned and wore proudly. I think this is getting closer to the Jim McDonald that we remember. I don't mean the dry statistics that he worked in every political campaign since 1928, or that he served for 20 years as a member, and later as chairman, of the 68th Assembly District Democratic Central Committee, or the 17th Congressional Democratic Committee. Those appointments were honors, of course, but they were honors that came because of the type of man he was—and that's what we want to remember today.

Some people can become important in politics because they contribute money. Others become important because they contribute time and ring doorbells. Jim McDonald became important because he contributed his heart.

The thing I remember most about Jim is his quiet concern for the problems of his fellow human being. In the two years that I have represented the 17th Congressional District, Jim frequently stopped by my office here in the District. If I was here from Washington, he would spend a few minutes to say hello and wish me well—but those occasions were rare—too rare. When I was not in the District I still knew if Jim had been by the office. Three or four times a month I would get a memorandum from the staff saying Jim had been in, and was there anything I could do for Mrs. Jones, who had been having some kind of mixup with her social security checks; or that Tommy Smith had been wounded in Vietnam and maybe I could check with the Army to see how bad it was, and let his mother know a little more than was in the telegram.

That was what earned Jim the title of "Mr. Democrat"—his concern for people. For it was always the little people who might not have anyone else to be concerned about them.

The love and humanity which Jim McDonald showed to everyone who knew him reminds me of the words of Jesus in the 25th Chapter of Matthew in which there was being discussed the last Judgment: It reads:

"Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world:

For I was hungry; and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me.

Then shall the righteous answer him and say, Lord, when did we see thee hungered and fed thee, Or Thirsty, and gave thee drink, when saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? Or naked, and clothed thee?

Or, when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee?

And the King shall answer and say unto them, verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

GUS BERNIER

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the usual course of things the news most often considered fit to print is bad news. It is heartening for me to be able to pass on some good news. The good news is the community spirit of one of my con-

stituents, Gus Bernier of Manchester, N.H. Gus is host of WMUR-TV's children's program, "The Uncle Gus Show" and a leader in the drive against muscular dystrophy. As pointed out in the following letter from the Muscular Dystrophy Associations of America, this one man has done far more than his share to improve the world we live in. I am proud to represent the city which counts the likes of Gus Bernier as one of its citizens:

MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY ASSOCIATIONS  
OF AMERICA, INC.,

New York, N.Y., February 12, 1971.

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN,  
P.O. Building, Room 217,  
Manchester, N.H.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WYMAN: I'd like to call your attention to the splendid contribution made to a worthwhile cause in the Manchester area by one of your constituents. He's Gus Bernier, host of WMUR-TV's children's program "The Uncle Gus Show" who for the past five years, has promoted CARNIVALS AGAINST DYSTROPHY on his show. In that time, CARNIVALS has raised over \$7,000 in Manchester to help advance the research and patient service programs of MDA.

Wholeheartedly endorsed by parents, educators and members of the clergy, CARNIVALS is a unique project whereby the hosts of popular TV shows invite their young viewers to write for free CARNIVAL kits which explain how funds can be raised to help children afflicted with muscular dystrophy. The kits contain all elements needed to produce a fun-filled CARNIVAL—which the youngsters run in their own backyards. There are many benefits to the children who participate: they learn how to organize and set up a relatively complex project, how to cope with responsibilities and needs outside their own daily lives, and how to meet the challenge of managing a "small business" of their own. Their approach to these projects brings with it all the energy and enthusiasm of childhood.

Perhaps the greatest benefit these children derive is their intense identification with those for whom the CARNIVALS are conducted—children who, because their bodies have been weakened by dystrophy, can't take an active part in such projects. In 1970, youngsters across the nation held 22,383 backyard CARNIVALS, raising more than \$500,000 for victims of muscular dystrophy.

For many years, Gus Bernier has identified with and dedicated himself to the world of children, bringing them laughter and joy—and also instilling in them a sense of compassion for the less fortunate. I thought you'd like to know how he's contributing to the education of these young viewers and how they, in turn, are helping to better the lives of dystrophy patients. You and the people of the Manchester area can be justly proud of his accomplishments. I bring this to your attention in the hope that you may want to commend Gus Bernier and WMUR-TV for the great public service they are performing.

Sincerely,

ROBERT ROSS,  
Executive Director.

GEORGE SPINK'S "THE ZOO THAT  
MADE MILWAUKEE FAMOUS"

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, associate editor George Spink recently wrote about American zoos in Adventure Road.

I include the article as follows:

### THE ZOO THAT MAKES MILWAUKEE FAMOUS

Folks from Milwaukee spell "brewers" with both a big and a little "b," but the city is famous for something else besides beer and baseball—its Zoo!

Wherever you live chances are you know all about the battling Brewers. But this may be the first you have heard about the Milwaukee County Zoo, considered by many persons, including zoo directors, to be the finest zoo in the world.

It is new, it is spacious. Construction began in the late fifties, and every major exhibit area and building is now completed, each incorporating the latest concepts in zoo design and operation. The Zoo is serenely situated on the western outskirts of Milwaukee, just off Interstate 94, in a woody, typically Wisconsin, 200-acre setting. While a beautiful fieldstone building houses a restaurant, picnic lovers will find tables and benches generously located along the wooded lanes meandering through the Zoo. As one would expect, the beauty of the Zoo's overall landscaping is also reflected in each individual exhibit.

It is the presentation of animals that makes the Milwaukee County Zoo stand tall among other zoos. Most importantly, animals are exhibited in continental groupings, which are shown in barless enclosures with astonishing, lifelike physical surroundings. The natural relationship between predator and prey is maintained in most of the exhibits, both roaming in apparent freedom.

The North American Group, for example, features Alaskan brown bear and Alaskan moose in the same natural habitat setting. While the bears gaze wishfully at the moose below, they are separated from their prey by a hidden moat.

The Alaskan moose, incidentally, is North America's most majestic mammal. Keep an eye open for mothers with their young (often twins), and for big "Major," the herd sire, with his five-foot spread of antlers. The Zoo claims he is the largest moose in captivity. During summer months you'll see the moose cooling off in their sizeable pond.

The king of beasts, the lion, dominates the African Group. As you stroll past the African exhibit, you'll see the regal beasts lingering around the waterfall. Again, a moat separates the lions from their prey: Chapman's zebras, ostriches, big eland antelopes, marabou storks, pelicans and goliath herons are some of the creatures that just seem to be in one big area with the king of beasts.

The Milwaukee County Zoo also has continental groupings for animals from Australia, South America and Asia.

In the east yard outside the Australian Building is a fine selection of kangaroos and their close relatives, wallabies and wallaroos. If you are lucky, you'll see these marsupials travel rapidly in a series of long springy hops, using their tails, which are very strong, as a third leg when they sit.

The jaguar is "the great cat of South America," and these handsome, meat-eating predators gaze down upon such natural prey as deer, tapir, llamas and miscellaneous South American birds.

The background of the Asiatic Group is highlighted by pacing Bengal tigers, separated from an exciting collection of their natural prey: blackbuck antelope, a herd of lovely spotted deer, a group of cranes, the lesser panda and some Indian waterfowl. Elsewhere in the Asiatic exhibit are Indian elephants, which differ considerably from the African: smaller ears, shorter, rounder backs, stockier frames, with bulging concave foreheads and only one (instead of two) finger-like projections on the end of their trunks.

Besides the five continental groupings, the Zoo also features a number of inside exhibits and water areas throughout the park. For sheer fun and laughter, spend some time watching the frolics on Monkey Island, where everything is quiet and peaceful until one of the 125 Indian rhesus monkeys pokes an-

other—then suddenly they all engage in a game of "pass it on."

The King of the Zoo is Samson, a 600-plus-pound gorilla who lives in a large, spacious cage in the Primate House. Samson holds court for the public by sitting (and sometimes sleeping!) on a steel platform eight inches above the floor—which just happens to be a scale.

Like birds, too? One of the first exhibits to see as you enter the Zoo is the Aviary, home to more than 800 birds from all over the world. The Aviary brings together birds of all sizes, from tiny jewel-like hummingbirds to the huge pelicans and great blue herons.

Penguin Hall is one of the high points of the Aviary, resembling natural (Antarctic) conditions in every way possible. Whether the penguins are making one of their casual dives, swimming rapidly to the depths of the tank, then up again—or merely basking in a "rain" spray that cleanses the surface of the rock formations, the cute birds are a delight to observe.

The Zoo's policy of presenting game in predator-prey settings is nowhere better illustrated than in Lake Wisconsin, an exhibit of fish found solely in Wisconsin waters. Its denizens include northern pike, various bass and gar, lake sturgeon, rainbow trout and many other species. Though there are scores of opportunities available to the "weaker" species of fish for escape and concealment in the 45,000-gallon tank, the crevices, undercuts, nooks and crannies in reality only provide temporary shelter and protection against the "stronger" fish. The Zoo, through regular feeding and nutritional policies, also helps maintain a good balance of predator, prey and scavenger fish.

While most people like to visit the Milwaukee County Zoo in spring and summer, the Zoo is open year-round—and fall and winter give one a chance to observe many facets of animal life not possible during other seasons. In fact, some local residents prefer wintertime visits to the Zoo because of the thrill of seeing a polar bear hop out of the water on a sub-zero day, or for the pleasure of seeing a Bengal tiger and a blackbuck antelope staring at each other across a barely visible moat while enjoying a snowy day in Milwaukee. The sea lions, of course, love winter and bask leisurely amidst ice and snow.

But no matter when you visit the Milwaukee County Zoo, you are in store for an unforgettable look at wildlife. The Zoo has achieved a happy blend of flora and fauna—and it is yours to enjoy any time of the year.

### THEY CAN'T BE JEW: THE PLIGHT OF SOVIET JEWS

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend the world received a firsthand account of the plight and suffering of Jews living in the Soviet Union. Mr. Leonid Rigerman has borne witness to the religious, political, economic, and cultural persecution of the Jewish population in Russia.

Commenting on the desire of many Jews to emigrate to Israel, Mr. Rigerman aptly noted that in the U.S.S.R. "they can't be Jews, they are deprived of all forms of Jewish meaning, culture." It is clear that the free world cannot permit this harassment and intimidation of Soviet Jews to go unnoticed and that a moral obligation exists to bring all pressure to bear on the U.S.S.R. to change its discriminatory and oppressive policies.

Last month, the New York State Senate passed a resolution, memorializing the Congress to use all means to persuade the Soviet Union to change its oppressive policies toward Soviet Jewry. This resolution is most timely and deserves our fullest and most favorable consideration and attention. I am pleased to bring this resolution to the attention of our colleagues and insert it in the RECORD:

### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO USE ALL MEANS TO PERSUADE THE SOVIET UNION TO CHANGE ITS OPPRESSIVE POLICIES TOWARDS SOVIET JEWRY

Whereas, persons of Jewish faith residing in the Soviet Union have long suffered persecution, oppression, and discrimination in their daily lives at the hands of the government of that country; and

Whereas, the authorities in the Soviet Union have suppressed, discouraged and prevented the free expression of Jewish education and culture, and have deprived Soviet Jews of the opportunity of worshipping freely and in accordance with the traditions of their age-old faith; and

Whereas, the Soviet Union has consistently denied the right of Jewish people to emigrate from that country to Israel, the beloved country of their forefathers, or to any country of their choosing, and in fact the Soviet Union has continuously prohibited and blocked each and every attempt made by Jewish persons to so emigrate; and

Whereas, recently eleven persons, nine of whom were Jewish, were convicted and sentenced to extremely harsh punishment for allegedly making plans to hijack a Soviet airliner in an effort to emigrate from the Soviet Union;

Resolved (if the Assembly concur), that the Legislature of the State of New York respectfully, yet firmly, urge and memorialize the Ninety-Second Congress of the United States to manifest our country's position as the guardian of the traditions of liberty and justice for all, the dignity of all mankind, and the freedom of worship, by taking such affirmative action as will tend to persuade the Soviet Union to revise its official policies in the following manner:

(a) To terminate its practice of denying Soviet Jewry of the opportunity of worshipping in a free manner and in accordance with age-old Jewish traditions;

(b) To permit Jewish persons to emigrate freely from the Soviet Union to Israel or to any country of their choice without restriction or limitation; and

(c) To reexamine and reconsider the harshness of the penalties recently imposed on the eleven persons sentenced in a Leningrad court for allegedly making plans to hijack a Soviet airliner, and to consider the possibility of permitting such persons to emigrate to Israel;

Resolved (if the Assembly concur), that a copy of this resolution be spread upon the journal, and that the Secretary of the Senate transmit properly authenticated copies of this resolution to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the two United States Senators from New York State, and to each member of the House of Representatives from New York State.

### EXCITING NEW REVOLUTION

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, like all unsuccessful revolutions, Mr. Nixon's "new revolution" is creating



some excitement and much confusion. Anticipation of significant improvements captures the attention of every American.

Unfortunately, this revolution will end in desperation because the anticipation will not be matched by performance.

Whether one examines the proposed change from a local or State perspective, the return from revenue sharing will be modest. Although Federal revenue sharing is thought to be the solution to the money shortage at the State and local levels, analysis of the proposal indicates that 20 times more money will remain in Washington than will be returned to the States and local governments.

Robert S. Boyd, chief of the Detroit Free Press Washington Bureau, writing in the Sunday, February 14, 1971, edition of the Free Press analyzes several aspects of Mr. Nixon's "new revolution." His conclusion is significant:

The danger is that if and when the programs are passed, the reality will fall so far short of the expectations now being raised that the end result will be disillusionment and frustration.

Because Mr. Boyd's article is so informative I include it at this point in the RECORD:

A CLOSE LOOK AT PRESIDENT'S "EXCITING NEW REVOLUTION"

(By Robert S. Boyd)

WASHINGTON.—In a series of messages to Congress, President Nixon has begun to spell out details of his "New American Revolution," which he says will be "as profound, as far-reaching, as exciting as that first revolution almost 200 years ago."

The fine print in the papers flowing from the White House, however, turns out to be considerably less far-reaching and exciting than the presidential rhetoric implies.

In fact, by overselling his programs, Mr. Nixon is beginning to run the risk of reopening that "gap between promise and performance" which he ritually decries in his predecessors.

Take his State of the Union pledge—swiped from the banners of the new left—to return "power to the people."

The principal element is supposed to be revenue sharing. It is one of the "six great goals" on the President's new agenda.

When you boil it down, Mr. Nixon is actually promising to ship \$24.80 per citizen, on the average, back from Washington to the states and cities across the land.

Yet, according to its own figures, the federal government will collect 20 times that sum from each man, woman and child in personal income taxes next year.

The question arises: Will the return of one-twentieth of your taxes from Washington to Lansing make such a "revolutionary" difference?

The modest nature of the change is also apparent on the state level.

Pennsylvania, for example, shipped almost \$12 billion in taxes to Washington in 1970. Under revenue sharing, the state will collect only \$246 million—barely one-fiftieth of its contribution to the federal establishment.

Furthermore, the terms of the deal are unfavorable for some states. Pennsylvania actually will be charged \$328 million as its share of the \$5 billion general revenue sharing fund—\$82 million more than it will receive. That's a return of 76 cents on each dollar collected from Pennsylvania, hardly the kind of arithmetic to relieve the state's financial problems.

Another example of White House super-salesmanship: The President says his family assistance plan will "generously help those who are not able to help themselves."

But a worker with a wife and two children

who now earns \$1.60 an hour—the federal minimum wage—may not consider Mr. Nixon's proposal all that generous.

His present weekly paycheck of \$64 would be supplemented by an extra \$5.70 a week in "family assistance." The bonus will be welcome, surely, but it's not going to mean a revolutionary improvement in the family's living standards.

Besides exaggerating their financial impact, the White House is downplaying what could be an ironic by-product of Mr. Nixon's proposals: Instead of shifting power away from Washington, some of them would considerably increase the power and authority of the federal government.

Even revenue sharing could have this effect: The law as drafted by the White House would require each state, county, city and township which gets a share of the fund to report to Washington how the money is spent.

Since the federal funds will be mingled with state and local revenues, the federal government is claiming the right to make sure that all these monies are spent honestly and without discrimination.

Treasury agents will have the right to inspect state, county, city and township books and records if they suspect hanky-panky.

It's easy to imagine the impact this could have, say, on the way city fathers divvy up the budget for fixing sidewalks in the black section of town as well as the middle-class quarter.

In many other programs, President Nixon is also seeking to expand, not contract, federal authority.

The environment program he sent to Congress last week could put the national government in the business of checking factory smokestacks, regulating noisy power-mowers, and issuing permits to dump garbage.

His family assistance plan would nationalize state welfare standards.

He has promised to use the federal budget aggressively to restore prosperity. This means red ink, or old-fashioned pump-priming.

None of this means that the President's proposals lack merit or are simply political gimmicks. They are steps in a direction which has been urged by a growing number of conservatives and liberals in recent years.

High-pressure salesmanship from the White House may be necessary to overcome congressional resistance and accomplish the reforms.

The danger is that if and when the programs are passed, the reality will fall so far short of the expectations now being raised that the end result will be disillusionment and frustration.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION IS ACHIEVING "RESPONSIVENESS"

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, in a rearrangement of jurisdictional lines as among subcommittees of the House Committee on Appropriations, I am pleased to note that the former Post Office-Treasury Subcommittee—on which I serve as ranking member—will pick up, under its new title as the Treasury-Post Office and General Government Subcommittee, budgetary jurisdiction over the Civil Service Commission.

I look forward to assuming my share of this additional responsibility, and also to the opportunity of getting acquainted with Robert Hampton, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, about whose work and achievements in that capacity

I have heard such good reports. As evidence thereof, prior to the beginning of our subcommittee hearings, I was pleased to note the following article about Mr. Hampton—and the new sense of "responsiveness" of the Commission—as published in the February 1971 edition of Government Executive magazine: CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION'S HAMPTON, AIMS AT ACHIEVING AGENCY "RESPONSIVENESS"

(By Samuel Stafford)

Over the years, the U.S. Civil Service Commission (CSC) has drawn as much criticism for its real or imagined failings as any Federal agency and probably has been the target of more brickbats than most.

It still has its detractors on Capitol Hill and in Government agencies, Federal employee unions and the media since modern personnel management still is an inexact and controversial science, but the critics seem—perhaps it is only the imagination—both less numerous and less belligerent than in former years.

As one longtime critic told *Government Executive*: "I hate to admit it, but things are really happening over there."

"Things" have been happening, of course, ever since the first three commissioners and their entire staff of four aides opened for business in a \$3-a-day room in Washington, D.C., in 1883, for the essentially negative purpose of curbing rampant political patronage and corruption in public service.

Beginning in the 1930s, the CSC's role—paralleling the rapid growth and increasing complexity of the Federal Government—slowly began shifting in the positive direction of building an effective modern personnel administration system for the Federal establishment.

During the last decade—and particularly during the Johnson and Nixon Administrations under the leadership of former CSC Chairman John Macy and present Chairman Robert E. Hampton—the commission has, say the veteran CSC-watchers, made impressive gains in meeting tough new Federal personnel challenges. Significantly, the spurt of activity in an agency with a longtime musty image of a paper-shuffling, foot-dragging bureaucratic bottleneck has paralleled the rapid growth of Federal employee unionization and general social and technological ferment in this country.

Among the solid advances made in fairly recent years: liberal revision of the Federal Merit Promotion system, extension of the Federal Employee Health Benefits program, firm establishment of the principle of pay comparability with the private sector, growing sophistication in dealing with labor-management and equal employment opportunity problems, establishment of new programs to recruit and train Federal executives and broad Federal involvement for the first time in intergovernmental programs to upgrade the quality of state and local personnel.

To CSC Chairman Hampton, 48, who was a Civil Service commissioner for eight years before assuming his present post in 1969, the "new look" in his agency is here to stay, and, with continuing White House and Congressional support and policy-making involvement, however amiable, of employee unions, the prospects for future innovative personnel management advances are bright.

"The first thing I initiated after becoming chairman was a review of every operating program of the commission—rules, regulations, laws and so forth—in the light of the contemporary problems," Hampton said.

"I always got the impression that here was a great big piece of granite . . . that everything revolved around it and had to adapt itself to the system.

"So one of the points stressed in our review was to make the system responsive to the needs of today—the idea that merit principles do not have to equate with rigidity—

that they can be flexible principles. We didn't lose sight of the main idea which is that the hiring and promotion of employees should be done on the basis of their qualifications and their contributions.

"Looking at the system in this light, we asked ourselves: Is it responsive to the needs of management and the needs and interests of employees and the public? And in general, what is the environment around us in which personnel policies are made?"

"So our reviews indicated that there were a number of items that required new legislation or changes in Executive Orders and we placed these in an order of internal priority, realizing that it was impossible to achieve major reform in one great big package in a program that had been modified by law and Executive Order for nearly 90 years. Actually, we came up with some 44 requirements for changes in the law and 77 indicated Executive Order changes.

"These are basic reforms. Some are breadbasket issues and some are aimed at setting up a methodology and a machinery whereby we get where we want to go."

Hampton said: "The second thing we did of significance, I believe—and something that ties into the idea of agency responsiveness—concerned a reexamination of our institutional attitudes.

"You know, we don't really need somebody always telling us how and where we went wrong. Our attitude should be that we are our own severest critics . . . that we have the machinery available to us to collect the views of the users of the system and to learn about and correct flaws rather than saying there are no deficiencies or lamely trying to defend them. In other words, we have to recognize our problems and move boldly toward really solving them.

"In this connection, we have no information in the commission that is classified or otherwise to be kept from the public except for internal working papers such as inspection reports, medical records, investigative files on individuals and documents submitted to the President on which he has not yet acted.

"We approached the problems of making reforms on an open basis. We established methods of consultation with most of the Government unions and before policy matters become issues we go to the unions and give them a draft of what we have in mind and say: 'Here it is, now take a shot at it—let's have your views, what's right and what's wrong about it?'"

"The unions have responded very well and their criticism of documents we've given them for consultation has been constructive. Of course, they don't lose sight of their objectives and there are some tough struggles on various points, but this is to be expected."

Following his first year as chairman, Hampton listed these gains, among others in areas of CSC activities:

Institution of new or substantially changed programs, Government-wide, in equal opportunity, labor-management relations and merit promotion.

Adoption of new recruiting methods affecting college graduates, worker-trainees and others.

Opening of new Federal information centers with the General Services Administration, expansion of Federal executive boards, and establishment of the first "listening posts" in large cities in line with the CSC aim of becoming more "responsive."

Takeover of the entire Post Office examining system.

Among other accomplishments last year, Hampton said, was the setting up of a framework of the labor-management system called for by Presidential Executive Order, retirement system improvements, a beefed-up employee health benefits program with the Government's contribution raised to 40 percent and assured automatic adjustments each year, an overhaul in grievance and appeals procedures, passage of the Intergovernmental

Personnel Act providing for aid to states and localities, and passage of the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970.

Of these, several have been hailed as "landmark" advances by many.

One of the most far-reaching is the pay comparability legislation which takes classified pay setting out of both Congressional politics and Presidential politics.

Under the new system, data on private enterprise pay will be related to Federal salaries. There will be consultation with union officials and any differences will be resolved by an objective third party committee.

If the President agrees with the findings, he will order the adjustments into effect immediately. This is seen as eliminating a customary lag of a year or more in effecting such pay adjustments.

Should the President propose smaller or later raises as during "national emergencies," he must send his plan to Congress, which may veto it by a simple majority vote.

Passage of the legislation, which gives employee unions a larger voice in pay recommendations, tells much about both Robert Hampton's stewardship at the CSC and about the prevailing Federal labor-management climate.

Many, if not all, of those who have worked with Hampton in hammering out legislation see him as more candid and open than the usual bureaucrat and a man who is flexible enough to work toward a meaningful compromise if this is indicated as the best solution.

The pay act in which Hampton engaged in the final give and take with John Griner, president of the AFL-CIO American Federation of Government Employees, Rep. Morris Udall (D-Ariz.) and others, was such a compromise.

Hampton told *Government Executives*: "I think this legislation will go a long way toward establishing a more professional pay-setting methodology free of the political process and the pressures that can either escalate or de-escalate or otherwise dictate what the pay should be."

A task force meanwhile is conducting a two-year study of job evaluation and pay practices in Government, with a preliminary report of findings due this Spring and a legislative proposal expected to be ready next year.

Of the task force's work, Hampton said: "One of the things I think is essential is that we have a coordinated system within the total Federal picture of how you price a job and there are a variety of systems for doing this in both industry and the Government."

"What our task force is trying to do is to find the best methodology they are able to find for evaluating job classifications in the Federal Government."

Hampton sees the continual assessment of labor relations problems as "something that will be with us for a long time."

As part of the general review of CSC operations early in the Nixon Administration, a review was made of a former Executive Order bearing on labor relations. An earlier review had been made at the end of the Johnson Administration and rather than rehold hearings, Hampton's aides reviewed findings from those hearings and "added in problems that had come up in the intervening period." Following the review, they wrote another Executive Order which was approved and issued by the President.

"About that time," Hampton said, "there was a postal strike and a sickout by air traffic controllers and many critics were quick to say that the Executive Order was obsolete, but we could not agree with this assessment."

He said: "Labor relations in the public sector is an evolving situation similar in many ways to that which evolved in the private sector, but also quite different."

"I personally don't believe that the Fed-

eral Government at this time can interpose an across-the-board collective bargaining system. Management in the Federal Government isn't ready for it and the unions aren't really ready for it.

"We'd have extreme difficulty in arriving at appropriate bargaining units—who does the bargaining and how do you go for a *quid pro quo*."

"But we had to have a beginning framework and I think the Executive Order gives us that. It's difficult even to administer this Executive Order because it sets new relationships—new give and take—on both sides.

"Leadership of the program is vested in a Federal labor relations council rather than the commission, but the commission, Labor Department, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and others, including an impasse panel have specific responsibilities.

"The head of an agency lost some of his autonomy for one thing. And we do have third-party involvement . . . we're beginning to have third-party precedents established in labor-management situations. I think people are beginning to realize the benefits of being able to go to an impasse panel as they now can do, as well as having the Assistant Secretary of Labor involved in elections, determining bargaining units, things like that."

Hampton thinks it is "possible" that there will be Government-wide collective bargaining some day, though not in the near future.

"But looking at it pragmatically," he said, "you'd still have labor tensions even with collective bargaining."

"I think you have to look at the long record of relative labor peace in the Government. Look at the pay increases, changes in fringe benefits—retirement and so on—that have been obtained by Federal employee unions. And the pay act which gives labor a greater voice than ever before. So there is something in the system that has given it some stability.

"What I'm saying is that this is an evolving situation. We're learning and the labor unions are learning."

He added: "There are differences in the motivations of people toward public service today than was true formerly. I'm not saying employees are less public service minded today, but I do think they are much more aware of the necessity of being treated similar in terms of pay and working conditions to people in the private sector these days.

"I think that in many cases the Government was remiss in not recognizing this and moving faster to do something about it."

The CSC has a central staff dealing exclusively with agency labor-management problems and 10 labor relations experts in regional offices ("our eyes and ears").

"But we haven't really developed a model in labor relations," Hampton said. "We really need to do more pioneering thinking. In the near future we will probably have formulated a labor relations policy in terms of our goals and possible methods of achieving them."

The Executive Assignment System, drawn up and established over the past two Administrations, envisioned a data bank or inventory of 25,000 or more high-level Federal executives from which agencies could draw as the need for specialized talent arose.

Other programs aimed at upgrading and making the best possible use of the Federal executive manpower pool include a university fellowship program for young executives, executive seminar courses at Kings Point, L.I., and Berkeley, Calif. (with a future seminar program slated for Oak Ridge, Tenn.), and a Federal Executive Institute.

How has the Executive Assignment System talent bank operation been working? Has it fostered mobility among the executive force? And have agency managers tended to draw too heavily from those in their agencies on the list to the detriment of outsiders?

"Agencies have been using the talent bank," said Hampton, "but I think it's been minimal. As for managers drawing heavily from their own agencies, I think it's difficult



to say categorically that this is detrimental to the program.

"I personally think there should be more mobility, more movement across agency lines but mobility seems to be something that is highly personal with an executive.

"All in all, the agencies are coming to us more than they did formerly.

"We have a staff proposal on this that hopefully will be part of the Administration's legislative package. Essentially, it moves from a position-oriented system to more of an individual rank-in-the-man system and would provide for greater freedom of movement in the use of these (executive) resources within the system. And it also faces up to the controversial issue of tenure—there has been some feeling that there might be abuses in terms of job transitions—that people might be moved out of jobs because of political reasons or cronyism. This is not our purpose."

He added: "The whole area of executive development needs some real attention—not only in terms of who is coming into the system but also who is already in the system. There has to be a more orderly development of executives, recognizing the need. In Government, you have a multi-billion dollar operation—one of the biggest in the world—and you simply must have people who are well qualified and up to date if the Government is to function properly."

Among other points made by Hampton: The CSC's first-time involvement in a grant-in-aid program under intergovernmental personnel legislation providing for grants to states and localities to upgrade public service there "is in line with the President's concept of federalism because if this concept is to work, it has to be underpinned by a first-class personnel system at the grassroots."

Under the program, he said, the CSC will take over from the Labor and Health, Education and Welfare departments merit system functions they have been performing in connection with other grant programs.

His aim, he said, is "a minimum of red tape and a maximum amount of the available money for the actual grant part of the program."

Revisions of Hatch Act provisions regarding political activity by Government employees probably will be forthcoming.

"Sex discrimination issues are very difficult to deal with. There is discrimination by managers, of course, but I don't think there are as many instances of it as the critics would have us believe.

"Regarding public service in general, if you

were to include state and local government, I'm not sure that our educational system is producing enough talent with the right skills."

Does Hampton believe that the old stereotype of Government service as a refuge for shiftless paper shufflers is drying out?

"It's hard to say," he said. "I think our image is better, but we'll always draw criticism. It's ingrained in Americans to continually reexamine their governmental institutions.

"I don't want to seem callous about this, but while image is something we constantly try to improve, it's not necessarily a good measure of whether you're accomplishing your purposes."

Summing up his feelings about his two years as top man at the CSC, Hampton, a native Tennessean who likes to golf and hunt, said: "I'm particularly pleased at the progress we've made in moving basic reforms along. And I'm proud of the way our staff has taken up the challenge to make the agency more responsive—to leave no doubt that we are what we should be—the servant of the people."

#### SCHOLARSHIP FUND FOR CHILDREN OF DECEASED MINERS

### HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, last December 30 a terrible tragedy occurred in the Fifth Congressional District of Kentucky. On that day 38 miners from Clay and Leslie Counties were killed in an explosion at Finley Coal Mines, Nos. 15 and 16.

The sadness caused by this news has gradually vanished and it has become only a regrettable event to most. It is remembered daily, however, by the children and wives of these miners who are now trying to patch prospects of hope together for a brighter future. The Clay County and Kentucky Jaycees are trying to do their part in securing a better future for these families by establishing a scholarship fund for the more than 100

children left fatherless. Some of the Nation's leading country music stars are freely giving of their time and energy to put on a benefit show in Louisville next month. The following letter has been sent to more than 50 benevolent foundations at the Jaycees' request and I submit it for the perusal of my colleagues:

DEAR SIR: I am sure that you read of the terrible tragedy at Finley Coal Co. Mines in Leslie County, Kentucky on December 30 when thirty-eight miners perished in an explosion. Nearly all of these men had families for whom they were the sole means of support.

Benevolent organizations sent truckloads of food and clothing to the families but these are only of temporary advantage. Most hopes for a better life for the children are lost unless long range financial assistance plans are made.

The Clay County and Kentucky Jaycees have adopted, as their project, a scholarship fund for the children of the deceased miners, but they need assistance and, as their Congressman, I wish to commend this project to you.

The average age of the deceased miners was thirty-three years. The total number of children is one hundred, forty-seven males and fifty-three females. Of this total, ten boys are between the ages of thirteen and eighteen and thirty-six are twelve or under. Thirteen females are between the ages of thirteen and eighteen and forty-nine are twelve or under.

One mother said of her deceased husband, "He always said he wished he had a better education so he wouldn't have to work in the mines. He wanted his boys to get a good education so they wouldn't have to work in the mines." His children will have the same thoughts but no alternatives exist unless financial assistance is offered for more scholastic training.

If you are interested in the Jaycee Scholarship Fund, you can either contact my office or Mr. Joe Swafford, Clay County Jaycees, Manchester, Kentucky 40962.

Sincerely,

TIM LEE CARTER.

Any assistance from those interested in making this worthy project a success will be appreciated, not only by the fund's organizers, but, most of all, by the children who will reap the benefits of your efforts in years to come.

## SENATE—Wednesday, February 24, 1971

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 17, 1971)

The Senate met at 11:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

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

*Seek ye the Lord while He may be found, call ye upon Him while he is near: Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and He will have mercy upon him: and to our God, for He will abundantly pardon.—Isaiah 55: 6, 7.*

O Lord, as on this day when the penitential period opens for millions of people in all nations, make us to know who we are and how we have been redeemed. Turn our gaze once more to the cross where we behold redemptive love. Let Thy cleansing stream flow

through us and Thy spirit come afresh upon us so that this day and throughout the holy season we may be sensitive to the spirit which makes all things new.

We pray in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 23, 1971, be approved.

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

#### THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendars Nos. 25, 26, and 27.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there

objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MEMBERSHIP ON THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

The resolution (S. Res. 52) providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 52

*Resolved*, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING: Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr. Allen of Alabama, and Mr. Griffin of Michigan.

JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY: Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr.