

Upon conclusion of the morning business on Monday next, the Senate will resume its consideration of the pending business. I anticipate no rollcall votes on Monday next.

At the close of business on Monday, under the previous order—which order is subject to change—the Senate will stand in recess until 12 o'clock meridian on Tuesday next.

#### PROGRAM FOR TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, under rule XXII, there will be 1 hour of debate on Tuesday next, the hour to begin immediately following the approval of the Journal, if there is no objection. Under the previous order, the 1 hour will be equally divided and controlled by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN) and the dis-

tinguished Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH). At the close of the hour, a quorum call is mandatory under the rule. Upon the establishment of a quorum, a rollcall vote is automatic on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 9.

Therefore, there will be at least one rollcall vote on Tuesday next. That rollcall will occur at about 1:10 p.m. or 1:15 p.m. on Tuesday next.

If the motion to invoke cloture fails to get the required number of votes on Tuesday next, it is anticipated that further consideration of Senate Resolution 9 will be put aside. I say this in view of the fact that the distinguished majority leader has already indicated that next Tuesday's vote on cloture will be final, inasmuch as it will constitute a fourth vote on the motion to invoke cloture.

Among the next items of business to be considered thereafter will be the proposed amendment permitting 18-year-olds to vote in Federal, State, and local elections, and a bill to extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act—probably, but not necessarily, in that order.

RECESS TO 11:30 A.M. ON MONDAY,  
MARCH 8, 1971

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 11:30 a.m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the Senate recessed until Monday, March 8, 1971, at 11:30 a.m.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### ENVIRONMENT—NUCLEAR POWER

#### HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, WRC television in Washington aired an editorial comment regarding nuclear power and the environment. The station's conclusion was that from an overall standpoint of an improved environment, nuclear powerplants represent the best available course.

Reasonable men truly concerned with protecting man from the ravages of pollution—particularly air pollution—usually reach the same conclusion.

I am pleased to include the station's editorial in the RECORD for the enlightenment of those who feel otherwise:

#### ENVIRONMENT—NUCLEAR POWER

Consumers are hungry for cheap electricity, more free from blackouts and smog. The atomic power plant may be the answer. It means buildings full of sophisticated equipment, often in remote locations humming quietly, without noxious sulfur dioxide and nitrous oxide and the belching smoke of the typical power plant.

But to the critic, that same nuclear power plant means possible release of radiation, heating of waterways and perhaps accidents—all a threat to the environment and human life.

These differing points of view clashed recently over the precedent setting Calvert Cliffs nuclear power plant on the Chesapeake Bay, about 45 miles from Washington.

The controversy brought out the fact that present conventional power resources in the area cannot keep up with the ever increasing demand nor meet the three to eight fold expansion needed in the Chesapeake Bay area by the year 2000.

The threat of atomic radiation leakage and the impact of a nuclear power plant on the ecology over a long period of time must be balanced against the present and future threat of oxide and particulate pollutants in the air.

At the heart of the issue is the desire of the people in the Washington-Baltimore area

and the nation for goods and services that use electrical power.

This demand is not likely to decrease, indeed it will increase and the bill must be paid.

In terms of an improved environment without reference to Calvert Cliffs, WRC-TV feels that the better course lies in the production of power with atomic energy.

### TRIBUTE TO DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

#### HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this happy occasion to join in paying tribute to the federally chartered Disabled American Veterans who have done so much to benefit the American victims of war in this 20th century and to assist the families of those dead and injured service personnel who gave their blood in defense of our flag.

On August 8, 1971—and extending through August 13—the DAV annual national convention will be held for the 50th time, bringing to a climax this 50th golden jubilee year in the organization's life.

A half century is a long time in the life of any organization and it always seems to me to be remarkable that the DAV is able to follow every year of accomplishment with new successes.

Time dims recollection and, for that reason, I think it appropriate to recall, Mr. Speaker, an event which occurred in the course of DAV's first national convention in June of 1921. That convention was held in Detroit and, for that reason, this year's session will be held in that same "motor city."

Those who are familiar with the history of DAV will remember that the single individual most responsible for the creation of the organization was a disabled veteran in Cincinnati, Ohio, Judge

Robert S. Marx. Judge Marx had entertained 100 of his fellow World War I wounded veterans at a Christmas party in 1919 and was so moved by their almost unanimous accounts of hardship in coping with the redtape of Government bureaucracy that he set out to persuade veterans and the Government that an organization of the disabled would be the best answer in dealing with the problems of the disabled.

At Detroit in that spring of 1921, Judge Marx—chosen in 1920 to serve as president of the DAV until its initial convention—massed the 1,000 disabled veterans in attendance and led them in a parade through the streets of that city.

The best description I have ever read of that event has been provided by the DAV national office in its jubilee anniversary report. Permit me to quote from this report:

It was a parade of people, some of whom coughed violently from TB, some hobbled unsteadily on new limbs, blind men were led by those who could see better and those who could not walk rode in cars or wheelchairs. The parade was escorted by the police and troop of cavalry—and it was raining. The DAV carried the flag of their country as they marched proudly in the rain of Detroit.

Men and women who watched dabbed back the tears of memory for loved ones who had not returned from the war. They took their hats off when the flags passed—and did not put them back on in tribute to the proud men who marched behind. The crowd lifted their chins and smiled proudly as they saw the determination of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War. Judge Robert S. Marx marched his troops into the heart of the American citizen.

That is the end of the quote, but I know of no better way to describe the DAV in the 50 years since its founding. It has steadily marched into the heart of the American people and, thanks to DAV's farsighted national service officers' training program for providing talented manpower seeking a career in service to disabled veterans, the DAV, I am sure, will continue to do so for many more golden jubilees to come.

THE KISSINGER-ROGERS  
CREDIBILITY TEST

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it has proven most interesting that the President was reportedly very annoyed upon learning that his Secretary of State Rogers, has become the laughing stock of the Washington cocktail circuit by many people who label him as a figurehead Secretary subservient to Henry Kissinger.

Perhaps the President is unaware that many American people around the country, not of the cocktail circuit, consider the President himself to be a figurehead and Henry Kissinger to be the man who is making the gut decisions in running the country.

In any event, a recent article by James Reston probably best describes the Kissinger-Nixon relationship through the manipulations of such a high-sounding committee as the National Security Council where Mr. Kissinger is the man who not only presents the problem and solution but too many times also recommends the alternative. But then in past history, every vacillating leader has always relied on an intellectual in the background to tell him what, how, and when. So, if the country fails, it will be Henry's error in decision, and Mr. Nixon will need only get himself another alter ego before the 1972 election.

I include several newscippings:

[From the Washington Evening Star,  
Mar. 3, 1971]

THE KISSINGER CONTROVERSY

Henry Kissinger is in the center of a bitter controversy here for three reasons: 1. Despite White House denials he is undoubtedly the principal adviser to President Nixon on foreign policy; 2. That policy, particularly in Indochina, is opposed by influential members of the House and particularly the Senate, who feel they have a constitutional duty to examine the logic of the President's decisions; but, 3. They cannot question Kissinger about Laos, the Middle East, or anything else.

They can, of course, summon Secretary of State Rogers to Capitol Hill and question him, but it is widely believed here, as Sen. Stuart Symington, D-Mo., asserted on the floor of the Senate yesterday, that Kissinger has been given many of the advisory powers normally reserved for the secretary of state, and that he exercises them in the "privileged sanctuary" of the White House, without congressional review.

It should be made clear what is not at issue here. Even Chairman Fulbright of the Foreign Relations Committee, Symington, and the other critics of the Indochina policy are not saying that Kissinger is responsible for that policy or that he is playing some devious Rasputin role.

The issue is simply that he defines the questions to be answered by the departments, formulates the options and the arguments for and against, consults privately with the President at the last stage before decision—and that he is not accountable, as the secretary of state is, to the Congress, though his influence is undoubtedly greater than Rogers'.

Several events have envenomed this conflict between the right of the Senate to "advise and consent" on critical foreign policy questions, and the right of the President to take executive action, protected by "executive privilege."

Kissinger, recognizing the dilemma, agreed to meet privately with Fulbright and members of his committee at Fulbright's house on Belmont Road. He did so twice, with the approval of the President, but the last time fell just before the U.S. invasion of Cambodia, and Kissinger said nothing about it.

He felt he was not privileged to do so, but Fulbright felt that the committee was misled by his silence, and that this sort of informal meeting merely gave the impression of consultation but not the substance.

Several weeks ago, a member of Kissinger's National Security Council staff, John Lehman Jr., was reported in the press to have attacked Fulbright in a private meeting as "mischievous" and not to be trusted with secret information placed before his committee.

Kissinger has since criticized Lehman for "poor judgment," but when Fulbright invited Lehman to explain his charges, the White House again invoked executive privilege and instructed both Lehman and Kissinger not to appear.

Last week, Kissinger added to the controversy over his role by going on a CBS television program with Marvin and Bernie Kalb to discuss the President's state of the world message, which was largely written by Kissinger and his staff.

Always before, he had refused to talk publicly about the substance of foreign policy, but this time he thought he could merely talk about how the report was written.

Was he trapped into answering questions by reporters after refusing to answer questions by senators? "No," he says, "I merely misjudged the situation, and I'll certainly never do it again."

There is, of course, nothing in the Constitution that says the secretary of state has to be the principal adviser to the President on foreign policy.

Roosevelt often used Harry Hopkins rather than Secretary Hull in this role. Kennedy drafted the Harvard faculty. Johnson often called in Justice Fortas, Clark Clifford, and Dean Acheson at the last minute before making his decisions.

What is new now is that Nixon has institutionalized the advisory function under Kissinger in the White House, given it a much larger staff (now 42 professional and 68 clerical and other aides) and larger responsibilities, and put these larger powers beyond congressional review.

This does not mean that the departments are cut out of the decision-making process. In fact, the more formal Nixon system is designed to involve them closer to the point of decision. Kissinger chairs first a senior staff committee composed of the undersecretary of state, the deputy secretary of state, the deputy secretary of defense, the head of the CIA, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and one staff member.

The job of this committee is not to make recommendations, but to define the choices open to the President. In fact, there is even one member of Kissinger's staff whose job it is to read all relevant public comments on the subject and suggest from these any additional course of action that may have been proposed.

This objective case study of the problem is then placed before the top National Security Council composed of the President, the vice president, and the principal security cabinet members. (Normally, Kissinger, as secretary of the council, defines the options in these meetings and the President asks each cabinet member for his recommendations, but sel-

dom Kissinger at this point. It is only later, after the President has studied the recommendations, that he usually calls in Kissinger before the final decision—but this, of course, is the critical moment and a major source of Kissinger's power.

In many ways it is the most orderly system of decisionmaking in Washington since the last world war, but this does not remove the central issue of congressional review with Kissinger or with John D. Ehrlichman, who exercises the same kind of unreviewed power on domestic policy.

The President, who is normally an advocate of decentralizing power, has actually centralized more power under the White House umbrella of executive privilege than any other chief executive in this century.

And the diplomats are almost as puzzled by it as the senators, for they want to get close to the power center and to Kissinger too, and actually they manage to do so more often than the Congress of the United States.

NIXON ASSERTS ROGERS IS TOP POLICY AIDE

(By Garnett D. Horner)

President Nixon has asserted vigorously that Secretary of State William P. Rogers is his chief adviser on foreign affairs.

Nixon was obviously very much annoyed yesterday at a Senate speech by Sen. Stuart Symington, D-Mo., describing Rogers as the laughing stock of the Washington cocktail circuit whom many people label as just a figurehead secretary.

Symington, in a speech yesterday entitled "The Kissinger Syndrome," said the President's personal adviser for national security affairs, Henry A. Kissinger, has acquired a "unique and unprecedentedly authoritative role in foreign policy." The result has been "obvious decline in the prestige and position of the secretary of state and his department," he said. Meanwhile, Kissinger has become second only to Nixon in power, he added.

Unlike Rogers, however, Kissinger refuses to testify before congressional committees on the shape and development of American foreign policy, claiming "executive privilege as a member of Nixon's staff."

Symington's speech followed an announcement by Sen. J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that he is urging legislation to compel administration foreign policy officials—including Kissinger—to testify before congressional committees.

Symington yesterday backed Fulbright saying isolation of key advisers from Congress "distorts the fundamental premise on which our country was founded—representative democracy."

Nixon replied by sending his press secretary, Ronald L. Ziegler, to tell newsmen that the impressions left by Symington's speech are "misleading, totally inaccurate and unfair."

Ziegler said Nixon emphasized that Rogers is a valued member of his Cabinet and a man he values highly as his "chief adviser on foreign affairs."

The President told him to say, Ziegler added, that he "has the utmost confidence" in Rogers and his judgment.

Nixon also emphasized, Ziegler said, that Rogers will remain his top adviser on foreign affairs.

"People who think otherwise are misleading themselves and others," he declared.

Ziegler said the President remarked that it is often traditional in Washington for "those who are politically motivated to attempt to drive a wedge between key advisers and the President."

Nixon went on to say, Ziegler reported, "that he knows better than anyone the contribution the Secretary of State has made to this administration in foreign policy."

Symington's remarks heightened discussion of the relative influence in formulation of foreign policy of Rogers and Kissinger.

As head of a White House foreign affairs staff of 110, Kissinger is in daily contact with Nixon. But Ziegler said the President talks with Rogers by phone several times nearly every day, and sees him as often or more often than any other member of his Cabinet.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,  
Mar. 5, 1971]

GIBE AT ROGERS: "A CHEAP SHOT"  
(By Chalmers Roberts)

President Nixon last night charged Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.) with taking "a cheap shot" by belittling the foreign policy role of Secretary of State William P. Rogers.

The President described Rogers as "my oldest and closest friend in the Cabinet," a man he has known for 24 years, and he said that his remark about Symington was based on the fact that the senator knows that relationship.

Rogers, said the President, is "the foreign policy adviser to the President," and the chief spokesman for the administration on foreign policy. The President said Rogers "participates in every decision and will continue" to do so and that he proffers advice on domestic matters as well.

As to Henry A. Kissinger, the White House assistant for national security affairs and the man Symington said on Tuesday is widely regarded as Secretary of State "in everything but name," Mr. Nixon declared, "I value his advice very much." Kissinger's role is different from that of Rogers, he said.

Kissinger covers not only foreign policy but also national security and coordinates these matters.

Thus, said Mr. Nixon, the answer to the question of which of the two men "is on first" is that the Secretary of State is "always the chief foreign policy adviser and spokesman of the administration."

The President was asked later in his press conference if he saw any limit to the doctrine of executive privilege which has shielded Kissinger from formal interrogation by congressional committees.

He smiled and said that issue "always depends on which side you're on."

He recalled that as a young member of the House he had raised "serious questions" about President Truman's use of executive privilege to shield officials and that, in retrospect, that privilege had been "properly insisted upon" by Mr. Truman.

"As President," he said of the doctrine, a bone of congressional-executive tensions during the whole history of the nation, "I believe executive privilege is essential for the orderly processes of government."

He went on to comment on a related issue, charges by Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman J. W. Fulbright (D-Ark.) and others that Rogers has ducked questioning by his committee especially in public sessions.

Mr. Nixon said he was surprised at the idea that the Secretary of State had been "unavailable for questioning." He added he had checked the record to find that Rogers had appeared before Senate and House committees 14 times in 1969 and 15 times in 1970 and that, further, he had had 167 private meetings with individual senators or in groups either at the State Department or at his home.

Furthermore, Mr. Nixon said that over the past two years State Department officials had testified 499 times at the Capitol. As to Rogers' own appearances, the President commented that he did not know how "he has time to talk to me with all the times he's talking to the Congress."

The expected defense of Rogers, the second time this week, however, is not likely to still those who contend he does not appear enough on the record and when he does appear even in private he is not sufficiently forthcoming.

Fulbright yesterday released, in advance of the press conference, a speech he intends to make today. He declared that "power and influence in the making of foreign policy have passed largely out of the hands of the State Department—which is accountable to Congress—into the hands of Dr. Kissinger's National Security Council Staff—which is not, under the present practice, accountable to Congress."

Fulbright termed executive privilege "a custom, not a law and, even as a custom, it has been understood until recently to apply to information rather than persons." He said Kissinger, whom he termed "the principal architect of our war policy in Indochina," had "steadfastly refused" to appear before any committee though he "appears on television, provides background briefings for the press" and occasionally for "selected" members of Congress.

This procedure, Fulbright went on, is "a repudiation of the very concept of a government of checks and balances," leaving a President at liberty "to do anything he wishes, at home or abroad, as long as he manages to keep it secret." That, he said, is what Presidents Johnson and Nixon have done in Indochina.

Since the courts have not adjudicated the executive privilege issue, said Fulbright, the remedy is a bill be proposed requiring Executive Branch employees to appear in person before Congress when summoned even if they do no more than invoke executive privilege.

The Senator also declared that either the Senate or House has the power to try and punish a "recalcitrant witness" including "imprisoning him in the Capitol." But, he added, he did not for a moment suggest "so drastic a procedure" for Kissinger or any other official. Yet, Fulbright added, something must be done by means such as his proposal, "to make a small breach in the wall of secrecy" separating Congress from the executive branch especially on matters related to the Indochina war.

#### DAV DAY IN CONGRESS

### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, today has been set aside in the House and Senate to commemorate the 50 years of service of the Disabled American Veterans to America's war disabled.

I think that it is appropriate that we should entitle this day, "A Tribute to Quiet Courage." Our disabled American veterans have sacrificed as much as any human beings could be expected to sacrifice—a part of their own person.

This quiet courage has really been brought home to me through my involvement in the case of one of my constituents, a Marine Corps veteran, Charles E. "Butch" Joeckel, Jr. Butch's tour of duty in Vietnam resulted in the sacrifice of both legs, yet his quiet courage prevails. He has been honored with not only the Silver Star Medal, but also the Navy

Commendation Medal for consistent high performance.

Not only should we pay tribute on this day to the courage of our disabled American veterans, but also to their dedicated service. I am continuously impressed by the quality and scope of their involvement in efforts to aid America's wartime disabled.

The Disabled American Veterans, Department of Maryland, was organized April 16, 1945, and has 5,000 members to date. They have participated in hospital work at five veterans and military hospitals in the State of Maryland. They have spent more than \$10,000 in the past year on this project and with the help of 650 volunteers have visited and worked with about 23,000 patients, resulting in a total of 7,000 man-hours.

This organization, whose main aim is to give direct aid and service to veterans in the hospital, has also been active in a salvage program which provides needy veterans with clothing and furniture.

On this occasion let us pay tribute to the DAV and to all disabled veterans for their quiet courage and dedicated service.

#### PERRY HALL MAN WHO VOLUNTEERED DIES IN VIETNAM

### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1971

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, a fine young man from Maryland, Sgt. Robert J. Potts, was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

#### PERRY HALL MAN WHO VOLUNTEERED DIES IN VIETNAM

Sgt. Robert J. Potts, who grew up in Perry Hall and had volunteered for a second tour of duty in Vietnam, was killed there when a rocket hit the jeep in which he was riding, the Defense Department has announced. He was 22.

Sergeant Potts was hit February 21 while riding outside of Da Nang, South Vietnam, the military command announced. He had been a radioman in the 173d Airborne Brigade.

Funeral services were held yesterday at the Kenwood Presbyterian Church, 4601 Fullerton Avenue.

Sergeant Potts had graduated from Golden Ring Junior High School, and from Perry Hall Senior High School in 1966. He worked about a year as a clerk with the State Roads Commission before enlisting in the Army.

He first went to Vietnam in April, 1968. He was later stationed in California and Hawaii before volunteering last August to go back to the fighting zone.

"He felt that by going back to Vietnam he would be fulfilling something he had to do," said his sister, Mrs. Beverly A. Williams, of Crownsville, Md. During the last six months he decided that he wanted to go to college when he got out of the Army, she said. He also had become engaged to Mary A. Hyman, of Belmar, and they were to be married next August.

Besides his sister, he is survived by his mother, Mrs. Marie C. Potts, of Crownsville,

and brother, Charles E. Potts, of Glen Burnie. Mrs. Potts had moved in with her daughter last April and the sergeant's official address was 716 Claire Road, although he had not lived there.

## THE ATOM VERSUS THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday night in Oak Ridge, Tenn., I addressed the annual Engineers Week dinner, sponsored by the Tennessee Society of Professional Engineers.

In my prepared remarks, I attempted to make what I feel are some important and often misunderstood points regarding the development of nuclear power and protection of the environment. Those remarks follow:

### THE ATOM VERSUS THE ENVIRONMENT

It was just two years ago—almost to the week—that I was last here in Oak Ridge for a talk on nuclear power. The audience that evening was the nuclear safety program information meeting. The issues then were pretty much as they are now—getting reactors licensed in a timely manner, winning public acceptance and coordinating our national energy resources in some sort of rational manner. But as I began to prepare my remarks for this evening, I was struck by just how much the socio/political climate has changed during those 24 months.

Development of the peaceful atom has regularly been beset by difficulties above and beyond the technical questions involved. But the problems of 1969 seem pale in comparison to the shadows lurking in and around and over nuclear power today.

Let me repeat a few of the sentences I uttered here in February 1969, not because the words are particularly memorable, but to illustrate how rapidly the winds of public opinion can change. I said:

"Because of a before-the-fact emphasis on reactor safety, the nuclear power industry has largely solved the public acceptance dilemma it faced just a few short years ago."

Furthermore, I was brash enough to add that:

"Most people today are confident that the peaceful uses of atomic energy are being developed with their best interests in mind, and that their personal health and safety are being skillfully protected by highly trained and competent individuals."

But that was two years ago. Today it is painfully clear that our efforts toward legitimizing the peaceful atom, making it an accepted and respected part of society, have largely been wiped off the books.

The fact is that a substantial and growing segment of the public somehow has become convinced that a reasonable doubt exists about the wisdom of developing nuclear energy at all. Perhaps this doubt has been engendered largely by the guilt-by-association syndrome fostered against all industry and all technology by an intrepid corps of anti-power, anti-industrial society critics who just don't want to stop at cleaning up our environment, but are hell-bent on sending the world back to whence it came to be refurbished into its original pristine condition.

Because of all this, the prevailing public mood seems to be that the smoke generated around nuclear power surely must mean that there is a fire somewhere. My personal impression is that if anyone actually pene-

trated all the smoke, he would only find Misterters Tamplin, Goffman and Sternglass running around in circles with stinkbombs.

### THE GOOD GUYS VS. THE BAD GUYS

It is ironic but true, nonetheless, that lately even the peaceful atom has been cast in the role of bad guy, little better to have around than his weaponized elder brother. The reason is simple enough to understand. Time and time again, those of us who believe in nuclear development have been forced into unwilling and unnecessary confrontations with such unquestionable latter day good, guys, the highly touted new folk heroes, the new breed of super environmentalists, looming sterile clean 10 feet tall above us.

And because radiation per se seems bad, and regardless of our carefully reasoned, scientifically sound arguments, we come off with the image of some sleazy no-good trying to rationalize pollution, sickness and death.

It's a bump rap. You know and I know and most reasonable people will agree—if they stop to think about it—that electricity in general and nuclear generated electricity in particular is among the least of our environmental worries. In fact, it is man's brightest hope for reducing and eliminating the whole spectrum of pollutants.

Let's set the record straight:

First, it is nonsense to talk about cleaning up the environment by cutting back on electricity. Pollution control requires more electricity—not less, and here I'm talking about such areas as recycling waste products, sewage treatment, water pollution control, stack emission controls and any potential alternative to the internal combustion engine. In addition, since almost two-thirds of all power generated goes to business and industry, power reductions would mean loss of jobs, loss of productivity and general economic chaos.

Second, given the alternative ways of generating power, nuclear plants are the cleanest. This is not to say they are perfect and have no environmental impact, but they are less objectionable than burning fossil fuels and there are hardly any rivers left to dam.

Third, after 13 years' experience in the design, construction, operation and regulation of central station commercial power reactors, the record shows that they are safe, reliable and that (relatively) their power is getting cheaper and cheaper.

The fact of the matter is that despite the current debate over radiation release standards, no one is really contending that nuclear plants as they actually operate today constitute a health hazard. The point in contention is whether or not they would pose a hazard if they actually operated at the maximum release levels, for human lifetimes—which they don't and which they never will.

And as far as thermal effects go, there is as much evidence of potential ecological benefits as there is of potential harm to fish, the places where they live, the food they eat, or even the enjoyment of humans who catch them.

### OVER-REGULATING THE ATOM

But despite all this, let's take a look at some of the dismal happenings to nuclear power over the past couple of years as a result of some people's ill-founded zeal for protecting the environment from evils which don't exist. Consider the following recent news items:

A group of pacifist scientists circulate a petition among their colleagues asking for a world-wide moratorium on the construction of nuclear power plants. They hope to present it to the United Nations.

The Sierra Club and the National Wildlife Federation file suit against the Atomic Energy Commission for not being sufficiently militant in enforcing the Environmental Policy Act.

An attorney, trying to hamstring the AEC Reactor Licensing Process, prolongs a marathon hearing with a meaningless discussion of a 1919 industrial accident involving the rupture of a vessel full of molasses.

A stockholder files suit against a power company charging mismanagement on environmental issues.

Then there's the people's lobby drive to ban nuclear power plants from California, which has 200,000 signatures and is sure to get the 325,000 needed to get on the statewide referendum ballot next year.

The list could go on and on, but the point is clear. Nuclear power, despite the fact that it is already the most carefully regulated industry in history, is being subjected to unprecedented harassment and legal obstructionism. The effect has been to inject mass confusion, considerable hysteria and partial paralysis into what heretofore has been considered a superior example of enlightened federal development and regulation and industry care and cooperation.

We have seen the Congress, the Executive Branch, many States and some cities take an increasingly hardnosed stance against the development of nuclear power. Part of this can be written off as merely political courting of a popular issue. Some of it, undoubtedly, is aimed at sincerely trying to correct what appears to be a problem. But I doubt that the brakes which have been placed on meeting the Nation's energy needs have been worth the roman candles by which they were achieved.

Take this, for example: The Congress added to the AEC's regulatory program requirements that it control so-called thermal pollution under the Federal Water Quality Improvement Act and any other loosely defined environmental effects under the Environmental Policy Act. Both of these laws have been justly characterized as universally confusing with respect to how they should be enforced and by whom, unconsciously vague, and probably unconstitutional.

The Commission itself responded to the environmental cause with a new requirement that radiation releases from reactors be kept "as low as practicable."—A crystal unclear phrase if ever there was one. The AEC has specifically avoided putting any numerical values of this level. As a result, while the industry may have an understanding of what is going on, the public still does not. And if the public doesn't understand, I fail to see what has been achieved other than the whetting of already founded suspicions, fears and alarms.

Many of the States are casting jealous eyes at the AEC's authority to control those radiation releases. Most of you are familiar with Minnesota's celebrated attempt to sneak off with the jurisdictional rule book, and apparently even a rebuff from the trial courts has not dampened its hopes of pulling off a switcheroo on appeal. Other States as well are trying to muscle in on this clearly defined area of exclusive Federal jurisdiction.

Possibly the most serious challenge to the nuclear regulatory picture, however, is coming from the new breed of militant intervenors armed with the widest variety of delaying legal weapons. Their strategy is to block the construction of nuclear plants by tying up the entire licensing process in knots. Their tactics border on capricious nonsense, but so far they have worked. The episode with the molasses vessel is a perfect example.

What is disturbing to me is that of the next 14 reactor license hearings scheduled, 11 of them are expected to be contested. And it is logical to assume that the prospective intervenors in these cases have been carefully following the dilatory antics of those in the Shoreham case in New York and the Palisades hearing in Michigan.

It is apparent to me and to many members of the joint committee that the public hear-

ing process as it is now constituted is not serving the function for which it was established. It is being thwarted and distorted. As a result, some major revisions are due. I think—at least I hope—you will see the Congress act this year to provide legislative relief in this area and afford the public protection from those who seek to turn this process into an administrative circus.

#### ECONOMICS AND THE ENVIRONMENT

The added environmental attention demanded in recent years also has turned out to be expensive. Delays in getting new power plants on the line are a part of it. The utilities estimate delays cost them from \$30,000 to \$60,000 per day—\$1 to \$2 million per month. Those are just direct costs to buy replacement power. Indirect costs such as carrying charges on unused capital, extra manpower charges and the like can run the total way up from there.

If a utility decides to build cooling towers to reduce heat discharges into a natural body of water—add \$8 to \$13 million to the cost of a 100 megawatt plant. Alternatively, cooling ponds have \$6 to \$9 million price tags.

Other environment-related costs could go this way: \$1 million for hardware to eliminate radioactive emissions; about \$250,000 per year per site for a spectrum of hydrological, atmospheric and radiation research; and heaven-knows-how-much for retrofitting, appealing and popular new environmental protection systems or safety devices to an existing plant. And all this, of course, is in addition to the \$415,000 which the AEC now charges a utility just to process the paperwork for a construction permit and the operating license.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL EXTREMISM

There is a third major area of environmental impact on nuclear power I would like to touch on. Perhaps from the long-range viewpoint, it is the most serious. It involves the loss of public trust. The scientific and political headline-seekers, the public name-calling, the anti-nuclear horror books, the sensationalized media coverage—all of these have eroded the well-earned public confidence which the outstanding safety record of nuclear power had built over the past 20 years. Until that trust is re-kindled, we can expect more legal and economic penalties which will make the job of building reactors and providing kilowatts very difficult, discouraging and costly.

Simply educating the public won't be sufficient. Nor can nuclear power ignore the layman or take refuge in some smug allegation that John Q. Public is intellectually incapable of comprehending the esoteric difference between absolute, unquestioned safety and the high but finite level of safety in a reactor involved in establishing socially acceptable risks. What is most important, I believe, is that the entire nuclear community must achieve a new and sincere willingness to adapt to the changing priorities of the public.

In the past, the objectives of the electric power industry were to provide reliable, adequate and cheap supplies of power. Now new requirements have been added. They are to do all that with minimum environmental and esthetic impacts. It is now the responsibility of industry and government to meet these challenging goals. That is what government by the people, of the people and for the people is all about.

For its part, the public has a concurrent responsibility. And that is to avoid demanding the impossible or the unfeasible, such as zero environmental impact. That demand is irrational. Extremism in defense of the environment is no more a virtue than extremism in other emotional causes.

A perfect example of environmental extremism is the petitions floating around out

in California for a moratorium on nuclear plant construction. If it ever gets on the ballot and the people are faced with the clear, stark possibility of dim-outs, rationed power, and all the personal and economic maladjustments involved, I can only hope that the people will see where their true interests lie and decisively reject this and any similarly ill-conceived plans to un-invent the wheel. However, in the particular climate that exists today there is some chance that voters will buy any measure purporting to protect the environment, no matter how disastrous its potential consequences actually may be.

To protect ourselves from such a risk we should, perhaps, reiterate publicly some of the incontrovertible truths of this nuclear age. In the first place, I fail to see how you could learn anything about the environmental consequences of nuclear power without an aggressive research, development and demonstration program, which is precisely what the AEC has been doing since 1954. In the second place, there is more knowledge, more knowledgeable people and more money spent on the environmental effects of nuclear power than in any other field. Third, from a practical standpoint, the power supply situation is such that we can't afford to shut off any source of electricity. And fourth, consider the alternatives. If we were to shut down all reactors, the result would be more fossil-fueled plants, more air pollution, a new drain on our already scarce reserves of coal, oil and natural gas or a substantial shut-down of the entire country.

On the other side of the fence, the nuclear community admittedly sometimes has been guilty of oracular excesses which do nothing except lead to further unnecessary confrontations. For example, we often have a tendency to regard nuclear development as something akin to a religious crusade, complete with infidels and non-believers who should at least be drawn and quartered or, better yet, hung on sight.

We can remind ourselves that it is not the responsibility of the AEC, the Joint Committee, the AIF, the ANS, Al Weinberg or anyone else to tell the citizens of Minnesota or Maryland or California that they must have a nuclear power plant whether they want one or not. Their proper functions are simply to develop a valuable technology, to make certain it is safe, to let American industry go ahead with it at its own pace and under proper regulation, and, finally, perhaps provide the public with a little soft sell about its benefits. We have to learn to accept the fact that if the residents of a certain community decide they don't want the priceless benefits we are bestowing upon them—as they did in Eugene, Oregon—then that is their God given right. It should be discouraged, but it should not be taken as either heresy, lunacy or a dire threat to the American way of life.

On their part, of course, the States and the communities should acknowledge that once a decision is made to build a reactor—and that decision is made by the power company and ratified locally through the Zoning Commission or PUC—then the Federal Government has the responsibility under the Atomic Energy Act to make certain that it is done properly. That's the law! The States have no more right to regulate these plants than they do to print their own currency. It is clear and simple that the Federal Government pre-empted this field. But if they don't want nuclear power, so be it. Let them build fossil-plants or unscrew their light bulbs.

#### GETTING ALONG WITH THE ENVIRONMENTALISTS

The real answer for the nuclear community lies not in further confrontations with the ecophiles but in reasonable compromise. As a member of Congress, I often have to accept amendments to my legislation in order

to get it passed. The result may not be as good a bill, but it is better than no bill at all. I think the same principle applies here. I can think of reactor siting and radiation releases as two needful areas for agreement.

Take siting for example. TVA's former power manager, George Wessenauer, recently said that the perfect reactor site is one in which there has been no evidence of any seismic activity over the past millennia and is not subject to hurricanes, tornadoes, or floods. It should be in an endless expanse of unpopulated desert with an abundant supply of very cold cooling water flowing nowhere and containing no aquatic life. Most important, it should be adjacent to a major load center. The only addition I would make is that the site also should be invulnerable to nuclear war or sabotage and serve the dual purpose of an indescribably inspiring natural park and wildlife refuge.

But since such a site does not exist—if it did, I'm sure either TVA or Con Edison would have found it by now—we have to take whatever is second best. Environmentalists should gracefully and tastefully accept the fact that power plants have to be built somewhere—and that they can't always be on somebody else's river in somebody else's State.

The power companies have to recognize that the public puts a high premium on recreation, esthetics and general ecological protection, and that kilowatts are not the exclusive exquisite feature of modern life. The compromise comes in balancing two very desirable goals—ample power and environmental protection. The question is who should have—or accept—the responsibility for this balancing act.

Several different answers have come forth in recent months. In his environmental message to Congress earlier this month, President Nixon offered a national power plant siting plan. Chairman Nassikas of the Federal Power Commission had a slightly different approach last year. Two years ago, Congressman Chet Holifield and I made our own similar "power park" proposal to California's Governor Ronald Reagan. And I understand the AEC is drafting a proposal for an early site hearing on reactors.

Irrespective of whose plan you look at, several common objectives become apparent. One is forcing the power companies into developing sensible and comprehensive long-range plans—in most cases 10 years ahead—and publicizing them. The utilities don't like to do this. It limits their flexibility. But they are going to have to. Another common feature is giving one agency the dual responsibility for considering both the power needs of an area and protection of its environment. Also in the common current is an idea that power companies should have reasonable assurance that once all the siting issues have been thrashed out in public hearings, they will be free to go ahead without the ground-rules being changed or new requirements added.

Unfortunately, I see no developing moves to consolidate and simplify the siting process but rather steps to further complicate it. The President's measure and the AEC bill, as I understand them, would require four separate hearings even before construction begins—two by the proposed regional siting agencies, plus an early site hearing by AEC, plus the regular construction permit hearing. That's just too many. It adds new levels of bureaucratic meddling to an already ponderous system.

A more simple and logical scheme would involve a single hearing proceeding during which all properly interested parties could state their positions on their respective items of interest. Then a final decision would be rendered by the hearing authorities—each as to its own area of jurisdiction—but as part of one, single, coordinated over-all judgement. This would avoid the enormous time

and expense of multiple hearings and avoid the possibility of conflicting rulings by different authorities.

As a parting shot on the subject of radiation release criteria-standards it is clear that reactors can operate satisfactorily at a fraction of the present limits. Technology also is making it possible to reduce these emissions even further. It also is clear that a lot of people would be more comfortable if the standards were reduced to something approaching the actual releases. Consequently, why not so reduce them officially—not because there is anything technically wrong with the standards as they are written, but as a public relations gesture designed to increase the probability of getting reactors licensed and on the line on schedule.

To sum all of this up, it remains to be seen whether the multifold problems of the nuclear community are just a temporary setback or the harbinger of more drastic things to come. That depends in good measure on how we, as engineers, scientists and politicians, measure up in terms adapting to significant changes in public interests and priorities which have occurred since last I was privileged to speak here in Oak Ridge.

There is a great challenge ahead to the nuclear industry and to each of us. In no small way the welfare of the Nation depends on how skillfully we meet it.

Thank you.

#### DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS' DAY IN CONGRESS: A TRIBUTE TO QUIET COURAGE

### HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join President Nixon and other distinguished Americans in saluting the Disabled American Veterans and the DAV organization on its golden anniversary.

Not only have they served as an effective liaison between Government agencies who have the responsibility of awarding disability benefits, and disabled veterans, attempting to secure these benefits to which they are rightfully entitled, but the DAV has now extended its efforts to seeking the return of prisoners of war presently being held in Southeast Asia. These efforts include television and radio spot announcements, the distribution of over 5 million leaflets which have been mailed to individual homes asking that they write to the North Vietnamese Embassy in Paris, and individual chapter participation in letter writing and petition campaigns. Their goal in this effort is to get Americans to write 20,000,000 such letters to the North Vietnamese.

Since visiting recently in Paris and transmitting my own letters of protest over the treatment of POW's to the North Vietnamese, I am convinced that a mail barrage of this magnitude could be one of the most effective methods of showing American solidarity on the POW issue to the North Vietnamese. I congratulate the DAV on this initiative on their part, and wish them well in their important work. I plan to support their efforts in every way possible.

#### GOLDEN JUBILEE YEAR OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

### HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join in this special observance of the golden jubilee year of the Disabled American Veterans, whose chartered purpose is to help the wartime disabled and their dependents.

The record speaks for itself. Since formal reports were first submitted in 1927, DAV service officers have reviewed more than 7.8 million cases and assisted disabled veterans and their dependents in obtaining more than \$1.4 billion in benefits to which they were entitled.

For the most recent year listed, 1969, the amount recovered for veterans was a record \$186.4 million.

In line with its founding principle that this Nation's first duty to veterans is the rehabilitation of its wartime disabled, DAV policies seek:

First. Proper medical care and treatment of veterans for disabilities incurred, increased, or aggravated by military service;

Second. Adequate compensation for the degree of disablement caused by such disabilities;

Third. Training and/or education to restore the gainful employability of the wartime disabled;

Fourth. Adequate compensation to the widows, minor children and dependent parents of veterans who die as the result of service-incurred disability.

Mr. Speaker, as of last September 30 the number of living veterans had risen to 27.8 million, of whom 3.1 million were on compensation and pension rolls. These rolls also counted more than 1 million widows, more than 971,000 children, and more than 226,000 parents.

As the war in Southeast Asia lingers on, so do these rolls grow. It is ironic that early evacuation of wounded soldiers by helicopter and improved medical technology serve to reduce battlefield deaths and thereby emphasize the personal toll paid by survivors.

Phrased statistically, the battlefield survival rate that was extremely low in World War I, 70.7 in World War II, and 73.7 in Korea, has risen to 81.3 in Vietnam. I believe the Disabled American Veterans can appreciate the shattering implications of these statistics better than anyone.

Perhaps the most appropriate tribute to the DAV comes from its own anniversary report, in these words describing its past and foreseeing its future:

The history of the DAV has been complicated and tumultuous. Nothing as important as the objectives of this organization is ever easy. The DAV has had its hours of trial—its moments of hopelessness—its time of glory—its periods of riding the crest of the wave. But the important thing to the organization itself, and to the American public in general, is that through all this it has determinedly stuck to its single purpose—that of aiding the wartime service connected disabled veteran return to civilian

life in a competitive position with his peers. That he and his family can face the future with confidence knowing that his medical, rehabilitation and employment requirements will be met.

No greater purpose can be served by any organization—no greater challenge can be accepted by any group—no greater privilege is requested by the Disabled American Veterans.

#### DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS MARK GOLDEN YEAR

### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Disabled American Veterans marks the golden anniversary of its organization this year with very appropriate observations on the House floor.

Preceding the House session today, the national commander, Cecil W. Stevenson, appeared before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am a member.

In his appearance, a traditional presentation by the organization to our committee each year, Commander Stevenson spelled out the status of laws and various programs affecting disabled veterans and made recommendations for additional legislation in the new Congress.

The Disabled American Veterans national organization has a very active Buffalo unit. Indeed, the second national commander of the organization elected at the convention in 1922 was a Buffaloan, the late Capt. C. Hamilton Cook.

Twenty-two years later, at the 23d national convention in 1944, another Buffaloan, the late Milton D. Cohn, was elected national commander.

#### VITAL ROLE OF DAV

The important role which the DAV plays in assisting veterans is to help in insuring that they receive all of the benefits to which they are entitled. Over the past half century, this has involved many, many individual cases, amounting to recovery of extensive benefits for disabled veterans.

The growth of the DAV over the years can be shown in no better way than to cite the fact that in 1922, a half century ago when it was organized, the membership was 17,486. The rolls increased by two and one-half times in the first year, and now—as of last June 15—the total enrollment has grown to 294,566, including 112,820 life members.

The other evidence of growth is in the area of achievement by the national service officers. There were no formal reports submitted for the initial years through 1926. In 1927, there were 11,079 cases reviewed by the service officers, of which 2,499 involving rating board appearances, with a total amount recovered for the veterans of \$1,801,852.06.

#### THOUSANDS OF CASES REVIEWED

In the last year for which I have a total, 1969, there were 220,358 cases reviewed, of which 108,507 involved rating board appearances, and the total amount

recovered for the veterans was \$186,434,-275.94.

This makes a total over the period from 1927 through 1969, the years for which there are formal reports, of 7,856,724 cases reviewed, of which 3,265,395 involved rating board appearances, for a total amount recovered for the veterans of \$1,404,739,999.36.

In his appearance before the Veterans' Affairs Committee today, Commander Stevenson reminded us of the prime purpose for which the DAV was created. His citation was as follows:

That purpose in part urges all of us "to uphold and maintain the Constitution and laws of the United States; to realize the true American ideals and aims for which those eligible to membership fought; to advance the interests and work for the betterment of all wounded, injured and disabled veterans; to cooperate with the United States Veterans Administration and all other public and private agencies devoted to the cause of improving and advancing the condition, health, and interest of all service-disabled veterans."

Commander Stevenson continued his remarks by commenting on its present operation in carrying out these principles. He said:

The DAV, as part of its National Service Program, is making a special effort to seek out returning war veterans to advise them that our Organization stands ready to offer assistance in securing for them all benefits to which they may be entitled.

For this purpose, the DAV maintains 150 National Service Officers—46 are Vietnam veterans—located in Veterans Administration Regional Offices and Centers across the country.

These dedicated, specially trained national employees—all of them disabled as the result of wartime service—assist the veteran in the preparation and presentation of claims for compensation, pension, hospitalization, medical treatment, education and vocational training, and sundry other benefits available under law.

To bring the activity of the DAV closer to my home area, I would like to cite for the Members a résumé of the activities of two national service officers of the DAV, John P. Battle and George Gregor, who have their office in Buffalo, N.Y., at the VA Regional Office:

We, as National Service Officers of the Disabled American Veterans, have dedicated our lives in assisting Disabled Veterans, their widows and orphans, with a service program of assistance in the field of Education, Rehabilitation, presenting of claims before the Veterans' Administration, in the field of employment of handicapped veterans and even in assisting them with many of their personal problems.

We have many volunteers, Chapter Service Officers, who work with us in helping us assist them in securing their veterans' benefits.

We are presently trying to organize handicapped Boy Scout Troops and we also have a disaster fund program similar to the American Red Cross.

We also have a DAV Scholarship program and this helps us help our severely handicapped veterans' children have a chance to receive a college education whereas because of a lack of funds, they would be unable to have gone on to a higher education.

These are only some of our programs that we service in the 31 counties that come under the jurisdiction of the Buffalo DAV Office.

We also initiated a program to get the re-

lease of all P.O.W.'s and we continue to do everything possible until the North Vietnam government does so under the rules of the Geneva Convention.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join my colleagues in giving this fitting recognition today to this dedicated organization of our veterans.

I have had frequent and close contact with the DAV over the years and particularly have come to know of its great work since I become a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

The work which this organization is doing in the area of disability compensation, medical benefits in cooperation with the Veterans' Administration, and the general counseling of veterans of all wars is a service which is vitally needed and is being very ably provided by the DAV.

#### IMPROVED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS RECOMMENDED

### HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1971

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, a highly respected professional consultant from New Jersey has suggested a comprehensive plan for improvement of America's intercity and interairport transportation systems.

Mr. Louis C. Ripa, president of Porter and Ripa Associates, Inc., Morristown, believes the time for action on making these improvements is now. And, I believe he is right.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Ripa to Transportation Secretary John A. Volpe outlining his proposal.

The letter follows:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The goals of the Urban Mass Transportation Act will not be achieved unless planning and development can be accelerated to keep pace with demand. Today's needs must be met today to prevent programs from becoming obsolete before they are operational.

Federal funding for mass transportation started in early 1960. A decade has passed with little or no progress in the creation of a unified and integrated mass transit system. Consequently, we suddenly find ourselves dealing with yesterday's problems. By 1980, we will have to double or perhaps triple our national transportation system (rail, highway and air) just to keep abreast of the normal growth demands.

It is important that the Federal government initiate drastic changes in their approach to the problems of today. For this reason, I am taking the liberty of pointing out what I believe have been the problems in the past of developing an adequate system, and offering my opinion on a possible solution to our current problem—inadequate transportation facilities. If this situation is not acted upon with immediate material results rather than studies and reports, it will seriously hamper the economic growth of our metropolitan areas.

For many years both government and industry have been attempting to solve the problem of inter-city and inter-airport transportation facilities through various systems analyses, simulation techniques, economic demand analyses, mathematical

models and other complex systems, including statistical data gathering and research into the ultra high-speed approach of rail and tube facilities.

In 1971, a 500 mile-an-hour jetliner takes only 40 to 50 minutes to travel from any one of the three New York-Newark Airports to Washington National Airport.

However, the total travel time for the suburban or city traveler averages four hours or more from the time of leaving either home or office to arrival in downtown Washington, D.C. The long delays in ground travel time are pretty much the same on coast-to-coast inter-city flights, and, as a matter of fact, on 70 to 90 percent of all national flights. The percentage is much higher on ground travel time to international airports for overseas flights. Crosstown traffic in New York moves at a speed of 8-12 miles per hour, a speed achieved by the automobile seventy years ago. In cities such as Boston, Newark and Philadelphia the delays are much the same.

During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, private enterprise, through its ingenuity and resourcefulness and with the consideration and cooperation of the Federal government, built a system of railroads throughout these United States—second to none. These railroads proved effective money-makers in moving goods and people at a time when population densities and numbers of passengers were far less than the records show in the last two to three decades. Yet during these last few years we have seen a reckless abandonment of a remarkable service to commuters and long distance haulers. This abandonment has been progressing at an ever increasing rate. The 1960's showed little progress in attempting to slow down or reverse the trend of reduction in rail service. Consequently, the 1970's will, by necessity, (if we are to survive) be the turning point in utilizing and adapting an existing system of rail, and developing and implementing additional modes of "people carriers".

It is my belief that as changes in life-style values occur, this nation and its people will address themselves to the important "human elements" of travel and not to the highly sophisticated elements of optimized performance, computerization, minimum costs and maximum utilization, as they relate to travel. History has recorded that we reached our level of achievement in these United States by "doing" and not by continually analyzing and creating equilibrium between supply and demand. I am a firm believer that all available technology should be used to replace human drudgery and wasted labor. This technology, however, should be harnessed to create for us the viable world of today not the utopian world of tomorrow.

The answer to this ground transportation problem may well be a utilization of existing railway systems, freeways and turnpikes—including a combined new freeway/railway system—plus a new third level air carrier concept which will include aircraft of the STOL concept.

Today, two basic systems of mass transportation exist—one a falling system of railways and the other large commercial airline operations as we know them. Any other form of travel is not recognized. We need today an organized plan of air travel, rail travel, and highways and freeways to meet the demand of the various sectors of the community. The creative aggressiveness of our nation has been due to the drive for mobility demonstrated by its people. To stifle this mobility is to create chaos. Unless the importance of ground and air travel to the economy of our congested metropolitan areas is realized and concentrated efforts made to catch up on lost time, the future growth of the Megalopolis will seriously be hampered and further

blight and decay of the city will occur at an increasing rate.

What is required to cope with this chaotic tardiness is a system of regional airports connected by rail and freeway systems. To be complete, however, this regional system must integrate with the city. It must integrate with other transportation systems and hub airports to create a network of interrelated airports and center city connections. These must finally be tied to semi-urban, suburban, and rural centers with an expanded freeway/railway system.

*A planner's dream?* . . . I say no. We have within our grasp the basic tools, ingredients and material right in the Northeast Corridor from Boston to Washington, D.C., if we do not lose sight of the problems—if we do not cloud issues with computer statistics—and if we do not mix realism and truism with political confusion.

The attached map demonstrates that every airport and city in the Northeast Corridor has good rail access. The right-of-way and the rail beds are there. What is needed is a modernization of equipment and systems with an integration and interconnection of the suburbs, center city and the airports.

For example, say a traveler wanted to go to San Francisco, California, and he lived in the Plainfield or New Brunswick area of New Jersey. If there were regular interconnecting rail service between all airports, it wouldn't much matter whether he went out of Newark or Philadelphia. Using 90 m.p.h. rail service, either airport would be not more than 30 minutes away. Under good conditions many passengers or daily commuters spend more than one to two hours on these trips.

If there were an interconnecting airport-to-city rail system and you landed in Philadelphia because of bad weather, it wouldn't be any inconvenience. You would simply take a train from Philadelphia International to Plainfield, New Brunswick, Trenton or Princeton or wherever you lived. Had your car been left in Newark on your initial flight, you would just continue to Newark Airport by rail.

Airports like Philadelphia, Friendship Airport in Baltimore, or Dulles Airport in Washington would carry many times the load they now carry if a reasonable twenty-four hour rail service were set up to interconnect the airports and the cities.

Such a plan would have the following beneficial results:

1. It would help the railroads now in financial trouble.
2. It would relieve highway congestion, which is near or beyond saturation in many places.
3. It would make use of valuable right-of-way which is currently idle.
4. It would reduce the cost of highways if railroads could be integrated into new combined freeway/railway design; and also reduce the cost of rail systems if double decking of freeways and railway systems could be made compatible in congested metropolitan areas.
5. New air traffic problems would not be created since better distribution of flights would develop.
6. Fewer noise problems would result.
7. Pollution problems would lessen.
8. Lastly, it would conserve valuable acres of land by either combining systems or taking advantage of existing rights-of-way.

In reviewing the enclosed map of the Northeast Corridor, you will note that there is almost no airport, large or small, that does not have a rail line adjacent to it or within two or three miles. Most of the large airports also have freeways or interstate highways within close proximity or provide direct access to the facility.

Another phase of the solution to mass transportation in the congested metropolitan areas is a system of STOL ports constructed

on buildings, over rail yards, floating docks, or ports over parking areas. This third medium is needed to complete the balanced system of moving people rapidly within a fully integrated system.

As can be seen on the map of the Northeast Corridor, this suggested system then puts people in the Westchester-Bridgeport area equally close to Boston in travel time as they are from the Philadelphia area, and less than 30 minutes from the Newark-New York metropolitan airports.

The daily local commuter can be served by a support system of mass transit that ties into the primary system. This local system would be developed along the fingers of heavy population density. With proper freeways and highways reaching the end point of each of these fingers of development, the commuter will have the individual mobility needed to get home from the mass transit lines. The resultant reduction in the number of vehicles on the metropolitan freeways and highways will provide additional capacity for thru business traffic.

The only way we can serve the public properly and reduce the serious problem of congestion on the ground and in the air is by fully utilizing existing facilities and opening up new and untried methods of moving people. The prime consideration, however, is to begin today and finish tomorrow—and then improve upon the system as we go. If this philosophy is not followed, ideas and projects which today might prove financially unsound, tomorrow may no longer be within the grasp of the Federal or State governments for the development of an integrated system.

Your full consideration of this proposal will be appreciated, as its implementation will be necessary if we are to develop a reasonable system between airports, center city and the semi-urban and rural areas.

Sincerely,

LOUIS C. RIPA,  
President,  
Aviation Planning Associates.

BLOOMFIELD, CONN.

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1971

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that a town in my district—Bloomfield—has been named an "All American City" in a nationwide contest conducted by Look magazine and the National Municipal League.

This is a great honor for the citizens of Bloomfield and one they justly deserve. I wish to take this opportunity to salute them for this achievement.

Eleven winners were chosen in this contest in which over 100 communities entered. Among these distinguished towns was the city of Bloomfield.

Bloomfield was chosen because it acted in a positive manner to eliminate any vestiges of racial discrimination in its school system. Bloomfield accomplished this task by a voluntary busing program set up by a citizen group to eradicate de facto segregation. Second, a bond issue initiated by the citizens of Bloomfield was passed to build a new middle school to replace racially unbalanced elementary schools.

Bloomfield has always had a reputation for being a forward looking and

innovative community with a progressive town government. With its informed and involved citizenry, I feel that Bloomfield is an outstanding example to the rest of the Nation and justifiably deserves its title of "All American City."

At this point in the RECORD I would like to include the text of the Look magazine article commending Bloomfield:

"YOU CAN'T COMPLETELY OVERCOME COLOR IDENTITY, BUT IT'S FADING"

(By Gerald Astor)

In the late 1950's, a number of citizens of Bloomfield thought they detected the cancer of de facto segregation—a concentration of blacks—in the Blue Hills elementary school. At the same time, the idea of a middle school for grades five to seven, that would separate upper-elementary pupils from primary-grade kids, was being discussed. Dr. Howard Wetstone, a board of education member for 14 years, recalls: "A lot of us felt the middle school was a good idea, and when we saw one pocket becoming black, we figured we could plan to integrate the middle school and improve our educational program."

An effort to inform the community followed. A school census confirmed the fears of de facto segregation. Blue Hills numbered close to 50 percent nonwhite; other schools, as low as 1.5. The issues were discussed at town and neighborhood meetings. A report on the situation went to residents. Compulsory two-way busing was rejected in favor of a voluntary tack. A committee hired four workers to canvass Blue Hills families in search of children to ride buses to other schools. About 150 black kids have transferred annually since the program began. Mrs. Ruth Mantak was one of the few whites whose daughter chose Blue Hills. "I think more white children's parents would have volunteered but nobody attempted to get them. My daughter is happy; she says Blue Hills is the best school in the whole world."

Busing, strictly a board of ed decision, moved Bloomfield down integration road. But the new middle school required taxpayers to accept a \$5.5 million bond issue plus involuntary integration. The Chamber of Commerce approved the idea of the middle school but wouldn't buy the cost. A Citizens for Community Coordination opposed the project because some members didn't like integration, others felt themselves deceived or manipulated. Tempers heated, but the bond issue squeaked by at the polls.

Roy Craddock, from the black community, sees benefits already in busing. "The feedback from parents and from observations shows that you can't completely overcome color identity, but it's fading. We're seeing mixed participation and representation in things like the PTA."

A few whites talk of a climate of fear caused by the controversy. But Alvin Wood, a black Hartford principal who grew up in Bloomfield, says, "If opened on the basis projected, I think the middle school can have a great and good effect."

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—  
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1971

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



Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

## THE TWO GREECES

### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, as further documentation of the case against the Greek military junta and continued U.S. support to the junta I would like to enter in the RECORD the following article from Commonwealth by Maurice Goldbloom, a close observer of the Greek situation who conferred with numerous Greek exiles during a recent trip to Europe. The article follows:

[From the Commercial magazine, Feb. 5, 1971]

#### THE TWO GREECES

(By Maurice Goldbloom)

There appear to be two countries, with very little in common, which go by the name of "Greece." The first is the one described by the Pentagon and the State Department in their testimony before Congress and their press releases. The second is the one whose history can be followed in the reports of international organizations, in the daily press of Western Europe and the United States—and even to some extent Greece itself—and in the public statements of the Greek junta's members and spokesmen.

Thus in June, during the debate on the Hartke Amendment to the Military Sales Act, designed to cut off U.S. military aid to Greece, a Defense Department memo introduced by Senator Strom Thurmond asserted: "Most importantly the Greek Government announced that in accordance with a specific timetable, to which it has thus far carefully adhered, the institutional structure of a democracy prerequisite to elections will be in place by the end of this year. This timetable is a public commitment on the part of the Greek Government. It seems to be a reasonable time element, i.e., the end of this year. . . . Some patience and restraint should be exercised by all, as the Greek regime seems to be moving ahead in the direction to establish democratic norms. . . . Greece can be helped by sympathetic understanding rather than by censure."

At the same time as the Pentagon was claiming that the "institutional structure of a democracy" would be in place by the end of the year, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Rodger Davies was admitting in secret testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "It (the constitution) will not be fully implemented until they hold their elections. . . . We have no commitment on date." (Neither the Pentagon memo nor Mr. Davies noted that even if the junta put its own 1968 constitution into effect, the result would be an authoritarian state dominated by the armed forces, not a democracy.)

But Mr. Davies cited as proof of "liberalization" the implementation on April 10 of "that part of the Constitution, which requires warrants for arrest, and provides certain safeguards against judicial processes." And in its statement of September 22, accompanying the announcement that full shipments of heavy arms to Greece would be resumed, the State Department again

declared that "the trend toward a constitutional order is established. Major sections of the constitution have been implemented, and a partial restoration of civil rights has been accomplished. The Government of Greece has stated that it intends to establish parliamentary democracy." In the off-the-record briefing which followed, the State Department spokesman appears to have told reporters that there were only five or six hundred political prisoners left in Greece.

#### CERTAIN CONDITIONS

But "the trend toward a constitutional order" was not noticeable to anyone without the State Department's special spectacles. A few days after the resumption of full American aid, Vice-Premier Stylianos Pattakos reiterated, in an interview with the German weekly *Der Spiegel*, that "certain conditions must be created before we can think of elections." Pattakos refused to specify what they were, but on October 9 the Premier's spokesman and key assistant, the former Communist exile George Georgalas, went on television to tell the Greek people that before they could have elections for Parliament five prerequisites would have to be fulfilled. Greek per capita income would have to rise from \$800 a year to \$1100; the reorganization of the state machinery would have to be completed; there would have to be an increase in social equilibrium, leading to a fairer distribution of wealth; the rehabilitation of Greece's national educational system would have to be completed; and finally, there would have to be a better press, a better informed public, and the Greeks would have to be suffused with a sense of national unity. Economists estimated that the fulfillment of the first condition would take a minimum of seven years, if the present rate of growth in gross national product was maintained. But the impending financial crisis made it very questionable whether that would be possible; the junta had been able to finance economic expansion only by dissipating Greece's foreign currency reserves, now approaching the vanishing point, and by pyramiding short-term debt at high interest rates. These debts were rapidly coming due, and there were no reserves with which to pay them.

This however, was the easiest of the five conditions to meet. For the "reorganization" of the state machinery in any positive sense was impossible for a government which, not incorrectly, regarded almost every literate Greek as its enemy. The numerous decrees issued by the junta which provided tax-exemptions and other special privileges for big business certainly contributed to a redistribution of wealth—but not in the direction of greater fairness. The need of the Greek educational system for rehabilitation had increased substantially under the junta, which had lowered the school-leaving age, reduced the numbers of teachers and schools, created a shortage of textbooks by banning those previously in use, and seriously obstructed learning by making the artificial *Katharevousa* the language of instruction in the elementary grades instead of the *Demotiki* spoken by the children and their parents. (Under the Papandreou government, steps had been taken to make *Demotiki* the language of instruction on the university level, as it already was in lower grades. But perhaps one should not be too critical of the failure of the junta to provide textbooks for large numbers of schools, and for its insistence that instruction be given in a language difficult for the children to understand. For the new textbooks, when they arrive, denounce democracy and glorify the military regime in a way that makes them rather worse than the absence of any books. And the children are certainly better off not understanding the lessons which the junta has ordered that they be taught.)

The better press which the junta sought

was hardly one which would be so defined in any democratic country; its nature was indicated by the prison sentences imposed on the editors and publishers of the newspaper *Ethnos* for publishing an appeal by former Minister of Industry John Zigidis for the formation of a government of national unity. (For the crime of making this appeal, Zigidis himself received a 5-year sentence.) Other indications were the prohibitions imposed on the printing of information about such things as mass arrests, the investigation of Stavros Niarchos' role in the death of his wife, and anything which might adversely affect the stability of the currency—in other words, accurate financial news. (There was, however, a possibility that the Greek public was actually becoming better informed than it had previously been; most Greeks were again, as during the Nazi occupation, listening faithfully to the BBC and other foreign radio stations—not including the Voice of America, which too often tempered its winds to the shorn junta.) Only on the last point was real progress being made; the Greek people were becoming suffused with a sense of unity—against the junta.

Meanwhile, as a substitute for the absent Parliament, the junta announced the creation of an advisory body, the so-called "mini-parliament," to be appointed by the Prime Minister; ten of its members are named by him at his discretion while the other 46 are chosen by him from 92 victors in an "election" in which the voters were local government officials and officers of professional and other organizations—almost all of whom had themselves been appointed by the junta to replace elected predecessors. The character of the electorate and of the body which may be expected to emerge is suggested by the fact that two of the five victors in the Athens area were the publishers of the monthly *Fourth of August*, named after the date on which the Metaxas dictatorship was established; the pages of this overtly anti-Semitic publication are studded with quotations from Adolph Hitler and similar experts on parliamentary democracy.

Two not necessarily incompatible theories have been advanced as to the purpose of this body, for which no provision exists even in the junta's own constitution. One is that it is intended as the nucleus of a junta political party, to be formed while all other parties are still banned, which will be in a position to win parliamentary "elections" when and if these are eventually permitted to occur in some denatured form. The other is that Papadopoulos hopes to use this body, with no powers, as an excuse for dissolving the "Revolutionary Council" of the officers who made the Coup, a body whose very real power—based on the fact that its members still are in command of troops—has frequently caused problems for him.

#### SAFEGUARDS

So much for "parliamentary democracy." What about the implementation of "that part of the Constitution, which requires warrants for arrest, and provides certain safeguards against arbitrary judicial processes?" One example: in the trial of certain leaders of the pro-Moscow faction of the Greek Communist movement, one of the defense lawyers told the judges of the court-martial—political offenses are still tried by military courts—"It is the fundamental quality of a judge to be independent of the parties to the case and to show himself impartial. It is thus that he can judge in an objective manner. But examine your position, gentlemen. It is certain that you are in the service of the present military government. It is also certain that my clients fight against that government. Under these conditions, you are not independent of the parties to the case." The lawyer, Constantine Kiziridis, went on to urge the judges "to fulfill your duty in all objectivity, in accordance with your oath." For

this "outrage to the tribunal" he was immediately sentenced to a year in prison. In protest the other defense lawyers, headed by former Justice Minister and President of Parliament Dimitrios Pappaspyrou, walked out of court in agreement with their clients, who declared that they did not want other lawyers to run the risk of being treated as Mr. Kizlidis had been.

A second example: a few weeks ago a bomb was exploded at the statue of President Truman. A communique issued by the "October 20 Movement," a small group on the far left, claimed responsibility for it. In the next few days at least 48 persons were arrested, mostly in pre-dawn raids and without warrants, and held incommunicado. (The actual number is believed to be over a hundred, but many arrests have not been announced.) Almost all of those arrested belonged to the Center. Three were Center Union deputies; the wife of one of them, Talbot Kefalinos, has gone to court to challenge her husband's arrest and continued imprisonment on the ground that they violate the constitutional protections of whose "implementation" the State Department has made much. (Mrs. Kefalinos is acting in a manner which carries risks of its own; the wife of Professor George Mangakis spent a year in prison for charging that her husband had been tortured, as he had been.)

And one of the others arrested in the same sweep as Kefalinos was Lila Filias, the wife of Athanasios Filias, whose sole offense appears to have consisted in her efforts to find out what was happening to her imprisoned husband. Another of those recently arrested, Mrs. Papamargaris, was also the wife of a prisoner, convicted like Athanasios Filias in the trial of Democratic Defense in April. Others arrested at the same time included several officers with Center Union sympathies, all of whom had previously been imprisoned and then released, and a large number of leading lawyers, some of whom had served as defense counsel for political prisoners. It seems likely that the real purpose of the arrest of lawyers was to make it more difficult for political defendants to obtain counsel in the future. A second purpose may have been to seek information as to how the prisoners have been able to smuggle out political statements and information as to the conditions of their detention.

The fact that the prisoners have been held incommunicado inevitably leads to the suspicion that the junta is using its customary methods of extracting information from its victims. When a bomb was exploded near the building where Defense Secretary Melvin Laird was conferring with Premier Papadopoulos, the man who planted it, a prominent 54-year-old lawyer named Ioannis Koronaios, was seen doing so and immediately arrested. Two other persons were subsequently arrested in connection with the incident, another lawyer named Gregory Kassimatis who was the cousin and namesake of a former minister in center and rightist governments, and an engineer named Andreas Frangias. According to Alfred Friendly Jr., writing in the *New York Times*: "The Government has promulgated laws establishing the sanctity of the domicile and requiring that arrests be accompanied by judicial warrants, but security policemen entered the home of Andreas Frangias, an Athens engineer, last week at midnight and took him away. His relatives next saw him under police guard in a neurological hospital here. According to reliable reports, Mr. Frangias suffered head and abdominal injuries during interrogation and is now being fed intravenously. He is said to believe that he signed one or more papers while in detention, and legal experts presume he signed a declaration saying that his arrest had been made according to a warrant that neither his family nor his lawyer had yet seen."

## CONVALESCENT QUARTERS

Koronaios was also hospitalized with serious injuries. Both men had been in good health when arrested. It seems likely, however, that fewer prisoners will be hospitalized after questioning in the future. The junta is reportedly adding convalescent quarters to its interrogation centers, so that prisoners will be shielded from the eyes of outsiders while their wounds are healing.

In 1969, as a part of its unsuccessful effort to convince the Council of Europe that its rule was compatible with European civilization, the junta signed an agreement authorizing the International Red Cross to visit all Greek places of detention. While this agreement was not always fully implemented, and while its value was considerably decreased both by the fact that only the Greek government could authorize publication of Red Cross reports and by the impossibility of frequent visits by the inadequate Red Cross personnel to the numerous places of detention, it nevertheless imposed some restraint on the junta in its use of torture and other forms of mistreatment. At least the Red Cross was able to report to the Greek government cases of prisoners who were dangerously ill and sometimes secure their release. And even occasional visits probably reduced the incidence of torture, although it still remained substantial. Now, however, the junta has refused to renew its agreement with the Red Cross. According to government spokesman George Georgalas, the agreement has served its purpose. And indeed it has; the United States has resumed the shipment of heavy weapons.

Only in Washington's eyes is "the trend toward a constitutional order . . . established." But in the eyes of the world—and of the Greek people—what is established is the complicity of the United States government in the crimes of the colonels. In the words of the last President of the Greek Parliament, Dimitrios Pappaspyrou, speaking before the Political Committee of the NATO Assembly at the invitation of its chairman, Senator Jacob Javits, "The State Department knows all this perfectly well. Hence its assertions about the evolution of the Athens regime toward democracy constitute proof of its complicity in the fraud."

The Greek people have not accepted the colonels, and they will not. No Greek political figure of importance, with the single exception of the late Foreign Minister Panagotis Pipinellis, has consented to cooperate with them. The ordinary people of Greece have found many ways of expressing their opposition to the junta, ranging from the turnout of hundreds of thousands at George Papanastasiou's funeral to the applause at every showing of the movie *Strawberry Statement* when it depicted students fighting police. (These demonstrations accompanied by shouts of "Down with the military regime!" led the junta to close down the movie after a week!)

If organized resistance has so far been largely limited to relatively small groups, this has at least in part been due to the fact that most Greeks expected the junta to fall in short order under the pressure of international disapproval. Today, because of the open support the junta has received from Washington, this hope has evaporated. There is an increasing realization that the fall of the junta will not be automatic, and may not be swift, despite its incompetence in all fields and its increasingly sharp internal conflicts. One may expect this to be reflected in the establishment of a mass Greek resistance movement prepared to wage a long-time struggle, and to seize whatever opportunities the junta's weaknesses present. Such a resistance movement will take on anti-American character, unless there is a drastic change in American policy. It will have no other choice, for it will face American guns.

## FLUNKING THE COURSE

## HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, irresponsible, rambling rhetoric has thus far characterized the premature presidential campaign of the senior Senator from South Dakota. Perhaps the most scurrilous statement made by the former history professor to date came in his recent charge that the U.S. bombing of Indochina is "the most barbaric act committed by any modern state since the death of Adolf Hitler." Is it possible that the ex-don has forgotten about the senseless slaughter of civilians in Hungary and Czechoslovakia by Soviet troops? Or the needless starvation of Biafran children? Or the mass murder of hundreds of thousands in Asia by the Red Chinese? Or the cruel and inhumane treatment of the 1,600 American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia? If GEORGE MCGOVERN really wants to be a serious contender for the Presidency in 1972, he should take a refresher course in his former academic field.

## NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART CALENDAR OF EVENTS, MARCH 1971

## HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Calendar of Events for the National Gallery of Art for the month of March 1971. As always, the National Gallery has scheduled outstanding and interesting events and exhibits, and I urge all who can to visit the National Gallery during this month.

The Calendar of Events follows:

## CALENDAR OF EVENTS, MARCH 1971

## REUNITED BRONZE GROUP

*Saint Christopher Carrying the Christ Child with the Globe of the World*, a sculpture group of two small Renaissance bronzes from the National Gallery and the Louvre, reunited when analysis by atomic reactor confirmed that the two once belonged together, will be on view at the Gallery, in Lobby B, through March 21.

The saint, attributed to Bartolomeo Beltrano (1434-1496/97), a Paduan follower of Donatello, fitted together with a bronze of a seated child known as "A Boy with a Ball," from the Gallery's Samuel H. Kress Collection, one of the world's greatest collections of Renaissance bronzes. A tenon (or projection) permits the Christ Child to sit on Saint Christopher's upraised palm, a rare motif in art history, as most other representations show the saint carrying the child on one shoulder or on his back.

The idea that the two bronzes constituted a single group was suggested by a Louvre curator while in Washington last spring to study the Kress Collection. With the cooperation of the Louvre, the Gallery was able to have the pieces tested by a non-dispersive X-ray fluorescence analyzer in one of the first dramatic uses of this mini-reactor designed to measure the composition of an

object with a precision that could revolutionize the classification of works of art. The exact similarity of material in the two pieces confirmed that they came not only from the same workshop, but had probably been produced from the same crucible.

#### THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY CONCERT PROGRAM

The National Gallery Orchestra, under the direction of Richard Bales, Conductor, will present a program of American music on Sunday, March 14, at 7:00 p.m. in the East Garden Court to commemorate the thirtieth anniversary of the National Gallery. The program will consist of three works, the first two composed for this anniversary concert: "A Buoyant Music" (Overture No. 2) by David Diamond; "Cello Concerto No. 2" by Washington composer Robert Evett; and "Symphony No. 2" by Charles Ives, which received its Washington premiere at the Gallery on May 2nd, 1954.

The National Gallery opened on March 17, 1941. The first concert was performed on Memorial Day, 1942. A year later, Mr. Bales came to the Gallery to take charge of its musical program by organizing the weekly concerts and assembling the National Gallery Orchestra. The free Sunday evening programs have continued except for the summer recess, without interruption.

#### HOGARTH PRINTS

An exhibition of prints by William Hogarth (1697-1764), on view from March 6 through May 30 in Gallery G-19 on the ground floor, will complement the exhibition of Hogarth paintings from the collection of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon. A selection of about 35 prints, owned by the National Gallery (primarily from the Rosenwald Collection), including examples of the artist's major series (*The Rake's Progress*, *The Four Times of the Day*, and *Industry and Idleness*, among others), effectively represent the range of the artist's graphic work. The exhibition will be accompanied by explanations of the eighteenth century social and political allusions in the works.

#### HOGARTH: PAINTINGS FROM THE COLLECTION OF MR. AND MRS. PAUL MELLON

Twenty-nine paintings and six drawings by William Hogarth from the collection of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon will continue on view through May 30. This is the fourth in a series of exhibitions of British artists in the Mellon collection. Outstanding is *The Beggar's Opera*, a scene from the third act of the most popular parody of contemporary theatricals of the early 18th century. A fully-illustrated catalog of the exhibition (\$2.50) has been prepared by Ross Watson.

#### MAZARIN TAPESTRY

The magnificent Mazarin Tapestry, acquired by the Gallery in 1942 with the Joseph E. Widener collection, is on view again in Gallery G-1 after restoration. Measuring eleven by thirteen feet, the tapestry was woven around 1500 in Brussels of gold, silver, silk, and wool. It once belonged to Cardinal Mazarin, 17th-century French statesman, and later to American banker J. P. Morgan. The recent restoration work was started by the late Louisa Bellinger, who was succeeded by Joseph Columbus.

#### GALLERY AND CAFETERIA HOURS

The Gallery is open weekdays and Saturdays, 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and Sundays, 12 noon to 9:00 p.m. The Cafeteria is open weekdays, 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.; luncheon service 11:00 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.; and Sundays, dinner service 1:00 to 7:00 p.m.

#### MONDAY, MARCH 1, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 7

##### Painting of the week<sup>1</sup>

Filippino Lippi, *Tobias and the Angel* (Samuel H. Kress Collection) Gallery 9,

Tuesday through Saturday 12:00 and 2:00; Sunday 3:30 and 6:00.

##### Tour of the week

*The Hogarth Exhibition*. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1:00; Sunday 2:30.

##### Tour

*Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda Monday through Saturday 11:00 and 3:00; Sunday 5:00.

##### Sunday lecture

*Vasari, the Man and the Book: The Greek and German Manners; Guest Speaker: T. S. R. Boase, A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts; Auditorium 4:00.*

"Civilisation," X—*The Smile of Reason*, Saturday and Sunday, 12:30 and 1:30.

##### Sunday concert

Marc Johnson, *Cellist*; Carolyn Pope, *Pianist*; East Garden Court, 7:00.

#### MONDAY, MARCH 8, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 14

##### Sculpture of the week<sup>2</sup>

Andrea della Robbia, *The Adoration of the Child* (Samuel H. Kress Collection) West Garden Court, Tuesday through Saturday 12:00 and 2:00; Sunday 3:30 and 6:00.

##### Tour of the week

*Hogarth's Italian Contemporaries*. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1:00; Sunday 2:30.

##### Tour

*Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11:00 and 3:00; Sunday 5:00.

##### Sunday lecture

*Vasari, the Man and the Book: The Critic; Guest Speaker: T. S. R. Boase, A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts; Auditorium 4:00.*

"Civilisation," XI—*The Worship of Nature*, Saturday and Sunday, 12:30 and 1:30.

##### Sunday concert

National Gallery Orchestra; Richard Bales, *Conductor*; Luis Leguía, *Cellist* (A Concert of American Music commemorating the 30th Anniversary of the National Gallery of Art) East Garden Court, 7:00.

#### MONDAY, MARCH 15, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 21

##### Painting of the week<sup>1</sup>

Picasso, *Still Life* (Chester Dale Collection) Gallery G-13, Tuesday through Saturday 12:00 and 2:00; Sunday 3:30 and 6:00.

##### Tour of the week

*Hogarth's French Contemporaries*. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1:00 Sunday 2:30.

##### Tour

*Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11:00 and 3:00; Sunday 5:00.

##### Sunday lecture

*Vasari, the Man and the Book: Errors and Omissions; Guest Speaker: T. S. R. Boase, A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts, Auditorium 4:00.*

"Civilisation," XII—*The Fallacies of Hope*, Saturday and Sunday, 12:30 and 1:30.

##### Sunday concert

Hamilton College Choir; James Fankhauser, *Director*; Hamilton College Brass Choir; Albert Rodewald, *Director*; East Garden Court, 7:00.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery Staff, are broadcast by Station WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5).

#### MONDAY, MARCH 22, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 28

##### Painting of the week<sup>1</sup>

Luini, *Portrait of a Lady* (Andrew Mellon Collection) Gallery 8, Tuesday through Sat-

urday 12:00 and 2:00; Sunday 3:30 and 6:00.

##### Tour of the week

*Hogarth's English Contemporaries*. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1:00; Sunday 2:30.

##### Tour

*Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11:00 and 3:00; Sunday 5:00.

##### Sunday lecture

*Vasari, the Man and the Book: Later Years; Guest Speaker: T. S. R. Boase, A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts, Auditorium 4:00.*

"Civilisation," XIII—*Heroic Materialism* Saturday and Sunday, 12:30 and 1:30.

##### Sunday concert

Jorge Zulueta, *Pianist*; East Garden Court, 7:00.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office or telephoned to (202) 737-4215, ext. 272.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> 11-by-14 inch reproductions with texts for sale this week—15 cents each. If mailed, 25 cents each.

<sup>2</sup> Color postcards with texts for sale this week—5 cents each, postpaid.

## DAV DAY IN CONGRESS

### HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today we honor men who have given their full measure of loyalty to this country and recognize the distinguished national organization which serves them.

The Disabled American Veterans through its national service program assists disabled veterans, their dependents, widows, and orphans in obtaining all benefits to which they have legal entitlement. In doing that it truly serves all of us because it helps us fulfill our national obligation to these men and their families.

Justice Brandeis said that the early Americans were characterized by a spirit "that believed liberty to be the secret of happiness, and courage to be the secret of liberty."

The disabled American veteran has shown that he has that same brave heart. He did his best at a time when his best required great sacrifice.

The dimensions of our tribute to these men must be far greater than the words spoken here today. As those who have the power to act for a national conscience, we must see that this Congress gives adequate recognition to the needs of the disabled veteran of past wars and his comrades returning today from Vietnam. Theirs must not be a forgotten sacrifice.

We commend the DAV for its great years of service and assure them of our support for their continued efforts.

We pledge our devotion to the memory of those we honor here today.

Let us be worthy of their example.