

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Larry H. Bowers *William A. Downs
*John Y. Chew *Paul B. Flandermeier
*John F. Donaldson

Jimmy L. Strube, temporary chief warrant officer to be a permanent chief warrant officer W-3 and temporary chief warrant officer W-4 in the U.S. Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following temporary chief warrant officers to be permanent chief warrant officers W-2 and temporary chief warrant officers W-3 in the U.S. Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert F. Carlton Neal D. Olson
Edwin L. Dickinson James A. Posey, Jr.
Billie G. Hannon Charles J. Reddix
Gerald S. Lear David L. Richardson
Theodore G. McManus James H. Richey
Joe D. Meade, III August Spata

The following temporary chief warrant officers to be permanent chief warrant officers W-2 in the U.S. Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

James E. Adrian Richard A. Biondo
Lary K. Alley Harold L. Bolton, Jr.
Ellis C. Anderson Robert S. Booth
Alfred E. S. Armfield George T. Boring
Andrew T. Atchley Allen G. Brice
Ricardo J. Aterrado Clarence Broussard
Gary E. Ball James E. Brueggeman
Sam M. Barnes Clyde L. Butler
James A. Bartley Alvin E. Callahan
Arthur Beatty Willis E. Campbell

John G. Catron
Roland L. Cave
Harold D. Chambers
Richard P. Chesbro
David L. Clements
Dennis E. Clifford
Jimmy T. Clifford
Earl M. Colley, Jr.
Ira B. Cortez
James O. Cooper
Anderson H. Cox
Frederick P. Crickman
William D. Cutler
Walter E. Courtney
Richard K. Cunningham

John Cultrera
William C. Daily
Bobby G. Davis
Gene F. Dove
James T. Dubose
Arthur A. Dumas
James R. Duren
Thomas M. Edwards
Norman H. Faulkner
Bernard J. Ferrara
Gordon P. Fields
Robert F. Fisher
Dale K. Free
George Freeman
Allen P. Freese
Robert Friedenreich
Jack W. Furlong
Robert M. Galindo
Richard E. Gibson
Durrell M. Bissinger
Joseph F. Giunta
Michael J. Grace
Charles R. Gray, Jr.
Edward C. Griggs

Leon T. Grigsby
Manuel W. Guerra, Jr.
Zollo R. Gutierrez
Henry C. Haggard
Harold W. Harter
Herbert M. Hartley, Jr.
James L. Harvey
Lynn D. Harvison
John F. Hilton, Jr.
William P. Hinson
William V. Hubbard
Donald E. Hubner
James E. Hutcheson
Charles R. Hughes
Roy D. Hughes
William P. Jeffries, Jr.
Charles D. Johnson, Jr.

Valery C. Keaveny
James H. Kilpatrick, Jr.
Edward Kopanski
Charles S. Krauch
Preston I. Carraway
George Lawson
John C. Lisk
John F. Loonam
Thomas P. Long
William J. Lynn
Thomas E. McClimont
John P. McGowan
Terry L. McKinney
Ernest J. Malboeuf
Vincent R. Marseglia
Dale A. Menard
Clyde D. Miller
Robert A. Morris
Walter S. Morrow
Kenneth L. Munn
Ronald E. Nash

Richard O. Nason
Stephen R. Nelson
Robert E. L. Norwood
James T. O'Keefe
Jim F. O'Neal
Joseph R. Paquin
William G. Parsons
Donald V. Patino
Joseph T. Patkus
Bryant L. Payden
Allen B. Perry
John E. Peterson
Vernon A. Plantz
Thomas R. Pletcher
Louis E. Potts
John E. Price
Charles J. Raggo
Richard A. Riddle
Neal D. Rife
Donald D. Robbins
Robert J. Robbins
David M. Roby
Roger W. Rutland
Lee E. Smith
Lewis B. Smith
Theodore L. Smith
Alton E. Stapp
James C. Stendel

Richard H. Story
John R. Strusinski
John E. Stuart
William W. Sutter
Clovis H. Tapp
George L. Taylor, Jr.
Donald R. Thomas
Byron H. Thompson
Jerry Tingle
Ernest A. Toth
George T. Treptor
Donald P. Turner
Thomas R. Turpin
Warner R. Tyler
Bennie J. Valeu
Robert J. Ventgen
George W. Wallace
William C. Walsh
William F. Walsh
Lee L. Walz
Robert H. Weaver
Elvin B. Webb
James G. Wilke
Joseph K. Winsey
Guy W. Woody
James L. Worley
Clarence F. Wreath
George D. Zeitler

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 1 (legislative day of February 17), 1971:

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Donald W. Whitehead, of Massachusetts, to be Federal Cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ABRAHAM LINCOLN AND HIS CHURCH ACTIVITIES

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, much has been written over the years about Abraham Lincoln and his church activities. In fact, some historians have claimed that the 16th President did not display much interest in church.

I want to dispel this point, Mr. President. Abraham Lincoln had a deep faith; he possessed a strong religious conviction; his actions showed a "Humble Lincoln Walked in the Path of God."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that news articles on Lincoln's birthday which have appeared in the Kansas City Times, the Phoenix Gazette, the Milwaukee Journal, and the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin be printed in the Extensions of Remarks. These articles were written by Herman Blum, of Philadelphia, who has an exceptional collection of Lincoln memorabilia and who, over the years before becoming a textile industry executive, was a reporter on newspapers in Wisconsin, St. Louis, New York, and Chicago.

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

CRAFTEX MILLS, INC. OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Philadelphia, Pa., February 20, 1971.

Senator HUGH D. SCOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HUGH: I thought you might be interested in a few of the nationally important newspapers that ran my byline article on the editorial pages on Lincoln's birthday this year. The most complete of these reprints is the one which appeared in the Kansas City Times.

If you think it worth while to insert it in the Congressional Record, I think it would be readable and a tribute to the understanding of our 16th President.

With kind regards, I am,
Yours very sincerely,

HERMAN BLUM.

[From the Kansas City Times, Feb. 12, 1967]

"LINCOLN THE INFIDEL" IN FACT RELIGIOUS
(By Dr. Herman Blum)

When Abraham Lincoln ran for president the first time, in 1860, his detractors claimed that since he was not a member of any church, had never been baptized or made formal profession of faith, he could not be considered religious. His outright enemies did not hesitate to call him an infidel.

It was in 1846, while a candidate for Congress that Lincoln felt impelled to state his position on the subject of religion which became an issue in his campaign. Accordingly he published the following letter:

"To the voters of the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois.

"A charge having got into circulation in some of the neighborhoods of this district, in substance that I am a scoffer at Chris-

tianity, I have by the advice of some friends concluded to notice the subject in this form. That I am not a member of any Christian Church is true, but I have never denied the truth of the Scriptures, and I have never spoken with intentional disrespect of any religion in general, or any denomination in particular.

I do not think I could, myself, be brought to support a man for office whom I knew to be an open enemy of, and scoffer at, religion. Leaving the higher matter of eternal consequences, between him and his maker, I still do not think any man has the right thus to insult the feelings and injure the morals of the community in which he may live.

"If then, I was guilty of such conduct, I should blame the man who should condemn me for it; but I do blame those, whoever they may be, who falsely put such a charge in circulation against me."

(Signed) A. LINCOLN.

Charges that he was an unbeliever continued, but these did not dismay Lincoln. He used to become enmeshed in distorted interpretations of Christianity, which were current then in the narrow religious ways of the day. He was not opposed to creed, but he did say this:

"I cannot without mental reservations assent to long and complicated creeds and catechisms. If the Church would ask simply for acceptance of the commands, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and thy neighbor as thyself'—that Church I would gladly join with."

OTHER EVIDENCE

Besides his own statement, there is other evidence that Lincoln had deep religious

convictions and constantly sought divine guidance. The Bible was probably the first book that Lincoln read.

A few denominations have falsely claimed Abraham Lincoln as a member. It is true that his father, Thomas, was a member of the Baptist church, but Abraham never joined.

If any particular congregation has a claim upon Abraham Lincoln, it is the First Presbyterian church of Springfield. His connection with this church is well documented, but he never became a member.

In the fall of 1849 Lincoln and his family journeyed to Lexington, Ky., to settle the estate of Mary Lincoln's father, Robert S. Todd, who had died on July 16 of that year. While in the Todd home, Lincoln browsed in the large library there. The Todds were Presbyterians, and Mary had been reared in the faith. But during her stay with the Ninian W. Edwards family in Springfield, she attended the Episcopal church with her sister and brother-in-law. For this reason, the Episcopal minister had married Mary and Abraham in 1842.

But Presbyterian books were in the Todd library, and one of them caught the fancy of Lincoln. This was "The Christian's Defense," by the Rev. James A. Smith. Dr. Smith was the pastor of the First Presbyterian church back in Springfield.

Lincoln was deeply impressed with Dr. Smith's logic, who dealt with all the usual objections which infidels raise against the Bible. Lincoln was so devoted to Dr. Smith's book that he secured a copy for the family bookcase. Robert Lincoln recalled that it was one of his father's few personal books.

It was a tragedy in the Lincoln household which brought them closer to Dr. Smith. Little Edward Baker Lincoln died on February 1, 1850, as a result of chronic consumption. He had suffered severely for 52 days, and the doting parents were worn-out physically and spiritually. In this time of affliction, Lincoln turned to Dr. Smith. This learned man conducted the funeral services at the home on the following day and later visited the Lincoln family to give them solace.

Soon the Lincolns began to attend the First Church which at that time was located on the southeast corner of Third and Washington streets. Within a short time Lincoln rented pew number 20. Mary Lincoln formally joined the church on April 13, 1852. Their son, Thomas, called "Tad," was baptized in the church on April 4, 1855.

NEW MINISTER

In 1855 Dr. Smith left Springfield to work for the Synod, and Dr. John H. Brown from Lexington, Ky., replaced him. Dr. Smith's departure did not affect the religious life of the Lincolns. They continued to attend the Sunday services as usual. Said Beverly P. Herndon, son of Lincoln's law partner, William H. Herndon: "I saw Lincoln often, at the 1st Presbyterian Church." Dr. Brown was an excellent preacher and must have also known Mrs. Lincoln's Lexington friends and relatives.

But Lincoln's religion penetrated much deeper into his soul than a mere personal attachment to a particular church or minister. His belief in God grew as Lincoln himself grew in knowledge. As President, Lincoln attended the New York Avenue Presbyterian church in the capital where the Rev. Phineas D. Gurley was pastor. In Dr. Gurley's mind, Lincoln was a practicing Christian.

Who could doubt this opinion after having read Lincoln's state papers? His Second Inaugural is not just a political declaration—it is a sermon: "With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle; and for his

widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just, and a lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations."

As he stood on the platform of the special train that was to take him from Springfield to Washington and to the White House, he said to those who came to bid him Godspeed, "Without the assistance of the Divine Being I cannot succeed. With that assistance I cannot fail. Trusting in Him who can go with me and remain with you and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all will be well. To his care commending you, as I hope in your prayers you will commend me, I bid you an affectionate farewell."

After taking his presidential oath of office, March 4, 1861, Lincoln declared in his inaugural address that he had a solemn oath "registered in Heaven" to "preserve, protect and defend" the government. He could not, he insisted, "shrink from the defense of" his oath and his government.

He truly symbolized the passage in the Bible which makes clear the nature of true religion: "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

Lincoln memorized long passages from the Bible, particularly those chapters that reflected his passionate oration of the Bible's doctrine of freedom for all, regardless of race or creed. Perhaps no president who occupied the White House ever read the Bible as much as Lincoln. The White House guards used to find him, before he had breakfast in the morning, turning the pages of his Bible in a small room he used for a library. His two great speeches, the Gettysburg address and the Second Inaugural, are filled with the words and poetry of the Bible. He prayed daily and called prayer "talking with God." In the Washington Cathedral the beautiful bronze statue of Houck's kneeling Lincoln recalls Lincoln's remark "That man is tallest who is on his knees."

[From the Phoenix Gazette, Feb. 12, 1971]

NO CHURCH AFFILIATION: HUMBLE LINCOLN WALKED IN THE PATH OF GOD

(By Dr. Herman Blum)

Historians cite Abraham Lincoln's religion as being of "no formal affiliation." Our 16th president attended Presbyterian services in Washington and Springfield, Ill., every so often, but was not a member of the church.

When he ran for president the first time, in 1860, detractors of Lincoln claimed that since he was not a member of any church, had never been baptized or made formal profession of faith, he could not be considered religious. His outright enemies did not hesitate to call him an infidel.

Notwithstanding these allegations, historians do not have any doubt that the epic that Lincoln lived was based on the broadest concept of religion.

It was in 1846, while a candidate for Congress, that Lincoln felt impelled to state his position on the subject of religion, which became an issue in his campaign. Accordingly he published the following letter:

"To the voters of the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois."

"A charge having got into circulation in some of the neighborhoods of this district, in substance that I am an open scoffer at Christianity, I have by the advice of some friends concluded to notice the subject in this form. That I am not a member of any Christian Church is true, but I have never denied the truth of the Scriptures, and I have never spoken with intentional disrespect of any religion in general, or any denomination in particular.

"I do not think I could, myself, be brought to support a man for office whom I knew to be an open enemy of, and scoffer at, religion. Leaving the higher matter of eternal conse-

quences between him and his Maker, I still do not think any man has the right thus to insult the feelings and injure the morals of the community in which he may live. If then, I was guilty of such conduct, I should blame no man who should condemn me for it; but I do blame those, whoever they may be, who falsely put such a charge in circulation against me."

Charges that he was an unbeliever continued, but these did not dismay Lincoln. He refused to become enmeshed in distorted interpretations of Christianity, which were current in the narrow religious sects of the day. He was not opposed to creed, but he did say this:

"I cannot without mental reservations assent to long and complicated creeds and catechisms. If the church would ask simply for acceptance of the commands, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and thy neighbor as thyself'—that church I would gladly join with."

Besides his own statement, there is other evidence that Lincoln had deep religious convictions and constantly sought divine guidance. The Bible was probably the first book that Lincoln read.

A few denominations have falsely claimed Abraham Lincoln as a member. It is true that his father, Thomas, was a member of the Baptist Church, but Abraham never joined. If any particular congregation has a claim upon Abraham Lincoln, it is the First Presbyterian Church of Springfield. His connection with this church is well documented, but he never became a member.

Lincoln's religion penetrated much deeper into his soul than a mere personal attachment to a particular church or minister. His belief in God grew as Lincoln himself grew in knowledge. As president, Lincoln attended with regularity the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, where the Rev. Dr. Phinaes D. Gurley was pastor. In Dr. Gurley's mind, Lincoln was a practicing Christian. Who could doubt this opinion after having read Lincoln's state papers? His Second Inaugural is not just a political declaration—it is a sermon: "With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle; and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and a lasting peace, among ourselves and with all nations."

As he stood on the platform of the special train that was to take him from Springfield to Washington and to the White House, he said to those who came to bid him Godspeed, "Without the assistance of the divine being I cannot succeed. With that assistance I cannot fail. Trusting in Him who can go with me and remain with you and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all will be well. To His care commending you, as I hope in your prayers you will commend me, I bid you an affectionate farewell."

After taking his presidential oath of office, March 4, 1861, Lincoln declared in his inaugural address that he had a solemn oath "registered in Heaven" to "preserve, protect and defend" the government. He could not, he insisted, "shrink from the defense of" his oath and his government.

He truly symbolized the passage in the Bible which makes clear the nature of true religion: "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" Perhaps no president who occupied the White House ever read the Bible as much as Lincoln.

Lincoln sought constantly, with humility and patience, to learn what his part was

in the divine-human drama. His faith in God and his reliance upon God freed him from any false pretensions and imaginings that he was greater and more important than any human being has a right to assume. Often he told those who came to him that his concern was not to get God on his side, but to be sure that he and the American people were on God's side.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Feb. 6, 1971]

DEEDS SHOWED LINCOLN'S FAITH

(By Herman Blum)

When he ran for president for the first time, in 1860, detractors of Abraham Lincoln claimed that since he was not a member of any church, had never been baptized or made normal profession of faith, he could not be considered religious. His outright enemies called him an infidel.

But historians do not have any doubts that the epic Lincoln lived was based on the broadest conception of religion.

In 1846, while a candidate for Congress, Lincoln stated his position on religion, which became an issue in his campaign. He published the following letter:

"To the voters of the 7th Congressional District of Illinois.

"A charge having got into circulation in some of the neighborhoods of this district, in substance that I am an open scoffer at Christianity, I have by the advice of some friends concluded to notice the subject in this form. That I am not a member of any Christian church is true, but I have never denied the truth of the Scriptures, and I have never spoken with intentional disrespect of any religion in general, or any denomination in particular.

NO RIGHT TO INSULT

"I do not think I could, myself, be brought to support a man for office whom I knew to be an open enemy of, and scoffer, at religion. Leaving the higher matter of eternal consequences, between him and his maker, I still do not think any man has the right thus to insult the feelings and injure the morals of the community in which he may live. If then, I was guilty of such conduct, I should blame no man who should condemn me for it; but I do blame those, whoever they may be, who falsely put such a charge in circulation against me.

July 31, 1846.

(Signed) A. Lincoln."

Lincoln refused to become enmeshed in the interpretations of Christianity that were current in his day. He was not opposed to creed, but he did say this:

"I cannot without mental reservations assent to long and complicated creeds and catechisms. If the church would ask simply for acceptance of the commands, 'Thou shalt love the Lord Thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and thy neighbor as thyself'—that church I would gladly join with."

CLAIMED BY SOME

A few denominations have falsely claimed Lincoln as a member. It is true that his father, Thomas, was a Baptist, but Abraham never was.

If any congregation had a claim upon Abraham Lincoln, it was First Presbyterian Church of Springfield.

In the fall of 1849, Lincoln and his family went to Lexington, Ky., to settle the estate of Mary Lincoln's father, Robert S. Todd, who had died on July 16 of that year. While in the Todd home, Lincoln browsed in the large library there. The Todds were Presbyterians, and Mary had been raised in the faith. But during her stay with the Ninian W. Edwards in Springfield, she attended an Episcopal Church with her sister and brother-in-law. The Episcopal minister married Mary and Abraham in 1842.

But Presbyterian books were in the Todd library, and one of them caught the fancy of Lincoln. This was "The Christian's Defense," by the Rev. James A. Smith, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church back in Springfield.

DEEPLY IMPRESSED

Lincoln was deeply impressed with Smith's logic, which dealt with the usual objections raised against the Bible. Lincoln was so devoted to Smith's book that he obtained a copy for himself. Robert Lincoln recalled that it was one of his father's few personal books.

A tragedy in the Lincoln household brought the family closer to Smith. Little Edward Baker Lincoln died on Feb. 1, 1850, as a result of chronic consumption. He had suffered severely for 52 days, and the doting parents were worn out physically and spiritually. In this time of affliction, Lincoln turned to Smith. This learned man conducted the funeral services at the home on the following day and later visited the Lincoln family to give them solace.

BELIEF GREW

Soon the Lincolns began to attend First Church. Within a short time Lincoln rented pew No. 20. Mary Lincoln formally joined the church on April 13, 1852. Their son, "Tad," was baptized in the church on April 4, 1855.

Lincoln's belief in God grew as Lincoln grew in knowledge. As president, Lincoln regularly attended the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, where the Rev. Phineas D. Gurley was pastor.

In Gurley's mind, Lincoln was a practicing Christian.

Lincoln memorized long passages from the Bible. Perhaps no president who occupied the White House ever read the Bible as much as Lincoln. White House guards would find him, before he had breakfast in the morning, turning the pages of his Bible in the small room he used for a library. He prayed daily and called prayer "talking with God."

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin, Feb. 12, 1971]

LINCOLN'S RELIGIOUS CREED

(By Dr. Herman Blum)

Historians cite Abraham Lincoln's religion as being of "No formal affiliation." Our 16th President attended Presbyterian services in Washington and Springfield, Ill., every so often, but was not a member of the church.

When he ran for President the first time, in 1860, detractors charged that since he was not a member of any church, had never been baptized or made formal profession of faith, he could not be considered religious. His outright enemies did not hesitate to call him an infidel.

Notwithstanding these allegations, historians do not have any doubts that the epic that Lincoln lived was based on the broadest conception of religion.

It was in 1846, while a candidate for Congress that Lincoln felt impelled to state his position on the subject of religion which became an issue in his campaign. Accordingly he published the following letter:

"To the voters of the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois."

"A charge having got into circulation in some of the neighborhoods of this district, in substance that I am an open scoffer at Christianity, I have by the advice of some friends concluded to notice the subject in this form. That I am not a member of any Christian Church is true, but I have never denied the truth of the Scriptures, and I have never spoken with intentional disrespect of any religion in general, or any denomination in particular.

"I do not think I could, myself, be brought to support a man for office whom I knew to be an open enemy of, and scoffer at, religion.

Leaving the higher matter of eternal consequences, between him and his maker, I still do not think any man has the right thus to insult the feelings and injure the morals of the community in which he may live.

"If then, I was guilty of such conduct, I should blame no man who should condemn me for it; but I do blame those, whoever they may be, who falsely put such a charge in circulation against me." July 31, 1846.

(Signed) A. LINCOLN.

Charges that he was an unbeliever continued, but these did not dismay Lincoln. He refused to become enmeshed in distorted interpretations of Christianity, which were current in the narrow religious sects of the day. He was not opposed to creed, but he did say this:

"I cannot without mental reservations assent to long and complicated creeds and catechisms. If the Church would ask simply for acceptance of the commands, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God and thy neighbor as thyself'—that Church I would gladly join with."

If any particular congregation has a claim upon Abraham Lincoln, it is the First Presbyterian Church of Springfield. His connection with this church is well documented, but he never became a member.

While President, Lincoln regularly attended the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church in Washington where the Rev. Dr. Phineas D. Gurley was pastor. In Dr. Gurley's mind, Lincoln was a practicing Christian. Who could doubt this opinion after having read Lincoln's state papers?

His Second Inaugural is not just a political declaration—it is a sermon; "With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle; and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just, and a lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations."

VOICES OF SPRING

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, former Under Secretary of State, George M. Ball, has written a perceptive article entitled "Voices of Spring," which appears in the March 1 issue of Newsweek magazine.

Mr. Ball is well qualified to discuss the subject of his article covering political and military commitments. He has served as Associate General Counsel with the Lend-Lease Administration, Director of the U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey in London, and Under Secretary of State in the Kennedy-Johnson administration. Most recently in 1968, he served as the permanent U.S. Representative to the United Nations. The article follows:

VOICES OF SPRING

(By George W. Ball)

Before Latin gave way to basket weaving, every schoolboy used to learn about Marcus Cato the Censor, a Roman statesman of quite remarkable achievement. By proclaiming again and again that Carthage must be destroyed, not only did he launch a vast urban-clearance project, but, even more important,

he taught future politicians that a good way to make a reputation is by repetition.

It is a lesson that has been well learned, as we Americans rediscover every spring, for, as inevitable as the ground hog or the seven-year locust—those animate symbols of punctuality in a computer-driven world—we know we will hear, again and again, certain old refrains as Congress reassembles. Among the most insistent of those chants—and always from the same senators—is the impassioned demand that American troops be promptly withdrawn from Western Europe.

FERVENT

A fervent declaration, and well intentioned, it carries a commonsensical appeal. For is it not "unnatural" that 25 years after the second world war we should still have 300,000 troops in the heart of Europe, 3,000 miles from home?

Yet, though no one who is serious and fair-minded can give other than an affirmative answer to the question, the conclusion that follows is by no means self-evident. To contend, because their current deployment is "unnatural," that we should, therefore, bring our men back presupposes that we live in a "natural" world, which is manifestly not the case.

Is it "natural" that Germany should be split into two parts? Or Western Europe? Or that the world should still be polarized between antagonistic centers of power? I know no one who would argue that such a grotesque global predicament is either "natural" or attractive; yet it is not likely to alter much overnight. Meanwhile, we must face the hard problem of maintaining an uneasy equilibrium in a period when the Soviet Union appears once again to be in an expansionist phase. It is an expansionism that is, unhappily, showing profits, since for the first time in history a Russian fleet patrols the Mediterranean, while the ancient czarist dream of a power base in Egypt grows more tangible each week, as more and more planes, ships, missiles and men debouch in Cairo.

Nor is the equilibrium strained only by forces on the East, for today the capitals of Western Europe are on the verge of central decisions. If, at long last, Britain casts her fortunes with the new Europe, then the slow evolution of a soundly balanced European political structure is not only possible but likely. But if Britain fails to take the lowered fence for quite unworthy reasons, then forces of fragmentation will likely accelerate. A new generation of Germans, uninhibited by bad memories, will be tempted to press even further their atavistic interest in an independent Eastern policy, while France, at long last free of the Gaullist illusion and anxiously aware of German weight and threatened dominance, will turn more and more inward. Meanwhile, Italy, a Mediterranean power no longer surrounded by an exclusively Western sea, may, sooner or later, be driven by her own faction-ridden politics into an uneasy arrangement with her huge Communist minority.

DELICATE

For America to choose such a fluid moment to disturb the delicate interplay of forces by removing the political and military assurance implicit in our stabilizing presence would be reckless indeed—particularly when the compensating benefits of withdrawal are quite insubstantial. Doctrine has already determined that our strategic military reserve can be as easily maintained in Europe as in the United States (perhaps even more cheaply in budgetary costs); and though, even after offset arrangements, there may still be a balance-of-payments disadvantage, that is no longer the obsessive concern it was some years ago.

So far President Nixon has stood commendably firm on this issue, and Senator

Muskie is now lending reinforcement. With good luck the embattled position can still be held during the critical months ahead. It had better be.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF STATE GARDEN CLUBS ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION PROJECTS

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, on January 27, 1971, I had the pleasure of welcoming to my office Mrs. Maxwell W. Steel, of Huntingdon, Pa. Mrs. Steel is the incoming president of the National Council of State Garden Clubs, Inc., and came to tell me about the national council's conservation environmental education project for 1971-72.

The goal of this project, which Mrs. Steel calls "one of the most timely, important, and far-reaching programs ever undertaken by a national organization," is to provide teachers with the material necessary to make conservation/environmental education an integral part of the educational activities of every classroom in the United States. They hope to reach this goal by donating to teachers in every school in America the appropriate volume from the eight-volume series of Teachers' Curriculum Guides to Conservation Education, People and Their Environment.

People and Their Environment is a program of over 400 lessons written by teachers for teachers and designed to make conservation/environmental education a living part of a school system's overall curriculum.

The publication of these teachers' guides is the culmination of a 7-year project by the South Carolina Department of Education, with a grant from the Belle W. Maruch Foundation, and under the direction of Dr. Matthew J. Brennan and Dr. Paul F. Brandwein of the Pinchot Institute for Conservation Studies. The Pinchot Institute is located in Milford, Pa., in the ancestral home of America's first conservationist and two-term Governor of Pennsylvania, Gifford Pinchot.

Each volume in the series was specifically developed for use in a particular grade or subject area.

To implement this ambitious educational program, the 387,700 members of the over 14,500 garden clubs affiliated with National Council of State Garden Clubs will seek the support and aid of friends, neighbors, other civic organizations, businessmen, and members of industry.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Education, I am most heartened to note that the National Council of State Garden Clubs' project directs its attention to that area of environmental education emphasized in Public Law 91-516, the Environmental Education Act of 1970, passed unanimously by this body and signed by President Nixon on October 30, 1970; namely, to encourage and support the development of new and improved

curriculums designed to develop citizen understanding of the Nation's environment and environmental problems and policies; and to encourage citizen support of activities designed to enhance environmental quality and maintain ecological balance. It appears that if National Council of State Garden Clubs' project is successful, the Nation will have taken a giant step toward accomplishing the purpose of the Environmental Education Act.

Furthermore, this project illustrates how—at no cost to the Federal Treasury—a national federation of State organizations, each member working within her own local community, can join with businesses and Government in an attempt to solve one of our Nation's most pressing problems.

I urge all Senators to support this project and to encourage the citizens of their States to do likewise.

A WAGE BOARD BILL IS NEEDED

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that a Wage Board bill to provide an improved method for adjusting the wage system of Federal blue collar workers was approved by the Congress in the last session. However, it was vetoed, and in the lateness of the session, no attempt to override the veto was made. In the House the measure passed by record vote of 272 yeas to 89 nays, and in the Senate this bill passed by voice vote. It is highly proper that further efforts be made to insure the enactment of this legislation. A wage board bill still is needed to provide an equitable system of wage adjustment and to eliminate discrimination in wages paid to nearly 800,000 Federal blue collar or prevailing rate workers, some of whom have suffered inequitable and unfair treatment for many years because of the lack of such legislation.

I am introducing such a bill. It will provide by statute the first equitable system for adjusting and fixing the pay rates of wage grade employees. There is within every State a large number of wage grade and nonappropriated fund employees who have been discriminated against. One cannot stress too strongly the need for immediate action. The issue has been ignored too long by those who had the power to correct this unjust system.

Prevailing rate employees make up 27 percent of those paid exclusively from appropriated funds. Adding the thousands of employees included in the non-appropriated fund list, the number would be about 800,000.

These patient workers have been loyal to their Federal job stature, but we cannot ask them to be patient longer. Ranking is the fact that the President vetoed a bill which would have helped these people—vetoed it at the end of the last Congress.

The need is apparent for speedy ac-

tion on this measure to cope with unfair treatment which has snowballed over the years and has made these loyal Federal workers the step-children of the Government service.

Discrimination is rampant against these employees. Wage grade workers earn annually on an average 16 percent less than classified workers or those in the postal field service.

This bill, in setting up 10 steps in pay differential, will not only compact the gross inequities of the present three step system but will establish a range of rates so Federal Wage Board can win comparability with private industry, who now operates successfully under similar rate ranges.

As things now stand, the pay differential for classified white collar workers is about 30 percent; the pay differential of blue collar workers in private industry follows a similar pattern; but the Wage Board blue collar workers in Federal installations can only increase their rate of pay by 8 percent. How, under existing rules, do you reward these employees, particularly since most of them are in the final step shortly after they begin work?

Supervisors are given the privilege of a five in-grade system now, so they can enjoy continued financial rewards while the workers they supervise are stuck in an inflexible grade system.

This bill will also establish a Federal Prevailing Advisory Committee within the Civil Service Commission with an impartial chairman appointed by the President to insure that the broad interests of both sides are represented and protected.

Five members of the committee will be appointed by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission from labor unions representing the largest number of prevailing rate employees under exclusive recognition in Government service. Management officials, five in number, will be appointed from each of the four executive agencies—other than the Civil Service Commission—and military departments having the largest number of prevailing rate employees and an employee of the Civil Service Commission appointed by its Chairman.

An important feature of the bill is that it would include the provision that the nonappropriated fund workers will receive the same benefits as the wage grade workers.

This measure is vital to the Federal service. These workers have been more than patient, but their patience is growing thin and they could, should we ignore them, resort to other means to connect a mishmash of antiquated Executive orders and chaotic regulations.

PRESIDENT'S FIGHT AGAINST CANCER MUST HAVE SUFFICIENTLY TRAINED MANPOWER

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, central to the effectiveness of any scientific pro-

gram is the presence of sufficient manpower—manpower that is trained and available at the point of greatest need. Central to the effectiveness of the President's fight against cancer will be the availability of that trained and experienced manpower pool, enlivened and enriched by a long association among the investigators and other research personnel who have brought us this far along the road.

To initiate now a new agency, or super agency, to handle an accelerated effort to conquer cancer is, to my mind, somehow lacking in logic, lacking in appreciation of what has already been achieved, and—finally—lacking in an awareness of the personnel problems that would inevitably be entailed.

The know-how—the day-to-day association and exchange of knowledge among virologists, immunologists, cell biologists, epidemiologists, pharmacologists, and others involved with research that is so critically relevant to areas of promise in the cancer field—all of these factors are in being at the National Cancer Institute. It would take years for an independent agency to construct a similar group. In the last analysis, it would seem to be a waste to try and double the workers in a field where critical trained manpower shortages now exist.

ONE MAN'S OPINION

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, recently, Mr. Frank McIntyre, vice president of KLUB-AM in Salt Lake City, ran a series of radio editorials on his show "One Man's Opinion." They dealt with professionalism and the deterioration of quality performance and workmanship in America.

I think the series was very interesting and ask that they be included in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Frank C. McIntyre)

Frank McIntyre at the microphone. One Man's Opinion. We had Christmas dinner at a lovely Salt Lake restaurant. Knowing how hard it is to get help on Christmas day, I was prepared for sub-par service. But, our waitress was doing her utmost under trying circumstances. I heard the host of the party at an adjoining table ask another waitress if his guests could have some water. The gal replied, "This isn't my table—and I'm awfully busy." The poor guy obviously looked shocked—so the waitress asked him to describe the girl assigned to his table. And she proceeded to look for the proper waitress. She spent precious minutes explaining why she couldn't get the water—and more precious minutes looking for the right girl—instead of spending a mere fraction of the time pouring the water. Not to do the job must have taken 5-minutes—to do the job would have taken about 60-seconds. An example of the lack of professionalism—that we find everywhere. How many Christmas toys have fallen apart? How many small ap-

pliances have you junked because they don't work? How many times have you reported for a 10 o'clock appointment and find yourself still cooling your heels waiting at 11. In government, industry, business, professions, education and the arts we find incompetence rampant—incompetence triumphant. A few years ago I was convinced all was lost—that we, as a nation—even as a race—couldn't survive. Then I read the Peter Principle—a book devoted to why things go wrong. Raymond Hull, in the introduction, says: "Incompetence knows no barriers of time or place". He lists as examples a report by Samuel Popys of the British Navy in 1684: "The naval administration was a prodigy of wastefulness, corruption, ignorance and indolence". Wellington examined the roster of officers assigned him for his 1810 campaign in Portugal and mused, "I only hope that when the enemy reads the list of names, he trembles as I do". Robert E. Lee complained bitterly, "I cannot get my order carried out". Harry Truman, many years later, echoed Lee's words. I'm convinced that any boss who strives for perfection will lose his mind, I'm also convinced it's difficult to attain mediocrity. Dr. Laurence J. Peter, in his book, "The Peter Principle," maintains the reason for inefficiency is that we all reach our level of incompetence. We rise from a position in which we function efficiently to a position we're incapable of filling . . . and there we stay, gumming up the works for ever more. Our level of incompetence. He gives many illustrations to back up his theory. I think that may be part of the problem—but only part. We'll go into that tomorrow. Frank McIntyre at the microphone.

ONE MAN'S OPINION—PART II

(By Frank C. McIntyre)

Frank McIntyre at the microphone. One Man's Opinion. We continue on the subject of incompetence-inefficiency. Dr. Laurence J. Peter, in his book, "The Peter Principle," says the reason incompetence is rampant—incompetence is triumphant everywhere—is because we all reach our "level of incompetence. By performing well in a lesser job, we're promoted to a job we can't handle—our level of incompetence." Maybe that's part of the problem—but I feel many—too many—people earn their living in a job they HATE at worst—or barely tolerate at best. I feel sorry for the man who dreads to see Monday roll around after a pleasant weekend—because he can't stand the thought of returning to his job. If you don't enjoy—yes enjoy—your job, you can't do your best work. We need dedicated workers—but it's impossible to be dedicated to a job you despise. If you're bored with your job—quit it. Or, make every effort to put some life, vim and vigor into what you're doing. Too many people—especially in government—have a tendency to play it safe—avoid controversial positions—they're afraid to rock the boat—and adopt a policy of blandness, until blandness becomes a way of life. Maybe you feel if you're anything but bland—if you speak your mind with force and candor—you'll grate on your bosses nerves and if you don't get canned, you'll languish in your present position and never advance. But, isn't it worth a try? You can't exist indefinitely in an atmosphere of boredom. Simple boredom drives able men to drink—or to the fringe of lunacy. If you don't choose to quit your job, at least look for ways to make it interesting. No matter how long or high your position, if you take pride in what you're doing, you'll automatically do a better job—and this in itself will bring you an amazing amount of satisfaction. Incidentally—and I've said this before—I have no sympathy with those who say increased pay means increased quality. Good pay, by itself, does not insure good work. To insure good work, you must first have good people. If pay is the in-

centive—the people and their services are of doubtful value. I'm not quarreling with any individual or group for wanting—asking for—or even demanding—more pay. But, please don't tell the employer, "If I made more money, I'd do better work." If you're not already doing the best job of which you're capable, you shouldn't receive more dough—you should be canned. Play the part of a martyr—do a minimal job because you feel you're underpaid, unappreciated and exploited, and the boss will probably say—or at least think—Hallelujah, if you tell him you're quitting. Make yourself so valuable—so close to being indispensable—do such a terrific job that the boss will shudder at the thought of losing you. You might be surprised what he'll do to keep you. More on professionalism—or lack of it—tomorrow.

ONE MAN'S OPINION—PART III

(By Frank C. McIntyre)

Frank McIntyre at the microphone. One Man's Opinion. During the past two days, I hope I haven't created the impression that I blame all of today's inefficiency and incompetence on the workers. Far from it. I feel the operation of any company—or department of government, industry, business, professions, education or the arts—is a direct reflection on the attitude of the manager—the top man—the guy in charge. For instance, have you ever noticed you do NOT receive the same treatment, consideration, courtesy at ALL outlets of any given chain? I refused to go inside one large, modern store because of the discourteous, disinterested treatment I received or imagined I received. Yet, a matter of blocks away this same company operated a store that was an absolute joy to visit. Every customer was treated as an honored guest—an old friend. The cold treatment at Store A was the direct reflection of a cold boss. The friendly treatment at Store B was the direct reflection of a friendly boss. To further prove my point, a new manager was appointed for the "friendly" boss—and almost overnight the atmosphere changed. Same employees, for the most part—but the new boss was a "cold fish" and his attitude soon rubbed off on his employees. "A happy ship" must be helmed by a "Happy captain." His enthusiasm can't help but rub off on his crew. Employees—knowingly or unknowingly—tend to take on the traits, mannerisms and characteristics of the boss. If the boss just couldn't care less—why should the employees? What can management do? Well, management must set the "tone"—show by example—and not just by pious lectures to the crew—that the company does care. If the employees see and hear with their own eyes that the boss is in fact concerned, they, too, will be concerned. Also, policy must be set by management—and transmitted clearly down the line. The employees must know the rules of the game they're playing. But, management must realize that people aren't computers. People can't be pre-programmed for every conceivable situation—so they must be given some flexibility. Flexibility tempered with common sense. The perfect exemplification of no common sense was the incident I spoke of Tuesday—the waitress who refused to get some diners glasses of water—because they weren't sitting at her table. Also, I'd suggest that management manage. Many decision makers are afraid to make a decision—afraid to manage. So they appoint committees to make decisions that are so watered down that they're really non-decisions. More about this tomorrow. Frank McIntyre at the microphone. One Man's Opinion.

ONE MAN'S OPINION—PART IV

(By Frank C. McIntyre)

Frank McIntyre at the microphone. One Man's Opinion. Yesterday, we suggested one way we could lick the inefficiency and in-

competence that is rampant—that reigns triumphant—would be for management to manage. In and out of government, we've fallen into a committee syndrome—committees and staff meetings. Henry Kissinger said, "The committee approach to decision making is less an organizational device than a spiritual necessity". Many decision makers are afraid to make a decision. I feel a manager or department head who has the authority to make decisions and doesn't, should be replaced. I'm aware many policies are loaded with booby traps—and some decision makers are afraid they'll wind up the booby. Making decisions a collective responsibility greatly reduces the risk—and also reduces the number of decisions. Policy by committee results in compromised language and obscurity—a hodge podge, greatly inferior to any of the individual views—out of which it is brewed. Committee systems also account for the extraordinary amount of red tape in the process of making policy. Many decision makers are afraid to make mistakes. But, the man who built AVIS—the "we try harder" people—(I forget his name)—to the great institution it became—frankly admits no more than 1/3 of his decisions were correct. He made wrong decisions 2/3 of the time—and look what a success his company became. What's the old cliché—"Do something, even if it's wrong!" Meetings—meetings—meetings. As many meetings as we have in government, industry, education, business and the professions—it's a miracle anything is ever accomplished. How can anyone take care of business—which to me means doing things—doing something constructive—if you're tied up in non-stop meetings? I don't think we've ever had a general staff meeting here at KLUB and KWIC. We operate under an "open door" policy. Anyone can walk in and talk to anyone at any time. But most of the time, we're not meeting—we're working. As a result, we accomplish a lot with a very modest staff. At the risk of being accused of indulging in self-righteousness or pious platitudes, I'll say I feel deeply that we're all here to serve our fellow man—and we must justify our existence. We all have responsibilities—we're all accountable. Responsibility and accountability. If we'd accept this precept of responsibility and accountability, we could lick inefficiency and incompetence overnight. We're all responsible for performing some service for our fellow man—we're all accountable to our fellow man. You'll sleep better tonight if you can honestly tell yourself, "I accomplished a lot today. I had a good day". Frank McIntyre at the microphone. One Man's Opinion.

H. CLAUSEN, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. PRICE of Texas, and Mr. MORSE and me in introducing H.R. 710, to establish a Student Loan Marketing Association.

Sally Mae—SLMA, or the National Student Loan Association as it is called in the President's proposal, will serve to widen the availability of insured student loans by creating a market for existing loans to which banks and other eligible lenders can sell their loan paper, thus increasing the pool of resources available for lending to students. The increased liquidity of student loans will solve the last remaining major problem which has kept a large percentage of the Nation's banks from participating in the program.

It would operate as a Government-sponsored, privately financed corporation. By the sale of Government bonds and preferred stock, it will permit the participation of large investors—pension and retirement funds, insurance companies, and the like—who, understandably, have been reluctant to participate at the primary lending level in the student loan program.

The concept is not new. It is patterned after an arrangement that has been in existence for some years in the housing mortgage market through the Federal National Mortgage Association.

Furthermore, by expanding credit in this manner, it will be possible to terminate the special allowance payments now made to lenders to induce them to make student loans. Interest rates on these loans will fluctuate at the market rate in the future.

Estimates of the Association's operations show that Sally Mae may buy up to \$2 billion worth of loan paper in its first year of operation.

The creation of this Association is vital to the continuing success of the student loan program, which has provided 2½ million students with \$3 billion in loan funds in 5 years. It is vital to the President's comprehensive student financial aid program contained in "The Higher Education Opportunity Act of 1971." I urge consideration of this entire package at the earliest possible moment.

THE SST AND THE 747

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, this body will soon be resuming debate on the supersonic transport program. The debate in the last session, unfortunately, was marked by a series of emotion-fraught, irrational attacks which came close to crippling a project of great importance to the Nation. Let us hope that this time we will all take a look at the latest authoritative, as opposed to speculative, information and vote on the program in an atmosphere of reason.

It is an unhappy fact of our history that major technological advances have always been resisted. Earlier in our transportation history there was

STUDENT LOAN SECONDARY MARKET VITAL

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, a key-stone in the President's student financial aid proposals this year is the call for creation of a secondary market to increase the amount of money available for student loans. The need for such a facility has been recognized by 18 of our colleagues: Mr. QUIN, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DENT, Mr. ESCH, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. DON

strongly expressed objection to the railroad train, the steamship, the automobile, and the first airplanes, for example, on grounds of safety, economics, and, yes, even damage to the ecology—arguments that have long been forgotten as their authors would wish them to be.

In the case of the supersonic transport, we are dealing with a truly major technological leap forward. It is also of great importance to our national economy in terms of employment, the balance of trade, and very substantial tax revenues to help pay for the programs we all realize must be implemented to meet our many urgent social needs.

Yet the SST is encountering the same kind of opposition faced by the earlier advances in transportation—and buttressed by equally specious arguments that the aircraft will somehow adversely affect the environment.

Mr. Speaker, it should have been apparent to us all during the consideration of this program last year that the great bulk of informed scientific opinion is in favor of continuing development of the SST prototypes. Further authentic information has been developed since and will be presented during the new hearings. I am confident it will dispel any honest doubts remaining in the minds of reasonable Members.

I have mentioned the value of the SST program to the economy. One aspect of the economics is the fact that there has been too little discussion of the investment made so far.

To date, the Government, the prime contractors and the airlines have committed nearly \$1 billion to the SST; it is expected that the total cost of building and testing two prototypes will be about \$1.3 billion. But this is a carefully calculated investment that ultimately will return the taxpayer's share of the funding plus a billion-dollar dividend. By contrast, killing the program would cost nearly as much as completing it—and obviously would represent an utter and unconscionable waste.

Still another aspect we have heard little about is the importance of SST development to national security. It seems to me sensible to assume that in the not-far-distant future our military will benefit greatly from SST technology and may possibly have a requirement for a supersonic troop transport. In the past, military aircraft programs technology has helped make possible civilian versions that have formed the bulk of our commercial airline fleets; in this case, I believe, almost the reverse will be true—a major step forward in civil air transport will benefit the national security in the future.

I recommend to my colleagues a recent editorial in the Washington Daily News entitled "The SST and the 747":

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 15, 1971]

THE SST AND THE 747

The argument over the SST (supersonic transport) is sure to be resumed as soon as the 92nd Congress finishes playing musical

chairs and gets down to work, and we suggest that both sides might find useful guidance by looking at the impressive record that is being made by the 350-passenger 747 (subsonic) jet.

The 747 has been in airline service for a year now and by any measure is well on its way to proving itself one of the greatest commercial aircraft ever built. It has flown 71 million miles and carried seven million passengers.

Once debugged (an evolution every new aircraft goes thru) it has proved itself an immensely reliable airplane. Boeing, which has delivered 100 of the huge planes since last January, reports reliability (departure within 15 minutes of schedule) is now running at 90 per cent. One carrier reported 100 per cent reliability for December, another posted 97 per cent.

Largely obscured by the horrible financial year the airlines had in 1970 is the fact that the 747 itself has wrought a minor economic miracle. Boeing and some 1500 subcontractors invested \$400 million in facilities to produce the 747. By the time 200 of the planes are in service (estimated mid-1972) the big birds will have generated \$3.6 billion in sales—\$1.3 billion of that in sales abroad with their vital impact on U.S. balance of payments.

Last year an average of 68,000 people were employed in building the 747, at an estimated annual payroll exceeding \$500 million. Airline revenues from 747 operations will reach \$6 billion by the end of this year.

One more measure of the magnitude of the economic impact of the plane: By next December 747 passengers will have paid out over \$300 million in ticket taxes alone.

What has all this to do with the argument over whether to continue with the two SST prototypes?

Simply this. In 1966, when the 747 was no more than a gleam in the eye of aircraft engineers, many of the same arguments were raised in opposition to it that are now being made in an attempt to smother the SST in its nest.

The 747, walled the crepe-hangers, would be so noisy that it couldn't use existing airports; so heavy it would crush present runways; its engines would gulp fuel at such a rate as to bankrupt the airlines; people wouldn't fly in it; it would dangerously overwork pilots; it would be perilously unstable at low speed.

The facts, of course, are the reverse. The 747 is perfectly at home in present airports. It is so economical that even the financially pinched airlines are stumbling over themselves to spend \$23 million each for the plane. People do like to fly in it (they seem to prefer it to the cherished 707). Pilots love it. So far its safety record is superb.

No one, pro or con, has sufficient information to be dogmatic about the SST—whether it will be a money maker, or whether people will prefer its 1,800 mph speed to the present jets' 500 mph or whether it will in fact pose insuperable problems of environmental pollution.

But the track record of the U.S. aircraft industry for building great airplanes is very good. Good enough, we judge, amply to justify going ahead with the SST.

Not until the prototype aircraft are flying will the truth be known about the ecological horror stories being laid at its door, or the equally speculative economic doomsdaying regarding it, or the dire prediction that after 5,000 years of wanting ever to travel at faster speeds mankind is suddenly going to decide that sub-sonic is quite fast enough.

There was never a sure-thing investment. But the SST looks amply good enough to get on with the prototype program.

FREE WORLD FORCES IN LAOS

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, there are elements in this country who would condemn the recent incursion by free world forces into Laos as aggression. This charge is easily refuted by anybody who knows the facts about the role of that troubled land in the Indochina conflict.

The aggression in Laos is clearly on the part of the Communists. Beginning with the 1962 Geneva agreements and continuing right up to our present day, North Vietnam has violated those agreements, using Laos as a supply route and base of operations for their war of conquest.

Now that our ally, South Vietnam, is taking action that threatens to cut off the Ho Chi Minh Trail, those who appear to want nothing less than total Communist victory suddenly demand that the neutrality of Laos be honored. But what about Hanoi?

The Communist disregard for treaties was so flagrantly shown in Laos, that even one of the better-known American "doves," Mr. W. Averell Harriman, felt compelled to acknowledge this treachery.

Unlike so many others who occupy our domestic dovecote, Mr. Harriman has the intellectual honesty to recognize Communist villainy when he sees it.

But in the current debate over Laos, Mr. Harriman's remarks, made nearly a year ago, would have gone unnoticed except for the alertness of one of our Nation's finest publications, Human Events. The liberal press, if they mentioned Mr. Harriman's remarks at all, certainly did not stress them. But Human Events, as it has done in so many other instances, has brought them to public attention.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the fine work that is being done by Human Events to alert the public and for the article which appears in the February 20 issue concerning Mr. Harriman's remarks.

In order to bring these important facts to the attention of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I ask to insert a copy of the article at this point in the RECORD.

I include the article, as follows:

HARRIMAN'S STAND BOLSTERS NIXON POSITION IN LAOS

Democratic presidential front-runner Sen. Edmund Muskie (Maine) criticized, albeit mildly, the South Vietnamese sweep of portions of Laos last week, but few realize that W. Averell Harriman, Muskie's chief foreign policy adviser, provided the rationale behind the President's go-ahead decision almost a year ago.

Harriman, who negotiated the Laotian agreement in 1962, acknowledged last March on NBC television that the North Vietnamese had violated the Laotian agreement from the beginning.

When an NBC reporter asked the former ambassador "Why haven't the agreements on Laos that were agreed upon in 1962 held," Harriman responded: "I have no idea. It's

written into the agreement that the British and the Soviets have responsibilities for the observance of the agreements. . . . The . . . Soviets are the ones that should have kept North Viet Nam in line. They [North Viet Nam] didn't keep the agreement for a single day, you know. We took out all of our military persons, some 600-odd, and the other side [North Vietnam] had some thousands and they left at least five or six thousand in the country [when they were supposed to withdraw]."

The NBC reporter then said: "Well, there's no doubt in your mind, then, the North Vietnamese have never abided by the Geneva agreements?"

Harriman replied, "That's right. They never abided by it. They were—they had one interest which they have, and they never intended to keep, which was that Laos should not be used against a neighboring country, and they've been using the Ho Chi Minh Trail, you know, to bring down their men and supplies and infiltrate them into South Viet Nam."

Asked if the U.S. had abided by the agreement, Harriman stated: "They abided by it completely. We—most meticulous, and then in 1962, both in the letter of the agreement and the spirit of agreement, we took out everyone—every military personnel we had, and we only gave supplies that were asked for by Souvanna Phouma which was—he was entirely entitled to ask for. . . ."

Harriman also denied that the situation in Laos amounts to a civil war: "The present situation is, I think, pretty entirely the North Vietnamese invading. The Pathet Lao no longer have any military strength that amounts to much, but the North Vietnamese are invading Laos to use it as a corridor and then, also, to keep the country divided."

Not only Harriman, however, but the neutralist Laotian government has blamed the North Vietnamese for the disintegration of the 1962 Geneva agreements. While liberal lawmakers were condemning the U.S.-backed sweep of Laos last week, for instance, the neutralist government of Laos felt the blame for the incident lay with Hanoi.

On February 8 the Laotian government issued a communique which regretted the action taken, but pointedly added: "It is true that primary responsibility for this development rests on the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, which has violated international law and the 1962 Geneva agreements. The DRV has violated and is continuing to violate the neutrality and territorial integrity of the kingdom of Laos."

According to military observers, however, the U.S.-supported incursion into Laos is not only justifiable on ethical grounds—i.e., the North Vietnamese didn't live up to the Geneva agreements—but it is correct militarily.

With the closing of the Cambodian port of Sihanoukville, the cutting off of other water routes to the Communists by allied ships, and the destruction of the North Vietnamese sanctuaries along the Cambodia/South Viet Nam border, the Ho Chi Minh Trail in Laos has become the sole remaining major artery supplying the North Vietnamese units fighting in South Viet Nam and Cambodia.

Thus the hope is that by harassing these sanctuaries, the offensive punch of the North Vietnamese can be greatly reduced. The goal is the strengthening of free Asia and the quickening of the Vietnamization program.

THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTER

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, in co-sponsoring today a House joint resolu-

tion proposing a constitutional amendment to fully enfranchise 18-year-old voters, I am reiterating my longstanding confidence in the ability of our young people to exercise a responsible role in the election of our Federal, State, and local officials.

I have sponsored 18-year-old suffrage legislation ever since my first term in Congress in 1961, and in light of the December 21, 1970, Supreme Court ruling which accomplished the enfranchisement of 18-year-olds in Federal elections, it seems only logical to me that the 1970 Voting Rights Act privileges be extended to include State and local elections.

A voice in the selection of a city councilman, a Mayor, a State legislator, or a Governor, is as important to the young voter as a voice in the election of a Congressman, a Senator, or a President.

Since the Supreme Court's ruling on the Voting Rights Act obviously resulted from the recognition that the individual States should maintain their authority to establish voter qualifications in State and local elections, it is now up to the Congress to complete the job it set out to do when it approved the 18-year-old provision of the Voting Rights Act.

To my mind, the full enfranchisement of 18-year-olds now eligible to vote in Federal elections is not even a debatable issue. The idea of requiring county clerks to maintain two separate registration lists, one for Federal elections and another for local and State elections, is absurd.

The House joint resolution requires prompt action by both Houses of Congress and an equally prompt ratification by the legislatures of the various States.

PETER COHEN TALKS OF FREEDOM

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, Peter A. Cohen, a senior at the Edward Little High School in Auburn, Maine, was recently awarded first place in the Maine's statewide Voice of Democracy contest.

The contest is annually sponsored on a nationwide basis by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies auxiliary. This year, according to Cooper T. Holt, executive director of the VFW's national office here in Washington, over 400,000 students participated in the contest, competing for the five scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. Winning contestants from each State will be brought to Washington for the final judging later this month as the guests of the VFW. The national winner will receive a \$10,000 scholarship; second prize is \$5,000; third prize, \$3,500; fourth prize, \$2,500; and fifth prize, \$1,500. The contest's theme this year is "Freedom—Our Heritage."

Peter Cohen, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Sheldon Cohen of 51 Grandview Avenue, Auburn, Maine, has, at 17, already distinguished himself as student, athlete, and writer. He is a varsity letterman in

football and track, a most successful participant in the advanced junior study program at the University of Maine, a coeditor of his school's yearbook, and winner of Pepsi-Cola's essay contest "I've Got a Lot To Live."

I congratulate Peter for achieving yet another high distinction, realizing that the excellence of his Voice of Democracy theme evidences a wisdom and understanding that will assure him many more future achievements. Peter, I understand, is considering a career in law. Should he be as successful in this endeavor as he has been in past performances, he is sure to be an outstanding credit to that profession.

Mr. Cohen's essay follows:

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

(By Peter Cohen)

It is now four A.M. I was awakened by the powerful words of Martin Luther King swirling in my mind:

"I'm not weary. I'm not fearing any man. Mine eyes have seen the glory. . . ."

I have seen fields pregnant with colorful blooms and children romping the hillside. I have seen the smiling little girl, with her soft hair swaying in the breeze, running along a desolate beach in pursuit of sea shells. I have seen the snugness of a New England farmstead during a Northeastern snowstorm.

I have seen everything that is distinctively American—from the sweat of the steel mill to the chilly ritual of maple sugaring in Vermont. I am happy; I am jubilant; I am exultant; I am feverishly optimistic.

Yes, I have seen the glory!

I have seen the little boy with his grandfather fishing on the bank of a stream. I have seen families sitting around a raging fireside, hashing over old times spent together. I have seen cheering fans eating sizzling hot dogs and steaming hot chocolate at a typical bleak football game. I have seen the young boy on a swing—laughing cheerfully as he swings higher and higher in the sky—flying into a new future. . . .

Yes, I have seen the glory!

I have seen an inner air, a majestic air in which an individual can draw the breath of self-respect.

I have seen a country that gives every individual—rich or poor—the opportunity to forge ahead and reach the top. I have seen a country that allows a man to work at what he pleases without interference from the government. I have seen a country that believes that men and women have an inherent right to hew out the patterns of their individual lives, just as long as they don't harm their fellow human beings.

I have seen a country where all sorts of different people, drawn from every nation in the world, get along together under the same big sky.

Yes, I have seen the glory!

I have seen a country that has created a Bill of Rights which protects the individual from narrowness and despotism. I have seen a country in which poor men can hold their heads as high as rich men, even when fate seems to be going against them.

But most important, I have seen people—people like you and me, who go to any church they choose, and who cannot be prosecuted for their religion. I have seen people who elect the representatives they wish to govern them, and remove those representatives by vote. I have seen people who remain loyal to one cause, one country and one flag.

I have seen people who have a fierce belief in individual liberty, in individual opportunity, and in the collective wisdom of free men.

Yes, I have seen FREEDOM, this seven-letter word that means so much to any

human being. But it is not enough to have freedom, what is needed is to use freedom responsibly. Men joined together in society lose some forms of freedom and gain others. We exchange the brutal freedom of the savage for the sophisticated freedom of civilized man.

This is how we grew. This is what we are. These are the things we believe. This is freedom!

The late Martin Luther King stated:

"When we let freedom ring, when we let it ring from every village and every hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when all of God's children, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual, 'Free at last! Free at last! Thank God Almighty. We are free at last!'"

POW PLEA TO VIETCONG

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. ICHORD. My Speaker, I include the following:

As you and my colleagues know, the Committee on Internal Security in the 91st Congress conducted several investigations and hearings into the activities of subversive groups, some of which were operating on campus and affecting the lives of our college students.

During two of those inquiries—one into the activities of Students for a Democratic Society, a second into the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam—we became especially concerned with the confinement and treatment of prisoners of war held by the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong.

Especially informative was the testimony of Lt. Robert F. Frishman and Petty Officer Douglas B. Hegdahl, two servicemen whose release from Communist captivity was ostensibly arranged through the intervention of a delegation which included representatives of the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, the Fort Hood Three, SDS, and Newsreel, the tradename of Camera News, Inc., which is affiliated with SDS.

Then we heard the heart-rending testimony of the wives of two prisoners of war, Mrs. Edwin Arthur Shuman III, and Mrs. Dale Walter Doss, both of Virginia Beach, Va.

Their accounts of efforts to send and receive mail from their husbands revealed the callousness of those not truly concerned with the plight of our prisoners.

However, perhaps some progress is being made in reaching and, hopefully, influencing the decisionmakers among the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong.

A few weeks ago in my district a small group of residents and students from Columbia were granted a rare interview with Vietcong representatives at the Paris peace talks.

A staff writer with the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Sue Ann Wood, wrote a noteworthy account of that meeting. Let me share her story, titled "Group Takes

POW Plea to Viet Cong," which appeared in the February 20-21 weekend edition of the Globe-Democrat.

The efforts of those students and educators point up the leadership and responsibility of our academic communities when, it seems to me, it has been, at least in recent months, almost commonplace to lambast the American college student and play down his evinced desire to end the war as radical campus rhetoric.

I am proud of the leadership exhibited by the teachers and students at Stephens College and by the Missouri State Teachers Association, whose executive director is my good friend, Everett Keith.

Miss Wood's story follows:

GROUP TAKES POW PLEA TO VIET CONG

(By Sue Ann Wood)

American concern about prisoners of war held by the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong was graphically expressed by a small group of Columbia, Mo., residents and students granted a rare interview with Viet Cong representatives at the Paris peace talks early this month.

Now back from their trip to Paris, members of the Columbia group were in St. Louis Friday to talk about their experiences.

Dr. David A. Otto, who teaches biology at Stephens College, headed the group of eight making the trip to deliver some 20,000 letters from Missouri State Teachers Association members and petitions bearing 15,000 signatures of Columbia students and citizens. Others in the delegation were Dr. Eugene Windmiller, a surgeon; Dale Cornelison, grocery store owner, and Misses Carolyn Crawford, Debby Hargett and Ann Searles, Stephens College students.

The idea for the Paris venture began last fall, Otto said, when he and others started gathering signatures on a petition to the North Vietnam government asking for humane treatment of prisoners under terms of the Geneva Convention.

At about the same time, the state teachers' organization, which has about 52,000 members, began a letter-writing campaign along similar lines. The drive was an indirect result of a talk given by H. Ross Peret, Texas industrialist who has worked for release of American prisoners in Vietnam, at the MSTA meeting last fall in Kansas City.

From the first, Otto said, leaders of the petition campaign had intended to go to Paris to try to deliver the petitions personally to North Vietnamese and Viet Cong delegates at the Paris peace talks.

When definite plans for the trip were made, Otto was asked by the MSTA to take along their letters for personal delivery and he readily agreed. The eight carried the letters and petitions in seven suitcases, he said.

Before leaving, they had consulted with leaders of groups in other states who have made similar trips on behalf of POWs and were warned of some of the difficulties that faced them.

"We were told we probably would have no chance of seeing the Viet Cong delegates," Otto said, "but might get to talk to some North Vietnamese representatives."

Arriving in Paris in late evening of Jan. 31, the Columbians waited until the next day to begin efforts to make appointments with the two delegations.

Miss Searles, 21, of Washington, D.C., speaks French and took over the telephoning chores, while others penned letters and wires to be delivered by mail.

To their surprise, the North Vietnamese gave them the cold shoulder while the Viet Cong gave them an appointment for an interview at the home of Madame Nguyen Thi Binh, foreign minister of the Provisional

Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam—better known as the Viet Cong.

For three hours on Feb. 3, the Missouri group sat in the living room of Madame Binh's suburban Paris house holding a trilingual discussion with three Viet Cong delegates to the Paris peace talks—Tran Van Tu, Madame Nguyen Ngoc Dung and Madame Pham Thanh.

Otto was spokesman for the group, Miss Searles translated his words into French and Tran Van Tu replied in Vietnamese, which was translated into English by a member of his staff.

"They were very polite to use," Otto said, "and listened while we made what I feel were several major points. We said most Americans would not favor complete withdrawal from Southeast Asia until all American prisoners are released."

Also, Otto said, the Viet Cong representatives were told that American people are tired of the war and feel they have made a gesture of peace by the withdrawal of 200,000 troops. Now, an "equal response" is expected in the form of release of American prisoners, he told them.

In reply, the Viet Cong spokesmen said they too are weary of the war but stressed that they will continue to fight and will not release any prisoners until all American troops leave, Otto reported.

During the next few days, the Missourians continued to try without luck to see the North Vietnamese, who were angry because another American group had staged a demonstration in front of their building in Paris, Otto said. So the letters and petitions finally had to be sent by messenger.

"We feel," he said, "that our trip was successful in that we saw a group that has rarely been seen by Americans and who control a large number of prisoners. . . . At least now they know how many Americans feel about not favoring troop withdrawal until the prisoners are released."

THE NATIONAL PESTICIDE CONTROL AND PROTECTION ACT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, pesticides have a double-edged effect on today's society—at the same time both beneficial and hazardous. The benefits of using pesticides have been clearly established. There can be little doubt that pesticides are important for protecting man from disease and increasing his ability to produce food and fiber. However, there is always some risk; and the acute need—while very real—does not mean that we can ignore the hazards that pesticides represent to man, wildlife, and the environment. We must always keep foremost in our planning the fact that some of these pesticides are highly toxic to man. Others persist in the environment as a threat to birds, fish, and beneficial insects.

Today, a number of pesticides are suspected of having a long-term impact on the health of those who come into contact with them directly through food, air, and water. Evidence presented by a researcher at a conference on pesticides in Stockholm, Sweden, showed DDT to affect the human metabolism. Other studies have shown that pesticides can

affect the liver, cause tumors, stunt reproduction, and possibly cause cancer.

The greatest recipients of the harmful effects of pesticides have been wildlife—particularly fish and birds. The pesticide DDT is known to impair reproduction of birds, because it acts to reduce the thickness of egg shells and thus causing premature breakage of the shells. Since the 1940's the population of such birds as hawks and eagles has been faced with extinction due to such mutations in reproduction. Also, last year, the Senate subcommittee hearing on the environment concluded that 2,4,5-T caused birth defects in many animals.

The nature of these hazards, and the growing evidence of tremendous threats of damage by pesticides, makes it obvious that our present pesticide control is not adequate to prevent environmental damage and to protect the public from chemical poisoning. Thus, the challenge is to institute the necessary mechanisms to protect man and the environment on the one hand, and to control pests on the other.

Ideally, legislation would promote complete public safety from the hazards of pesticides. However, safety is a relative term; in any of his activities, man cannot achieve absolute safety. Therefore, more realistically, we need to enact legislation which will help assure that danger to health and the damage to the environment will be reduced to the absolute minimum.

In order to do this, I am introducing the National Pesticide Control Act. This legislation will make an assessment as to whether the benefits of the pesticides exceeds the risks. Under this legislation, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would have the responsibility of making such a cost-benefit analysis. In making the determination, the EPA and the HEW must consider: First, the extent of and the nature of the harm done to nontarget organisms; second, the persistence and the mobility of the pesticides or its by-products; third, the toxic and other health effects of the pesticide or its by-product; fourth, and the adequacy of the knowledge of its effects on the public health, safety, and welfare or the environment.

Also, by transferring the authority for pesticide regulation from the Department of Agriculture to the new EPA, more uniformity in the regulation of pesticidal pollution should emerge. As Senator NELSON has concluded:

Simple geographic boundaries of a state cannot assure that a pesticide used in one state will not move through the soil, air, water, or animals and cause distinct environmental health hazard in another state. The persistency and mobility of pesticides is too great to be contained by invisible barriers. Therefore, all pesticides should be subject to the same requirements and the same regulations.

Other provisions of the bill include the following:

First, the EPA will act as a clearing-house which would be responsible for a

systematic examination of all pesticides and devices prior to marketing and prior to their entry into commerce.

Prior to registration, the EPA must determine if another biological or non-chemical alternative means of pest control could more harmlessly replace the use of each pesticide.

Upon examination, all pesticides must be classified according to their degree of harmfulness to the public health and the environment. Those believed to have a high degree of harm or substantial environmental contamination can be obtained only by a "prescription" or by an approved pest control operator.

This pesticide regulation will apply only after the classification and registration of each pesticide. All conflicts will be settled by the EPA, but all cases are free to appeal any EPA decision.

Private individuals and groups of individuals should have the right and means to protect themselves from the hazards of pesticides. Thus, private citizens will be able to sue the manufacturer, distributor, or company from which the pesticides were purchased. The suit can only be justifiable if the market of the pesticide has been prohibited by the EPA.

The issues of the need for pesticides, the manner by which the Government influences their availability and use, and the unintended side-effects to man and the environment, have been subject to exhaustive study by Congress, the executive agencies, and others for over a decade. But, the need for reform of our pesticide law is now. Thus, in presenting this bill which is synonymous with the proposed legislation of Senator NELSON and Congressmen OBEY, I would hope that new pesticide regulation and control will be one of the accomplishments of the 92d Congress.

NIXON HAS EDGE ON KEY ISSUES

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, the American public is obviously not fooled by all this talk of ecology and the environment. They have been able to sift through the rhetoric and throw their support behind the one man who is doing something concrete about the problem—Mr. Nixon. A recent Harris poll said that in answer to the question, "Who do you think could do a better job on air and water pollution control as President?" thirty-six percent chose President Nixon over Edmund Muskie and George Wallace. I submit this poll for inclusion in the RECORD so my colleagues may study its other significant findings as well:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 23, 1971]

NIXON HAS EDGE ON KEY ISSUES

(By Louis Harris)

In a first test on who might handle 12 key issues better as President, Richard Nixon finishes ahead of Sen. Edmund Muskie (D.,

Me.) on eight ties with him on one and runs behind on three. These results indicate that Nixon has a reservoir of strength on the current issues of American politics and that Muskie has yet to establish an impact on the American public on the issues of the day.

Recently, a cross section of 1,627 households was asked:

"Here is a list which has on it some problems people say they are concerned about these days. Now for each problem on this list, who do you think could do a better job on this issue as President—Richard Nixon, the Republican; Edmund Muskie, the Democrat, or George Wallace the Independent?"

| | [In percent] | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|--------|---------|----------|
| | Nixon | Muskie | Wallace | Not sure |
| Build up national defense..... | 37 | 25 | 11 | 27 |
| Foreign aid..... | 36 | 26 | 9 | 29 |
| Drug-abuse control..... | 36 | 23 | 11 | 25 |
| Air and water pollution control..... | 36 | 33 | 7 | 24 |
| Crime prevention..... | 35 | 27 | 16 | 22 |
| New welfare program..... | 35 | 30 | 9 | 26 |
| Health-care aid..... | 34 | 33 | 3 | 25 |
| Control of pornography..... | 32 | 25 | 11 | 32 |
| Aid to public schools..... | 32 | 33 | 9 | 26 |
| Racial equality..... | 30 | 35 | 10 | 25 |
| Aid to cities..... | 32 | 32 | 7 | 29 |
| Aid to the poor..... | 29 | 37 | 10 | 24 |

Some of the issues on this list could be considered areas of natural Nixon strength: such as crime prevention, control of pornography, buildup of national defense and drug-abuse control—all matters on which Nixon campaigned rather vigorously in both 1968 and in 1970.

The surprise of this poll is Nixon's ability to outscore Muskie on such issues as air and water pollution control and health care.

Muskie has been a leading sponsor of much of the antipollution legislation over the last few years. Democrats in Congress repeatedly have stressed the health issue, even to the point of overriding Nixon vetoes.

When asked about the health, pollution and education issues in previous Harris Surveys, the public has expressed roughly a 3-to-2 preference the way the Democrats might handle them.

Yet, Muskie does not run nearly as strongly as his party on these issues. He does edge out Nixon on aid to schools, and holds a clear lead on matters of racial equality and aid to the poor. But he achieves no better than an even split on the crisis over aid to the cities.

In light of these results, two questions must be raised:

1. Why does Muskie come thru relatively lacking in appeal on so many of the key issues?

2. With this kind of weakness on issues, how did Muskie manage in the same poll to lead Nixon by a margin of 43-40 per cent in a trial heat for 1972?

Part of the answer to the first question can be explained in terms of personality of appeal. Nixon and Muskie have parallel profiles, but Muskie has fewer negatives against him, while projecting just about all of the positives Nixon possesses.

The key to the Muskie appeal is a sense of sincerity, coolness, calm and communication of quiet confidence. The latest results also suggest that this low-key style has not forged a clear-cut position in the minds of voters on many issues of the day.

The fact that two to three out of every 10 voters are not sure which man might do better on each of the issues leaves room for change. Muskie also has the advantage of public discontent with an incumbent President in many areas without paying to offer concrete alternatives.

NIXON GIVES COURT A CONSERVATIVE STAMP

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons Americans elected Richard Nixon as President in 1968 was on his promise to restore a conservative balance to the U.S. Supreme Court. At the time, they were dismayed by a Court which time and again ruled in favor of law breakers while ignoring the rights of the law abiding. The public was losing confidence in a Court which acted as a legislative body rather than a judicial one in instances such as reapportionment and voluntary prayer in public schools.

Since his election, two of the President's nominees, Chief Justice Warren E. Burger and Associate Justice Harry T. Blackmun, have been confirmed to the Court. Recent Court decisions indicate they are beginning to restore some balance to the Court.

In the March 1, 1971, Washington Post staff writer John P. McKenzie wrote an excellent analysis of the rulings. Because of their importance to a reversal of the Warren court's liberalism, I include the article in the RECORD. It clearly shows that the President has kept his promise.

The article follows:

PRECEDENT-UPSETTING RULINGS GIVE COURT A NIXON STAMP

(By John P. MacKenzie)

If ever it seemed that President Nixon had made his mark on the Supreme Court, it was last week.

On two successive days the court handed down decisions cutting deeply into precedents of recent years. No holding of the Warren Court was directly reversed, but foundations were shaken.

Rumblings from the week's output of 20 decisions indicated strongly that further shakeups in the law are on the way, spurred by the votes of the Nixon appointees, Chief Justice Warren E. Burger and Associate Justice Harry A. Blackmun.

On Tuesday, the court proclaimed a rebirth of "Our Federalism" and told federal judges to keep their hands off criminal cases in the state courts except in the most provocative circumstances.

Then on Wednesday, Burger casually released his first majority opinion of his second term, a 5-to-4 decision that opened a gaping hole in the confession rules laid down in the much-disputed 1966 case of *Miranda v. Arizona*.

After 18 months of inconclusive maneuvering among the court's factions, the message suddenly was this: The conservatives are ready to deliver some major results. Furthermore, important movements in the conservative direction can be made without going to the trouble of directly repudiating past rulings.

The "Our Federalism" and criminal cases were not the only signals of change. Blackmun delivered an opinion which took pains to point that the court was not—that is, not now—reexamining a 5-to-3 decision of June, 1969, expanding servicemen's rights to civilian trials.

And in a series of decisions involving the power of states to inquire into the character and beliefs of applicants for the bar, the majority stressed repeatedly that it was hostile to broadside attacks on the bar exam-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

iners' rules and preferred to review the complaints of individual lawyers.

Not long ago the high court was very receptive to attacks against a law "on its face" and was quick to strike down many of them because of their potential for intimidating people out of exercising their rights of free speech and association.

Some of these signals of change were transmitted by language telling the bar and the public that the court was merely refusing to go one step further than required by a prior decision. Such are the dynamics of Supreme Court decisions that the refusal to expand on prior rulings can start the law traveling in the opposite direction.

Burger did not come to the court with a reputation as a scholar in the field of federalism, which to the judiciary means the proper relationship between federal and state courts. The U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington, where Burger served for 13 years, handles masses of cases involving the federal government but is unique among the federal appellate courts in the small number of federal-state problems that reach it.

However, Burger has made clear, in wide-ranging, off-the-bench speeches, how deeply he desires a reduction in federal court case-loads.

By contrast, Burger is a veteran of combat over the use of incriminating statements obtained illegally from suspects in police custody. He labored in the court of appeals to limit the impact of the Supreme Court's 1957 decision, *Mallory v. United States*, a forerunner of *Miranda*.

Over a dissenter's protest that the result was "monstrous," Burger held that illegally obtained statements, which could not be used in the prosecutor's basic case, may be used to discredit the testimony of a defendant who takes the stand.

In the course of a brief opinion, Burger cast doubt on the court's policy, dating back 50 years and more, of excluding evidence that authorities have obtained illegally. With none of the majority justices indicating the contrary, Burger said he was only "assuming" that the policy had validity before going on to say that it would not be employed in the case at hand.

To many observers it is too early to say that the Supreme Court has been "turned around." Administration officials, for example, won't feel secure until there are nine Burgers and Blackmun.

There still is much momentum in the civil rights area—at least until the court rules on school busing—that hasn't been completely halted. Among the five-member majority of Wednesday there are three justices, John M. Harlan, Potter Stewart and Byron R. White, who sometimes take turns crossing over to vote for the defendant's claimed rights. But there is much uncertainty, drift, and change.

THE FAMILY FARM

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Farmer's Union held their National Convention here in Washington, D.C. Many members of this outstanding farming organization from throughout the Nation were meeting and planning for the future during these sessions. Participants included men, and women of all ages, families and relatives all dedicated to improvement of the problems

March 1, 1971

facing the modern farmer. Among the participants was a young lady from Georgetown, Ohio which is in the Sixth Congressional District. Sixteen-year-old Sandra Schmidt won her trip to Washington through a statewide Farmer's Union Essay Contest in Ohio. Her essay on the topic "The Family Farm," provides an insight, through the eyes of youth, into the problems, emotions, strength, and future of farming in the United States. I commend this essay to my colleagues and congratulate Sandra on her fine cogent remarks:

THE FAMILY FARM

(By Sandra Schmidt)

What is the value of the family farm? Its worth cannot be determined in any one sum.

The family farm is a combination of family love, cooperation, and understanding. It is one of the major vertebrae in the backbone of our nation. It builds the foundation of prosperity that motivates our world.

The family farm is where the family can enjoy fishing in the farm pond. It's fun to watch the children catch fish with a cane pole and an earthworm as bait, while the father stands by and wonders why he isn't even getting a bite on his expensive equipment.

On the farm, each member does his share of the work—not only the parents but also the children, even the small ones.

The farm must receive good care to produce an abundant harvest. God lends a helping hand by sending sunshine and rain. Then He places His blessing on the crops.

The family farm is all of the crops that provide sufficient products for marketing and personal use. These products help to build a stronger nation, just as calcium helps to build and strengthen foundation bones.

At times, the sale of a farmer's products is threatened by production and sale of synthetic products. This is where the Farmer's Union steps in. It may introduce bills to prevent excessive production of these synthetic products. This is only one of the jobs that is attended to, by the Farmer's Union, to help keep the farmers in business.

The family farm is all of the joys and satisfactions of living. I know because I live and work on a farm. I realize that there is a lot of work to do on the farm, but the product of this work is always rewarding.

A BILL TO DOUBLE THE PROPOSED GENERAL REVENUE SHARING FUND FROM \$5 BILLION TO \$10 BILLION

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill sponsored by the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), in the other body last Thursday and cosponsored today by Mr. HORTON and Mr. HALPERN as well. This bill would double the proposed general revenue sharing fund from \$5 billion in the first year, as requested by the President, to \$10 billion.

The increase would cover just less than half of what State and local governments indicate is the additional burden being placed on them this year. Equally, the States and localities would still have

to raise more than \$10 billion additional themselves to meet their fiscal needs.

The Javits bill also doubles the percentage of the Federal income tax base that would go into the general revenue sharing fund from 1.3 to 2.6 percent.

Finally, the new bill moves the date of the first revenue sharing payment up from October 1, 1971, in the President's bill to July 1, 1971. This coincides with the start of the fiscal year in most States and would enable a greater portion of State services to be met out of general revenue sharing funds.

While I am a cosponsor of President Nixon's \$5 billion revenue sharing plan, I am introducing this larger bill today because I feel that only the Federal Government has the resources to help State and local governments meet their pressing financial needs.

GIRL SCOUTS OF THE U.S.A., 59TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, during the week starting on March 7 through 13, the Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., will observe the 59th anniversary of their founding, and certainly I consider it a distinct honor and pleasure to take this opportunity to salute this outstanding and commendable organization.

The Girl Scouts of the United States of America was founded by Juliette Gordon Low on March 12, 1912, in Savannah, Ga., and was chartered by Congress on March 16, 1950. During the intervening 59 years the impact of nearly 4 million Girl Scouts and adult volunteers has touched every State in our country and every community overseas where there are Girl Scouts.

There are about 400 Girl Scouts councils in the United States. Troops of these Scouts are organized and meetings are held weekly with adult leaders to plan their various activities and I think it is an impressive fact that there are now 163,000 Girl Scout troops in this country and at U.S. military and civilian locations in about 48 countries around the world. Membership is open to all girls in the age brackets of 7 through 17 and statistics bear out a substantial growth on a national, regional, State, and program age-level basis. These are typical young girls, spirited and fun-loving, yet fully aware of both their opportunities and responsibilities. Clearly they exemplify that organized youth can be and often is, a vital force in establishing the principles and ideals that are so much a part of our great American heritage.

Actually it is hardly necessary to cite the excellent programs carried out by a national membership of nearly 4 million girls and adult volunteer leaders, because I am sure that all of us are well aware of their remarkable achievements.

The country is divided into six regions and Kentucky is in region No. 2 and, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to tell you

that at the present time my home state has an enrollment of nearly 37,000 Girl Scouts and adult leaders. Starting with the Brownie membership and on through the Junior, Cadette, and Senior levels, each group is making excellent progress and handling their various assignments with the utmost diligence and enthusiasm. I can further assure you that this successful expansion certainly applies to the Girl Scouts in the Second Congressional District as they continue to provide an efficient and effective organization through which they can work together to serve and improve their communities.

As we all know, the purpose of the Girl Scouts organization is to inspire girls with the highest ideals of character, conduct, patriotism, and service so they may become happy and resourceful citizens. If one were only to scan the activities of our Girl Scouts we could not fail but be impressed with their genuine concern for those individuals with special needs; those homeless children of migrant laborers, and the very young children who need a "big sister." Numerous other situations could be cited to prove beyond a doubt the truth of one of the most important doctrines of the Girl Scouts: namely, that it's what you do that counts, and that the truly worthwhile deeds are those that make life better for everyone.

Certainly these young ladies excel to an admirable degree in many areas and as they prepare to observe their 59th anniversary I want to extend my sincere congratulations to the entire membership of the Girl Scouts everywhere for their past tremendous accomplishments and to wish them even greater success and the happiest of birthdays.

ADULT EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY ACT

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing H.R. 5292, the Adult Education Opportunity Act of 1971, which has as its basic purpose the coordination and improvement of adult education throughout the country.

Although this purpose is simple to state, it will be extremely difficult to achieve. The Federal Government alone funds more than 475 programs which have adult education components. And this vast array of programs is in addition to the uncounted number funded solely from State, local governmental, and private funds.

All these efforts have no focal point, no central leadership and physical location where adult educators and administrators can learn from each others' mistakes and accomplishments. The Federal Government, for instance, has no coordinating mechanism to plan or operate a unified adult education strategy. Every Federal department operates adult education programs with the Office of Education, ironically, administering only a

few. The National Government spends almost \$3 billion a year on these programs, but nowhere within the Government is there one agency charged with evaluating their effectiveness or even with collecting simple information on all of them.

The Adult Education Opportunity Act would seek to remedy this failing by providing for central leadership for Federal programs and by creating a focal point for all efforts, Federal, State, local, and private. The act would seek this goal by: first, creating a U.S. Council on Adult Education which would be charged with making recommendations for effective allocation of Federal resources and for coordination of all adult education programs however funded; second, establishing within the Office of Education a Bureau of Adult Education which would have the prime responsibility for collecting information about all Federal programs and for promoting their coordination, and which would also administer such programs as would be assigned to it; and third, creating a National Center for Adult Education which would serve as the focal point for information and ideas about all programs however funded. The authorization of appropriations for all three of these bodies is only \$1 million a year.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to thank the Legislative Policies Committee of the Adult Education Association of the United States for its excellent assistance in helping draft this bill. I know that the AEA and all other organizations interested in adult education will join me in seeking the improvement of our programs by better coordination and by better exchange of ideas.

The bill follows:

H.R. 5292—THE ADULT EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1971

A bill to make possible appropriate, economical, and accessible learning opportunities for all adults, both for their individual fulfillment and for the social and economic well-being of the Nation.

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the Adult Education Opportunity Act of 1971.

PART I ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 101(a). There shall be created the United States Council on Adult Education to serve in an advisory capacity to the Bureau of Adult Education and to serve as the policy body for the National Center for Adult Education. It shall be composed of 15 members broadly representative of the field of adult education and shall be appointed by the President. One of the members shall be designated as Chairman.

(b) The Council shall consider as its main responsibility making recommendations for effective allocation of Federal resources as between public and private facilities, programs and services, and recommendations for the coordination and development of Federal, State, local, and regional activities to meet the education needs of adults. It shall use its collective knowledge and experience to expand consideration of ways of evaluating effectiveness, of disseminating information, of expanding alternatives, and of developing improved systems of providing opportunities and relationships among adult education programs.

(c) The Council shall meet at least four

times a year to review activities and recommendations of the Bureau and of the Center, and to react thereto, as well as to consider matters developed as a result of its own deliberations pursuant to subsection (b).

(d) The Directors of the Bureau and of the Center shall sit ex officio with the Council and shall submit monthly summaries of activities, problems and recommendations to be considered by each Council member who, in turn, shall be responsible for involving his constituency in discussions concerning problems and possibilities.

(e) For the purposes of this Act, adult education shall include all education for adults who have completed or interrupted formal schooling and who have assumed adult roles and responsibilities. Such education may be for purposes involving occupation, family, citizenship, self-development, and similar adult learning concerns.

PART II

BUREAU OF ADULT EDUCATION

SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby created in the Office of Education a Bureau of Adult Education (hereinafter called the "Bureau").

(b) The Bureau shall be headed by a Director who shall be selected from a list of candidates which shall include at least five names recommended by the Advisory Council. There shall also be appointed a Deputy Director to perform such duties as the Director may designate and, during the absence or incapacity of the Director to act as the Director.

SEC. 202. (a) The Bureau shall work with all Federal adult education programs, to collect and disseminate information about each of the programs, to lead comprehensive planning, and to promote coordination for such programs and services in cooperation with the various Federal agencies involved in adult education, and to promote knowledge of adult learning processes and the improvement of methods and materials in the field.

(b) The Bureau shall administer such adult education programs as may be assigned to it by the Congress and by the Commissioner of Education.

SEC. 203. (a) The Director shall implement the purposes of the Bureau.

(b) The Director shall employ such experts, consultants and staff personnel as he considers necessary to effectuate the intent of this Act, including specialists in the following areas: data processing and information retrieval, planning and coordination, systems development and research, and reports and liaison.

(c) The Director shall utilize, with their consent, the services, personnel and facilities of other Federal, State, and private agencies and instrumentalities with or without reimbursement therefor. He shall make every effort to develop coordination of planning programs and resources among the several Federal agencies involved in adult education and with existing coordinating, information, and planning groups concerned with specific areas in the field.

(d) The Director shall transmit to the Congress each year a report for the preceding year, including a comprehensive statement of activities and accomplishments, and an evaluation of the status of adult education, together with his recommendations. He shall also serve as an advisor to Congress on the relation to and possible effect of proposed legislation on existing adult education programs.

(e) The Director shall serve as Executive Secretary of the Advisory Council.

PART III

NATIONAL CENTER FOR ADULT EDUCATION

SEC. 301. (a) There is hereby created the National Center for Adult Education, to be located in the District of Columbia.

(b) The Center shall develop information and referral services for adult educators throughout the nation, pilot projects and

applied research to improve knowledge and techniques in solving problems in the field of adult education, promotion of in-service education of adult educators through internships and special programs, and the exchange of ideas and information to improve adult education throughout the Nation and to promote working relationships with other nations.

SEC. 302. (a) A Director of the National Center for Adult Education shall be appointed for a period of three years by a two-thirds vote of the Advisory Council. He may succeed himself.

(b) The Director is charged with developing a program to demonstrate creative and effective education for adults, and with making optimum use of data systems and telecommunications in promoting exchange of information and application of knowledge.

(c) The Director shall employ such experts, consultants, and staff personnel as are necessary to effectuate the intent of the Act regarding the Center, with specialists in applied research, information-referral resources, professional in-service education, program and systems development, communications, and such other specialists and staff as are required to implement the program.

PART IV

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 401. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year through 1976 at least \$1,000,000, of which will be allotted:

(1) to implement Parts I and II, for the Advisory Council and the Bureau, a sum not less than \$250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; than \$300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; than \$450,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; than \$600,000 for the fiscal years ending in 1975 and 1976; and

(2) to implement Parts III, for the National Center, a sum not less than \$735,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; \$700,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; \$550,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; \$400,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975; and \$200,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976. Thereafter, the Federal share for the Center shall not exceed 20 percent of the operating budget.

(b) (1) Any operating programs assigned to the Bureau shall be separately funded.

(2) The Center shall develop non-Federal sources of funding, and may accept grants, contributions, and other sources of income as well as property in furtherance of the intent of this Act.

BABY ELIMINATION IN MILITARY HOSPITALS

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, all across the country now there are signs of growing revulsion against the practice of abortion on demand, particularly where the law permits elimination of babies at an advanced stage of development. In New York State, 26 babies have already been aborted alive; one actually survived to be put up for adoption.

Dr. Jean Pakter, director of the maternity and newborn services of the New York City Department of Health, and a former supporter of that State's new abortion law, is quoted now as saying:

In many of these cases where the fetus comes out alive, it takes a gasp or two and

that's it. This is not right. As a physician I don't like to see life ended or hurt in any way.

Dr. Vincent Fontana, director of pediatrics at St. Vincent's Hospital in New York where two babies were aborted alive, spoke more bluntly:

To have a woman go in for an abortion and then to have the baby born alive only to die later is tantamount to murder. There's no question about it.

Since abortion has been, and in most States still is, a crime defined by State law, and in view of this rising opposition to abortion on demand, it would seem that at least the Federal Government should not be in the forefront of the baby elimination movement. Yet, through a mere administrative memorandum last July 31, virtually all previous restrictions on abortions in U.S. military hospitals were withdrawn. A fact sheet of August 10, 1970, from the office of Dr. Louis Rousselot, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health and Environment, states the current policy:

Pregnancies may be terminated in military medical facilities when medically indicated or for reasons involving mental health and subject to the availability of space and facilities and the capabilities of the medical staff.

Overriding a recommendation by Lt. Gen. Alonzo A. Towner, Surgeon General of the Air Force, that abortions in military hospitals be performed only "within the limits of local State laws," memorandum of July 22, 1970, Dr. Rousselot ruled that "authorized family planning procedures"—including abortion—"should be provided in military facilities in the United States without regard to local State laws," memorandum of July 31, 1970.

This directive is now being implemented by the Army, Navy, and Air Force, still with no limit on the age of the baby being eliminated. The Defense Department has admitted that since last August there have been 135 abortions at one military hospital alone: The Wilford Hall Air Force Medical Center in Houston, Tex.

Late last year 15 prominent persons, including doctors and theologians, sent a letter to President Nixon protesting the new abortion policy in U.S. military hospitals. Among them were Paul Ramsey, professor of religion at Princeton; George H. Williams, professor of religion at Harvard; and Arthur J. Dyck, professor of population ethics at Harvard. All three are Protestants. As the Christian Science Monitor pointed out January 9, opposition to abortion "is commonly but mistakenly thought to be a sectarian Roman Catholic view."

On February 10, I introduced H.R. 4257, which would require military hospitals to abide by the abortion laws of the State in which they are located, just as they must abide by other State laws regarding crimes against persons. The 10 cosponsors of H.R. 4257 include Congressman ALTON LENNON, a senior Democrat member of the House Armed Services Committee, and Dr. TIM LEE CARTER, a Republican Congressman from Kentucky, long active in public health legislation.

The conscience of America cannot rest while babies are being forced out of the womb alive to die gasping on hospital tables. The right to life is sacred, and our Constitution guarantees it.

SUPPORT OUR POW'S

HON. JOHN H. TERRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, few problems have caused this Nation more distress than the continuing shame of the treatment of our men currently being held captive in North Vietnam POW camps. This problem has touched my family very closely since our son-in-law was reported missing in action in December of 1968.

Last week, my former colleagues in the New York State Legislature passed a resolution memorializing Congress to take such affirmative action as necessary to obtain the immediate release of our prisoners of war.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to submit for the attention of the House of Representatives the following joint resolution of the New York State Legislature.

The resolution follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK MEMORIALIZING THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS TO TAKE SUCH AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO OBTAIN THE RELEASE OF THE AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR HELD BY THE PEOPLES REPUBLIC OF NORTH VIETNAM

Whereas, the government of North Vietnam is now holding certain United States citizens as prisoners of war and has knowledge and information concerning the identity of other United States citizens who have died in captivity; and

Whereas, The government of North Vietnam, although a signatory to the Geneva Conventions, refuse to supply a complete list of the name, rank and serial number of all United States prisoners presently held or who have died in captivity, in violation of the Geneva Conventions; and

Whereas, The government of North Vietnam has refused to allow the International Red Cross to regularly inspect its prisoners and communicate with its United States prisoners of war, in violation of the Geneva Conventions; and

Whereas, the government of North Vietnam has refused to allow prisoners to regularly receive and transmit letters to their families in violation of the Geneva Conventions; and

Whereas, the government of North Vietnam has refused to enter into prisoner exchange allowing its United States prisoners of war to return to their homes and families; and

Whereas, the government of North Vietnam has disregarded the rules of civilized conduct and have held these prisoners in violation of the Geneva Convention; and

Whereas, the said government has conducted itself in a manner which acts against the rights of human beings; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of New York respectfully, yet firmly, urge and memorialize the members of the Ninety-first Congress to take such affirmative action as may be necessary to obtain the immediate

release of such prisoners of war; and be it further.

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Vice-President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the Congress of the United States duly elected from the State of New York.

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION CALLING FOR HUMANE TREATMENT FOR AMERICAN POW'S

HON. K. GUNN MCKAY

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. MCKAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like, at this time, to call attention to a Concurrent Resolution of the 39th Legislature of the State of Utah, with the Governor concurring, asking the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam to take all necessary actions to insure fair and humane treatment for American prisoners of war and to insure the release of these prisoners unharmed.

I am greatly concerned over the welfare of our prisoners of war and those missing in action in Vietnam and I am sure the people of the State of Utah are equally concerned. This joint resolution from the State's elected officials expresses this concern by adding their names to the list of concerned citizens asking for humane treatment or release of these prisoners.

Our prisoners are entitled to fair and humane treatment and I would like to urge, as my State is doing with the concurrent resolution, that the officials of North Vietnam treat these men as members of the human race abiding by the accepted rules of war for the treatment of prisoners of war.

The Office of the Secretary of State of Utah has submitted the Resolution of the Utah Legislature, calling for humane treatment for American prisoners of war, to the North Vietnamese Delegation at the Paris Peace Talks, and, I urge this delegation to take all necessary action to insure fair and humane treatment for American prisoners.

I would like now, to have the concurrent resolution of two-thirds of all members elected to both Utah Houses and with the concurrence of Utah's Governor, Calvin L. Rampton, officially enclosed in today's House Record:

STATE OF UTAH,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Salt Lake City, February 5, 1971.

To: Hon. K. Gunn McKay,
Hon. PREMIER PHAM VAN DONG,
Democratic Republic of North Vietnam, c/o
North Vietnamese Delegation, Paris Peace
Talks, Paris, France

Honorable PREMIER PHAM VAN DONG: The Office of Secretary of State of the State of Utah, United States of America, has been instructed by its 39th Legislature to transmit to you copies of a Resolution, concurred in by both houses of its legislature, memorializing the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam to take all necessary actions to insure fair and humane treatment for American prisoners of war and to assure the release of American prisoners of war unharmed.

Copies of this Resolution are enclosed to you by registered mail. Your acknowledgment would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

CLYDE L. MILLER,
Secretary of State.

Enclosures.

1971 AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR IN NORTH VIETNAM

A concurrent resolution of the 39th legislature of the state of Utah, the Governor concurring therein, memorializing the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam to take all necessary actions to insure fair and humane treatment for American prisoners of war and to assure the release of American prisoners of war unharmed

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah, two-thirds of all members elected to each of the two houses voting in favor thereof and the Governor concurring therein:

Whereas, an unavoidable incidence of the conflict in Southeast Asia is the taking of prisoners of war;

Whereas, prisoners of war are entitled to fair and humane treatment as members of the human race;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam is requested to take all necessary actions to insure fair and humane treatment for American prisoners of war and to assure the release of American prisoners of war unharmed.

Be it further resolved, that the 39th Legislature of the State of Utah is concerned about American prisoners of war in the Republic of North Vietnam and desires to add their names to the list of concerned citizens asking for the humane treatment or release of these prisoners.

Be it further resolved, that the members of the Legislature and the Governor of the State of Utah do hereby affix their signatures in support of this resolution.

Be it further resolved, that the Secretary of State of the State of Utah shall send copies of this Resolution to the President of the Democratic Republic on North Vietnam in Hanoi.

SUCCESS IN LABOR AND RACE RELATION PROBLEMS: INDUSTRIAL CALUMET REGION OF INDIANA

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 21 at a testimonial dinner sponsored by the steelworkers of the Calumet region, and outstanding testimonial tribute was paid to Curtis Strong, a member of the United Steelworkers of America for over 35 years and now one of the organization's top officials.

Over the years, Curtis Strong has been one of the pioneers in successfully handling and assisting the district director, Joe Germano, and the subdistrict director, Orval Kincaid, in many of the critical problems confronting union problems and race relations in the Calumet region.

The following editorial from the Gary, Ind., Post Tribune reveals a great message to the people residing in all urban communities as to the results which can be obtained in labor and race relations by leaders who use common-

sense, good judgment, and sensible discussion on both sides. The great Calumet industrial region of Indiana has had an excellent record of peaceful negotiations on labor and racial problems over the years.

I include the article as follows:

GOOD ADVICE FOR BOTH SIDES

The very persons who most openly protested in advance the speech here of Negro civil rights leader Bayard Rustin in paying justifiable tribute to Gary's Curtis Strong last weekend will cheer considerable of what he said.

We hope, though, they will also understand it is advice which needs to be heard on both sides of the color line.

Because he was a black speaking to a primarily black audience, Rustin warned against those of his race who advocate separatism and advised that "it's time to stop blaming the white man for all our problems."

But the coin is also valid on its other side. It is likewise time for the whites to stop blaming the blacks for all of the nation's troubles, whether it's in the field of crime, narcotics, welfare confusion or political chaos.

While Rustin showed the courage to denounce by name such black revolutionaries and separatists as H. Rap Brown, Huey Newton and Bobby Seale, those whites who cheer that aspect of his speech should likewise have the courage to denounce such white extremists as George Wallace, Lester Maddox and others of their ilk.

His advice that "the only way blacks and whites are going to be uplifted from their

present economic status is by holding a union card and getting to the ballot box" is also worth reading by members of this nation's two largest racial divisions.

Not everyone of either race, of course, needs to be in a union. That will depend in part on whether he is a worker or a representative of management regardless of color. But the idea that men with common goals need to work together without regard for skin color remains sound.

We called the tribute paid Strong "justifiable." That's because he is a man who, while standing up for men of his own Negro race, has recognized that its goals may best be attained by seeking to change the system gradually from within, working with whites as well as blacks in seeking the betterment of his people.

**GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF THE
DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS**

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, today marks the golden anniversary of the Disabled American Veterans. It gives me great pleasure to be able to participate in the celebration of this anniversary and to commend the deeds of this worthy organization.

The Disabled American Veterans, Department of Maryland, is an especially active organization founded April 16, 1945. It has over 5,000 members at the present time and is headed by Mr. Walter D. Hyle, Jr., department commander. The DAV, Department of Maryland participates in hospital work at five veterans and military hospitals in the State of Maryland. This program has expended over \$10,000 in the last year and has involved 650 volunteers visiting and helping over 23,000 patients. A salvage program also assists needy veterans with clothing and furniture problems.

The Disabled American Veterans, Department of Maryland is presently active in the POW/MIA program. They have joined the national DAV effort to send millions of letters and cables to the North Vietnamese Embassy in Paris and to the North Vietnamese in Hanoi. These letters express the concern of the American people for the welfare and safe return of the American POW's and urge the North Vietnamese to abide by the provisions of the Geneva Convention. This is a commendable program—one which deserves the support of every American.

It is work such as this that commands the respect of the American people and makes the golden anniversary of the Disabled American Veterans a significant event for all of us.

SENATE—Tuesday, March 2, 1971

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 17, 1971)

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

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

Bless the Lord, O my soul; and all that is within me, bless His holy name.

Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all His benefits:

Who redeemeth thy life from destruction; who crowneth thee with loving-kindness and tender mercies.—Psalms 103: 1, 2, 4.

We thank Thee, O God, that Thy dwelling place is not in temples made with hands but in the human soul open to Thy presence. But here we thank Thee also for this visible temple of democracy and this forum of freedom. May it be so hallowed by the people that it may never again be tarnished by terrorists nor assaulted by anarchists, but preserved unscarred and undecorated for generations yet to come.

Deliver us, O Lord, from excessive fear and the hysteria which makes judgment weak and the will impotent. Heal all sickness of soul and assuage the hurt of those who are distraught or discouraged. Make our leaders great and good and strong. Out of difficulties bring a new unity and a firm loyalty to the things that matter most for the welfare of the people, the enhancement of public order, and the dawning of a permanent peace.

We pray in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

**DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1971.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 1, 1971, be approved.

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

**ORDER FOR RECESS FROM
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 3, 1971, UNTIL
11 A.M. THURSDAY, MARCH 4,
1971**

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business tomorrow, Wednesday, it stand in recess until the hour of 11 o'clock on Thursday morning

next; and that, immediately after the prayer, the distinguished Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE) be recognized for not to exceed 1 hour, for the purpose of conducting a colloquy.

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

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING
SENATE SESSION**

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

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

**FURTHER CONCENTRATION OF
POWER, EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE,
AND THE "KISSINGER SYNDROME"**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. At this time, in accordance with the previous order, the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) is recognized for not to exceed 1 hour.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in his state of the Union address this year President Nixon presented a series of proposals which he stated he believed would "reform the entire structure of American government so we can make it again fully responsive to the needs and the wishes of the American people."

The President cautioned that—