

authorize the acquisition of certain properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 11694. A bill to restore and maintain a healthy transportation system, to provide financial assistance, to improve competitive equity among surface transportation modes, to improve the process of Government regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11695. A bill to encourage national development by providing incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing and job-training industrial and commercial facilities in rural areas having high proportions of persons with low incomes or which have experienced or face a substantial loss of population because of migration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 11696. A bill to suspend the duties on fluorspar until the close of January 1, 1974; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 11697. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to increase flood insurance coverage of certain properties, to authorize the acquisition of certain properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 11698. A bill to amend sections 9 and 11 of the Clayton Act, as amended, to provide for the continuance of the family farm and to prevent monopoly and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H.R. 11699. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to provide for grants to local public housing agencies to assist in financing security arrangements designed to prevent crimes and otherwise insure the safety and well-being of low-rent-housing tenants; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11700. A bill to provide for police and security protection for persons living in low-rent housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CAREY of New York (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CELLER, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. EILBERG, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MANN, Mr. NIX, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RODINO, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 11701. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax to a taxpayer who pays the tuition and certain re-

lated items of a student at an institution of higher education, where the taxpayer and the student agree to repay the credit (with interest) to the United States after the education is completed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 11702. A bill to amend the act of August 6, 1958, 72 Stat. 497, relating to service as chief judge of a U.S. district court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11703. A bill to authorize additional judgeships for the U.S. courts of appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 11704. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 11705. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the creditable service of Members of Congress for civil service retirement purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 11706. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture, in the event of a natural disaster, to make adjustments in payment yields for producers of cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. QUILLLEN:

H.R. 11707. A bill to amend the age and service requirements for immediate retirement under subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11708. A bill to increase the contribution of the Federal Government to the costs of employees' health benefits insurance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 11709. A bill to promote development and expansion of community schools throughout the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 11710. A bill to permit suits to adjudicate disputed titles to lands in which the United States claims an interest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 11711. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to specify that emergency loans for annual operating expenses may be payable for periods up to 7 years; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASPIN:

H.J. Res. 956. Joint resolution directing that no further action be taken with respect to the development of the trans-Alaska pipeline until a comprehensive and independent study is made of the economic and ecologi-

cal aspects of a trans-Canada pipeline; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DENNIS (for himself, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. MAYNE, and Mr. BERRS):

H.J. Res. 957. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. POAGE, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. BELCHER, and Mr. TEAGUE of California):

H.J. Res. 958. Joint resolution to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASPIN:

H. Res. 700. Resolution calling for the shipment of Phantom F-4 aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H. Res. 701. Resolution calling for the shipment of Phantom F-4 aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAREY of New York (for himself, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. RODINO, Mr. HAWKINS, and Mr. EILBERG):

H. Res. 702. Resolution calling for peace in northern Ireland and the establishment of a united Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H. Res. 703. Resolution calling for the shipment of Phantom F-4 aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BEVILL:

H.R. 11712. A bill for the relief of Hassan Abai, Mehri Abai, Abraham Abai, Afshin Abai, Mehran Abai and Mohammad-Hussein Abai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRON:

H.R. 11713. A bill for the relief of Kenneth R. Eton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 11714. A bill for the relief of Alazine Ferris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON of New York:

H.R. 11715. A bill for the relief of Cpl. Paul C. Amedeo, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A FREE-NATION WORLD ORGANIZATION

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the Sunday, October 31, 1971, State newspaper, of Columbia, S.C., contains a timely editorial entitled "Free Nations Should Form One World Organization."

In view of the deterioration of the U.N. into a Communist-influenced, anti-American gathering place, the suggestion in this editorial deserves serious consid-

eration. The U.N. has been effective as a world problem solver, and with the increasing influx of Communist domination, it has become less and less the representative of peace and independence.

Mr. President, the U.N. has as its pledge the goal of establishing the independence of nations and peace on earth. The stated goal of communism is world domination. Thus, with the change in the U.N. comes the fear that the U.N. will become a tool for the spread of international communism.

Two-thirds of the world's population and 60 nations still believe in the freedom of man. The time has come when these free nations must band together to preserve this freedom and stand up to

communism. An organization of free nations deserves the consideration of Congress. I have long favored this.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

FREE NATIONS SHOULD FORM ONE WORLD ORGANIZATION

The time has come for the people of the United States to recall the sage advice of the late President Herbert Hoover and contemplate a world organization of free, non-Communist nations.

As long ago as 1950, Mr. Hoover realized that Communist involvement and obstruc-

tionism would prevent the United Nations from achieving the high aims set forth in its charter. He was proved right when the Soviets walked out of the Security Council at the outset of the Korean War, thereby permitting the only effective action ever undertaken by the United Nations against an aggressor nation.

He was proved right by the Communists' role in Southeast Asia, and by Communists we refer not only to the North Vietnamese but to the Chinese and Russian Communists who have sustained and abetted the conflict there during all these long bloody years.

Now that Communist China has been admitted to the United Nations, there is all the more reason to take stock of Mr. Hoover's prophetic words. Listen to his message (of July 1950) with respect to Russian participation in the United Nations:

"The purpose of Soviet Russia is not to carry out the four times repeated pledge in the United Nations charter to establish the independence of nations and peace on earth. Forty-two times Soviet Russia has used its veto to thwart important efforts toward peace. The Kremlin representatives have denied membership in the United Nations to nine anti-Communist nations.

"Thirty-four times they have walked out of meetings in an effort to coerce the members into accepting Communist China into its very seat of power—the Security Council—which would further communize the organization . . .

"Yet, if we survey the world, we find that although one-third of the people on Earth have been subdued to Communism, there still remain 60 non-Communist nations, comprising two-thirds of the people on the Earth who yet cling to belief in God and the independence of nations."

Mr. Hoover proposed then and later that "the United Nations Communist nations in it. If that is impractical, then a definite new united front should be organized of those peoples who disavow Communism, who stand for morals and religion, and who love freedom."

The thrust of the Hoover argument was essentially that of Woodrow Wilson in the formative days of the ill-fated League of Nations:

"A steadfast concert for peace can never be maintained except by a partnership of domestic nations. No autocratic government could be trusted to keep faith within it or observe its covenants."

There is every reason to fear that the United Nations, now that it embraces numerous nations imbued with the essence of Communism, whether of Russian or Chinese extraction, will become less and less the guardian of peace, liberty, and independent sovereignty. Indeed, it is well within the range of possibility that the United Nations could become an instrumentality for the spread of international Communism.

Look now to Mr. Hoover's suggestion of August 10, 1962, made on his 88th birthday, two years before his death:

"The time is here when, if the free nations are to survive, they must have a new and stronger worldwide organization . . . the 'Council of Free Nations.' It should include only those who are willing to stand up and fight for their freedom.

"The foundations for this organization have already been laid by the 40 nations who have taken pledges in the five regional pacts to support each other against aggression . . ."

Perhaps Mr. Hoover was overly optimistic about the willingness of nations other than the United States to stand up against Communism. Indeed, the vote on seating Red China and ousting Nationalist China would indicate a lessening of such resolve on the part of many countries, including some within those very defense pacts cited by the former President.

Yet the idea of an organization of free

nations, by whatever name it may be known, deserves the most serious consideration by the government—and by the people—of the United States.

JOHN J. RHODES REPORTS

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, following is a reprint of my newsletter—the "John J. Rhodes Reports" of November 12 which will be sent to my constituents in the First District of Arizona later this week:

JOHN J. RHODES REPORTS

UNITED NATIONS VOTE IN PERSPECTIVE

On October 25 the General Assembly of the United Nations voted to admit the government of Red China as a full member, and to disenfranchise the government of the Republic of China which is now located on the island of Taiwan. This vote came after many days of hard campaigning on both sides. The resolution finally adopted was offered by Albania. We opposed it, but many of our traditional friends and allies worked and voted against our position. We had agreed to the admission of Red China to the United Nations, but insisted that the Republic of China should not be excluded. The final vote was overwhelmingly against our position.

Many of the nations who voted and worked against us have pointed out that the choice was really between a government which actually represented mainland China, and another government which only pretended to do so. The fact is that at no time did the Nationalists seek to keep their place in the United Nations solely as a representative of the island of Taiwan, but insisted that they are the representatives of all China, including the mainland portion. Thus, these nations who opposed us will maintain, with some credibility, that they were merely voting to recognize the world as it is, not as many of us would like it to be.

No matter who is right or wrong concerning the reasoning behind the vote in the United Nations, the facts are that a significant majority of the members of the United Nations failed to sustain a position which the United States pressed with great vehemence. The open glee of many of the members of the General Assembly when the vote was announced was probably not due to the results of the vote as much as to the defeat of the United States. It comes as a shock to many Americans that our estate in international circles has sunk so low.

It is time for us to review the evolution of our present international position. We have certainly tried to win friends among the world's nations.

In the area of foreign aid for instance, the United States has been exceedingly generous to the other nations of the world. Since 1946 we have spent \$138 billion in foreign aid to 135 countries. Much of this aid was necessary and accomplished much good for the world. However, we have been so free-handed with economic aid that in many instances we have lost the respect of the very nations we tried to help.

Certainly, much of the blame for our loss of favor must rest on our participation in the Vietnamese war. The Communist nations have very successfully exploited the fact we are fighting non-white populations in Indochina. This has given us a racist tinge which we do not deserve.

It is a fact that we entered the Vietnamese conflict commonly acknowledged to be the

most powerful nation in the world. It was assumed we would do those things which were necessary to bring the Vietnamese war to an early and successful conclusion. Instead, the world saw us temporize with the war, then escalate in response to the escalation of the North Vietnamese.

At the same time, we failed to recognize the drain on our economy caused by the Vietnamese war. Fighting that war with "business as usual" as our watchword, we started a "demand-pull" type of inflation which was fed by tremendous deficits in the federal government; deficits caused in part by contemporaneously undertaking the largest so-called "social reform" program in history.

As a result, when President Nixon came to office the American people had already tired of the whole sorry mess, and he had no choice but to get us out of it as rapidly as possible. This he is doing. Although we certainly are not "cutting and running", neither are we getting out with our pre-war national prestige intact. It seems that our conduct of the Vietnamese war has given us the reputation in many parts of the world as being racist, bumbling and lacking in resolution. This is hardly calculated to lead to increased international respect.

Clearly another factor contributing to our image around the world is our economic program. The pay per hour of the American industrial worker has been rising at an average annual rate of 6.8 percent for the past five years, while output per hour has been increasing by only 1.6 percent per year. This has added a "cost-push" inflation to the "demand-pull" inflation already discussed, resulting in the phenomenon of unemployment and increasing prices.

At the same time, the trade balance which had been favorable enough to the United States to finance our many commitments abroad has turned to the unfavorable side. Our lower volume of exports was largely caused by higher prices, without any appreciable superiority in quality. The results were huge increases in dollar balances in central banks, and a run, or a threat of a run, on gold.

These factors, and the resulting economic crisis, forced President Nixon to take steps to stabilize the nation's economy. I do not intend to go into all of the reasons why it was necessary to freeze wages, demonetize gold and impose a surcharge on imports. Suffice it to say, I agree with the President's actions. These actions should not have shocked the rest of the free world—but much of the free world was shocked, and people who are in shock are often hostile, at least temporarily. So, this by itself may have cost us some votes in the United Nations.

In summation, the whole situation, oversimplified, boils down to this: in the Sixties, we tried to rewrite all of the economic rule books. We tried to fight a war out of the petty cash fund, and at the same time we tried to provide ourselves with all of the good things of life immediately, while having no cogent, coherent plan of achieving our national purposes. In other words, we have failed to exercise the type of responsible conduct expected of a great nation, and our conduct has had a tremendous impact on our world prestige.

Certainly, I am not suggesting that the whole world has fallen apart because we lost a vote in the United Nations. I do, however, intend to point out that this loss was not an isolated phenomenon but came as the logical and foreseeable consequence of the drifting course we followed in the 1960's.

Action is being undertaken to stop this tragic drift. In the last two years, we have done several things which will be of great aid in restoring our position in the world.

First, under the Nixon Doctrine we have made it clear that we will continue to support the freedom-loving nations of the world,

but only to help them to help themselves. We do not intend to continue to act as the world's policeman.

Second, we are winding down our participation in Vietnam, and trying to minimize the economic dislocations at home which always appear when defense expenditures are slashed and men are released from the armed services.

Third, through the Nixon economic plan, we are at last acting to curb runaway inflation in the private sector.

Fourth, we have made it clear to our trading partners that we are no longer in any position to give them the favored treatment which they have received since World War II, and that we must now insist on equal treatment.

I certainly am not in favor of our retiring from the rest of the world and setting up a "fortress America" here in the Western Hemisphere. To do so would be shortsighted and futile, since it would ultimately endanger our security to a far greater degree than is currently the case. I do feel, however, that our relations with other nations, both diplomatic and economic, should now be conducted on the basis of an enlightened self-interest, with hard bargaining on both sides. I think the peoples of the world will understand this approach much better than they have understood or appreciated the free-handed manner in which we have given away our goods, services and wealth ever since 1946.

Neither do I believe we should get out of the United Nations. We should, however, in furtherance of the new policy of enlightened self-interest, insist upon a new formula for our participation in the financial burdens of the United Nations. Certainly, we have been paying more than our share for the upkeep of the United Nations and its various agencies. We should immediately insist that each nation of the world pay its share, and do so promptly, and that our share be reduced to an appropriate figure. We should do this out of a sense of enlightened self-interest, not in a fit of pique following the loss of an important vote in the United Nations.

We often complain because the rest of the world does not understand us. The facts are that many of our citizens do not even understand our own political and economic system. They expect things of the economy and the government which are out of reason and impossible of attainment at this stage of

our development. As we try to make ourselves more credible and understandable to the rest of the world, let us also try to reeducate our own people as to our capabilities and limitations.

We are the greatest nation in the world. I am pleased at the signs that we are, at long last, beginning to act the part.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 630

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I was wondering, in view of the events of the past few weeks in Saigon, if any Member of Congress or any member of the executive branch would care to say he or she is willing, from this day forward, to give his or her life, limb, sanity, or freedom—POW even for another day—further to prop up the Saigon dictatorship.

Other Americans are being ordered to do so today.

Following is the language of House Resolution 630, which I introduced on September 30, 1971:

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

Whereas Madame Nguyen Thi Binh, chief delegate of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam stated on July 1, 1971, that the policy of her government is: "If the United States Government sets a terminal date for the withdrawal from South Vietnam in 1971 of the totality of United States forces and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp, the parties will at the same time agree on the modalities:

"A. Of the withdrawal in safety from South Vietnam of the totality of United States forces and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp;

"B. Of the release of the totality of mili-

tary men of all parties and the civilians captured in the war (including American pilots captured in North Vietnam), so that they may all rapidly return to their homes.

"These two operations will begin on the same date and will end on the same date.

"A cease-fire will be observed between the South Vietnam People's Liberation Armed Forces and the Armed Forces of the other foreign countries in the United States camp, as soon as the parties reach agreement on the withdrawal from South Vietnam of the totality of United States forces and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp."

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

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, in July my office sent out a questionnaire which provided a convenient way for many Michigan people to register their views on a wide variety of important issues.

While such questionnaires cannot substitute for professional and more scientific public opinion surveys, nevertheless, the responses are very interesting and informative.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a tabulation of the responses be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Question	Response (percent)				Question	Response (percent)			
	His	Hers	18-21	Total		His	Hers	18-21	Total
1. One of the most difficult tasks facing Congress is to design a welfare system that will help the deserving needy and still provide incentives for the poor to improve their economic position—without overburdening the taxpayer. Most people agree that our present welfare system needs reform. Do you favor:					3. Do you think the Federal Government should:				
(a) Requiring 1-year residence in a State before welfare payments are made:					(a) Underwrite health care for the total population to be paid for through additional payroll taxes:				
Yes.....	79.6	80.0	64.2	78.6	Yes.....	17.1	17.1	21.2	17.4
No.....	11.3	10.8	22.9	12.0	No.....	67.7	66.9	59.9	66.7
No opinion.....	9.1	9.2	12.9	9.4	No opinion.....	15.2	16.0	18.9	15.9
(b) Federal assumption of all welfare costs to be covered by increased Federal taxes:					(b) Require employers to provide and pay 75 percent of health insurance costs for employees, while the Government provides coverage for those who cannot get it through employment:				
Yes.....	14.1	12.8	12.8	13.4	Yes.....	35.2	34.3	30.7	34.4
No.....	66.5	66.1	62.8	66.0	No.....	49.8	48.2	49.1	49.0
No opinion.....	19.4	21.1	24.4	20.6	No opinion.....	15.0	17.5	20.2	16.6
(c) Requiring able-bodied on welfare to accept whatever work is available:					4. Prices at the supermarket and in other stores continue to climb higher. In your view, who is most responsible for this situation:				
Yes.....	92.2	92.9	81.6	91.6	(a) The businessmen.....	19.3	18.6	23.3	19.3
No.....	2.5	2.6	8.3	3.0	(b) The unions.....	54.4	58.0	49.8	55.6
No opinion.....	5.3	4.5	10.1	5.4	(c) The President.....	10.6	11.0	15.2	11.1
(d) Guaranteeing a minimum income to all families with children:					(d) The Congress.....	15.7	12.4	11.7	14.0
Yes.....	22.1	22.1	35.0	23.1	5. Prices on consumer goods would probably go down if we imported even more foreign-made products. But imports made with cheap foreign labor already threaten many U.S. jobs. What do you think Congress should do:				
No.....	58.7	57.4	41.5	56.8	(a) Increase tariffs and keep more imports out.....	14.2	15.1	10.5	14.3
No opinion.....	19.2	20.5	23.5	20.1	(b) Lower tariffs and encourage more imports to come in.....	3.2	3.7	3.5	3.4
2. Do you believe the New York Times was justified in publishing classified documents from the Pentagon papers:					(c) Toughen labor-management laws to hold U.S. wages in line.....	56.5	58.3	43.3	56.1
Yes.....	37.9	39.9	58.5	40.4					
No.....	52.6	48.0	29.0	48.7					
No opinion.....	9.5	12.1	12.5	10.9					

Question	Response (percent)				Question	Response (percent)			
	His	Hers	18-21	Total		His	Hers	18-21	Total
(d) Do nothing and rely on competition to force U.S. industry and labor to do a better job in keeping prices down.....	15.5	11.7	14.6	13.7	11. If the minimum wage is increased to \$2 an hour, would it make sense to have a lower minimum wage for inexperienced teenagers who want to work:				
(e) Other.....	3.5	2.5	5.3	3.2	Yes.....	64.4	65.6	47.7	63.6
No opinion.....	7.1	8.7	22.8	9.3	No.....	26.0	25.5	40.4	26.9
6. Most people agree that more must be done to fight the drug menace. Which of the following would you support:					No opinion.....	9.6	8.9	11.9	9.5
(a) Legalize marihuana.....	3.6	2.6	7.5	3.6	12. When workers go on strike, should they be eligible to receive:				
(b) Broaden methadone treatment under safeguards.....	3.6	2.6	1.9	3.0	(a) Food stamps:				
(c) Crack down harder on drug peddlers.....	35.5	34.9	18.9	33.3	Yes.....	19.7	19.2	26.7	20.0
(d) Crack down harder on drug users.....	1.4	2.6	3.8	2.1	No.....	72.7	72.3	59.9	71.5
(e) Cut off foreign aid to countries that refuse cooperation in curtailing the international drug traffic.....	27.3	32.3	15.1	27.9	No opinion.....	7.6	8.5	13.4	8.5
(f) Other.....	3.6	2.6	1.9	3.0	(b) Unemployment benefits:				
No opinion.....	25.0	22.4	50.9	27.1	Yes.....	7.8	9.1	14.9	8.9
7. The Nixon administration wants legislation to eliminate national emergency strikes in the transportation industry (railroads, airlines, trucking and maritime) by allowing a Presidential panel to impose a final settlement when negotiating parties cannot reach agreement. Do you favor such an approach:					No.....	80.8	79.3	70.2	79.3
Yes.....	76.6	75.8	56.9	74.7	No opinion.....	11.4	11.6	14.9	11.8
No.....	15.9	14.1	25.0	15.8	(c) Welfare payments:				
No opinion.....	7.5	10.1	18.1	9.5	Yes.....	7.2	5.7	7.8	6.6
8. As a step in the fight against pollution, do you believe phosphates should be banned from all detergents:					No.....	80.2	80.8	75.2	80.1
Yes.....	69.9	71.1	74.2	70.7	No opinion.....	12.6	13.5	17.0	13.3
No.....	15.6	15.6	7.8	15.0	13. So far as our Vietnam policy is concerned, which of the following comes closest to your view:				
No opinion.....	14.5	13.3	18.0	14.3	(a) Immediately withdraw all U.S. troops, regardless of the consequences.....	10.0	12.1	19.1	11.6
9. Effective antipollution programs can be costly. Are you willing to pay increased taxes and higher prices to support them:					(b) Announce a December 31 withdrawal date and cut off funds thereafter.....	17.0	20.4	27.9	19.4
Yes.....	53.7	48.6	61.6	52.0	(c) Support the President's withdrawal policy so he can negotiate with maximum effectiveness.....	63.9	57.8	35.3	59.0
No.....	33.9	36.8	23.1	34.3	No opinion.....	9.1	9.7	17.7	10.0
No opinion.....	12.4	14.6	15.3	13.7	14. When the U.N. reconvenes in September, the United States will have to take a position on admitting Red China. Which of the following policies do you favor:				
10. Some people support a proposal in Congress to increase the Federal minimum wage from \$1.60 to \$2 an hour. Others say this would be inflationary, and that it would create more unemployment. Do you favor raising the minimum wage to \$2 an hour:					(a) Stand pat against admitting Communist China to the U.N.....	15.4	17.6	9.7	15.9
Yes.....	33.0	32.0	32.1	32.5	(b) Vote to admit Communist China and expel Nationalist China.....	3.3	2.8	5.1	3.2
No.....	60.0	59.2	53.7	59.1	(c) Vote to admit Communist China to the U.N. in addition to Nationalist China.....	71.8	67.8	64.4	69.4
No opinion.....	7.0	8.8	14.2	8.4	No opinion.....	9.5	11.8	20.8	11.5

THE AMCHITKA QUAKEMONGERS: WHERE ARE THEY NOW?

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, with as much restraint as possible I am including in the RECORD an editorial from the Anchorage Times, titled "The Sky Did Not Fall":

THE SKY DID NOT FALL

It would be nice to think that all of those who participated in the quakemongering of recent weeks would stand up today and confess that they were wrong.

It would be a good thing if they would apologize for scaring some people half to death over fears of earthquakes, tidal waves, radiation destruction and other horrible consequences they said would result from Cannikin, last Saturday's nuclear test at Amchitka.

It would be a happy thing if all the noisy, publicity seeking participants in the Greenpeace mission would send a note to the President of the United States saying that they were sorry that they failed to recognize that the American scientists were telling the truth.

It would be a great day for Alaska if Senator Mike Gravel would take a picket in hand again and stand in front of the White House, this time with a poster admitting that he made a fool of both himself and the people of Alaska.

It would be an even greater thing if all the network and television crews who spent countless days roaming through Alaska, chat-

tering up a doomsday storm until listeners and viewers outside must have thought the world was coming to an end, would have guts enough to confess on a prime time that they made a mountain out of a molehill.

It would be good if the so-called environmental coalition of the Sierra Club and its sisters of sob and fear would appear before U.S. District Judge George Hart in Washington, D.C., and compliment him for his judgment in describing the whole Cannikin ecological protest as "a tempest in a blinking teacup."

We would like to see somebody high in the Government drop a memo to Russell Train, head of the Council on Environmental Quality, and ask him whether he still believes himself qualified to hold that post in the light of the total inaccuracy of his super secret report indicating that vast tidal waves and earthquakes were likely if Cannikin were fired.

Our faith in the future of the younger generation, and the credibility we grant some of their concerns, would soar if those youngsters who marched in silly circles in front of the Federal Building here last week would turn their energies to constructive things.

Instead of being duped and made to follow the pattern of equally outlandish exhibitions which seem to get so much public attention elsewhere, Anchorage youngsters who want to do something useful could find many challenges at hand.

Rather than march in circles, they could volunteer their youthful energies to a number of projects around town—shoveling snow or scrubbing hallways for the Alaska Crippled Children's Center, helping in the Community Chest drive, assisting with Boys Club or Scout work, working at the hospitals as volunteers, or almost any other like task.

Most of all, perhaps, we wish people who were upset by all the wild, erroneous and

phony charges against the Amchitka test had reminded themselves last week that the attempt to generate hysteria was exactly what happened before in the last Atomic Energy Commission project in the Aleutians.

And next time, in whatever similar circumstances that might arise, maybe more people will think of what is vital to America's defense—and ignore the voices of dissension among us.

LIBERALS IGNORE GUILT OF ALGER HISS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, James J. Kilpatrick, syndicated columnist, recently authored an article entitled "Hiss Guilt Is Ignored by Liberals."

Mr. Kilpatrick recalls some history that Congress and the people of the Nation would be well advised not to forget.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article published in the Augusta, Ga. Chronicle of October 31, 1971, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

HISS GUILT IS IGNORED BY LIBERALS

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Alger Hiss turned up in England last week, launching a five-week lecture tour. And sure enough, Alfred Friendly, senior correspondent for the Washington Post, promptly

turned up to write a friendly piece about him.

There is one thing to say for the old Libs: They never quit. They will go to their graves defending Hiss. For nearly a quarter of a century, this has been their ultimate touchstone. One imagines that whenever the Bilderbergers meet or the Council of Foreign Relations convenes, a guard is posted to question arriving guests: "Do you believe in the innocence of Alger Hiss?" "I believe." "Then enter the inner sanctum."

Yet it is a curious thing—one of those rainy-day reminders of approaching age—that a whole generation has grown up that knew not Alger Hiss. I put the question to a young lady of 25. She thought he was the Nazi, you know, who had escaped and spent so many years in prison. And Chambers? Whittaker Chambers? A dead blank.

Friendly's interview brought it all flooding back. For the record, my children, Hiss was the impeccable young lawyer who emerged from Johns Hopkins and Harvard Law to become secretary to Mr. Justice Holmes, later a high-ranking attorney in the State Department, adviser in 1945 to Roosevelt at Yalta, president of the Carnegie Endowment for World Peace. In the summer of 1948, when the drama began to unfold, he was 43; and the world was his beautiful oyster.

Whittaker Chambers was known that summer, to the extent he was known at all, as a senior editor of Time. He was a pudgy man, squat and homely; his background was obscure. He had joined the Communist Party as a young intellectual in 1925; he had repudiated the party in 1937. For the last three years of his membership, he had served in Washington as a secret courier and minor functionary, attached to what was known as the Harold Ware cell.

On Aug. 3, 1938, Chambers testified before the House Un-American Activities Committee, which then was investigating Communist infiltration of government. Chambers came unwillingly, in one sense, for he knew he himself would be doomed; but he came also from a powerful motivation to bear witness, to make atonement: "I sensed, with a force greater than any fear or revulsion, that it was for this that my whole life had been lived."

Chambers publicly identified Alger Hiss as a member of the Harold Ware cell. Four days later, in executive session, Chambers described his relationship with Hiss in meticulous detail; he told of the Hiss apartment, the Hiss cars, the Hiss dog, the Hiss hobbies. He recalled that Hiss, an amateur ornithologist, once had seen a rare prothonotary warbler.

But Chambers at first was not believed. Hiss denied everything; and Hiss was—well, he was Alger Hiss. The whole liberal establishment leaped to his side. Then Hiss came before the committee in executive session on Aug. 16. Congressman John McDowell put the question casually: "Did you ever see a prothonotary warbler?"

"I have," said Hiss, "right here on the Potomac."

It was the beginning of the end. In January of 1950, Hiss was convicted on two counts of perjury; he served three and a half years at Lewisburg. Chambers died in 1961. To this day, the record still rings with the truth of Chambers' testimony; and it still reeks with the stench of Hiss's lies.

The revisionists hint at nothing of this. To them, Hiss remains a man of "rather charming gravity and grace." He is gentle of manner, soft of voice. A sense of injustice and outrage still burns within him, but he is filled with consuming hope of ultimate vindication. He is still bewildered at what he believes was a monstrous and deliberate frameup. He surmises that Chambers was psychotic. Or perhaps Chambers rigged a certain Woodstock typewriter that figured significantly in the trial.

It won't do. Chambers was among the sanest, purest, and noblest men of America in this century. And it wasn't the typewriter that trapped Alger Hiss. It started with a tiny warbler, "beautiful yellow head, a gorgeous bird." And so long as professional paintbrush artists defame the memory of Whittaker Chambers, those of us who respected that brave and brilliant man will remember that warbler and bear our own witness to the guilt of Alger Hiss.

THE PACE OF MIDEAST DIPLOMACY

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, a just solution to the Mideast crisis can be achieved only if the Israelis are permitted to maintain a strong bargaining position. Should the United States falter in its support of Israel, the only result would be to force Israel to make possibly damaging concessions. It is for these reasons that I cosponsored the recent House Resolution urging the sale of F-4 Phantom jets to Israel.

I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from today's Washington Post which describes the situation in the Middle East, expounding a point of view to which I too subscribe.

The editorial follows:

THE PACE OF MIDEAST DIPLOMACY

"I shall not allow 1971 to pass without the battle (with Israel) being resolved, either by war or by peace," Egypt's President Sadat said July 23. But of course he will. Peace by year's end is out of the question; nobody's ready to compromise. And there is, by Mideast standards, no more than routine danger of war.

Israel, enjoying both the possession of Egyptian territory and an American-made cease-fire, simply has no logical incentive for war. Some partisans of President Sadat insist that he is the prisoner of his rhetoric and cannot much longer hold his championing army back, but his record belies that belittling judgment. Since replacing Gamal Nasser, he has undone a serious political challenge, turned his people's attention toward domestic reform, and made more effective arrangements with Russia for the defense of Egypt against Israeli air strikes. The result is that he is freer than ever from a compulsion to lead Egypt to a fourth defeat, as the experts agree another war would be. A policy combining ardent slogans and prudent acts seems to suit his diverse political needs. Certainly that's better than the other way around.

The attitude of the superpowers is also relevant. Moscow, by agreeing to receive Mr. Nixon next May, has in effect said it won't precipitate a Mideast collision before then. Moreover, the deeper the Russians penetrate into the Egyptian military, the more they presumably discover its inadequacies relative to Israel. Moscow could compensate by accept before next May. Soviet policy comes down to waiting.

Waiting for what? For the United States to force Israel to withdraw to pre-1967 borders on terms acceptable to Egypt. The U.S. wants summing an even larger direct combat role than it had before the cease-fire started in August, 1970, but that would involve political and military risks it can hardly wish to

a settlement in a hurry: there lie easier relations with the Kremlin, political rewards in 1972. To a settlement pressed by Washington, however, Israel prefers a peace fashioned with Egypt. In pursuit of a made-in-America settlement, Secretary Rogers is trying to compromise Egyptian-Israeli differences. The Egyptians stand firm, so the compromises now all involve Israeli concessions. In an interim settlement, Mr. Rogers argues, Israel should let Egyptian forces cross the Suez Canal, accept a certain time limit on the cease-fire, and agree to move on to complete withdrawal from Sinai. To overcome Israel's reluctance to accept these points, the United States is withholding Phantoms, which are militarily, politically and psychologically Israel's critical weapon.

The pressure is not working. American undercutting of its negotiating position while cutting off its Phantoms has stirred Israel's deepest fears and alarms and has frozen its Mideast diplomacy. The way to thaw it is for the United States to open the Phantom pipeline—what goes through it may not be so important as Israel's knowing that it's open—and to back off and let Egypt and Israel reach toward each other at their own pace.

VENTURE CAPITAL: A GUIDEBOOK FOR NEW ENTERPRISES

HON. ROBERT T. STAFFORD

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, I am impressed by a recent publication entitled Venture Capital, A Guidebook for New Enterprises, sponsored and funded by the New England Regional Commission. This volume was prepared for the commission by the Boston College School of Management as a part of the commission's New England Industrial Resource Development program. The able director of that program, Mr. Roland A. Loveless, has recently been appointed secretary, Agency for Development and Community Affairs, to Gov. Deane C. Davis of Vermont.

In my judgment, Venture Capital is a practical, useful handbook for business entrepreneurs in the best sense of that word. As the Federal cochairman of the commission, Chester M. Wiggin, Jr., said to me:

New enterprises face a serious gap between their need for new investment capital and its availability.

This document represents a constructive effort to bridge this gap and, I might add, it reflects the kind of imaginative and, more frequently than not, effective approach taken by the New England Regional Commission and its sister economic development commissions.

It indicates to me that Congress wisely invested the commissions with a flexible capacity to meet current problems with imagination, a flexibility which is so often lacking in many of our Federal grant-in-aid programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article commenting favorably on Venture Capital, which was written by Donald White, and published in the financial pages of the Boston Globe on November 3, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEREM'S JOBLESS—READ THIS BOOK

(By Donald White)

The technologists are in town today—the ones who are working and a good many who are not.

They are here for the 25th NEREM electronics show but not all of them—particularly the ones who are jobless—care about the aisles of esoteric gadgetry and the heady technical sessions. Having raided the family's petty cash for the registration fee (\$50 for members, \$65 for non-members), they will have more important things to do finding a job, for example, perhaps even discussing with others of their ilk the unlikely prospect of turning entrepreneur and starting their own business.

Such talk is not altogether outrageous. Some pretty successful businesses have been founded in less auspicious circumstances. Desperation can occasionally trigger entrepreneurial urge in persons who might otherwise have shrugged it off.

Those in whom the entrepreneurial bug is beginning to bite could not have arrived in Boston at a more auspicious time—"Venture Capital, a guidebook for new enterprises" is hot off the press.

This locally-produced how-to-do-it was prepared by Albert J. Kelley, dean of Boston College School of Management; Frank B. Campanella, an assistant professor at the BC School of Management, and John J. McKiernan, a research associate in the BC Management Institute. It was funded by the New England Regional Commission.

It is, the foreword states, designed as an entrepreneur's handbook. "The authors and sponsors felt there was a need to remove some of the aura of 'black art' or mysticism from the entrepreneurial process, especially the financing aspects."

What makes the book of particular interest to the visiting NEREM conferees is that much of the advice offered results from information gleaned among technologically-oriented companies, the high-growth companies that have been "the glamorous high-flyers in the investment community."

The book cites a technology company as an example in listing those things a venture capitalist likes to know about a situation, though it adds that the same concepts apply to any new company. Here are the questions would-be investors are most likely to ask:

Is the company in an area of emerging technology?

Is there a market for the technology or product?

Why didn't an established company decide to exploit and market the product?

Is there a natural product line or follow-on technology?

Does management have corporate experience?

What are management's goals?

Does management have a ten-year objective and a five-year operating plan?

Does management understand and have capabilities for all phases of its operations, from research through production and marketing, as well as support functions—controller, accounting, legal and so forth?

Does management understand the nature and use of money?

Does management have a competent recognized leader and decision maker?

Having had all those questions answered to his satisfaction, the potential investor will still face the fundamental question of whether he feels comfortable with the company. "If his own intuition or gut reaction makes him feel uncomfortable, he should and probably will stay away from the company."

A word of warning about the venture capitalist: if he tries to tie up the company with too many financial gimmicks or penalty clauses, have second thoughts about dealing with him. As the guidebook states: "If a new company is going to fall extra penalty clauses aren't going to help the situation. They will only put more pressure on the entrepreneurs, causing their performance, in fact, to be reduced in a down-side situation."

One section of the book that will be prized by latent entrepreneurs is that which lists sources of capital—about 100—in the U.S. Venture capitalists seldom advertise—they have no need to because they are deluged with propositions—so this becomes a valuable source of information, something that no unemployed or disillusioned technologist can afford to miss.

M-16 DOCUMENTS REVEALED

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, on November 5 I told my colleagues about a report released by the Connecticut Citizens Action Group that charged the Colt Arms Manufacturing Co., of Hartford, Conn., with subversion in its quality control program in the manufacture of the M-16 rifle. Today I am releasing to the public the text of seven affidavits signed by Colt workers which detail their charges against the company. Some of the affidavits also indicate that there may have been some form of collusion between Government officials and the Colt Arms Manufacturing Co.

The report and these affidavits have raised such serious questions and doubts about the integrity of both the Government's inspection system and Colt's quality of program control that I have written the Secretary of Defense and Attorney General requesting a complete and thorough investigation.

The Government has a responsibility to deliver only the best equipment to our men in the field. Both Colt's management of the quality control system and the Government inspectors' lack of vigilance may have endangered the lives of American fighting men in the field.

I call to the attention of my colleagues these affidavits which follow, and congratulate the Colt workers who have shown the courage and the integrity to speak out.

The affidavits and letters follow:

AFFIDAVIT

I, Wayne Handfield, do hereby swear that all the following information is the absolute truth, to the best of my knowledge.

I am a citizen of the United States, and I reside at 17 Bristol Street, Wilson, Connecticut. I am thirty-one years old.

In March, 1964, I was first hired by Colt Industries, as a filer in the Hartford plant, on Huyshope Avenue. In 1968, I was transferred to the West Hartford plant on Talcott Road, where I was trained for the position of weapons tester. From 1968 to the present time I have been a weapons tester in the firing range at the West Hartford Colt's Firearms Division plant.

When I first came to the West Hartford

range, I worked in the second shift, from three-thirty P.M. until twelve o'clock midnight. My immediate supervisor at that time was Frank Holledrofer. The second shift was later eliminated, and I was assigned to the regular day shift, the only shift which is presently scheduled, which works from seven o'clock A.M. until three-thirty P.M. My immediate supervisor on the day shift has always been Oliver Ivy. I have always been under the direct orders and supervision of either Mr. Holledrofer or Mr. Ivy. In June, 1971, I was removed from the range by management when high lead concentration was found in my system. I worked in the packing department at the plant until September 20, 1971, when I returned to my regular duties at the range.

My duties at the range have not changed since I began work there in 1968. I test-fire and repair military and civilian rifles manufactured by Colt's and designated M16A1, M16, and XM177. I have participated in the three types of tests conducted at the test range. They are: function-firing, target and accuracy-firing, and endurance testing. Random assignment of range personnel to a specific test area is made at the start of each day by the range supervisor. Once assigned to an area, I remain at that test for an entire day.

The firing range in which I work is actually a large steel shell, designed to contain both noise and lead dust. Inside, centered near one end of the rectangular shell, is a concrete block-house, in which most of the work is done, and from which the rifles are fired. Extending from the block-house toward the near end-wall of the rectangular shell are the baffle boxes for the function-firing tests. Extending outward from the opposite side of the block-house, toward the far end-wall of the shell, are the one-hundred yard target and accuracy tubes. The endurance gun tube is on the functioning side of the range. In one corner of the block-house is a glass-enclosed office used by the supervisor.

Rifles are brought into the range in racks of eighty. Every rifle has a distinguishing serial number, and has a "traveling card" attached. The rifles of each shipment, consisting of approximately six thousand weapons, are all tagged with a distinguishing color-coded traveling card. Rifles of one shipment cannot be transferred to another shipment. No shipment can leave the plant until all rifles originally tagged for that group have either been approved, repaired and approved, or permanently rejected. We run complete three phase testing on approximately one shipment per week, or twelve hundred rifles per day.

A rack of incoming rifles is first function-fired, to assure that the weapon operates safely. Twenty rounds are put through each rifle on full automatic fire. The rifles are individually mounted on a concrete and steel stand, and fired through a hole in an armour shield. The bullets, traveling about thirty-two hundred feet per second, travel three feet before striking a series of armour plate baffles. The rounds disintegrate into dust and gases and perhaps tiny pellets. If malfunctions occur here, rifle parts are changed and the rifle is immediately re-tested. If the rifle passes the test, we stamp the travel card with our name, indicating that it passed. The rifle is replaced on the rack, and the procedure is repeated for all eighty weapons. The tested rack is wheeled to the target and accuracy area.

There are seven target tubes, each one hundred yards long. The rifles are fired on semi-automatic, only, into the tubes from the block-house. An area about four feet square is partitioned off at the port of each tube, to separate the firing stations. A concrete and steel rifle mount stands on the floor at one side of each booth, so that

the rifle, when mounted and braced by suction clamps, will protrude just into the long tube. The worker stands to the left of the mount. He peers through the mounted rifle's sights to zero the weapon in on the distant target. The target is a bull's eye printed on a paper roll of some one hundred such bulls' eyes. A closed circuit television camera is fixed on the target over the tube, and the image is displayed on a monitor mounted on the firing booth wall, to the left of the rifle mount and in front of the worker. The tester pushes a button in the booth which activates the target mechanism, rolling up a fresh target. On the left side partition of each booth is a government specification sheet, mounted under clear plastic. It indicates the precise operation to be performed at the target range, and outlines special tests to be applied in case of inaccuracies.

To test the weapon, the rack or rifles is wheeled to within four feet of the rifle mounting. The weapon is mounted and visually sighted; a point just under the bull's eye is aimed at, to compensate for the rising trajectory. The worker checks the sights alignment with a hand held rear sight gauge. We make sure the front sight is flush with the front sight assembly. We load the gun with a magazine. The charging handle is pulled back; the breech plug is removed from the chamber; the charging handle is allowed to travel forward, engaging the bolt and stripping one round from the magazine; the round passes into the chamber, and is ready for firing. We proceed to fire ten rounds, semi-automatic only. One shot is fired at a time.

Government regulations specify that we are to shoot ten rounds, with three shots to zero the rifle in. That is, if the first round hits outside the acceptable target area, I stop firing, recheck the sights, and, depending on where the round fell, I move the sight up to two clicks to the left or right to compensate. Only one such adjustment is allowed by the posted government rules. If the next two rounds fail to strike within the bull's eye zone, the rifle is rejected. If all ten rounds, or eight rounds after an adjustment, fall within the specified area and form a group on the target no larger than four and eight tenths inches in diameter, then the rifle is accepted. The travel card is stamped with worker's name and marked accepted. If any round falls outside the four and eight tenths inch area, the rifle is rejected. The card is marked to indicate gun "shoots high;" "shoots low;" "shoots right;" "shoots left;" "failed to hit the target." Rejected rifles are put on special racks marked "Repair" in the back of the range room near the Talcott Street wall.

Only a very limited number of rifles from each shipment of six thousand is subjected to the endurance test. Accepted rifles are sent to the wash room, in another part of the plant, and then to an adjacent room. There a government inspector randomly selects four rifles to be endurance tested. Note that rifles rejected for repairs remain on special racks within the range room for up to three days before being repaired and then removed for cleaning. The odds of a repaired rifle being in the group from which the endurance guns are chosen are terribly small. To my knowledge, a repaired rifle, that is, one having been rejected from the target test and barrel-straightened, has never been subjected to the endurance test. Each of the four endurance rifles are fired nearly continuously, one each for eight hours a day. We test one rifle on each day, Monday through Thursday. If at any time one of the four guns has to be rejected, the whole group of four is rejected and four new rifles from the same shipment are randomly selected for similar testing. Endurance rifles are fired in cycles of semi- and full-automatic, but are cooled periodically, and cleaned. It is not uncommon for parts to be substituted on the

endurance rifles, in order to avoid rejection of the whole series.

Repair rifles rejected from the target and accuracy range sit on special racks for three to four days, depending on how fast they accumulate. The average reject figure per day from target and accuracy is a hundred rifles, with a minimum of sixty and a maximum, to my knowledge, of two hundred and forty. Repairs are initiated generally before three racks, which can hold two hundred and forty rifles, are full. The range supervisor decides when repairs are to be made.

When I worked on the second shift most repairs were performed during a two hour over-time period from midnight until two A.M. There was no third shift, so that government inspectors, who were assigned to the area during normal work hours, were absent during the major repair period. Since I have been with the day shift it has been the only work shift for the rifle range. The majority of repairs are performed during over-time hours, usually from three-thirty in the afternoon until five-thirty. Sometimes we have worked over-time on repairs from five A.M. until seven A.M. Government inspectors keep regular hours, and thus are absent from the range during over-time periods. During the heavy production period roughly from 1968 through 1970, we worked at repairs over-time nearly every day, plus some Saturdays and Sundays. Now I do over-time repair work about once a week. During the heavy period, the supervisor frequently, nearly daily, assigned repairs during the regular work hours, although it has been a consistent policy throughout my experience on the range to perform all barrel repairs out of the sight of government employees of all designations, including regular inspectors and visiting officials.

On the day shift, Mr. Ivy, the supervisor, has always announced when repairs are to be started. Around two-thirty or two-forty-five he approaches all the range personnel and asks them individually whether they would like to work over-time. I generally ask what sort of work we are going to do. The answer is one of two things: either new work, or "T.R.'s." T.R. designates target repairs, or repair of target and accuracy rejects.

There are fifteen men assigned to the range, including the supervisor, and acting assistant supervisor, ten range personnel or weapons testers, and three ammunition loaders. All ten of the current range personnel have performed barrel straightening as described below. Generally, all but one, Robert Morin, stay during over-time repair work. Infrequently, Mr. Ivy leaves the range after initiating repairs. He is replaced by James Hollis as supervisor.

We take the repair racks to the target ports of the accuracy range where we prepare to fix them. If they are few in number, we split them up, distributing them so that each man has an equal share of the work. Sometimes, Mr. Ivy hands repair rifles to workers at around five o'clock to occupy the men during the last minutes of overtime. We go through the same procedure with these weapons as earlier, verifying the discrepancy noted on the travel card by firing a couple of shots. The gun is then unloaded and the breech plug is inserted. The rifle is freed from the mount, and the muzzle is pointed toward the floor and placed between two steel I-beams which extend aft-ward from the firing mount. The beams are anchored in concrete. The muzzle is lowered to the front sight assembly. We grab the butt stock and pull down on it, straining the muzzle against the beams, and bending it in the opposite direction from which the off-target rounds were flying. The hand-bent gun is remounted and test fired twice. If the rounds still fall outside the acceptable area, the rifle is again removed and hand-bent. Once the two rounds are accurate, the rifle is fired

ten times at each of two targets on semi-automatic. The travel card is stamped "Adjusted" and the target numbers and group sizes are noted. The rifle is returned to the rack, sent to the washroom, and rejoined with the shipment.

During my training in the range in 1968, the supervisor, Mr. Holledrofer, ordered Mr. Donald Swanson, a weapons tester, to instruct me in "barrel calibration." Mr. Swanson proceeded to show me the hand bending technique. This was obviously the accepted method, as it was witnessed constantly by Mr. Holledrofer. Once I nearly hand bent a rifle in front of a government inspector, but was severely rebuked by all the plant personnel present, who advised me it was O.K. as a normal procedure, but it was never to be done in front of government personnel. On several occasions I saw Mr. Holledrofer hand-bend rifles for workers who were having a difficult time of it. My experience in Mr. Ivy's shift has been the same, with Mr. Ivy actually hand-bending rifles on innumerable occasions. At least five or six times he has hand-bent rifles at my station when I have had a problem. The most recent such occurrence was in the last week in May, just before the lead poisoning incident.

I have seen the following men witness the hand-bending process: Mr. Ivy; Mr. Holledrofer; Mr. Robert Craig, the acting assistant supervisor; plant manager Carl Mara, who has on many occasions walked through the area during over-time bending work; and Mr. Harry Spilline, supervisor in charge of first and final inspection. Mr. Spilline was formerly a weapons tester himself, and had experience in hand-bending. He was later a range supervisor, and was subsequently made a supervisor in another department. Ray Myatt has also witnessed the process. He was quality control inspector for the company, assigned to the range, before his position was dissolved, and he has since become a weapons tester.

On Friday, October 1, 1971, Mr. Dick Welsh, a weapons tester, and a union (UAW) department steward, was told by Mr. Ivy that when he, Welsh, ran out of new work, he was to do repairs as best he could without being seen by the Federal inspector who was present in the range. I overheard the conversation and saw Mr. Welsh work on repairs the rest of the day. The repairs were in the form of hand-bending barrels.

During regular work hours on Wednesday, October 6, 1971, I witnessed the following scene at the targeting area in the firing range. Ray Myatt was testing and hand-bending M17's which were known to be destined for a foreign power (Thailand). A U.S. government inspector, passing through the area on his normal rounds, was heatedly told by Mr. Myatt that the bending was none of the inspector's business, as the rifle wasn't for U.S. troops. The inspector took no action and walked away. Mr. Myatt continued bending.

Shortly after I arrived in the range in 1968, I saw an unused piece of equipment in the range repair crib. It was explained to me at my request by a fellow targeter. It is a straightening machine made especially for the range by Colt's at a reputed cost of many thousands of dollars. It consists of a steel slab about twenty-one inches long, eighteen inches wide and two inches thick. Pegs inserted in it position and brace the deficient barrel which is first removed from the upper receiver assembly of the rifle, and from which is removed the gas tube. Thus only the barrel itself is subjected to the stress applied by the machine. A constant pressure, measured by a torque gauge built into the machine, is applied, over a six to eight hour period, to the barrel. Hand bending of a fully assembled gun, as we normally do it, takes forty to fifty seconds. The machine can only repair barrels shooting left or right; not high or low. I have never seen the machine used in

my entire period of employment. Sometime since 1968, the machine has been removed to the junk heap in back of the ammunition loading dock. With it are broken TV monitors, discarded mounts, and the like. Because the machine, which is approved by the government for repair work, is never used, no repairs are performed in government employees.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
County of New Haven, ss:

Then and there personally appeared the above-named subscriber, Wayne L. Handfield, who made solemn oath to the truth of the foregoing statements by him subscribed, before me.

[SEAL]

JONATHAN JAY EMBERS,
Justice of the Peace.

AFFIDAVIT

I, Richard J. Welch, do hereby swear that all the following information is the absolute truth, to the best of my knowledge.

I am a citizen of the United States and I reside at Cobb City Road, Colebrook, Connecticut. I am twenty-nine years of age.

I was hired by Colt's Firearms Division of Colt Industries on March 28, 1966, as a first and final inspector of M16 rifles. On November 2, 1966, I became a targeter in the West Hartford firing range, I still work in that capacity. I have always worked on the day shift, formerly under Gordon Johnson, and after him, Ora Ivey.

The prime method I was taught and which I have used to repair inaccurate rifles is to bend the barrel either by straining the muzzle between the mounting beams or by striking the flash suppressor against the floor. I have used the barrel bending machine once or twice.

Bending is done during early or late overtime periods. Once in a while, we are told by Mr. Ivy to bend a few in any port while the government men are out of the range at the wash rack, with the endurance gun. Mr. Ivy had us do this just last week. I have also worked in booth seven during the day, performing repairs of the above described sort behind the closed door. Two hundred to six hundred repair rifles might stack up before general repairs are initiated.

Government inspectors have seen the bending of foreign guns. Last week I was bending a rifle that didn't say "Property of U.S. Government" on the lower receiver. The inspector saw me bending the barrel, but he didn't say anything. He didn't question me as to whether or not it was a U.S. gun.

Ed Foley and Carl Mara have both seen the bending during the last two weeks, as well as innumerable times earlier. Paul Masocott, the quality control head after Mr. Foley, also saw us bending. Mr. Ivy has himself bent rifles on the range.

I have also worked with the endurance guns. Around 1968 we were getting a large number of guns which didn't have a chamber on the bolt; failure to feed malfunctions were regularly occurring in the endurance weapons. We were covering these malfunctions, on orders, while the government men stood or sat behind us. We could take the magazine out and clear the weapon without their seeing us. Last year we had a recurring problem in the form of a bolt stop failure after the last round. We were regularly covering that malfunction. We are still clearing the weapons during endurance testing, without the government men knowing.

After every thousand rounds or so we tell Mr. Ivy, usually in his office, what sort of problems we have covered up in the last series. Parts, including carriers, extractor springs, and bolts, are switched on the endurance gun, out of sight of the government men. All such switches are against government rules, due to the point in testing at which they are made, or the nature of the

malfunction. For thousand round regular wash break the spring is switched by the targeter or by Mr. Craig, the quality control analyst. Sometimes the quality control analysts will distract the government man long enough for us to clear the gun while it is in the mount.

The endurance test is run in a five magazine, one hundred round sequence:

- A—four five round bursts.
- B—full-automatic, one magazine (all twenty rounds at once).
- C—semi-automatic, one shot every two seconds.
- D—repeat A.
- E—repeat C.

After each sequence, compressed air is pumped through the barrel from the breech, out the muzzle, in the same path a round would follow. The barrel is cooled in this manner for some two minutes, until it is cool enough to be held in the hand.

RICHARD J. WELCH.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
County of Hartford, ss:

Then and there personally appeared the above-named subscriber, Richard J. Welch, who made solemn oath to the truth of the foregoing statements by him subscribed, before me.

ALBERT R. MAULE,
Notary Public.

[SEAL]

AFFIDAVIT

I, Victor L. Martinez, do hereby swear that all the following information is the absolute truth, to the best of my knowledge.

I am a citizen of the United States and I reside at Cobb City Road, Colebrook, Connecticut. I am fifty-four years of age.

I was hired by Colt Industries on October 9, 1961, as an archery inspector at the Hushope Avenue, Hartford, main plant. I became a leadman in the grenade launcher section, in charge of firing and inspection, and then a layout inspector, working with crew serve weapons. In February or March of 1968, I was transferred to the West Hartford plant on Talcott Road, where I was a process inspector working on M16's. In May of 1968, I was assigned to the firing range as a targeter. I was temporarily transferred out of the range in July of 1971 when excessive lead concentration was found in my blood. I will be returned to the range as soon as the doctors are satisfied with my blood tests. I have always worked on the day shift, and have always been supervised by Oliver Ivy, range master.

Prior to my employment with Colt Industries, I served twenty-two years with the Marines, retiring with the rank of Master Sergeant.

When rifles prove inaccurate at the target area, we isolate them in repair racks. I have participated in the normal repair process, which involves bending fully assembled weapons between steel beams at the targeting mounts, or whacking the muzzle end on the floor of the firing booths. I was originally instructed in these methods of repair in 1968 when Mr. Ivy ordered one of the targeters to break me in. I have only done such repair work on U.S. government weapons during overtime periods, on weekends, or during normal work hours in the privacy of the enclosed firing booth, number seven. Mr. Ivy comes around in the afternoon, offering overtime work to the targeter according to the worker's seniority.

Booth seven was enclosed and had a window-less door installed about 1969 or 1970, when it was designated for special evaluation of the Sharp's Rifle, to be done by a well known gun authority, Lester Bowen. Since the remodeling, it has been infrequently used by the Sharp people, and never by the range personnel for normal testing. However, on occasion when there is a sizable back-log of repair weapons and a shortage of new work,

Mr. Ivy assigns a man to bend rifles during the regular shift, behind the closed door of the booth, out of sight of the government inspectors. The person in seven fires a few rounds, verifying the inaccuracy, bends the rifle in the above noted fashion, then fires a few more rounds. If the bent rifle lands the test rounds anywhere on the target, the rifle is sent down to an open booth and put through the regular government approved postrepair test sequence—two targets, twenty rounds.

I, and the other targeters, have hand bent during regular hours and in the open, rifles belonging to foreign nations and rifles of the non-military sports model. U.S. military weapons are stamped with a government identification.

Everyone in the range has seen hand bending at one time or another. Whenever Mr. Ivy wants the work pace accelerated during overtime repairs, he bends the guns himself, and passes them out to targeters to be test fired. He started this practice just during the last year. Plant manager Mara has been in the range during over-time bending operations. Government inspectors have witnessed bending of commercial and foreign rifles. Bob Craig, now a technician in the range working for management with government men at the endurance gun, has bent rifles himself, in his former position as targeter. I have seen Ed Foley and Cliff Allen witness the bending. Former plant manager Paul Masocott walked through the range during bending operations while I was there on over-time.

There is a machine which is designed to straighten disassembled barrels, correcting either right or left inaccuracies only. On one occasion a couple years ago, Bob Gregorie and I were assigned to use it for the better part of a day. On Mr. Ivy's orders, the two of us broke down repair weapons, positioned the barrels, one at a time, applied the required pressure momentarily, and reassembled the weapons. That was the only time I ever used it; I saw it used one other time, by Herbie Lenholtzer, a repairman.

I have frequently been assigned to test fire the endurance gun. These weapons are supposed to be fired six thousand rounds, with only specifically designated, and limited, malfunctions. Joe Tomaselli, a targeter who has been assigned to the gun with me, and I have been instructed by Ed Foley and Oliver Ivy to cover up malfunctions. For instance, it is standard practice that if the gun should fail to feed and fail to fire, we pull back the charging handle, recharge the gun, and continue firing without the government man detecting it. The Colt's weapons technician would keep the government agent occupied during the cover-up. We are reminded prior to shooting the gun that we are to cover up malfunctions, or, if too many of a particular type of malfunction have occurred, we are told not to reveal any more. The latter instruction might apply to bolt stop failures. If a weakened extractor spring is causing trouble, the Colt's man might give you a new spring without the government agent knowing it. Specifically, Ray Myatt and Bob Craig actually handed me parts while they were assigned as technicians. They have also changed parts themselves, including bolts and carriers. Their boss, Tony Kasminsky, told me once to change a part—a spring or bolt or the like.

In another government supervised test called the Ten Gun Interchange, ten randomly selected weapons are broken down and then ten weapons are rebuilt from the mix of these parts. The weapons are then tested. The test usually requires two days. Now the government locks up the test group of parts or rifles during over-time periods, but formerly, the range-master had access to them after the government inspectors left for home. I have seen the whole upper receiver—the barrel—changed during over-time, with

the new receiver selected from outside the test group. I have seen the guns test-fired during over-time, and corrected, to insure that good results would be had during the government-witnessed regular test-firing. I myself have test fired such interchange rifles in the early morning over-time hours, under the direction of Mr. Ivy.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
County of Hartford, ss:

Then and there personally appeared the above-named subscriber, Victor L. Martinez who made solemn oath to the truth of the foregoing statements by him subscribed, before me.

[SEAL.]

ALBERT R. MAULE,
Notary Public.

AFFIDAVIT

I, Robert J. Gregoire, do hereby swear that all the following information is the absolute truth, to the best of my knowledge.

I am a citizen of the United States and I reside at 45 Joyce Street, Bloomfield, Connecticut. I am thirty-eight years of age.

I was hired by Colt's Firearms in November 1963, as a cleaner and loader in the small-arms range at the main Hartford plant. In February of 1964 I became a weapons tester of the AR-15 in the main plant, in Department 152. In May of that year the whole group was moved to the new facility at the West Hartford plant. I have worked there in the same capacity continuously, except for three months this past summer, when I was temporarily removed to another department due to lead poisoning from range work.

I have always been on the day shift, due to my seniority. My range masters have been Gordon Johnson and Ora Ivey.

I have been doing bending repairs, forcing the barrel between steel rods on the firing mounts, ever since I started range work with the AR-15 in 1964. I remember Ora Ivey showing me how to do it then. When we moved to the new West Hartford range, they installed a bending machine for the barrels, but it was used as a front. Only when there was a large accumulation of repair guns and the range master had to have some done while government men were around, we used the machine. I used it occasionally with Vic Martinez. It's been several years since I saw the machine used at all.

Between 1964 and 1966, government men used to stay with us during over-time periods to check our work. The range master or his assistant, the lead man, would tell us at 3:30 to walk out of the range, and leave the company grounds for a half hour or so, to give the impression that we were not staying for over-time. This would deceive the inspectors; they would leave for the day; we would return and bend. We were all on the clock the whole time, as was the approved arrangement. Twice I was caught doing bending during such secret over-time periods. Once an agent named Tom O'Connell found me; he took the rifle out of my hands, recorded the serial number, and reported it to the range master, Johnson, who took the gun himself. Sometimes, if we stayed right through 3:30 for regular testing work, around 5:30 we would be told to bunch up near the time clock to give the government men the impression that we were about to leave for good. The government would check out, and we would stay all hours to bend. This was all before a second shift was put on.

I worked at the interchange test from 1964 up until about a year ago, when the job was given to the repairmen. We used to do the interchange mixing in a room called the process room or the parts inspection room. We did a "dry run" before and after the disassembly. This consisted of a check of indent, head space, and trigger pull. Although these weapons came straight out of

the final inspection room, we often found improper fits on these checks. We always changed the part, whether it was before the break down, or after reassembly. Orders for switches were given by the quality control man, like Ed Foley, or the range master. Many a night I or someone in the second shift sneaked into the room to shoot, change barrels, and even target the test weapons.

I also did a lot of work with the spare parts test. This test was to determine whether shipments of thousands of parts should be brought by the government. Five weapons were taken off the final inspection racks by the government men. Each was fitted with any number of different parts from the barrels of parts being considered. If twenty different parts were under consideration, then each of the five guns had twenty new parts fitted on it. The guns were then function fired for forty rounds. If any malfunction occurred, the quality control man had to convince the government man of the reason. If the government man approved the reason, he could accept the whole shipment of parts. We regularly covered malfunctions in this test. For instance, I remember having jammed keys, which I was told to unplug anywhere I could without being seen by the quality assurance representative of the government. The company quality men always provided distraction so we could cover or make adjustments. This test was run from 1964 until a few months ago.

Cover ups have always been done on the endurance gun. Fail to feeds and fail to rejects are common problems that we are told to cover, and which we usually succeed in covering. Broken parts are switched during washing, when government aren't looking. Sometimes the government men don't even stay to observe the process.

Ivey has bent barrels many times by hand.
STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
County of Hartford, ss:

Then and there personally appeared the above-named subscriber, Robert J. Gregoire who made solemn oath to the truth of the foregoing statements by him subscribed, before me.

[SEAL.]

ALBERT R. MAULE,
Notary Public.

AFFIDAVIT

I, Wayne Handfield, do hereby swear that all the following information is the absolute truth, to the best of my knowledge.

I am a citizen of the United States, and I reside at 17 Bristol Street, Windsor, Connecticut.

When I was being broken in at the interchange test in 1968, in the Colt's Firearms testing range for M-16 rifles, I damaged the barrel nut and was tube on several weapons. I was told by the quality control man to replace the damaged parts with fresh pieces from the assembly line.

When the weapons are disassembled for the interchange, the parts are placed in numbered boxes. Frequently a box is upended and some of the parts are lost. We take new parts from the assembly line to replace them. Government agents are not told.

Sometimes a piece won't fit when we try to reassemble from the parts. Through a magnifying glass we can see it is damaged, so we switch it for a new one. This happens mostly with small parts, such as the bolt rings, extractor springs, the paw, frequently the firing pins and the disconnects, and occasionally the buffer.

All the above activities occur during normal work hours, while government inspectors are preoccupied.

The interchange guns are reassembled, function-fired, checked for cycling rate, and targeted. Since we are not closely watched during interchange targeting tests, we have

been instructed to cheat in that area. The traveling card, which remains attached to the serial numbered lower receiver throughout the test, indicates the group size, in inches, that the gun scored during previous normal target and accuracy testing. If the post-interchange group is an inch or two larger than previously recorded, we wheel in the gun so the group size figures match.

Before the interchange weapons were locked up over-night, we were frequently told during over-time to function fire and target those interchange guns which had already been reassembled. Of the ten, at least three or four were usually reassembled before the day shift ended. These we tested, to assure good results in the following day's government-monitored tests.

Two weeks ago I was assigned to the endurance gun. Every time I fired it, it malfunctioned, usually due to a failure to feed, which reflects a basic weapon failure. I covered once or twice, as instructed by the range master and quality control officers. But three or four times the government agent, Roland Sharon, looked up from his crossword puzzles and caught the malfunction. He and the quality control representative blamed the problems on the magazine, a squashed round, etc. These were not the causes. Finally Bob Craig, management's technician at the endurance gun, pulled me off the test, accusing me of purposely jamming the gun. During the twenty round full automatic part of the endurance cycle, the gun is supposed to be "adversely handled," i.e. held loosely with no firm support. Craig wanted me to brace the weapon.

Due to the sludge that forms from lubricants and dirt when the barrel is forced cooled on the endurance test, the first few rounds on full automatic after cooling regularly jam. I have seen the gun force cooled for five minutes; it wouldn't fire on full automatic until it warmed up.

Parts are regularly switched on the endurance gun. I've been told by Craig to switch a whole bolt. I have seen Craig change bolts, extractor springs, bolt rings, and, often, the disconnect, which is vital to the full automatic mechanism. When we take the gun to the washroom, the government man comes in to check the bolt rings and the extractor spring. He leaves when that is done. We then inspect these and all the other sensitive parts, replacing those that look weakened.

Two weeks ago, between October 11 and 23, a shipment of M-16's marked with yellow traveler tags had a common problem of slow cyclic rate of fire. Instead of meeting the government standard of 700-900 rounds per minute, full automatic, they were hitting 585-680. For the first half of the shipment, range master Ivey told us that plant manager Mara wanted them accepted as long as they touched 700 rpm. That meant taking weapons when they registered 701, 702, etc. Finally it was found that the locking lugs on the bolts were one one-hundred-thousandth of an inch too large, and that was the problem with every gun. A new order of bolts were substituted for insertion on the second half of the 6,000 gun shipment. No attempt was made to correct the first 3,000 that will surely jam after any amount of usage.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
County of Hartford, ss:

Then and there personally appeared the above-named subscriber, Wayne Handfield who made solemn oath to the truth of the foregoing statements by him subscribed, before me.

[SEAL.]

ALBERT R. MAULES,
Notary Public.

AFFIDAVIT

I, Wayne Handfield, do hereby swear that all the following information is the absolute truth, to the best of my knowledge.

I am a citizen of the United States, and I reside at 17 Bristol Street, Wilson, Connecticut. I am thirty-one years old.

On October 6, 1971, M16A1 rifles with the following serial numbers were in the rejected group of rifles, awaiting repairs to bring them up to target and accuracy standards:

4-596-221	4-594-476
4-592-319	4-596-160
4-596-364	4-596-410
4-598-338	4-596-180
4-595-687	4-598-390
4-593-485	4-595-238
4-596-581	4-591-880
4-594-568	4-594-985
4-593-127	4-596-299
4-594-483	4-596-383
4-595-844	4-596-767
4-576-489	4-595-507 (or 307)
	4-579-073

On October 6, 1971, I rejected the following M16A1 rifles at the target and accuracy range for the accompanying reasons (all data on this affidavit refer to the weapons firing and testing range at Colt's Firearms Division of Colt Industries, Inc., West Hartford, Connecticut):

4-596-851—left; off target
4-599-672—high 3'; right 2'
4-599-708—high; off target; right 3'
4-595-645—low; off target
4-599-651—left; off target

The latter group of rifles, as of October 6, 1971, was on a repair rack at the range. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, County of New Haven, ss:

Then and there personally appeared the above-named subscriber, Wayne L. Handfield who made solemn oath to the truth of the foregoing statements by him subscribed, before me.

[SEAL.]

JONATHAN JAY EMBIN,
Justice of the Peace.

AFFIDAVIT

I, Shaun E. Brown, do hereby swear that all the following information is the absolute truth, to the best of my knowledge.

I am a citizen of the United States, and I reside at 419 Main Street, East Hartford, Connecticut. I am thirty years old.

In February 1964, I was first hired by the Colt's Firearms Division of Colt Industries. From 1959 until 1963 I served with the Navy, attaining the rank of Second Class Aviation Ordnance Man. I was hired by Colt's as a first and final rifle inspector, but within six months I was assigned as a proof house tester, and then, still in 1964, as a targeter in the firing range. I worked in the day shift at the range from 1964 until 1967, when I quit. In 1968 Colt's rehired me with no cut in pay. I worked seven or eight months in the same capacity as before but in the second shift, and quit finally in 1968.

I tested M16A1 and M16 Colt manufactured rifles. When rifles were rejected for inaccuracy on the target range, they were repaired in one of two ways. The vast majority of the repair weapons were set aside to be bent by hand during over-time work period when no government inspectors were in the range. We never took the risk of bending a barrel during the regular work shifts, since it was perfectly understood by all range employees that the practice, while approved by the company, was strictly against government regulations. Bending was supervised by the regular supervisory personnel, and was carried out at the target mounts, where the barrels were levered between two steel beams. Occasionally, if the fault was only a slightly low trajectory, the rifle was held by the stock and the flash suppressor at the muzzle end was knocked on the rubber floor mat in the shooting booth. The second manner of repair was to send the rifle back to the assembly area to be recalibrated, that is, retorqued. Practically all were hand bent. The

rifle that was returned to assembly was very rare.

When I began with the company, on their day shift, there was no other shift on the range. Repairs were done following the normal seven A.M. to three-thirty P.M. work period, and usually lasted two hours. The company paid time and a half for the over-time. My direct supervisor, the range master, was Gordon Johnson, who was later replaced by Ora (Sonny) Ivey; he reported to Ed Foley, who in turn reported to Dan Grove, head of the quality assurance inspection department. All these men witnessed the hand bending process.

When I returned to the range in 1968, I worked in the second shift, where Cliff Allen was the range master. Since government agents were assigned in both the day and night shifts, repairs, which were still limited to over-time periods, were made only in the early morning, before the day shift, and in the late night, after the departure of the three-thirty to midnight government men. Mr. Allen, of course, witnessed the hand bending, and I saw on occasion the plant manager, Mr. Mara, witness the process. There was unlimited over-time available to range personnel who wanted it. Twelve hours a week is a conservative estimate of the over-time I averaged per week. That time was spent on both new pieces and repairs. I sometimes saw Mr. Allen and Mr. Ivy take whole racks of repair weapons and hand bend them themselves, particularly when there was a shortage of men. That practice was stopped when the union (UAW) complained that the two were salaried workers.

One night in 1968, while I was targeting rifles, Mr. Allen conducted a group of military officers through the complex. Upon the conclusion of the tour, I walked up to a Colonel White, and asked whether he would like to see how the guns were recalibrated so that they could pass the targeting qualifications. Over the protests of Mr. Allen, the Colonel and the others accompanied me to the shooting booth, where I demonstrated the normal hand bending technique. I remember questioning aloud whether this process would permanently correct the barrel's inaccuracy. I have always felt that the barrel would return in time to its former misalignment. The officers seemed interested, and asked many technical questions about the rifle. An hour and a half after their departure, I was informed by Mr. Allen that I was indefinitely suspended from work. Two weeks later I was put back on the payroll, though I was never told anything about the reason for the suspension. I had not disparaged the company or the weapon. From that day on I never bent another rifle, although I was asked repeatedly to do so. Two other targeters refused to bend barrels after the incident: Pete Taylor and "Smokey" Corlis. I quit some two months later. Hand bending was still the standard mode of repair.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
County of Hartford, ss:

Then and there personally appeared the above-named subscriber, Shaun Edward Brown who made solemn oath to the truth of the foregoing statements by him subscribed, before me.

[SEAL]

JOB L. EMERSON,
Notary Public.

AFFIDAVIT

I, Vearon S. Corlis, do hereby swear that all the following information is the absolute truth, to the best of my knowledge.

I am a citizen of the United States, and I reside at 38 Zwicks Farm Road, Southington, Connecticut. I am thirty-nine years of age.

I was first hired by Colt's Firearms as a first inspector in May of 1967. Two months later I was transferred to the firing range to be a targeter of M-16 rifles. I worked on

the second shift under range masters Cliff Allen and Frank Holledofer, and then on the first shift under Ora Ivey. I quit at the end of November 1969.

Although I never test fired the interchange rifles, I was assigned to work at the disassembly and reassembly of the weapons on two or three occasions. (Second shift personnel were rarely allowed to do interchange work, and I wasn't shifted to first shift until 1969.) On one occasion I was told by one of my supervisors to take a spare part from outside the interchange group and switch it with a group part, in order to avoid rejection of the group. There was a bench in the interchange room with a couple of drawers in it; the drawers contained a variety of spare parts, that could be secretly switched into the test group. (I switched front sight taper pin.)

I have seen "Elbow" Adams, a targeter, take reassembled interchange weapons out of the interchange room during the second shift, behind the backs of inspectors (government men) in order to test fire them. He often put them through both function fire tests and target and accuracy tests, to insure high performance the following day, when the government inspectors would be observing. This was done for just about every shipment, i.e., about once a week. Sometimes first shift men would perform the job during over-time period, into second shift hours. There was usually only one government man on the second shift for the range area, and he would spend most of his time with the first or final inspection, which was done outside the range.

I have seen other targeters change parts during the interchange test, usually when the government man left the room for coffee or such, and always under the orders of or with the standard approval of the range master or company quality control man. We would change any part that threatened the acceptance of the test group. This included parts with burrs, or those that showed "skipped operations," which meant that a machining requirement had not been met during production. Parts that wouldn't interchange, either because they were too loose or too tight would be substituted for. When we found alignment problems, which was very frequent, we would either bend the barrel, or replace the barrel, or the front sight group, or even both.

I never fired the regular endurance gun. However, after the 1967 hearings, special endurance tests were run weekly for my remaining years, and I participated in two of these. Government inspectors randomly selected from two to six final inspected weapons, and these were subjected to endurance tests of about 10,000 rounds. One failure to extract and one failure to eject were allowed. In one of my tests in 1969 the gun jammed with the cartridge stuck in the chamber. The government man told me to take the weapon apart, and we found a broken spring (ejector spring). After the test, Ora Ivey wanted to know why I let the man see the malfunction; it was normal procedure to cover the malfunctions. Government men were very often persuaded by Ed Foley, the Colt's quality control engineer, to accept a company excuse for malfunctions, and thus allow the defective weapons to be accepted, and the whole lots delivered.

I quite often heard other targeters describe cover-ups and switches performed at the endurance guns. Usually switches took place in the wash room. Targeters carried spare parts in their pockets, and these were secretly switched into the endurance test weapon. If a man didn't have the appropriate part, he would excuse himself to visit the men's room, but would in fact get the required part from the assembly area or from a repairman. Such switching occurred on about half of the endurance tests.

The only way we ever repaired weapons

that were inaccurate was to bend them, either by wedging the barrel at the firing mount, or by banging the muzzle on the floor. Rifles were almost never sent back to repairman for such repairs. I bent barrels in the two inch gap in the steel mounting casing, at the firing mount. Others used the larger space between the mount's two rails.

I would estimate that a conservative figure for the daily number of target and accuracy rejects which I had was 20%. I recall a low of about 5% and sometimes highs of 50%. These were the rifles that had to be bent.

Sometimes during the regular day shift we were supposed to bend rifles while we were targeting them and while the government man was out of sight. This not only reduced the accumulation of rejects but it also reduced the figures of rejects appearing on the company's books—it made it appear that we had a lower rejection percentage than actually occurred. Bending usually was done during over-time.

In 1968 I witnessed Shawn Brown's demonstration of the bending for Colonel White. I was at the next firing station. Cliff Allen objected to Brown's offer to demonstrate, telling Brown he should keep out of it (the official tour). Brown told the colonel that he doubted the value of the bending process in terms of a permanent repair. A little while later, Brown was escorted off the company grounds. After that, neither I nor Shawn nor Peter Taylor ever bent a rifle again. We weren't allowed to do any over-time work as long as we refused to bend.

I told several supervisors on many occasions that I disapproved of the company's policies regarding the performance tests, and the bending procedures. I spoke about these things with Holledofer, Allen, Ivy, Ed Foley, and a government quality assurance inspector whose first name was Jerry, and who was from the Springfield Armory. I didn't believe that bending actually fixed the weapons. Often we would bend a rifle and target it. It would hit the target after bending, but wouldn't group within the 4.8 inch area specified. Later we would chamfer the muzzle (an approved countersinking action performed on the end of the barrel) and re-fire the weapon, only to find it had returned to its original inaccuracy—completely failing to hit the target. This led me to believe that bending was ineffective.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
County of Hartford, ss:

Then and there personally appeared the above-named subscriber, Vearon S. Corlis who made solemn oath to the truth of the foregoing statements by him subscribed, before me.

[SEAL.] FLORENCE R. GILLET,
Notary Public.

NOVEMBER 10, 1971.

HON. JOHN MITCHELL,
Attorney General, Justice Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MITCHELL: On November 1, the Connecticut Citizens Action Group released a study detailing a program of systematic subversion by Colt Industry of their own program of quality control in the manufacture of the M-16 rifle. In this study not only has the integrity of a major arms manufacturer been called into question, but serious doubts have been expressed about both the effectiveness and seriousness of the government program of inspection.

I have released today the text of seven affidavits of Colt workers which details their case against Colt and the government.

One of the affidavits charges that a government inspector worked on newspaper crossword puzzles while the M-16 rifles were being test fired. Another affidavit asserts that an inspector who saw workers bending rifle

barrels said or did nothing. One worker has stated in his affidavit that government men were often persuaded by Colt's quality control engineer, to accept a company excuse for malfunctionings and thus allowed defective weapons to be accepted, and whole lots delivered. Another worker claimed that he informed a government inspector of Colt's policy of bending weapons by hand or pounding them on the floor. Nothing, the worker reported, was ever done.

On the basis of the charges in these affidavits I am requesting a complete and thorough investigation of the systematic subversion of the M-16 quality control program and possible collusion between company officials and government inspectors. An investigation should be undertaken to determine (1) the adequacy of the government's program of inspection, (2) means of eliminating Colt's policy of subverting its own quality control system and (3) the rate of failure of the M-16 rifle in the field.

The government has a responsibility to deliver only the best equipment. Both Colt's management of quality control system and the government inspectors lack of vigilance may have endangered the lives of American fighting men in the field.

Sincerely,

LES ASPIN,
Member of Congress.

NOVEMBER 10, 1971.

HON. MELVIN LAIRD,
Secretary of Defense, The Pentagon, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LAIRD: On November 1, the Connecticut Citizens Action Group released a study detailing a program of systematic subversion by Colt Industry of their own program of quality control in the manufacture of the M-16 rifle. In this study not only has the integrity of a major arms manufacturer been called into question, but serious doubts have been expressed about both the effectiveness and seriousness of the government program of inspection.

I have released today the text of seven affidavits of Colt workers which details their case against Colt and the government.

One of the affidavits charges that a government inspector worked on newspaper crossword puzzles while the M-16 rifles were being test fired. Another affidavit asserts that an inspector who saw workers bending rifle barrels said or did nothing. One worker has stated in his affidavit that government men were often persuaded by Colt's quality control engineer, to accept a company excuse for malfunctionings and thus allowed defective weapons to be accepted, and whole lots delivered. Another worker claimed that he informed a government inspector of Colt's policy of bending weapons by hand or pounding them on the floor. Nothing, the worker reported, was ever done.

On the basis of the charges in these affidavits I am requesting a complete and thorough investigation of the systematic subversion of the M-16 quality control program and possible collusion between company officials and government inspectors. An investigation should be undertaken to determine (1) the adequacy of the government's program of inspection, (2) means of eliminating Colt's policy of subverting its own quality control system and (3) the rate of failure of the M-16 rifle in the field.

The government has a responsibility to deliver only the best equipment. Both Colt's management of quality control system and the government inspectors lack of vigilance may have endangered the lives of American fighting men in the field.

Sincerely,

LES ASPIN,
Member of Congress.

RESERVE ROLE IN TOTAL FORCE
CONCEPT AS EXPRESSED BY DR.
TED MARRS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the November 1971, issue of the Officer, the official magazine of the Reserve Officers Association, contains an interview-type article concerning Dr. Theodore C. Marrs, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs.

In the interview, Dr. Marrs is asked some important questions about the future of the Reserve forces and how the increased emphasis on Reserves is being implemented.

Mr. President, Dr. Marrs offers a lucid and frank explanation of these matters. I ask unanimous consent that his answers be included in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

DR. MARRS CITES ADVANCES IN TOTAL FORCE PLAN

TOTAL FORCE CONCEPT PRESENTS NEW MISSIONS, NEW RESPONSIBILITIES

Dr. Marrs, the members of ROA heard with hope and pleasure the statements by you and other officials of OSD that the Reserves are being given a larger share of the Defense mission and greater support to accomplish the task. Although the statements sound good, we would like to know what actions are being taken to make stated policy a reality.

When you are seeking to attain reality, you must be realistic in your assessment of progress and must recognize that major changes do not occur overnight. On the other hand, a look at the record will show that the actions to date by OSD and the Services are in consonance with the stated policies of Secretary Laird and that the first steps toward reality of the Total Force have been taken.

One indicator is the manner in which policy has been interpreted in governing policy directives. While a listing of all the revisions pertaining to the Guard and Reserve would be too long for the editor to handle, some samples may serve to show the type of changes which are being made.

Changes being made

DoD Directive 1225.6 now requires that the Guard and Reserve units be issued combat-serviceable equipment in quantities and in accord with priorities required for the performance of training and accomplishment of mobilization missions. In the Army Components, this means Standard A and B equipment as opposed to the contingency and training standards which once characterized the bulk of the Guard and Reserve inventories. In the Navy, it means fleet-compatible ships, aircraft and other unit equipment which can be used in concert with that of the Active Force. In the Air Force, it means combat-capable, mission-effective aircraft and support equipment of all types.

DoD Directive 1235.10 incorporates the lessons learned in past mobilizations into a new compilation of procedures and standards for the mobilization of all Reserve Component units and individuals.

DoD Directive 7180.1 establishes controls and procedures for the identification and

use of moneys earmarked for the Reserve Components and places the budget reins in the hands of the Chief of each Component.

But application and implementation of new Guard/Reserve policies have not awaited the publication of new directives, and there are solid, measurable impacts of the Total Force concept. One of these was the share of the Defense Budget for Fiscal Year 1972 which was requested for support of the Guard and Reserve. The Guard/Reserve budget of \$3.1 billion for FY 1972 is almost 50 percent greater than the \$2.1 billion figure of FY 1969—an increase which occurred while the total Defense Budget showed a decrease. This is significant.

Total force steps

Other actions by the Services illustrate realistic implementation of the Total Force policy:

Army issues of combat serviceable equipment to the Guard and Reserve during the past two years had a value of more than a billion dollars—a far cry from the five-year period ending in 1969 when the value of assigned combat serviceable equipment decreased by \$72 million. And these issues include M-16 rifles, M-60 tanks, modern vehicles, new generation radios and late model aircraft—both fixed-wing and rotary. To expedite the equipment flow, the Army has budgeted special funds for depot rehabilitation of additional first-line equipment for issue to the Reserve Components.

The Navy has accomplished the first increment of its program to replace older ships assigned to the Reserve with fleet-compatible, modernized vessels which greatly increase the productivity of training as well as combat capability. The Naval Air Reserve reorganization has resulted in better equipment levels and quality as well as new concepts of training and operations which produce combat capable units. And proof of this is the fact that operational readiness inspections during carrier operations have confirmed the air crew readiness of the first Naval Air Reserve squadrons to undergo testing.

The Marine Corps continues to modernize its 4th Division right along with the active force, and to bring more capable aircraft (including new OV-10s) into the 4th Air Wing.

The Air Force is performing conversion, modernization and mission changes in the Guard and Reserve at the fastest rate in history * * * the associate unit program is being expanded to include the C-5 as well as the C-141 and C-9, and involvement of the Reserve Components in active force operations continues to characterize the training emphasis.

The record contains many other developments, but those I mentioned should be sufficient to show that actions are truly speaking with the same volume as words. We recognize the existence of additional problem areas—and we shall pursue actions in these areas to eliminate or minimize problems which hamper our progress.

Changes create problems

Is it not a fact that "modernization" of Air Force Reserve units has actually reduced capability?

It is an historic fact that, whenever you change missions or equipment in a military unit, there is a period when capability and readiness drops as people are trained in new skills, transition is completed, and readiness training reaches desired standards. The rapidity with which changes are taking place in the Air Guard and Air Force Reserve today has created some special problems which are delaying the reconstitution of combat readiness.

Required construction and modification of facilities have not been able to keep pace with the receipt of newer aircraft. Some sup-

port equipment is in short supply. Requirements for retraining of personnel (including technicians) have exceeded the programmed availability of school spaces. It has been necessary to limit the numbers of aircraft authorized for certain types of units in order to maintain required organizational structures until additional aircraft become available. These difficulties are being met by the units with their usual great enthusiasm for doing the impossible, but they are bound to cause drops in current capability and in some cases extended delays in the reattainment of standard readiness levels. It is the Air Force opinion, and OSD concurs, that the resultant and eventual increase in total force capability through modernization of the Guard and Reserve is worth the temporary decrease in current capability.

We have heard reports that Secretary Laird's repeated emphasis on the Total Force concept and the Williamson Study which he directed have met with resistance on the part of the Service staffs. Is this an indication that Active Force attitudes toward the Reserves oppose any increase in Reserve roles or readiness?

Total force acceptance

It has been my experience that there are always elements of any organization which are reluctant to accept change. I can remember Air Force Reservists who didn't want to give up their C-119s and change to four-engine aircraft—others who didn't want any part of the associate unit program.

The degree to which the OSD and Service staffs have accepted the Total Force concept and are implementing it is almost without parallel. The increases in equipment flow and the other actions we can see are only secondary to the change in thinking which has taken place.

Acceptance has not been unanimous or total, and I think this is both normal and healthy. New ideas and new initiatives should be subjected to severe questioning—thoroughly evaluated and, if necessary, field tested—before they become an accepted program. We have, in fact, built into our guidance regarding the OSD Reserve Components Study a requirement for such evaluation.

Part of the task of the Guard and Reserve under the Total Force concept is to prove their eligibility for increased reliance—to accept the new missions, new equipment and new responsibilities which are being thrust upon them and demonstrate their ability to measure up.

Markedly improved support

The Active Forces are making available markedly improved support of all types. If some Active Force members are waiting to see how well the Guard and Reserve do with this unaccustomed wealth of assistance, then my advice is to show them. As leaders of the Reserves, the members of the Reserve Officers Association have an unequalled opportunity to demonstrate the effectiveness of Reserve leadership in dispelling any doubts the Active Force may entertain.

Does the full application of the Total Force Concept include expansion of the individual Reservist's role as well as that of combat and combat support units?

The simple answer to this question is "yes"—the Total Force concept applies the full resources of the Guard and Reserve components to the requirements of national security.

Taking into consideration the hows and whens, however, makes the answer somewhat more complex. I think we all understand that there are priorities and that the first priority in application of the Total Force Concept must be increasing the capability and readiness of the units which comprise the force structure required to meet mobilization

needs. Another priority is to reorient some of our people-holding programs into unit structures designed to fill unmet mobilization needs.

These priority emphases do not by any means preclude expansion of the individual mobilization assignment programs or other individual training elements. If the Services show us a training program which will produce needed and real personnel readiness and hold interest, and propose funding which will support Service efforts to obtain the resources necessary.

No made positions

It should also be clearly understood, however, that the effort to structure the Total Force which will most effectively and economically meet national security needs does not allow for the creation of jobs or programs to "make a position" for anyone—GOs or GIs—Regular, EAD Reservist, or member of the nonactive duty components.

We have stated and restated that our policy is to make maximum use of our highly skilled manpower resources—and, in accord with priorities. We hold firm to this policy.

We recognize that steps toward Total Force reality must be taken in order of priority and that readiness of the existing Reserve Forces structure is the primary objective. What do you see as the principal constraints to attainment of this goal?

One ever-present constraint is the availability of funds. Within the Total Force framework, the Guard and Reserve expenditures are justified on the basis of the same priorities as Active Force expenditures. Admittedly, the Guard and Reserve enjoy an advantage in the present Defense climate because of the recognition that sustaining a given peacetime structure is less expensive in the Reserve Components than in the Active Forces. However, the Guard and Reserve have to prove by their own performance a useful and credible military force.

Public acceptance problem

Another constraint is the degree of public acceptance of the military in general and of the Guard and Reserve specifically as an honorable and necessary part of society. While the problem involved here is national and regional as well as local, it shows most vividly at the unit level where decisions on enlistment, reenlistment and participation depend to a great extent on the attitude of peer groups, neighbors, families and employers. We are initiating an effort to mobilize the business community nationally in support of the Guard and Reserve program. Our ability to obtain general adoption of personnel policies and practices which will recognize and encourage the citizen-soldier role of the Reservist-employee will depend largely on the degree to which we are supported by ROA and other national organizations.

Perhaps the major constraint to the full realization of the Total Force reality is the receptiveness of Guard and Reserve leaders to the new challenge and broad opportunities for service contained in the Total Force concept. Leadership is the real key. And while I do not advocate blind, unquestioning acceptance of new ideas by Reserve leaders any more than by Active Force leaders, I strongly urge receptiveness to good new ideas.

The accelerated flow of equipment to the Reserve Components is creating real and pressing problems, but the best guarantee of obtaining the technicians, facilities and other support requirements generated by the flow is to invoke the principle of field expediency if necessary to put this equipment to work and build combat readiness. Streamlined organizational structures, tailored to specific mobilization needs, are causing some dislocations, but such dislocations are being held to a minimum, and the talents and training of these people must be used by

the Services to the maximum extent in the development of reserve organizations to meet new requirements generated by the Total Force concept.

Dissension aids opponents

Fighting among ourselves about the details of program implementation, complaining about the demands created by equipment flow, or trying to obtain "make job" programs under the guise of Total Force will provide ammunition to those who have doubts about the capability of the Guard and Reserve to be part of the Total Force.

Balanced against these constraints is the most potent array of sincere and dedicated leadership which has ever been brought to bear on improvement of the Guard and Reserve: Secretary Laird and Secretary Packard—the signers of the Directives and decisions which make Total Force an attainable objective; Secretary Kelley—whose support of the Guard and Reserve has been evident, within the corridors of the Pentagon and also in the halls of the Congress.

And speaking of the Congress, there is no more outstanding example of leadership than that demonstrated by the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House, their distinguished and dedicated Chairmen, and the many other members of the Congress and staff members who not only provide the support for accomplishment of Guard and Reserve objectives but also encourage us to attempt and attain new heights of achievement.

When I speak of constraints and challenges, I do not minimize the job that lies before us in living up to the role which Secretary Laird has set forth for the Guard and Reserve. But I believe that our leadership—and I count Jerry Hart and his team in the Reserve Officers Association as an essential part of that leadership—is equal to the task.

PROBLEM OF SOVIET JEWRY

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, under the able direction of the chairman, the Honorable BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL, of New York, the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has held extremely useful hearings this week on the problems of Soviet Jewry.

Among the distinguished witnesses was Rabbi Zev Segal, chairman of the Essex County Conference on Soviet Jewry—New Jersey—who has labored unceasingly to secure redress of the grievous wrongs suffered by Soviet citizens of the Jewish faith. It was my privilege to introduce Rabbi Segal at the hearing and to witness the profound impression his testimony made upon the committee and audience. Since it merits the attention of all Members of the Congress, I am pleased to insert into the RECORD Rabbi Segal's statement at the session on November 9.

STATEMENT BY RABBI ZEV SEGAL

Mr. Chairman, and distinguished members of the House subcommittee on Europe. My name is Rabbi Zev Segal and the testimony which I am privileged to present for your consideration is on behalf of the Essex County Conference on Soviet Jewry. This organization, which I have served as Chairman for the past three years, comprises some 26 local religious and secular organizations

which embrace all of Essex County's Jewish population totalling some 100,000 persons.

It would be gratuitous on my part to recount for you the tragic nature of what it means to try to live as a Jew in the Soviet Union today. The grim features of the religious, cultural and physical persecution perpetrated by the Soviet Union upon its Jewish citizens have been thoroughly researched and carefully documented by scores of objective observers as well as by those Jews who have managed to flee to Israel and other parts of the Western World.

Just a few weeks ago, the Essex County Conference held a Rally of Concern for Soviet Jewry in South Orange, N.J. For this occasion, Seton Hall University, a distinguished Catholic center of higher education, offered its facilities. The audience heard messages of concern from the University President, Msgr. Thomas G. Fahy, The Reverend Paul Stagg, General Secretary of the New Jersey Council of Churches, our own distinguished Congressman from New Jersey, Joseph Minish, and Mr. Gustav Henningburg, President of the Greater Newark Urban Coalition. I call your attention to copies of news stories reporting this remarkable demonstration of religious and racial solidarity with Soviet Jewry. I cite this event because to me it is a most heartening and significant evidence that the plight of our fellow Jews is of real concern to all men of good will.

Let me quote a few excerpts from Mr. Henningburg's remarks which interpret my feeling in a most eloquent manner. He said, "I am a black American, preoccupied since birth with survival in a nation which has not yet, even in 1971, abandoned its efforts to destroy or inhibit my freedom, history and cultural heritage. Given that reality, it may be reasonable for some to wonder why I am here tonight, joining with you in an expression of concern about Jews halfway around the world. The answer is so obvious as perhaps not to be obvious. They are the same as those which brought so many to the march on Washington on behalf of American Blacks. It would be the height of hypocrisy for me to demand freedom from all forms of oppression for myself, my brothers and my children, while being unconcerned about the freedom of others. . . . What a charade it would be for me to challenge and attack racism in America and sit complacently by while three and a half million Jews face physical, spiritual and religious persecution in Moscow and Leningrad and Kiev and Vilna, and Minsk and Odessa."

At the same Rally, Dr. Mikail Zand, the internationally known Soviet Jewish scholar, was our guest speaker. Dr. Zand who for years has been an active spokesman for those Russian Jews wishing to depart for Israel, said this, "We are no longer the Jews of silence," referring to his brothers and sisters in the Soviet Union. "But many people who have to help us are now silent."

And this brings me to the heart of what I wish to discuss with you. Soviet Jews have seized the initiative in demanding their right to either live fully Jewish lives in the Soviet Union—or, failing this, their right under Soviet law and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to depart for Jerusalem. Those of us who remember the tragedy of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising and the thousands of Jewish lives that were lost in that heroic encounter with the Nazis are fearful that history may repeat itself. I think it is fair to say that the new, vigorous, outspokenness of Russian Jewry has been, at least in part, fanned and encouraged by demonstrations of support and concern voiced by a myriad of groups and individuals, large and small, throughout the civilized world. It would be a disaster, ladies and gentlemen, if the worldwide outcries in which we have been participating were to diminish or regress. Its inevitable result would be to isolate and

make most vulnerable those Russian Jews who are now demanding their human rights.

We are deeply grateful for recent statements in behalf of Soviet Jewry by Mrs. Rita Hauser, U.S. Representative to the U.N. Human Rights Commission and Mr. George Bush, U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. We are equally appreciative of the concern voiced recently by Mr. Fletcher, the United States Representative on the Third Commission on "Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination."

Similarly, I must applaud the recent statement by Attorney General John Mitchell concerning our government's new parole policy in regard to those Jews able to obtain exit visas to the United States. These actions by our government's ranking officials make it clear that the United States government fully accepts its responsibility, not only to focus world attention on the Soviet Jewish issue, but to take concrete steps to persuade the Soviet authorities to release those Jews who wish to emigrate.

Finally, I would respectfully suggest some specific actions which I hope will receive your thoughtful consideration: 1. In order to sustain the morale of Soviet Jewry, I urge that America's broadcast facilities, particularly the Voice of America, increase substantially the number of Jewish cultural programs beamed to the Soviet Union and other Iron Curtain Countries. 2. America's concern with Soviet Jewry can and should be more forcibly voiced in the United Nations. I am not referring to the UN's special subcommittees, but rather its highest councils. For too long the pleas and messages from responsible organizations urging full rights for Soviet Jewry have been pigeonholed and are gathering dust in committee folders in the UN basement. Several months ago, thanks to Congressman Minish's good offices, thousands of petitions addressed to President Nixon and pleading for his intercession in behalf of Soviet Jewry, were delivered to the State Department. We have yet to learn whether President Nixon or any of his staff have received these documents. I would hope that Secretary of State Rogers, in his consultations with the President, would suggest to him that it is vital to negotiate in behalf of Soviet Jewry on all levels of intercourse with the diplomatic arms of the Soviet Union.

In closing, let me again express my deep appreciation for the honor and privilege of bringing these heartfelt feelings and concern to your attention. I can assure you that America and the free world are counting on your moral leadership in this valiant struggle for human freedom.

Thank you.

DEATH OF ROBERT H. PORTERFIELD

HON. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, the recent death of Robert H. Porterfield is a loss to the country, particularly to Virginia, where Mr. Porterfield organized the now world-known Barter Theater during the height of the depression.

Mr. Porterfield was a good and kindly man, who dedicated his life to the theater. He provided entertainment for many thousands who, otherwise, may not have been given the opportunity to see live theater. In the process, he gave opportunity to many young people who later became famous actors and actresses

after learning the profession under Mr. Porterfield's guidance. Mr. Porterfield is memorialized in Virginia through the pleasure he gave so many.

Much-deserved tributes have been paid Mr. Porterfield in editorials published in Richmond Times-Dispatch and the Washington Evening Star and in a feature article published in the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot. I ask unanimous consent that these items be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Washington Evening Star]

A VISION THAT SUCCEEDED

"The State Theatre of Virginia" it is called, and at first glance that seems presumptuous for an establishment with such a modest marquee, on a small-town street far down in the hills. But the Barter Theatre at Abingdon is something very special to Virginians. And the man who founded it, and who died last week, was someone very special.

When Robert H. Porterfield moved back to his home area in 1932 to start a professional stage theater, few people thought he would last more than six months. The depression had thrown scores of New York actors, himself included, out of work, and also had made it hard for rural Virginians to sell their farm products. So he conceived of a barter theater, in which hungry actors would perform for payment in produce.

The amazing thing is that it worked. Bacon and beans flooded in and toil-weary farmers watched Shakespeare. Then a trickle of hard money began coming (including some from the legislature), and many young actors who later became renowned received their first chances at the Barter. Its stage was honored by such famous people as Ethel Barrymore and Helen Hayes.

It is nationally known and acclaimed now, but its main contributions are to Virginians, as a cultural asset and tourist attraction. A memorable ambience envelops it. On a certain summer evening not long ago, for example, a visitor would have found Macbeth playing, and Porterfield taking tickets at the door, and high school students pouring out of buses to fill the theater. They listened raptly, and when the play was over they departed into a quiet and flower-scented night. Across the street, a historic antebellum inn with tall columns was bathed in moonlight and memories.

To this small town Robert Porterfield brought a fine vision that flourished because of his untiring work and his warm and powerful personality. The theater is a living legacy, and we trust that its curtain will go up on schedule for next year's season, and for many more after that. There is nothing else like it in the nation.

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Oct. 30, 1971]

ROBERT PORTERFIELD

The death of Robert Porterfield, Barter Theatre's founder, has cast a pall of genuine, affectionate sorrow over thousands throughout the nation. Some have known him only as the charismatic person whose potent draw charmed nightly audiences with witty curtain speeches at his Abingdon playhouse. Others of the theater world feel deeply indebted to the man who created the concept of regional theater when he took Depression-plagued actors out of New York and bartered their performances for produce, tendered at the box-office of the erstwhile Town Hall. Others, now stage and screen stars of international repute, credit him and giving them their first chance to learn their craft.

It may come as a surprise to those who consider Bob Porterfield only in the context of show business that his dedication to theater largely grew out of his love for his home state. Born and reared in tiny Glade Springs on acres that had been in his family for 200 years, his life-long dream was to bring attention to Virginia in general and the Virginia Highlands in particular.

A few years after the 1932 formation of Barter Theatre, he toured his companies to every available hamlet, auditorium and meeting hall in the state because he had learned that 90 percent of the people of Virginia had never seen a live actor. Later, when costly out-of-state tours were planned, he impertuned the Virginia Legislature to grant appropriations and to acknowledge the Barter as the official State Theater. True, the annual subsidy scarcely paid for one week's touring expenses, but it was a source of pride to Bob Porterfield that he could boast of his state as the first in the nation to support its own theater.

The famous Barter Theatre Awards also had their element of chauvinism. They were presented annually for an outstanding contribution during a New York theater season and consisted of "a Virginia ham, a platter to eat it off of, an acre of land on the mountains of the Virginia Highlands and the right to award scholarships to two deserving young actors." The platter came from the Cumbow China Shop in Abingdon and the acre of land was mostly perpendicular, but that didn't deter award winners from coming to Abingdon to view their property and, under Porterfield's persuasive enthusiasm, to decide that his Virginia Highlands were about the most enticing acres in the world.

In later years, Porterfield also directed his energy into affairs of the Virginia Travel Bureau, the State Conservation Commission and the State Department of Education.

There is little doubt that he turned modest Abingdon into the home of a nationally recognized phenomenon of the theater world or that his contributions to that world can be reckoned in the myriad delights he produced for audiences and the scores of careers he aided. But his service to his state through his talents and persistence is incalculable.

[From the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot]

THE SHOWMAN THEY CALLED "MR. P"

Bob Porterfield used to have a group of well-heeled friends he called his "in-the-hole-committee." That consisted of people like Lady Astor and Eleanor Roosevelt, he didn't want broadcast too widely. He often called on them for help when things at his Barter Theatre were in a bad way. They knew this and almost without fail responded with a check.

"Bob Porterfield was the Barter Theatre," Governor Holton said at his death last week.

"Mr. P," as he was known to hundreds of actors, directors, and producers in the theater, had a way of making friendships easily and keeping them. You might not always like Mr. P's casual way of doing things (hundreds of letters from important people would pile up on his desk unread) or the way he occasionally mistreated actors. For many years he would not allow members of the acting company to go into Abingdon for fear the townspeople would revolt against the odd costumes and manners and throw the Barter out of town. But you never lacked respect for the courage he had shown in trying what many people believed impossible, starting on a shoe-string a professional theater in a rural Southwest Virginia town of about 5,000 and making it work.

The memory of people in the theater is shortlived. Yesterday's hit is today's college literary exercise, a dull fate for the playwright's craft forged as it is in the heat of battle; or, worse, yesterday's hit is today's late movie. Mr. P's career spanned a great

many years, nearly all of them taking place in the heat of battle. The one man in the theater he used to talk about more than any other was David Belasco, the great showman. Mr. P met Belasco once, had read at an impressionable age Belasco's pronouncements on the theater, and kept his admiration for Belasco's belief in the importance of theatrical illusion—that which separates the stage from and makes it bigger than everyday reality.

This was what Mr. P wanted the theater to be. He wanted it bigger, filled with a magic beauty that would give people a feeling of being involved in something larger than themselves.

Mr. P's showmanship was evident in a multitude of ways. There was the incredibly naive idea of doing "Romeo and Juliet" (with him doing Romeo) in rural Abingdon during the Depression, when people had no money and couldn't be bothered with star-crossed lovers, or at least thought they couldn't. Weren't many of the people in Southwest Virginia not only poor but illiterate as well?

There was the shrewd idea of mixing Shakespeare with folk plays about the mountain people themselves. Mr. P, who was born and grew up about 30 miles from Abingdon, especially liked these plays. He played the title role in "The Virginian," a play in the same genre if not about mountain people, hundreds of times, and the people would come back to see it a second, third, and fourth time.

To gain publicity for the Barter, there was his idea to give an award, a Virginia ham and an acre of Southwest Virginia land (actually land on a scrubby mountainside on Mr. P's farm), to the best Broadway actor and actress each season—long before the Tony Awards came into existence.

There was also his annual Ground Hog's Day newsletter, received by Kings and Queens as well as the humble.

Mr. P has never received full credit for being the first modern producer to dare step out of New York to present a season of plays, in repertory, with a full professional company. The Arena Theater in Washington, the Guthrie Theater in Minneapolis, and the Alley in Houston, and all the others took the Barter Theatre as their model.

Every night, Mr. P. delivered a curtain speech. After introducing himself, he would give away a pair of Mary Gray nylon hose to the person in the audience who had come from the greatest distance. When a man won the hose, it was always time for a terribly corny and vaguely risqué joke followed by Mr. P's rolling laugh which immediately wiped out any hint of the risqué.

He always ended his speech with the same two-liner:

"If you like us, talk about us. If you don't, just keep your mouth shut."

His voice would crack like a teenager's voice in transition at the word "just." It was the same every night and people who knew it was coming waited for it eagerly and always laughed in the same place. They knew and liked Bob Porterfield. You couldn't help but like him.

FOREIGN AID TO ICELAND

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Iceland, population 203,400, is scheduled to receive \$802,000 worth of wheat, flour, and tobacco from the United States under a Food for Peace agreement. This figures out just under \$4 in U.S. taxpayers' money for every Icelander.

This announcement follows Iceland's vote to seat Red China in the United Nations. It cannot be considered a bribe nor a peace offering for alinement with the free world.

I insert a news clipping:

[From the (Washington, D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 29, 1971]

UNITED STATES TO AID ICELAND

The United States will furnish Iceland with \$802,000 worth of wheat, flour and tobacco by next June 30 under a Food for Peace agreement, the Agriculture Department announced yesterday.

A spokesman said the agreement is the first for Iceland under the aid program.

INFLATION—CAUSE AND EFFECT

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems, we are told, confronting this Nation today, is inflation. Ludwig von Mises, a classical economist, has written many books and documents clearly outlining the causes and effects of inflation. At the close of World War II, this Congress was wrestling with the question of whether wage and price controls should be continued at the conclusion of the war. On December 20, 1945, Ludwig von Mises wrote an article in the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, which is a very concise and to-the-point document on the causes and effects of inflation. He spoke very directly to the issue as to whether wage and price controls really do solve the problem of inflation.

I commend this article to my colleagues' attention because it directly applies to the very issue that we are now considering as a Congress, that is, whether or not we will extend Federal wage and price controls:

[From the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, Dec. 20, 1945]

EFFECTS OF INFLATION

(By Ludwig von Mises)

Inflation is the process of a great increase in the quantity of money in circulation. Its foremost vehicle in continental Europe is the issue of non-redeemable legal tender notes. In this country (the U.S.) inflation consists mainly in government borrowing from the commercial banks and also in an increase in the quantity of paper money of various types and of token coins. The government finances its deficit spending by inflation.

Inflation must result in a general tendency towards rising prices. Those into whose pockets the additional quantity of currency flows are in a position to expand their demand for vendable goods and services. An additional demand must, other things being equal, raise prices. No sophistry and no syllogisms can conjure away this inevitable consequence of inflation.

The semantic revolution which is one of the characteristic features of our day has obscured and confused this fact. The term "inflation" is used with a new connotation. What people today call inflation is not inflation, i.e. the increase in the quantity of money and money substitutes, but the gen-

eral rise in commodity prices and wage rates which is the inevitable consequence of inflation. This semantic innovation is by no means harmless.

First of all there is no longer any term available to signify what "inflation" used to signify. It is impossible to fight an evil which you cannot name. Statesmen and politicians no longer have the opportunity to resort to a terminology accepted and understood by the public when they want to describe the financial policy they are opposed to. They must enter into a detailed analysis and description of this policy with full particulars and minute accounts whenever they want to refer to it, and they must repeat this bothersome procedure in every sentence in which they deal with this subject. As you cannot name the policy "increasing the quantity of the circulating medium," it goes on luxuriantly.

The second mischief is that those engaged in futile and hopeless attempts to fight the inevitable consequences of inflation—the rise in prices—are masquerading their endeavors as a fight against inflation. While fighting the symptoms, they pretend to fight the root causes of the evil. And because they do not comprehend the causal relation between the increase in money in circulation and credit expansion on the one hand and the rise in prices on the other, they practically (i.e. as a practical matter) make things worse. . . .

The problems the world must face today are those of runaway inflation. Such an inflation is always the outcome of a deliberate government policy. The government is on the one hand not prepared to restrict its expenditure. On the other hand it does not want to balance its budget by taxes levied or by loans from the public. It chooses inflation because it considers it as the minor evil. It goes on expanding credit and increasing the quantity of money in circulation because it does not see what the inevitable consequences of such a policy must be.

There is no cause (in 1945) to be too much alarmed about the extent to which inflation has gone already in this country. Although it has gone very far and has done much harm, it has certainly not created an irreparable disaster. There is no doubt that the United States is still free to change its methods of financing and to return to a sound money policy. The real danger does not consist in what has happened already, but in the spurious doctrines from which these events have sprung. The superstition that it is possible for the government to eschew the inexorable consequences of inflation by price control is the main peril. For this doctrine diverts the public's attention from the core of the problem. While the authorities are engaged in a useless fight against the attendant phenomena, only few people are attacking the source of the evil, the Treasury's methods of providing for the enormous expenditures. While the bureaus make headlines with their activities, the statistical figures concerning the increase in the nation's currency are relegated to an inconspicuous place in the newspapers' financial pages.

Here again the example of Germany may stand as a warning. The tremendous German inflation which reduced in 1923 the purchasing power of the mark to one billionth of its prewar value was not an act of God. It would have been possible to balance Germany's postwar budget without resorting to the Reichsbank's printing press. The proof is that the Reich's budget was easily balanced as soon as the breakdown of the old Reichsbank forced the government to abandon its inflationary policy. But before this happened, all German would-be experts stubbornly denied that the rise in commodity prices, wage rates, and foreign exchange rates had anything to do with the government's method of reckless spending. In their eyes only profiteering was to blame. They advocated thoroughgoing enforcement of price control as

the panacea and called those recommending a change in financial methods "deflationists."

The German nationalists were defeated in the two most terrific wars in history. But the economic fallacies which pushed Germany into its nefarious aggressions unfortunately survive. The monetary errors developed by German professors such as Lexis and Knapp and put into effect by Havenstein, the Reichsbank's President in the critical years of its great inflation, are today the official doctrine of France and of many other European countries. There is no need for the United States to import these absurdities.

BLUNDERING AMERICAN POLICY IN ASIA

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most perceptive and resourceful diplomats our Nation has produced, Chester Bowles, recently wrote an article on American policy in Asia which appeared last week in Saturday Review magazine.

In this essay, Mr. Bowles examines "Five Major Blunders by the U.S. in Asia" during this century. One of the most important of these disasters has been the continued, benighted American policy in the Indian subcontinent. For almost 20 years now the United States has callously peddled all manner of arms to the repressive government of Pakistan. With incredible naivete the Eisenhower administration accepted Pakistan's pledge that the millions of dollars worth of arms we were supplying, presumably to block a Soviet or Chinese thrust through South Asia, would never be used against India. The chickens of this myopic policy came home to roost in 1965, when, during the brief but bloody India-Pakistan War, ". . . every Indian casualty in the conflict was caused by an American bullet, bomb-shell, or hand grenade."

And, until this past Monday the administration allowed the supply of spare parts for these American-supplied weapons to continue despite the Pakistan dictatorship's genocidal military policy in East Bengal and the threat of renewed war between India and Pakistan. As we review the sorry record of American policy in South Asia set forth by Ambassador Bowles, it should no longer remain a mystery why American-Indian relations are at their lowest point in the last 20 years or why the world's largest democracy felt compelled in September to enter into a friendship and cooperation pact with the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, as I include the Bowles article at this point in the RECORD, I would also like to remind my colleagues that I will be reintroducing with co-sponsors next Monday a resolution on the Pakistan situation. The text of that resolution also follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas there is tragic suffering and loss of life in Pakistan and India caused by starvation, disease and civil war in and about

the eastern Indian states and East Pakistan and these conditions prevail today;

Whereas this situation has been caused and aggravated by the Pakistani Government in pursuit of genocidal military policies which constitute a crime against humanity;

Whereas increased shipments of food and medical supplies are needed to reduce the tragic rate of starvation and related deaths: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House that: (1) the President should act to increase significantly the amount of surplus stocks, relief moneys, noncombat aircraft, medical personnel and other such supplies and personnel as may be necessary for relief purposes; and that (2) this relief assistance should be made available to international relief organizations directly involved in the alleviation of conditions within that Asian sector and proportionate amounts should be made available to the Government of India; and that (3) the President should immediately suspend all forms of assistance to the Government of Pakistan, save humanitarian relief supplies, pending a peaceful settlement of the civil war in that country; and that (4) the President urge the Pakistani Government to end the strife in that country, such urging being undertaken through direct diplomatic channels and through the offices of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization; and that, (5) the Government of the United States should solicit the cooperation of other nations in this humanitarian effort.

[From Saturday Review magazine,
Nov. 6, 1971]

FIVE MAJOR BLUNDERS BY THE UNITED STATES IN ASIA

(By Chester Bowles)

(NOTE.—Chester Bowles retired from governmental service in 1969 after a long and distinguished career during which he twice served as U.S. Ambassador to India; from 1951 to 1953 and from 1963 to 1969. His political memoirs, *Promises to Keep*, were published this spring by Harper & Row.)

At the end of World War II, American prestige and influence in Asia were at their peak. We had liberated nearly a billion people from Japanese rule and followed our military victories with a flood of economic assistance for relief, rehabilitation, and development. The massive amounts of capital and technology that we provided for our former enemy—Japan—helped it to become within a single generation the third most productive nation in the world.

After this brilliant beginning, however, we appeared to lose our way. Greatly underestimating the revolutionary new mood in Asia in which people and ideas provided a powerful motivating force, we clung doggedly to the assumption that our enormous military capacity would enable us to write our own political ticket.

Let us examine our five most costly blunders and then consider what lessons may be learned from them.

1. China. Dr. Sun Yat-sen's emergence as President of China, following the collapse of the Manchus before World War I, provided us with a unique opportunity and challenge. But his pleas to the United States and the nations of Western Europe for economic and technological assistance were ignored, and in 1923 Dr. Sun reluctantly turned to the Soviet Union.

In the succeeding years China was torn by civil war between Nationalist forces under Chiang Kai-shek and the Communists led by Mao Tse-tung. During World War II, we helped train and equip twenty Nationalist divisions to oppose the Japanese and following the war helped train and equip forty more to oppose Mao Tse-tung. However, while Mao Tse-tung was offering each Red Army

recruit five acres of land, we were supporting the old regime dominated by war lords, landlords, and monopolists who had been exploiting the Chinese people for centuries. At no time during those critical years did the U.S. government indicate a genuine understanding of the powerful political, economic, and social forces that were gradually creating a new China.

In the summer of 1951, General Albert Wedemeyer stated to a Senate committee, "China fell not for lack of military manpower or equipment, but for lack of spirit. The Nationalist armies could have defended the Yangtze with broomsticks if they had had the will to do so."

On December 7, 1949, just eight years after the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, Mao Tse-tung in Peking proclaimed the People's Republic of China. Our abortive effort to bolster a corrupt, reactionary, and ineffective government that had almost no following among the Chinese people thus came to a dismal end. With Senator Joe McCarthy leading the way, we then embarked on a bitter political witch hunt to determine who had "lost China," which further weakened our ability to deal effectively with new problems to come. Our traditionally close relationship with China makes our dismal record in dealing with modern China all the more tragic.

2. Korea. In January 1950, Secretary of State Dean Acheson in a speech before the Press Club in Washington drew a line defining our "national interests" in East Asia. The Philippines, Taiwan, and Japan were placed within that line, but South Korea was placed outside of it.

Six months later, when the Soviet-trained North Korean Army moved across the 38th parallel boundary line to invade South Korea, the U.S. government, no doubt to the surprise of China, the U.S.S.R., and North Korea, asked for and received a U.S. mandate to organize a United Nations army to halt the invasion.

On September 15, General Douglas MacArthur landed U.N. forces at Inchon just below the 38th parallel borderline and cut off and largely destroyed the North Korean Army, which by that time had occupied most of South Korea.

But instead of halting the advance of the U.N. armies at the border from which the North Koreans had launched their attack, MacArthur, with no clear political guidance, proceeded rapidly to move his forces north. As the U.N. armies neared the Chinese border along the Yalu River, the Chinese launched a massive attack, precisely as they had threatened to do. The U.N. forces, caught by surprise, were forced to retreat 250 miles to positions below the 38th parallel.

In July 1953, two years and ten months later, we agreed to a ceasefire on roughly the 38th parallel, where the U.N. forces could have stopped in September 1950, with its stated mission accomplished. In the interim, some 25,000 additional American soldiers had been killed, plus many other officers and men of the U.N. army, and no one knows how many Koreans and Chinese. The cost was an additional \$45-billion.

3. Taiwan. When Chiang Kai-shek with the remnants of his forces retreated to Taiwan following his crushing military defeat in 1949, we offered a security guarantee and generous economic assistance. Under the circumstances, this was a reasonable position. Unfortunately, our government then went much further and agreed to retrain and re-equip what was left of the Nationalist forces, not simply to protect Taiwan from invasion but to land on the mainland, "liberate" China from Communist rule, and re-establish Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist government in Peking.

This bizarre undertaking was vigorously supported by the White House, the Pentagon, the State Department, and many influential

members of Congress as "essential to our security." The relatively few American leaders who understood the military absurdity of this exercise were quickly cowed by the China lobby, spearheaded by the Committee of One Million.

4. Southeast Asia. During World War II, President Roosevelt often expressed his determination to keep the French from re-establishing their colonial position in Indochina. However, official papers in his library indicate that he was undercut by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who were encouraged by the British to take a totally different position.

As a consequence, in May 1950, we agreed to underwrite the French effort to maintain their colonial position in Indochina as a *quid pro quo* for a French agreement to contribute twelve divisions to the recently organized NATO defenses in Europe. The purpose of this military aid, according to Secretary of State Acheson, was to assist France "in restoring stability and in permitting the Associated States of [French] Indochina to pursue their peaceful and democratic development [sic]."

In August of 1952, on my first visit to Saigon, an average of one freighter loaded with U.S. military equipment was arriving daily. Although the equipment we provided under this agreement amounted to \$2.3-billion before the collapse of the French stronghold at Dienbienphu, the promised French divisions for NATO never appeared.

On February 4, 1954, less than two months before this disaster brought an end to the French military effort, Admiral Arthur W. Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told the House Foreign Affairs Committee that "the development of a broad strategic concept by the French and Vietnamese commanders in Indochina, supported by the United States' financial and military assistance, should ensure within a very few months a favorable turn in the course of the war. . . . Communist prospects of achieving any decisive immediate successes are non-existent."

Following the French defeat, from which we appeared to learn nothing, we assumed a series of self-selected obligations that led to a new succession of errors. First, we helped sabotage the free elections in Vietnam that had been agreed to at the Geneva Peace Conference of 1954. We then poured in large amounts of military and economic assistance to prop up the new South Vietnamese government, with no serious effort to press that government to make essential reforms in land ownership and taxation, the lack of which had been a major factor in Chiang Kai-shek's failure in China. In 1961 we introduced U.S. Air Force and Army ground training units, followed in 1964 by a major commitment of American ground forces, plus air and naval support. In 1970 we invaded Cambodia and, in early 1971, Laos, in order, we explained, to "assure the peace."

The direct cost to the American people of the Vietnam debacle thus far is estimated by the Foreign Affairs Division of the Congressional Research Service at \$120-billion in addition to the combat deaths (as currently reported) of more than 45,000 American soldiers and the destruction of the country and the people we had set out to "save."

5. South Asia. This blunder is now being compounded by the same kind of military and political miscalculations that have cost us so dearly elsewhere in Asia.

The sequence of errors began in the fall of 1953, six months after I resigned as U.S. Ambassador to India, when Ayub Khan, then Chief of Staff of the Pakistani Army, came to Washington with a proposal of Pakistani military and political "support" for U.S. policies in Asia in return for a large grant of military assistance.

On December 23, 1953, I wrote Secretary of State John Foster Dulles describing what I believed to be the danger of a U.S. military

pact with Pakistan. Such an arrangement, I wrote, would exacerbate relations between India and Pakistan, divert their resources from economic development to an arms race, increase the possibility of war, and ultimately lead to much closer relations between India and the U.S.S.R. It was no more sensible, I said, than an attempt by France or the Soviet Union to build up Mexico's military capacity vis-a-vis the U.S., or that of Denmark vis-a-vis Germany.

In a speech to the Indian Parliament in February 1954, Nehru described the proposed U.S.-Pakistani agreement as "a step that will bring the threat of war to our frontiers." He also pointed out that the military equipment that the Pakistanis had requested from us had no relevance to our stated objective, i.e., the creation of a Pakistani Army and Air Force capable of opposing a Soviet or Chinese military movement through the Himalayan or Hindu Kush passes. The tanks, fighter planes, and motorized artillery that the United States had agreed to give Pakistan were unsuitable for mountain warfare. They were designed for use on flat terrain; in other words, on the plains of northern India.

But this was only the first scene in a play that has continued for seventeen years. And, as each argument in support of U.S. military supplies for Pakistan has been challenged, its proponents have quickly and adroitly substituted a new explanation.

By the late 1950s, Mr. Dulles's assumption that West Pakistan (East Pakistan was 1,200 miles to the east and not a factor) could play a significant role in blocking a Soviet or Chinese military move into the Middle East and South Asia, began to be questioned by Congress, the press, and the public. The influential Pakistan lobby in the Pentagon and the State Department then quickly shifted its rationale. This aid, they said, was essential to ensure our continued access to the U.S. military base at Peshawar in Pakistan, from which the U-2 flights over the Soviet Union took off, thus providing the Pakistani government with one more lever with which to influence U.S. policy in South Asia.

In August 1965, some 5,000 Pakistani guerrillas infiltrated the Kashmir Valley and the brief but hard-fought Pakistani-Indian war began. Although President Eisenhower's pledge that we would never allow U.S. equipment to be used by Pakistan against India (later reaffirmed by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson) was broken, our government refused even to make a public protest. Since every Indian casualty in the subsequent conflict was caused by an American bullet, bombshell, or hand grenade, the Indian government, public, and press were predictably bitter. By then our military assistance to Pakistan totaled more than \$1-billion.

Ironically, the political and military price that the Pakistanis exacted for our "indispensable" Peshawar base was spent in vain. In 1968, under pressure from the U.S.S.R., Pakistan refused to renew our agreement, and we were forced to leave the base the next year.

But the resourceful advocates of military assistance to Pakistan promptly pulled another rabbit out of the hat. American military equipment, it was now argued, must continue to go to Pakistan because "the Chinese will provide it if we don't," a rationalization that might be used with equal validity by a drug peddler selling heroin on a street corner.

In late March 1971, when the bloody upheaval occurred in East Pakistan, American military equipment was used by the Pakistani government to subdue its citizens in the eastern part of the nation whose crime was the overwhelming vote they had cast for greater autonomy within the Pakistan union in the December 1970 election—the first democratic election ever held in Pakistan.

Shortly after the fighting began in East Pakistan, the State Department and the Pentagon assured the Congress, the press, and the public that there would be no further deliveries of military equipment to West Pakistan until the political situation had settled down. But a few weeks later, an alert Congress and press disclosed that Pakistani ships loaded with military equipment for Pakistan were still quietly leaving American ports. By mid-July it was clear that this decision had been made in the White House, presumably as a *quid pro quo* for Pakistani assistance in setting up Mr. Kissinger's visit to Peking.

In September 1971, the Indian government, fearful of a combined attack by West Pakistan and China and convinced that now (unlike 1962) it could expect no help from the United States, signed a treaty of friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union.

As this is written, the one man who might still make peace in South Asia is Mujibur Rahman, the charismatic president of the Awami League, which won 167 out of 169 seats in the East Pakistan constituent assembly in the elections of December 1970. But Mujibur is now languishing in a West Pakistan prison, having been charged with treason, the penalty for which, the Pakistani authorities emphasize, is death.

Without massive economic and military assistance from the United States, it is unlikely that West Pakistan can reassert its authority over East Pakistan. For better or for worse, the die has been cast; East Pakistan will eventually win its independence.

This series of blunders constitutes a shocking record of miscalculations, mismanagement, and a lack of understanding within our government of the tidal wave of political and economic change that is sweeping Asia. How can this be explained?

World War II left the United States in a position of substantial military and economic hegemony over a large portion of the globe, and this position of temporary predominance quickly became the basis for our expectations about how events in all parts of the world should proceed. Our policies were further distorted by our failure to recognize the new dimensions of power in the developing countries and by our conviction that a monolithic, worldwide Communist movement directed from Moscow was about to destroy the U.S. and take over the world.

As we felt threatened by military power, our response became more and more militarily oriented. In spite of our long anti-military tradition, military men on active duty began for the first time in our history to play key roles in formulating American foreign policy during what was generally considered a period of peace.

In arguing their case before the President, Congressional committees, or in day-to-day dialogue within our own government, the military has had important advantages.

Political, social, and economic forces, no matter how important, are often difficult to define and even more to evaluate, while the case for military action can be stated in much more precise terms, e.g., such and such number of ground troops, so many air strikes, so many tons of bombs, and so many "body counts" will provide such and such a result.

This tactical advantage of the military in the bureaucratic give-and-take is increased by its near control over 25 per cent of our vast national budget and by its power to allot contracts and to locate thousands of military installations in areas where members of Congress have a major political interest; a substantial Pentagon public relations budget has been thrown in for good measure.

This is not to imply that advocates of our disastrous military-oriented policies in Asia all wear military uniforms; a great many do not. Among the most articulate and dogged are civilians in the White House and

the State Department as well as the Pentagon who are eager to prove to the President, to their associates, to the press, and to the world at large that they are "tough-minded realists" who are prepared to "face the hard facts." In fairness to the military, it may be pointed out that the White House and the State Department, by failing to provide clear political guidelines for our armed services to follow, have created the political vacuums that the military have attempted at such heavy costs to fill.

In Korea, as we have seen, General MacArthur was allowed to use his own judgment, which on most political questions turned out to be bad. The result was a needless prolongation of the war, a needless loss of life, and the transformation of a brilliant military victory into a costly military and political stalemate.

In China and later in Taiwan it was again the military-minded men, in the absence of clear political direction from the White House and the State Department, who led us to support Chiang Kai-shek and then to avoid putting him in a politically embarrassing position by exerting pressure for the economic and social reforms that alone could have saved him.

In Indochina the military pressed for more and more logistical support for the French forces even when the French were clearly doomed to defeat. Before and again just after the collapse at Dienbienphu, high officials in the State Department and the White House in addition to the Pentagon seriously advocated American intervention with nuclear weapons.

Many high-level civilians as well as military policy makers still can't understand how a motley army of undernourished Vietcong and North Vietnamese, armed with only the conviction that they were fighting for their freedom, could for eight years successfully cope with our best U.S. Army and Marine units supported by a large Air Force and nearly a million well-equipped South Vietnamese troops.

In South Asia it was the support of two Presidents and two Secretaries of State that for seventeen years enabled the strong Pakistan lobbies in the Pentagon and the State Department to keep large quantities of arms flowing to Pakistan, even after it had become evident that this was not only a bottomless pit but that it jeopardized our relations with democratic India, with its 500 million people, and may create new tensions in South Asia that could easily erupt into war.

Among the most critical foreign policy questions that the American people and their government are now called upon to answer are: 1) Can we understand, while there is still time, the political, economic, and social forces that are now shaping the future of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, where two-thirds of mankind live? 2) And if we do understand those forces, can we create a governmental structure capable of dealing effectively with them?

Unless we can answer those two questions affirmatively and abandon our present tough guy posture in world affairs (which frightens our remaining friends at least as much as it frightens our enemies), the American government and people will increasingly find themselves cut off from and at odds with a sizable majority of mankind.

AMERICA WE LOVE YOU

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it may be stating the obvious, but the

one common thread which binds all of us in this body is a genuine liking for people. I am not speaking of a love of mankind, which often is a thing apart, but a liking, a feeling of warmth, toward those with whom we come in contact.

In my district, in the city of Danville, dwells a fine lady who also shares in this liking for her fellow man, and who puts her beliefs in practice every day. Retired from that city's schools, Mrs. Alice Haden Merritt, who resides at 1245 West Stokes Street, now devotes much of her time to visiting the sick, the elderly, the shut-ins, and inmates at the city's jail. Mrs. Merritt passes along a word of encouragement, and a smile, as we all might do. But she does something more. For Mrs. Alice Haden Merritt is a talented poet, a published author, and an accomplished composer as well.

Recently it has been my good fortune to obtain a copy of a patriotic song, "America We Love You," which Mrs. Merritt has written. It is an inspiring tribute to her country from one whose life displays the virtues we all associate with the word "American." I insert the lyrics to this song in the RECORD at this time. Hopefully, after reading the lyrics, Members will encourage its use.

The lyrics to the song follow:

AMERICA WE LOVE YOU

(Words and Music by Alice Haden Merritt)

We love your walls of service,
And monument that stands
For him, who saved his country
With strength and eager hands.

America, we love you . . .
You taught our hearts to dream
Among your hills and mountains,
Beside your crystal streams.

America, we love you . . .
We pledge so faithfully
To cherish one another
With faith and loyalty.

STATEMENT FOR NATIONAL YOUTH
APPRECIATION WEEK

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Youth Appreciation Week, and I think it is an ideal time to express our appreciation of the vast majority of young people who are leading constructive lives, making outstanding contributions in home, school, church, and community.

Never before in the history of mankind has life so challenged a nation's youth as America in the decade of the seventies. And, I believe, never before has a generation of young people been so eager and so well prepared to meet that challenge. Young Americans graduating from our high schools and colleges today are better educated, more aware of the significance of national and international events, and more sensitive to the needs of their fellow human beings than any previous generation.

In recent years our young people have

been in the forefront in the ongoing task of evaluating our national goals, priorities, and institutions. This is as it should be, because, 100 million strong, they have the greatest stake of all in our Nation's future. There is, unfortunately, a highly vocal and activist minority which is sworn to the project of liquidating American society and starting anew, but it is a distinct minority. The great majority of our young people is preparing to undertake the awesome tasks of our time constructively, and with quiet dedication to the American ideals we cherish.

The thrill of our era is the new hope that technology, subordinated to the search for dignity and quality in human life, can now provide the tools which will make the American dream a reality for all Americans. The frontiers of our technological knowledge will yield the means to preserve and protect our magnificent natural heritage, revitalize our rural areas and the cities, make available the resources of the seas, and lay before us the mysteries of the solar system and the universe beyond.

Today our young people are asking that our technological accomplishments lead to a new emphasis on the dignity of the individual and the quality of human life. They are asking that our institutions be as responsive as possible to individual wants and needs. Surely we could ask of them no finer quest. We are rightly proud of their efforts, which reflect the finest ideals of patriotism and citizenship.

INCREASE IN DAIRY IMPORTS

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, over 3 months ago the U.S. Tariff Commission recommended to the President the establishment of absolute quotas on imported cheese selling for over 47 cents per pound. I was hopeful the President would act quickly on that recommendation. Unfortunately, to date no positive action has been taken.

During this delay imports of these cheeses have been increasing. Department of Agriculture figures show that imports from January 1 to August 30, 1971, of Swiss-Emmentaler, Gruyere process and other varieties selling for over 47 cents per pound grew by 107 percent, 108 percent, and 111 percent over this same period in 1970. Between August 30 and September 30, these imports grew even more—to 113 percent, 110 percent, and 115 percent to their 1970 levels.

This increase in dairy imports is a burden to the American taxpayer because imports displace from normal market channels domestically produced dairy products which are then purchased by the Federal Government under our dairy price support programs. With domestic production itself increasing, it is obvious that the Tariff Commission recommendations should be implemented soon—because both the taxpayer and

our domestic dairy farmers are now the losers.

Action should no longer be put off. Imported cheeses selling for over 47 cents accounted for almost 25 percent of all dairy imports in 1970. The figures I cite above indicate this situation may even be getting worse. Certainly if it is the intention of the President to support the dairy industry and keep the cost of dairy support programs down, he must take action now.

TWO SIDES TO THE INDIA-
PAKISTAN DISPUTE

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the American public has heard Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of India, on a nationwide broadcast conducted by one of the major networks. These broadcasts by distinguished visitors serve a useful purpose. However, in this case, only one side of a major controversy has been given. It is equally important and the fair thing to present the other side in the dispute between India and Pakistan. A very considerable part of the recent broadcast had to do with the difficulties between these two nations. A leading Pakistani official should have equal time on a program of equal prominence to discuss Pakistan's views on the questions which were discussed.

It is regrettable, but it has been consistently true, that only one side of the India-Pakistan controversy has been given to the public by the news media. I doubt that anyone really knows the truth about what is happening over there. Possibly an unbiased congressional team should visit the area and attempt to ascertain the facts. Many of the statements which have been made are extreme and controversial. It is almost certain that the truth about the problems in East Pakistan is somewhere between the claims of the anti-Pakistan groups and the statements made in defense of Pakistani policies by friends or officials of that country and that neither is entirely correct.

There is now serious threat of war between India and Pakistan. It would be a grievous mistake if it were to break out. It would settle nothing. It would produce only more deaths and more suffering. The war probably would be fought largely on East Pakistani soil where there already has been trouble enough. Pakistan's forces are heavily outnumbered by Indian forces and they also are lacking in modernization. Pakistan has had to rely largely upon Red China for military equipment and the quantities of such equipment have been limited. India has had the benefit of generous supplies of armaments, principally from Russia. It could be a one-sided war and result in the occupation by India of parts or all of East Pakistan, just as Kashmir which is claimed by both nations also has been occupied in part by Indian forces. India's

interest in East Pakistan apparently is in seeing that independence or self-government is gained by this part of Pakistan. Thus war would add to and aggravate rather than solve the already existing problems.

All in all, it is a very complicated question and one which is not clearly understood by the American people. This much is certain: If the United Nations is to exercise any worthwhile influence as an organization, this is a fertile area in which its efforts can be expended. The major nations of the world, including the United States and Russia, should also be bending every effort to restore order in this troubled part of the world.

GLENN ELLIOTT, OLD-FASHIONED
FLAG-WAVING AMERICAN PA-
TRIOT

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, at a time of apparently diminishing patriotism in our Nation, I am most proud to bring to my colleagues' attention the activities of one of my constituents, Lt. Col. W. Glenn Elliott, retired. Colonel Elliott is the founder of the American Society of the Golden Horseshoe, an organization dedicated to reviving and stimulating patriotism in our land and to honoring and aiding the many veterans who have served our Nation well in its time of need.

Colonel Elliott himself began his military service as an ambulance driver in France during the First World War, and he is preceded by a long list of patriots dating back to the Revolutionary War. I feel that he should be highly commended for his benevolent and patriotic activities which have continued over his lifetime, and I wish to insert the following articles outlining his efforts in the RECORD:

[From the Virginia Beach Sun, July 29, 1971]

GLENN ELLIOTT—OLD-FASHIONED,
FLAG-WAVING AMERICAN PATRIOT

(By Howard Swindle)

W. Glenn Elliott, 74, white-haired and bow-tied, had just finished telling about driving a Model-T Ford ambulance through the ruts of a war-torn France in 1918 and about his mule named Maude.

Elliott's experience sounded much like those of novelist Ernest Hemingway, also an ambulance driver, during his tour in Italy. Perhaps it was these experiences, encountered more than 50 years ago, that led Elliott to his "labor of love"—the American Society of the Golden Horseshoe.

Navy Lieutenant Phillip Heth, Elliott's next door neighbor and close friend, describes the society as "an organization dedicated to good, old-fashioned, flag-waving American patriotism."

And, if ever there was an old-fashioned flag waver, it would have to be W. Glenn Elliott, World War I ambulance driver, World War II lieutenant colonel in the Virginia State Guard and current advocate of anything patriotic.

Hanging in a prominent place in Elliott's home within earshot of Oceana Naval Air Sta-

tion is a plaque from a naval evacuation hospital in DaNang, Vietnam. The hospital, along with other military and veteran hospitals throughout the world, has reaped the benefits of Elliott's flag-waving brand of patriotism. Since he founded the Society of The Golden Horseshoe in early 1966, the organization has sent more than \$18,000 in cigarettes, tobacco, peanuts, candy and books to servicemen everywhere.

About every 10 days, Elliott gets in his nine-year-old Chevrolet for a tiring trip that takes him through Chesapeake, Suffolk, Petersburg, and Richmond collecting money from nearly 100 quart jars he has placed in restaurants, small grocery stores and other businesses. It is the pennies, nickles, dimes and sometimes quarters left in these jars by customers that finance a pack of cigarettes, a bar of candy or a can of peanuts for a GI in Vietnam.

True to Elliott's lifestyle, every jar has a small red, white and blue flag taped to it. Elliott's den, or "office" as he calls it, is covered with small flags and boxes of jars. On a cluttered cot lies a large, faded flag. I've got to get another flag," Elliott said "This one's getting pretty old." He flies it in front of his house every day, and he says he'll continue to fly it until the war in Vietnam ends.

Of his cross-country-fund-raising trips, Elliott says, "We do anything and everything we can possibly do to revive patriotism in Americans." Though the American Society of The Golden Horseshoe (the name comes from an event in development of colonial America) concerns itself primarily with servicemen overseas, it also attempts to have the flag flown from as many places as possible.

The society lists as honorary life members former Alabama governor George C. Wallace, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., Virginia Beach councilman Frank A. Dusch and former Senator A. Willis Robertson who suggested the society's name.

One of the society's most recent campaigns revolves around gaining support "for our leaders in their defense of J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI." But a talk with the society's founder leaves little doubt as to the primary aim of the society—helping the serviceman.

Elliott, a former adjutant of the Virginia American Legion and a civil service worker, speaks proudly of his family's military service. "One of my forefathers fought in the Revolutionary War," he said. Since then, there have been relatives in the War of 1812, the Civil War, the Spanish American War, World Wars I and II, the Korean Conflict and Vietnam.

At the age of 69, Elliott exhausted all avenues trying to volunteer for duty in Vietnam so his grandson wouldn't have to go. He told a neighbor, "That's one less young man who'd be shot at—I've already lived a full life."

A small picture frame with an American flag and three rows of ribbons hangs in Elliott's den-office. "Those belonged to my son Jack," he says. "Raising children you can be proud of is one of the most noble things a parent can do." His son, a member of a flight crew during World War II, was killed during a mission over Germany.

Elliott's campaign to send gifts to servicemen dates back to World War II when a cigarette salesman told him he could send tobacco overseas tax free. He took time off from his post as editor and business manager of the Virginia Legionnaire magazine to pass out containers for the funds.

Today, Elliott has an agreement with several tobacco companies in which they pack the cigarettes and send them directly from their factories. "Since they're sent tax free," Elliott says, "we only pay about 11 cents per pack." He has similar agreements with peanut and candy manufacturers.

To pacify one woman who was "hard against tobacco," Elliott changed the sign on his canisters from "Send Tobacco to Men in Vietnam" to "Send Goodies to Men in Vietnam." "After I changed the sign, she let me put a jar in her store," he said.

He said a few gift packages sent to individuals in Vietnam have come back stamped KIA (Killed in Action) and MIA (Missing in Action).

Elliott's canisters also serve as a pretty good barometer for public opinion on the war in Vietnam. "When Lieutenant Calley was being tried, donations went up quite a bit," Elliott said. Thinking people might give more money if they were contributing to veterans in government hospitals, Elliott changed a few of his signs, emphasizing the veteran. "Those canisters with Vietnam written on them drew quite a few more donations than the others (those emphasizing the veteran)," Elliott said.

"You'd be surprised how many (jars) are tampered with," Elliott said. "Some are gone. Some are broken. I'm sometimes lucky if a third aren't broken or stolen."

Occasionally when he packs a box of gifts for men in Vietnam, Elliott encloses a letter asking the GIs to write businessmen who have allowed him to put canisters in their stores. "That's just so they (businessmen) will know the money is going where I say it's going," Elliott said. As treasurer of the society, he keeps records of incomes and expenditures which he makes available to members periodically.

"About 90 percent of our dues goes for sending items to Vietnam," Elliott said. "Postage is one of the big things."

Though Elliott won't admit it, his travel expenses every 10 days are another big expense—an expense not completely covered by donations. "Oh, I dip into my jeans every once in a while," he said. "I've got clothes to wear, food to eat and a place to sleep and I just thank the Lord that I can spend my time doing something to help, however small it might be."

[From the Virginia Beach Beacon]

GOLDEN HORSESHOE FLAG FLIES HIGH

(By Jim Stiff)

VIRGINIA BEACH.—Everytime W. Glenn Elliott tucks his American flag under his arm and heads for a flagpole, you know another load of books, candy or cigarettes is winging its way to America's fighting men.

That is how Elliott commemorates the occasions.

Elliott, at 74, is one of our staunchest patriots. He is founder of the American Society of the Golden Horseshoe, an organization devoted to the pursuit of patriotism.

It numbers 200 and has members in almost all states. Virginia is the most active, Illinois second and California third, according to Elliott.

Elliott, who lives on Indiana Avenue in Oceana, founded the Society of the Golden Horseshoe on Washington's birthday, Feb. 22, 1966.

The name for the society came from former U.S. Sen. A. Willis Robertson, who is one of six honorary members of the society.

Robertson was telling Elliott about the time in Colonial days when Alexandria Spotswood, governor of Colonial Virginia, took a group known as the Golden Knights and went inland into Virginia to discover the Valley of Virginia.

Elliott liked the name.

"The idea was to try to do something to revive the old time patriotism as it was known from the time of our founding fathers," said Elliott.

"Naturally, we needed a flag, so I wrote to Sen. (Harry F.) Byrd Jr. and he presented us with this one," said Elliott, unfurling an eight by five foot American flag.

Byrd was no stranger to Elliott. "I have

known him since he was 12 years old and I had an office on the first floor of the capitol building. His father was governor then," recalled Elliott.

That was in 1928 when Elliott was Virginia State Adjutant of the American Legion.

The flag was presented to Elliott by Byrd on Oct. 31, 1966, and on that day it was flown from the State Capitol Building, the first of many times and places the flag has been flown.

Elliott flies the flag to commemorate the days on which he gets together a load of items for GIs overseas and in the hospitals.

So far the flag has flown over:

Virginia Beach City Hall Dec. 7, 1966 (Pearl Harbor Day).

MacArthur Memorial in Norfolk, Feb. 6, 1967.

The Virginia Capitol again, Feb. 22, 1967, (Washington's Birthday).

Fort Story, March 22, 1967.

National Guard Armory in Norfolk, April 27, 1967.

Norwegian Lady Shrine, Virginia Beach, May 30, 1967, (Memorial Day).

First and Merchants Bank, Virginia Beach, May 16, 1969.

Vepco Building, Virginia Beach, June 2, 1969.

Oceana Naval Air Station, June 5, 1969.

USS Enterprise, Gulf of Tonkin, Viet Nam, Sept. 5, 1971.

The flag will fly next over the Veterans Administration Hospital in Richmond where the Society of the Golden Horse-Shoe has deposited books for the patients.

The flag is flown only briefly so it will remain in good condition for future ceremonies.

The Gulf of Tonkin in Vietnam was the most distant point the flag has been flown. It was arranged to be flown aboard the Enterprise by Lt. Philip Heth, Elliott's next door neighbor who is legal officer aboard the USS Forrestal.

The society gets its funds from dues and from collections. Elliott has about 100 quart jars decorated with the American flag placed in restaurants and stores in Chesapeake, Suffolk and Petersburg. Every two or three weeks, he makes the rounds to collect from the jars.

"We've never actually solicited, except for the jars," said Elliott. "The trouble is, so many of them are stolen or broken."

Elliott was unhappy over the fact patriotism is not an "in thing" with some of today's younger generation.

"It better be," warned Elliott. "One of these days they will wake up and it will be too late."

As for the present membership, Elliott said, "Most of them are my old friends. Some of them are 80 years old or more."

Elliott formed the friendships in his years in civil service and the Virginia State Guard in which he served as a lieutenant colonel. He retired from civil service in 1960.

Membership in the American Society of the Golden Horseshoe is by invitation only and by honorary membership.

"We haven't been pushing it too hard because we want the right people. We don't want any radicals," said Elliott.

Elliott identified the honorary memberships as belonging to former U.S. Sen. Robertson, U.S. Sen. Byrd, Alabama Gov. George C. Wallace, Charles (Mike) Houston, columnist for the Richmond News Leader, and Virginia Beach City Councilman Frank A. Dusch, former mayor.

One of the aims of the society is to encourage everyone to fly the American Flag daily.

As an example of the society's influence, Elliott said the Chicago society has gotten the Chicago Cubs baseball club to have the Star Spangled Banner printed on the backs of the programs sold at their games.

"So you see," said Elliott, "we are succeeding."

[From the Morning Call (Allentown, Pa.), Sept. 22, 1971]

LITTLE CHRONICLES

(By John T. Cathers)

Lt. Col. W. Glenn Elliott, Virginia Beach, Va., founder and treasurer of the American Society of the Golden Horseshoe, thinks the original Liberty Bell should be taken on a tour of the 50 states to "reawaken the patriotism of the nation." Glenn isn't exactly a stranger to Allentown—he served with author Ernest Hemingway and actor Adolph Menjou at Camp Crane in the Allentown Fairgrounds in 1918. Ambulance drivers for the American Expeditionary Forces in France were trained at the camp.

STOP SALT

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker—

"It is certainly a very striking combination of circumstances that within four days of the United States committing itself to major defensive systems (ABM) the Soviet government seized upon the option which had lain dormant for almost a year of starting joint arms limitation talks (SALT)." — John Erickson, *Soviet Military Power*, Royal United Service Institute.

Mr. Erickson, one of the foremost authorities on Soviet military development in the world, identifies the key point in the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT). The Soviets agreed to start talking only after we decided to start building the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system—ABM—to protect our land-based Minuteman missile force. Now, after 2 years of negotiation, there are those who advocate stopping, or limiting, our ABM system to show that some good has come out of all the talking.

In fact, extremely deceptive and dangerous propaganda is creating a climate to prime the public to look with favor on an agreement with the Soviets to limit ABM's only.

My newsletter No. 71-23 explained why the United States must not stop deploying the ABM. To review this briefly, we began construction of Safeguard because the Soviets were deploying the missiles necessary to destroy our Minuteman force. The threat to Minuteman made the construction of this defensive system imperative. Any reasonable arms agreement would therefore necessarily have to assure a reduction of the threat which made the ABM necessary in the first place.

This was confirmed by Dr. John Foster, Director of Defense Research and Development, in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee in April of this year, eventually declassified after pressure from a Senator. Dr. Foster stated that:

Until we can obtain an arms-control agreement that will constrain the threat to Minuteman solely through offensive force

limitations, we must continue with the deployment of Safeguard and the development of Hardsite defense [a follow-on ABM] for the protection of Minuteman.

The Soviets have not stopped building the massive first strike force which made the ABM necessary. All evidence indicates that they are moving in this direction faster than ever. Since the SALT talks began, the Soviets have increased their land and sea based missile force by 70 percent. Our force level has been fixed since 1967 and the Soviets now have over a 50-percent edge in land based missiles. Just 3 weeks ago, Secretary of Defense Laird announced that they would match us in numbers of Polaris-type missile submarines by 1973, 1 year earlier than his own prediction of last February.

The threat which necessitated the ABM is therefore growing at a faster than expected rate. It will not be reduced but rather substantially increased by a mutual limitation of ABM systems. Increasing the danger to ourselves is the exact opposite of what negotiations are supposed to achieve.

For this reason, in normal times, we would probably assume that the Congress would not consent to any such agreement. But the 1972 presidential elections are approaching. Where presidential politics are involved, as we saw in the case of China, the critical judgment of many good men tends to be severely impaired. The President would like to go into the 1972 race with a major arms limitation agreement. The pressure will mount to accept any Soviet proposal the American people will buy. Powerful bipartisan disarmament groups are lobbying hard for an arms limitation agreement for ABM's only.

There is one way to assure that this type of disastrous agreement does not sneak in through the back door of politics or serve as a campaign weapon of disarmament-minded office seekers. Stop SALT until after elections. Since we are supposedly basing our own defenses on Soviet capabilities rather than Soviet intention, and negotiations signify nothing more than possible intentions, this will not in any way jeopardize our national security.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR MORTON SPEAKS BEFORE THE AMERICAN MINING COMPANIES

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the speech delivered by Secretary of the Interior, Rogers C. B. Morton, before the American Mining Congress in Las Vegas, Nev., on October 11, 1971, for the benefit of my colleagues:

REMARKS BY ROGERS C. B. MORTON

I want to begin by saying that it is both a pleasure and an education to be here for the 1971 Mining Show. I have had the opportunity to see all the many mechanical marvels

developed by this industry and now I want to talk with you about some other forms of progress and the prospects for America's mining future.

A major theme of your meeting is communications . . . finding ways of improving communications within the industry . . . between industry and government . . . and between industry and the public at large.

I congratulate you for your emphasis on this critical area. Like the shifting surfaces of the sea, the field of communications is constantly changing. It will behoove everyone of you to determine whether his point of view is being received . . . and understood . . . by the people who should be aware of your position. Anything less would indicate a failure in communications . . . and in your obligation to the mining industry.

I don't need to communicate to you that the future holds exciting promise for this industry. The United States is fast approaching its 200th birthday and is still a growing Nation . . . not only in numbers but in expectations. In the next few years we will need tremendous amounts of the materials which provide all the underpinnings of our civilization. Mineral resources make up a major segment of those materials.

The construction business alone during the coming decade will absorb an estimated 4 million tons of aluminum and copper . . . 16 million tons of clay and cement . . . and nearly 200 million tons of sand and gravel. Telephones, TV sets, and other furnishings in the American home will make massive requirements of your industry . . . not to mention the wire and piping which carry water and power. I predict that needs will increase so profoundly that the demand for minerals may double or triple in the next 30 years.

In addition to technological developments as exhibited in your show, there must be a sound policy for the relationship between mining and the public, between mining and the government and between mining and the environment.

In this context, I want to tell you how the programs of this Administration in economic policy, minerals policy, environmental quality . . . and proposed mining legislation for the public lands relate to these overall concepts.

First and foremost, this Administration is working to create an atmosphere of economic stability and growth. Two months ago, President Nixon announced a plan to shape the Nation's economic future by coming down hard on inflation and achieving a refreshing degree of stabilization.

The initial phase of the President's 90-day program is about two-thirds complete. Now, we have had the opportunity to look at his program for the future.

The new economic policy is not designed to favor any segment of the economy. Its purpose is to create jobs . . . to increase industrial productivity . . . to stabilize consumer prices . . . and to encourage capital investment.

These initiatives, in my opinion, must be matched by the leadership in business and by efforts in your own country. In a free country, economic stabilization must be a joint venture between industry and government.

While we have begun to turn the economy around, we must also take a look at where many of our valuable raw materials are coming from.

As all of you know, there are certain minerals, such as tin, for which we are almost wholly dependent upon foreign mines. The total value of minerals and fuels consumed in 1969 exceeded American production by more than eight billion dollars. This gap may widen.

This increasing reliance on foreign production runs head-long into the ever-increasing demands by developing countries for their own mineral resources to use in their expanding economies.

We must realistically face the possibility that the availability of foreign sources of minerals, as well as of other materials, may become restricted.

It is essential that we increase exploration for new mineral deposits both at home and abroad . . . and that we step up our capability to meet more of our mineral needs through recycling and reclamation of mineral products.

I know that secondary recovery is considered by many of you as competitive. But don't stiff-arm it. The country that best husbands its mineral resources will umpire the international ball game. Secondary recovery will soon become a great economic opportunity. Don't pass it by!

The escalating demand for minerals and fuels which are essential to our economy and security have had the attention of Congress for some time. As a first step Congress enacted the Mining and Minerals Policy Act last December . . . with the strong support of this Administration. The objective of this legislation is to encourage the utilization of domestic mining and mineral sources to the fullest extent practicable.

This act imposes upon the Secretary of the Interior the responsibility for reporting annually to the Congress on the state of the domestic minerals and fuels industries . . . and for formulating recommendations under which private enterprise would be encouraged to find and develop our mineral resources.

We are currently in the process of developing data for the first report, which is due early next year. This report will determine the exact state of our minerals industries and delineate the problems which face them.

We expect to supplement the first report with recommendations for action to meet domestic mineral problems. This document should be completed in 1972.

Congress has also created an independent task force called The National Materials Policy Commission. This body is charged with the responsibility of reviewing overall materials requirements for the Nation except for food. I am a member of this commission and will participate actively in its deliberations and determinations . . . particularly with respect to mineral resources.

I want to go on record this morning by saying that we need plenty of help from the industry to insure that these various policy reports will be factual, helpful, and beneficial to the American people.

As we go forward at this point in time, it's important that we recognize we're in a new ball game . . . old standards are not good enough . . . old practices won't do. Let's face it squarely and not dodge the issue.

The mining industry and mineral processing companies have not in the past been in the vanguard of effort to clean up the environment. They have concerned themselves with meeting a steadily rising demand for mineral resources. That's all that was asked of them for many years.

But times have changed. We have come to realize that nature's bounty is *not limitless*, and that the actions of industry, as well as of government, can seriously affect the quality of our air, water and land.

Environmental concern has aroused the American public to action . . . intensive action. If the minerals industry does not begin to respond to the public demand for clean energy and a clean mining industry, then the public will lose faith in the great industry which did so much to build America.

No one has convinced me that the mining industry cannot be a clean industry, nor that the mining industry cannot be clean and profitable.

When this becomes your attitude, when these become your convictions, we will truly have reached a new plateau in the relationship of this industry and the environment.

The seriousness of pollution is now being recognized throughout the world and the American Mining Congress has responded in

at least one key area. Your recent decision to endorse *Federal* guidelines for mined land reclamation was a responsible and welcome action. I trust that you will continue to support the efforts of this Administration to impose environmental quality.

Now let's look at mining on the public lands.

I believe that the prospector who discovers a valuable hardrock mineral deposit should be entitled to the first crack at its extraction.

This Nation's economic system was built on the profit motive. Individual initiative will be encouraged . . . not stifled. This will be done while, at the same time, protecting the quality of the lands and resources involved.

Another Administration proposal that will profoundly influence mineral policy is the President's plan for reorganization of the Executive Branch. A major component of this plan provides for creation of a Department of Natural Resources into which all major responsibilities for energy and mineral resources would fall.

The Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970 would be profoundly affected by executive reorganization. A key phrase in this act reads ". . . it is the continuing policy of the Federal Government in the national interest to foster and encourage private enterprise . . ." . . . surely a clean restatement of traditional American economic philosophy. The Department of Natural Resources will not only stimulate industrial productivity but provide the scientific capability and regulatory responsibility to insure that environmental considerations are accounted for.

Your conference theme, "From the Earth . . . A Better Life" is appropriate. But I would add: from the earth responsibly . . . so there can be a better life.

The things man has needed to create his society have come from the earth, in large measure through the minerals industry. But the better life we seek today includes beauty as well as affluence; clean air and water as well as efficient transportation; and playgrounds as well as shopping centers.

The stewardship of America's natural resources is an awesome responsibility and an immense public trust.

If our stewardship is wise, we can have both aesthetic pleasures and creature comforts. We are capable of such stewardship. The mining industry can play a major part in that stewardship. No other objective outweighs the need to balance the development of our mineral and fuel resources with a clean, healthy, and enduring life for all Americans.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 191 PRAYER AMENDMENT

HON. RALPH H. METCALFE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1971

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion recently about the proposed constitutional amendment which, according to the sponsors, would permit nondenominational prayer in the public schools. I signed the discharge petition and voted for the motion to debate the question because I know this proposal is of concern to very many Americans. The question should be discussed in these chambers and decided in an open and recorded vote by the Members of the House.

However, I voted against House Joint Resolution 191. I agree with the philosophy that was the basis of the first amendment and I happen to think that the first amendment should remain intact. The colonists when they ratified

the first 10 amendments, the Bill of Rights, were well aware of what could happen when the State became involved in the religious sector. They had but to look at the religious strife and tension which existed in Europe. They did not want any possible repetition of this strife in the United States. Therefore, they adopted the first amendment to the Constitution which is an unequivocal stand in favor of a separation of these two entities, the church and the state. I think the separation should continue.

The other day I listened to a very sincere woman who was concerned about the social problems that confront us. She came into my office to ask my support for this amendment. She thought that prayer in public schools, in her words, would restore a sense of respect for the law and give us, as a people, a sense of national purpose. I agree with her objectives but not her means.

There are many religious groups who have expressed their objections to this amendment. They, too, fear that the proposed legislation would not bring about any constructive change within the country.

I see the word nondenominational in the amendment and I see the possibility of countless school boards across the country attempting to determine what constitutes a nondenominational prayer. This will add to the strain and tension which already exists in many school districts and I think they can very well do without this. I think this process of having local governmental bodies decide such issues is what the colonists, based upon their experience, wanted to avoid. At a time when we are attempting to forge a new unity in this country we should not attempt to pass legislation which could possibly become a cause of division within communities throughout the country.

I think the separation of church and state as established by the First Amendment has served us well. I do not see any cogent reason why the Constitution should be amended. I think that the objectives of those who sponsor House Joint Resolution 191 can be achieved in other ways.

I think that the views of President John F. Kennedy on this issue are as applicable now as when he first stated them in June 1962:

We have in this case a . . . remedy, and that is to pray ourselves, and I would think that it would be a welcome reminder to every American family that we can pray a good deal more at home and attend our churches with a good deal more fidelity, and we can make the true meaning of prayer much more important to the lives of all our children.

DEMISE OF U.S. FILM INDUSTRY DUE TO UNIMAGINATIVE FOREIGN POLICY

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, recently my General Subcommittee on Labor heard CXVII—2551—Part 31

testimony from employer and worker representatives of one of our vital but threatened industries—the American film industry. The preponderance of views underscored, once again, how our foreign trade posture has allowed foreign nations and “run-a-way” American enterprise to undercut the foundation of an industry and displace thousands of workers.

One such statement by Donald P. Haggerty, executive secretary of the Film Technicians Local 683, cogently set before the subcommittee the continuing demise of our film industry due largely to our unimaginative, and capitulatory foreign policy. I am inserting Mr. Haggerty's statement into the RECORD for the information of my colleagues.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF DONALD P. HAGGERTY, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, FILM TECHNICIANS LOCAL 683 AND FIRST VICE PRESIDENT, HOLLYWOOD AFL FILM COUNCIL

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: As 1971 draws to a close, the decline of all forms of domestic film production activities in the United States has reached alarming proportions. It has been reliably estimated that more than half of the labor force in Hollywood is jobless and, some local union memberships have suffered an average unemployment in excess of 80% during 1971. Many of the Hollywood craftsmen, technicians, and artists whose jobs have been “exported” to other countries have already suffered the ravages of “runaway” to the extent of losing their homes, their cars, their hospital and medical coverage, and their retirement pension credits. Meanwhile, the Federal Government has not taken a single step in the direction of altering its outdated, unrealistic and irrelevant trade policies and negotiating postures in the film field. It continues to permit the unrestricted importation of foreign-produced motion pictures and television films, on a non-reciprocal basis.

Notwithstanding concern expressed by the White House for “the economic well-being of this vital industry” as recently as last month; the fact remains that the critical unemployment situation brought about by unrestricted importation of foreign-made films for exhibition on U.S. theatrical and television screens, accompanied by the unfair and discriminatory treatment afforded films produced here in the United States by foreign governments, still remains unchecked. The number of films made annually in this country for exhibition at home and abroad continues to decline. The number of American-interest films made abroad annually continues to sharply increase, with larger aggregate investment and mostly financed by American companies, either through their foreign subsidiaries or under some involved type of co-production or co-financing arrangement.

The so-called “Major” motion picture studios that once provided regular gainful employment for thousands of skilled and talented studio employees are today waning shadows of their once-prosperous past; when Hollywood was recognized as the international film capital. Companies like RKO Pictures, Republic Studios, and Hal Roach Studios have vanished completely. 20th Century Fox and Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios have disposed of their “back lots” resulting in the elimination of “standing sets” and other essential facilities for healthy film production activities. Columbia Pictures Corporation and Warner Brothers are in the process of completing arrangements to give up their separate studio holdings and to jointly share a single set of production facilities now occupied in Burbank, California by Warner Brothers

alone. Mass lay-offs of key employees and reduction, or even elimination of key departments have taken place at leading film studios.

The failure of the United States Government to take effective steps to equalize the competitive position of domestically-produced motion pictures with foreign-made motion pictures, which receive governmental subsidies or other forms of state aid from all other significant film-producing countries, has inflicted ever-increasing economic loss upon many long-time American film workers; reduced job opportunities for new, younger workers; and slashed the annual earnings of most American film workers.

The plight of American film workers due to the skyrocketing rise of “runaway foreign film production” has been observed in detail by both the Congress and the Executive Department for years and years; without any branch of the Federal Government doing anything affirmative to stop this trend.

As long ago as 1962, the Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on Employment of the House Committee on Education and Labor found that “the strongest inducement to foreign production is subsidy” and declared that “if our Government demanded an end to subsidies, the so-called American motion picture runaway production problem would become minuscule.”

In the years that followed, the OECD forum was never properly utilized. U.S. Government agencies continued to work actively and closely with the Motion Picture Export Association of America for the reduction of specific trade barriers to the distribution activities of the MPEA companies on a bilateral basis, but obtained no concrete results in multi-national bodies by way of eliminating foreign film production subsidies, screen-time quotas, and other forms of state aid, favoring foreign-made films in violation of the principles of free reciprocal trade.

The passive attitude of the State Department, supported by the Commerce Department, Treasury Department, the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, and the White House staff in the Nixon Administration, as in prior administrations, has been to tolerate and virtually ignore the direct and indirect foreign film production subsidies offered by other governments.

This weak negotiating posture taken by U.S. spokesmen in such international forums as the GATT and the OECD stems from the openly-expressed fear of the State Department, the Special Representative, and the White House staff that a strong stand or aggressive opposition in “defense of parity” for our domestic film production would adversely affect MPEA private negotiations with foreign governments for “distribution rights” in other countries would irritate foreign producers; or might disturb the relations of U.S. film companies with their foreign customers in essence saying to “Hell” with the thousands of unemployed workers in the Motion Picture Industry but protect the “runaway” producers' investment in exports at all costs.

Existing U.S. trade policies and attitudes have sought a solution through half-hearted proposals, mild protests, and pale suggestions for gradual dismantling of existing foreign film trade barriers and reduction or elimination of foreign film trade restrictions.

Many unemployed American film workers are unable to understand why, at this late date, the Nixon administration still responds to their desperate plea for governmental assistance, by what Mayor Yorty has accurately described as “a monotonous rewrapping philosophy that has marked the lack of effort by previous administrations to adequately cope with the problem.”

Many U.S. film workers are absolutely disgusted by the fears and hesitations expressed by some highly-placed spokesmen

for the Nixon administration who oppose the adoption of more affirmative policies to offset the "commercial protectionism" being practiced by foreign governments under the guise of supporting their domestic film industries on the ground that a more positive stand might provoke "emotional responses" or even "retaliatory measures" abroad.

The United States is the only important film-producing country in the world which extends no governmental assistance—either in the form of subsidies, low interest loans, investment guarantees, or other types of state aid—to help provide adequate economic encouragement for domestic film production. (While the United States Government imposes no limitations on the import of foreign-made films into this country.)

Traditional bilateral and multilateral approaches in international trade discussions have produced no immediate prospect for relief. (For example, the United States stood alone among member governments in the OECD in maintaining the position that film production subsidies "significantly distort international competition" and must be abolished in compliance with Article 2 of the OECD Films Annex. As a matter of fact, other member governments have even attempted to persuade the OECD Invisibles Committee to actually endorse film production subsidies over U.S. opposition.)

The United States Government must re-examine its policies and attitudes regarding foreign trade with respect to films, in the face of the realities of the present-day situation. At a time when our domestic film production activities are threatened with virtual extinction and mass unemployment confronts American film workers, there is no legitimate excuse for our Government's failure to protect the domestic film worker.

The inadequacy of the existing foreign trade policies and attitudes of the American government to cope with unfair restrictive trade devices in the film field is underscored by the rising importation of foreign-made television films.

A series of "voluntary cooperation" conferences during 1966-1967 between representatives of Hollywood unions and guilds with key executives of the American Association of Advertising Agencies, the Association of National Advertisers and the three nationwide television networks (NBC, CBS and ABC) failed to head off the rising tide of imported foreign-made television films. In fact these same agencies and television networks are not only purchasing foreign TV episodes, foreign-made Motion Picture and commercial products but are directly and indirectly involved in financing and/or producing these products in foreign countries.

In November of 1970, the AFL-CIO Executive Council went on record officially condemning the growing importation of foreign-made television productions by American commercial sponsors for use in the United States.

Earlier this month, the *Hollywood Reporter* described one of the latest such developments in a news story headlined "MORE BRITISH TV SERIES ARE SET TO INVADE U.S." Humphrey Barclay, producer of the British-made television series entitled "Doctor in the House" was making a tour of 10 key American cities on behalf of the imported program, being distributed in 41 U.S. TV market areas by Westinghouse Broadcasting Company, and announced that he had "completed 52 half hour shows in England and plans to make another 26 next year." NBC, CBS and Westinghouse are showing the English-made TV program in various U.S. cities where prime time became available locally on network stations because of the so-called "prime time access rule" adopted by the Federal Communications Commission as a supposed stimulant to "local" programming. (I have been reliably informed that KNXT, a

CBS owned-and-operated television station, purchased the right to televise "Doctor in the House" in the Los Angeles market from Westinghouse and sold participating advertising on that foreign-made program to a number of national and local concerns, including *Safeway Stores*, and the manufacturers of *Best Foods Mayonnaise*, *Breck Shampoo*, *Maybelline*, *Carnation*, *Friskies*, *Olympia Beer* and *Pfizer Visine*. When W. S. Mitchell President of Safeway Stores, received union protests over his company's sponsorship of this English-made TV program in the face of the mass unemployment of American Film Workers, Safeway's president responded that it had nothing to do with the production of this film series and "would not deliberately do anything to deprive American craftsmen and technicians of jobs or job opportunities.")

Last month, the *Hollywood Reporter* carried a banner headline on its front page reading "Canada production up 100%." According to the trade paper story, dated Montreal, production of features, TV series and shorts in Canada has increased 100% over the same time in 1970. Some of these independent productions were reportedly being made with grants from the Canadian Film Development Board, a governmental agency, while others were "being financed and co-financed by American film companies and other American business firms." Also last month, the 30% import quota allowable by Canada was emphasized in a feature story on the radio-television page of *Daily Variety* as one of the advantages of "runaway" production "across the border." The feature story deals with Four Star International shooting a 90-minute film in Canada for CBS entitled "The Deadly Hunt". It reports the building of a two-stage studio in Vancouver for interiors; and indicates that Four Star has three "development deals" for CBS and ABC which will also be produced in Canada.

The United States Congress can no longer justify the continued loss of job opportunities at home by the short range financial advantages being gained by greedy, selfish American film production and distribution companies who qualify for foreign subsidies, screentime quotas and other forms of aid from foreign governments. Congress must immediately provide U.S. trade policies that will serve the best interests of all the American people. Such policies must be initiated promptly before the long time battle of the American film worker is lost through more passiveness, indifference and frustrating delay on the part of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government.

WHICH ARE YOU, DON QUIXOTE OR SANCHO PANZA?

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, nothing need be added to the following, which says it all:

"... which are you, Don Quixote or Sancho Panza?"

Almost certainly you are both. There is one part of you that wishes to be a hero or a saint, but another part of you is a little fat man who see clearly the advantages of staying alive with a whole skin. He is your unofficial self, the voice of the belly protesting against the soul. His tastes lie towards safety, soft beds, no work, pots of beer and women with "voluptuous" figures. He it is who punctures your fine attitudes and urges you to

look after No. 1, to be unfaithful to your wife, to bilk your debts. Whether you allow yourself to be influenced by him is a different question.

GEORGE ORWELL.

What should be made of that? Perhaps only that Orwell had won out against the fat man within, a victory that is crucial for everyone to try for, even if we are the only ones to celebrate it, in our dying days with a child who knows nothing of our struggle.

COLMAN MCCARTHY.

AIRMAN OF THE MONTH

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of October 23, 1971, George Air Force Base, Calif., Tactical Air Command celebrated its 7th year of involvement in the program known as Airman of the Month. The banquet for this affair was held at the NCO open mess.

The program referred to herein is basically standard within the Air Force. It seeks to recognize one outstanding member of the service among many on a competitive basis, within the confines of a given cantonment. Each Air Force installation has a similar program.

The uniqueness of the program at George Air Force Base stems from the outstanding civilian-military rapport which has developed through the efforts of a group of interested people.

The program began with an idea on the part of a military member, M. Sgt. Delmar J. Urich—now retired—who was an instructor at the George Air Force Base NCO leadership school, and a member of the Noncommissioned Officer Academy Graduate Association. His idea, which was simply for some of the merchants to donate a small sum, either in cash or trade to the Airman of the Month, received instant acceptance at the next business meeting of the association. Shortly thereafter, he and another member contacted a local Victorville merchant, Mr. William C. Melton.

Mr. Melton, a very public-spirited individual, contacted several merchants, and received a modicum of support. The members of the NCOAGA arranged for a luncheon, and a program was tentatively arranged. Eight business firms each provided \$5 gift certificates to the winner. Response to the publicity which followed was gratifying. The next luncheon saw the addition of more merchants. Over the ensuing months, the movement gathered impetus until sheer numbers dictated a shift to the evening banquet. Almost imperceptibly, the NCOAGA became the liaison between the base and the local community. Efforts have been directed toward injection of new ideas into the program, and equal efforts have been made to schedule the banquets at various clubs throughout the Victor Valley. Additionally, procedural changes have also been made, including civilian sponsorship on a 1 for 1 basis—merchant and wife paying the dinner cost

for one military man and wife—military sponsorship on a 1 for 1 basis, co-sponsorship and no-host. Master of ceremonies duties are jointly shared, with a merchant acting in that capacity for one banquet, a member of the NCOAGA for the next, in a rather loose, alternating fashion.

From the original eight business firms participating, the program has grown to its present status wherein over 100 firms in the communities of Adelanto, Apple Valley, Hesperia, and Victorville are actively participating. Moreover, in several cases private citizens having no commercial ties have donated small cash gratuities to the winners. The banquet of October 23, 1971 included 128 firms.

The fame of the program has kept pace with the program itself. The NCOAGA has received requests from widely separated points in the United States for information about the program. These include Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., Fairchild Air Force Base, Wash., Pope Air Force Base, N.C., and Pensacola Naval Air Station, Fla.

BLOOD BANKS—A MATTER OF LIFE AND DEATH

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, this month's issue of *Changing Times* contains a useful discussion of blood banking in the United States. The article describes the life or death importance of blood banks, and some of the problems that need attention. Next week I plan to introduce legislation to deal with the unnecessary dangers now present in the blood we receive. I commend the Kiplinger article to the attention of my colleagues:

BLOOD BANKS—A MATTER OF LIFE AND DEATH

The need for blood may be sudden. Will it be there? Here's how to make sure.

Last January a 29-year-old woman with a bleeding ulcer was rushed to the hospital in Milford, Del. During the next three days doctors transfused 13 pints of blood into her veins, enough to save her life. Fortunately, her type of blood in the amount needed was on hand in the hospital, which is served by the Blood Bank of Delaware. The bank, which she had joined just six months before, replaced the blood, which otherwise would have cost her \$25 a pint, in addition to hospital service charges that were covered by medical insurance. Altogether she saved a total of \$585.

Early in 1967 another woman, the wife of a man from a small Pennsylvania coal mining town, entered a district hospital to have a baby. She hemorrhaged severely during delivery and required transfusions. Her blood, a rare type unavailable locally, had to be sent from a central blood bank miles away. By the time it arrived she had lost the baby and had barely survived the ordeal herself. There is nothing to assure her that she would have any better luck if she should need blood today.

How is it that one community can meet an emergency need for blood while another is unable to? What about your town? Could any family get blood if an illness required it?

Would it be safe? What if a number of people in the community needed transfusions the same day?

Keeping an adequate supply of blood available is a complex business. Consider these basic problems:

DEMAND

The need for blood grows every year. In 1968 blood banks drew from donors about 6,600,000 pints, representing an increase of 2,000,000 over 1958. About one in 17 hospital patients gets a transfusion, and modern operations such as open heart surgery can take up to 20 pints. Your own chance of needing a transfusion anytime is about one in 80.

Yet all this blood comes from a small group of people who are willing to give, fewer than 3% of the 100,000,000 eligible donors aged 18 through 65, not really enough to give blood banks much of a margin. A year ago in New York City, supply during one week dropped to less than enough blood for a single day.

SPOILAGE

After three weeks whole blood begins to deteriorate, so by federal regulation blood can be kept only 21 days and then it must be discarded or separated into plasma and components (see box at the right). Unfortunately, a certain amount of outdating occurs, with anywhere from 3% to 20% spoiling on the shelves, mostly in more remote hospitals.

INFECTION

Hepatitis, a viral disease that can damage the liver and cause death among the aged and debilitated, is an ever-present risk for patients receiving transfusions. Ordinarily, donors who have had jaundice or a diagnosed case of hepatitis are turned down. But hepatitis isn't always detected or reported and some tainted donors slip by, accounting for an estimated 30,000 cases of the disease among the more than 2,000,000 persons receiving transfusions each year.

No doubt the riskiest blood is that purchased for a few dollars from skid-row denizens and drug addicts. And, although a new procedure called the Hepatitis-Associated Antigen test can intercept about a quarter of the disease carriers, something needs to be done about the other three-quarters whom the test overlooks.

MANY WAYS OF GIVING

Technical problems aside, blood banking tends to confuse donors and patients because there are so many banks and transfusion facility services—nearly 6,000 in all—and because they have overlapping and sometimes conflicting activities. The Red Cross, the biggest single agency, accounts for half of all the blood collected. But there are localities where it doesn't operate at all. In addition to the Red Cross, there are community blood banks, hospital banks, commercial blood banks, nonprofit insurance plans and commercial plans.

Sometimes several of these agencies function in the same place, though not always under the same rules. For example, banks belonging either to the Red Cross or the American Association of Blood Banks handle most of the blood collected, and they must meet the standards of these organizations. But nonmember banks may operate pretty much as they choose. And those that limit their activities within a state are exempt from the federal licensing that covers agencies that ship blood around the country.

Blood donations can be made in several ways. One method is to give an advance donation with no specific person or medical case in mind. A second is to replace blood that has been used by a relative, a friend, a fellow employe or a fellow club member.

Advance donation is a way of both giving to others and helping yourself. In many plans if you donate a pint of blood, the immediate members of your family are

eligible to receive blood for a specific period, usually one year.

In replacement donation, when someone receives a transfusion, the hospital or blood bank requests the patient's family to replace the blood. If this is impossible, and you live outside an area of total Red Cross coverage, there will likely be a charge for the blood, usually \$25 or, if the blood is rare, much more. To encourage replacement, the price is set high; if medicare applies, the patient is still responsible for payment or replacement of the first three pints.

Some hospitals require a replacement rate of two and even three for one, while others apply the two-for-one replacement only to the first pint, with additional pints being replaced one for one. The two-for-one policy is intended not only to replace blood actually transfused but also as a hedge in case blood is spilled, rejected or outdated or given to charity cases. In some specialized hospitals replacements must be on hand before elective surgery is performed. Note that a donor can ask that his donation be credited to a person in another part of the country.

Whether the blood is replaced or not, there are processing fees involved in a transfusion. Both the patient's and donor's blood must be tested and typed by a laboratory. The samples must be merged or cross-matched to assure perfect compatibility. Charges for the infusion itself include the price of the needle, tray and professional time. Altogether these costs average around \$32 and are often paid by medical insurance.

DIFFERENT PLANS

Blood bank plans vary from town to town and from hospital to hospital.

The Red Cross program operates 59 blood centers, some of which cover entire states. But the program has never become the single collection agency that health and medical groups expected it would after World War II. Critics say its failure to campaign aggressively for donors at the start left some regions without blood. So hospitals and communities began setting up their own blood banks. Also, venturesome laboratories have established a commercial business in blood that now provides 15% of the nation's requirements and as much as 40% in many large metropolitan areas.

Today the Red Cross blood program stresses advance donation by unpaid volunteers. Patients who receive blood and have none to their credit are asked to have it replaced on a one-for-one basis. There is a processing charge, which hospitals collect from patients and reimburse in part to the Red Cross.

Community blood banks emphasize advance donations much the same as the Red Cross. But many community banks do use paid donors to make up deficits, and they do charge a "responsibility" fee, usually \$25 to patients unable to supply a replacement. Some plans, called "blood assurance" programs, work this way: Companies, clubs, unions and other organizations are assigned a quota asking that 20% of the participants donate once a year. If the quota is met, all members of the organization and their immediate families are covered for a year.

Hospital blood banks are independent and range from those with a few pints on hand in a refrigerator to full-fledged blood bank operations. A patient who receives blood but lacks credit with a donor group is asked to replace it, sometimes on a two- or three-for-one basis, or, if that is not feasible, to pay for it.

Blood insurance plans may be either nonprofit or commercial. Nonprofit plans are associated with hospital or community blood banks. An applicant can join one nonprofit plan, for example, by donating a pint of blood or paying a \$7.50 annual family premium. Paid donors make up the blood deficits and, except for certain exclusions, all

blood needs of a member are met for a specified period. Commercial health insurance policies sometimes make cash payments for blood used. The trouble with these plans is that they relieve the insured person of the responsibility for finding blood replacement and thereby hurt efforts to line up volunteer donors.

THE FUTURE OF BLOOD BANKS

No reasonable person would deny that there is room for improvement in blood banking. Most groups relying on volunteer donors say the best thing to do is to strengthen their approach and eliminate the practice of paying for blood.

The Red Cross, the American Association of Blood Banks and the AFL-CIO Committee of Community Services, while they have their differences, see an all-volunteer program as about the only way to rule out derelects and drug addicts who sell their blood for \$7 to \$20 a pint to commercial "walk-in" banks operating in virtually every big city.

Dr. J. Garrott Allen, professor of surgery at Stanford University School of Medicine, a critic of blood selling, says an all-volunteer system will wipe out 90% of all transfusion hepatitis. And until a reliable test for the infection is devised, he says, every physician should ask that blood come from volunteer donors.

Not everyone agrees that all paid donors are the menace they are made out to be. And a distinction should be made between "safe" donors associated with community blood banks—teachers, hospital workers, medical students and the like—and the risky "walk-in" clients of profit-making commercial banks.

Also, the argument goes, paid donors are better than no donors at all. They will be needed at least until we can improve the efficiency of the system and until more of us overcome our apathy or our fear of being drained every now and then of a pint of blood, a gift that only the human body can manufacture.

STORING BLOOD

With modern technology, blood can be separated into various parts, which can be used independently for different diseases. Plasma, for example, has a factor useful in treating the bleeding disease hemophilia, and platelets are given to patients with platelet deficiency. People suffering from anemia can be infused with red cells.

More than half of the whole-blood transfusions being done today could be replaced with red cells. This would make remaining components available for specific uses as needed and thereby spread the supply of blood further.

Another important feature of red cells is that they can be frozen and stored until required, a technique that has two advantages: It preserves the life of the cells beyond the customary 21 days and provides a supply relatively free of the risk of hepatitis.

There is nothing new about freezing red cells, but recently the American Red Cross said it had found a better way of removing the preservative from the stored blood. The method has the advantage of sparing more of the red cells for transfusion into the patient. As a result, the Red Cross Blood Research Program is expanding its freezing facilities in a number of cities and expects a supply of 50,000 units by the end of the year.

Wider use of freezing and components is also recommended by such groups as the American Medical Association's Committee on Transfusion and Transplantation, the Component Therapy Institute of Washington, D.C., and the American Association of Blood Banks.

PLANS THAT GET THE JOB DONE

Nobody can arbitrarily say which is the best method of providing blood. Here's how two successful organizations do it.

The Delaware blood insurance plan now has 85,000 members and, counting dependents, covers over 250,000 people, or 50% of the state's population. Each participating member agrees in advance to donate, or to recruit someone to donate, a pint of blood when called upon.

This unusual nonprofit arrangement does away with imbalance of voluntary plans where a few members give all the blood while the rest get a free ride. Because nearly everyone gives in the Delaware plan, members are now called no more than once every five years. Moreover, the Delaware plan eliminates "crash" recruiting that sometimes loads hospitals with more blood than they can use before it spoils. Operating on the principle that the donor's body is the best storage place, the Delaware plan calls upon members as requested by the hospitals. That way supply stays more nearly even with demand.

To join the Delaware plan, a subscriber agrees to give one pint when called upon. If this is not feasible, he has a friend or relative supply it, or he must pay \$25. Each member pays \$1 initiation fee and \$1 a year dues. Then all dependents listed on his income tax are covered for as much blood as they may need. One member got 348 pints. Neither sickness nor age is a bar if the applicant pays the \$25 or gets a healthy substitute.

Since it began in 1955, the Blood Bank of Delaware has reimbursed hospitals of the state with 100,000 pints.

The Irwin Memorial Blood Bank of San Francisco is the blood bank for 59 hospitals and 1,300,000 people in eight counties. This 30-year-old nonprofit bank employs nearly 200 persons and uses the aid of 300 volunteers.

Open seven days a week, the Irwin Bank draws 100,000 units a year, mostly in advance donations, from 40,000 donors in a variety of donor groups. Strict inventory control and active, coordinated appeals to bring in donors account for its success as a nearly all-volunteer blood bank. Its losses have been minimal—just 50 pints of a total of 8,030 collected in July, for example. No quota of blood is set for volunteers, but the Irwin Bank soon plans to request donations of 10% above the amount used by members of donor groups.

THE NORTHERN IRELAND SITUATION: A REPORT, NO. 14

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most graphic of my reports over the last several weeks have been those that detail cases of British atrocities that arise under the use of the infamous Special Powers Act. This "law" permits the internment of citizens without charge or trial for indefinite periods of time.

Jim Hagen, president of the Irish American Club of Washington, D.C., has just secured additional affidavits from the Association for Legal Justice. Through the club's legislative chairman, John F. Grant, I now have these affidavits and will include them in my series in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Amnesty, International on the basis of similar affidavits, has called for an international commission of inquiry into the violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. I have called for

just such an investigation time and time again for over a year now. Hopefully, action will be taken soon or the killing and terrorism will continue to take its toll.

Mr. Speaker, I will include at this point in the RECORD the affidavit of Mr. James Magilton:

INTERNMENT—NORTH IRELAND 1971: REPORT ON ARREST, INTERROGATION, AND TREATMENT OF JAMES MAGILTON, 68 CLOWNEY STREET, BELFAST 12

Age: 60.

Occupation: Mechanical Clerk of Works with Building Design Partnerships.

Health: Diabetic, Hypertension, 2 minor strokes.

On August 13, 1971 at 5 a.m. soldiers hammered at my door. My wife opened it and soldiers met me on the stairs. I was dressed in pants, undershirt, pullover, shoes without socks. The soldiers began to search. They found 1 old radio receiver from my former days as a ham radio operator. In order to avoid a search which might ransack the house, I told them that I had a licensed pistol and a licensed rifle, the licenses being at the moment renewed at R.U.C. Barracks Springfield Road. The soldiers went almost berserk, and said I had been sniping. They also said "this is all we want, we've got you now." They refused to listen to my explanation that the articles were licensed.

They took me out in a saracen on the Falls Road (almost 400 yards). There I was savagely beaten by soldiers and military police with fists, batons, rifle butts and kicked. On the journey with John Murphy, a neighbour, I was given occasional blows by fists.

When I arrived at Girdwood Barracks I was thrown out of the jeep and made crawl on all fours into the corridor. I was abused physically while I crawled. My hair was pulled.

I was placed against a wall with finger tips only giving me support. Military police kicked my shins and I fell flat on my face. This action was repeated several times with the variation of punches to the stomach and kicks on the shins. I don't remember how often. They tested me with the "gelly sniffer" and the results were negative.

I was taken immediately for interrogation by two Special Branch men. They gave me a cup of tea heavily sugared. As a diabetic I refused it. They sent for an army sergeant who first took me to a doctor and who later promised to get my tablets from the house. I was merely questioned about the licenses for my guns and radio and got absolutely no abuse from the Special Branch men. The sergeant returned and he said that the tablets were unobtainable. I learned later they hadn't come to my home, they had contacted my doctor.

After this I was taken to the gym and seated in a chair in the middle of the gym with 14/20 others widely spaced, also spaced on chairs. I sat there staring ahead. Talk was not allowed. The army sergeant came with my tablets and I took two and water. Another Military Policeman gave me a blanket for my shoulders. The army sergeant came back and asked to be notified immediately if I felt any diabetic symptoms. He offered me a cigarette which I refused although I am a chain smoker. I did this as I was sickened and disgusted at my own treatment and the treatment of others. I was told that contacts were being made with police officers who knew me as a competitor in shooting competitions and whose names I gave during interrogation.

I was taken to another room and given the paraffin test on my hands and face for evidence of recent use of guns. I hadn't fired a shot for over two months due to the disturbed situation. (Fortwilliam Rifle and Pistol Club.)

I was taken back to the gym. Some time

later the sergeant said confirmation of licenses and Gun Club Membership was being confirmed.

I had a second interrogation a little later re name, address and personal details. I was asked to sign the answers. It was read to me as I couldn't read without my glasses and I signed it.

A sergeant gave me back my pocketbook and small change. He told me my guns would be given back later. I was taken in a jeep and left in Beechmount Avenue, about 200 yards from my home.

A neighbour, Marie McNeill met me and was horrified at my condition. I was hardly able to walk. My pullover was torn and my pants were dirty. She asked two men to carry me home. I got in about 1 p.m. to my own home.

My wife sent for Dr. Jim Ryan who examined me and took details of my multiple bruises and abrasions. He has been my doctor since 1934 and only yesterday did he realize that I was a Protestant living in a totally Catholic neighbourhood. The one and only time I was ever beaten was on August 12, 1971 and that was by the British Army. Today I am confined to bed unable to walk and I don't know when I shall be able to.

I am a diabetic and suffer from hypertension. About a year ago I had two minor strokes and was confined to bed for a month. I have since been attending clinics of Dr. Boyle in the Royal Victoria Hospital. I am on constant medication for both complaints.

To the best of my knowledge the informa-

tion which I have given above is a true and accurate account of what happened.

Signature: J. Magilton.

Witness: Rev. B. J. Brady.

Date: 14 August 1971.

ENVIRONMENTAL PESTICIDES CONTROL ACT

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to support the Federal Environmental Pesticides Control Act which regulates the production and sale of potentially dangerous chemical compounds.

The fact that there are presently over 60,000 pesticides on the market demonstrates a clear need for some form of regulation. These products could pose a serious threat to the health of our environment. While it is true that the vast majority are quite safe, there is always the possibility that some may have undesired and as yet unknown side effects. Therefore, it is reasonable and per-

haps necessary that we require the closest possible scrutiny of these compounds before they are sold.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that my home State has been a leader in controlling the sale and use of pesticides. Michigan has recognized that the health and safety of her people demands government standards that are set and reviewed by a neutral third party.

Unfortunately, the dangerous effects of these pesticides often spreads far beyond the boundaries of the States where they are initially applied. Carried by winds and streams, they pose a threat to many neighboring States. This is one reason why individual State regulations are not enough. Complete security can only be assured through federally enforced national guidelines.

I was encouraged that a provision which would allow stricter State laws to stand even if Federal ones are weaker was added to the legislation. Surely it would be ironic if under the banner of environmental protection this measure would operate to dilute strong State laws now in effect. In this way, those States which have recognized the critical need for review and licensing of pesticides will not be reduced to a lowest common denominator.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, November 11, 1971

Rev. V. Fr derick Halboth, Jr., pastor, Grace Lutheran Church, Detroit Mich., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Our Heavenly Father, we give Thee thanks for our country, for those who laid its foundations, and for those who have sacrificed their lives in its service. Strengthen those who now labor to keep it strong.

Heavenly Father, you know the problems of our world better than we do. Decay in morals, hunger of spirit and stomach, pollution of mind and air, broken relationships between generations and classes, crime in the streets, and the war in distant lands.

Heavenly Father, give wisdom and courage to these leaders of our beloved land as they grapple with these pressing problems. Give them counsel and defense, health and patience to bear the heavy burdens of their office.

We are grateful to them, Heavenly Father, as they serve us with ready hearts and willing minds. Amid the turbulent tenor of these troubled times, we seek Thy security and shelter.

Bless all citizens of this our native land. Make of us a nation and a people who do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with Thee, their God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2820. An act to provide foreign economic and humanitarian assistance authorizations for fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes.

SOUTH CAROLINA NO. 1 IN NATION'S BOND MARKET

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, South Carolina is No. 1 in the Nation's bond market. A \$37.5 million State bond issue, the proceeds of which will in large part be used for education, recently sold in New York at the fantastically low interest rate of 3.867 percent. Mr. Speaker, this is a splendid tribute to the Democratic Party of South Carolina. The South Carolina Democratic Party has for more than 100 years provided our State with progressive and efficient good government.

This good government makes it possible for our State to sell its bonds at the lowest interest rates, rates that each year save South Carolina taxpayers millions of dollars. Good government has made it possible for South Carolina to make a splendid investment in tomorrow at the lowest possible costs. In the words of South Carolina's very able and dynamic State treasurer, Grady L. Patterson, Jr.:

This sale is another chapter in the continuing story of sound fiscal management

and financial responsibility in South Carolina.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, South Carolina is truly No. 1; and South Carolinians point with great pride to the fact that our State's splendid credit rating makes possible new investments for education and a better tomorrow.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

(Mr. MIKVA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent when the House voted yesterday on whether the United States should violate the international boycott of Rhodesia by importing Rhodesian chrome—roll 379. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AN FBI INVESTIGATION

(Mr. SCHEUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post contains a confirmed story about an FBI investigation of a national television correspondent, Mr. Daniel Schorr of CBS.

The investigation, which involved the questioning of Mr. Schorr's friends and neighbors, was allegedly conducted, because Mr. Schorr was being considered for a "position of trust and confidence" in the Government. This explanation is not credible. In fact, the story suggests to all but the most naive that the investigation was conducted, because the White