

duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving: Rear Adm. Frank W. Vannoy, U.S. Navy. Rear Adm. Means Johnston, Jr., U.S. Navy. Rear Adm. Harold E. Shear, U.S. Navy. Rear Adm. Frank W. Vannoy, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Navy senior member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 711.

#### U.S. MARINE CORPS

MaJ. Gen. William G. Thrash, U.S. Marine Corps, having been designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

Lt. Gen. Raymond G. Davis, U.S. Marine Corps, for appointment as Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5202, with the grade of general while so serving.

MaJ. Gen. Wallace H. Robinson, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, having been designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

#### IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning John S. Ingari, to be major, and ending Ronald D. Wood, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 23, 1971.

#### IN THE NAVY

The nominations beginning Robert R. Abbe, to be commander, and ending David M. Muschna, to be lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 23, 1971; and

The nominations beginning James R. Allen, to be ensign, and ending George D. Zeitler, to be chief warrant officer, W-2, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 1, 1971.

#### IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Rafael Candelario, to be second lieutenant, and ending Peter A. Zaudtke, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 23, 1971.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### INTERNATIONAL DECADE OF OCEAN EXPLORATION

#### HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the excellent address of Feenan D. Jennings, head of the International Decade of Ocean Exploration to a luncheon of the American Oceanic Organization on Thursday, February 25, 1971.

Mr. Jennings, who studied oceanography at the Graduate School of the University of California and at Scripps Institution of Oceanography, is highly qualified to speak on this subject. He has done extensive work on the effects of radiation fallout in relation to oceanography, participating in nuclear tests at the Pacific Proving Ground, and was project officer for Project Redwing, a series of nuclear tests in 1956.

In 1958 Mr. Jennings served as head oceanographer, Geophysics Branch of the Office of Naval Research. In 1966 he was promoted to deputy director, Ocean Science and Technology Division, Office of Naval Research. His many awards include the Navy's meritorious civilian award in 1960; outstanding award in both 1961 and 1963; the Navy superior service award in 1966; and the 1970 Military Oceanography Award, oceanographer of the Navy.

I am sure that my colleagues and the American people will find much of interest in Feenan Jennings address on the "International Decade of Ocean Exploration."

PRESENTATION TO THE AMERICAN OCEANIC ORGANIZATION

(By Feenan D. Jennings)

It is a genuine pleasure for me to address this meeting of the American Oceanic Organization. In particular, I am pleased because this is the first opportunity we have had to discuss the international decade of ocean exploration program outside of the foundation.

As most of you know, the vice-president assigned responsibility for the management of the decade program to the National Science Foundation in November of 1969 as one of the President's five initiatives in marine sciences for fiscal year 1971. The vice-president said the United States would propose emphasis in the international decade of ocean exploration on the following goals:

(1) Preserve the ocean environment by accelerating scientific observations of the natural state of the ocean and its interactions with the coastal margin—to provide a basis for (a) assessing and predicting man-induced and natural modifications of the character of the oceans; (b) identifying damaging or irreversible effects of waste disposal at sea, and (c) comprehending the interaction of various levels of marine life to permit steps to prevent depletion or extinction of valuable species as a result of man's activities.

(2) Improve environmental forecasting to help reduce hazards to life and property and permit more efficient use of marine resources—by improving physical and mathematical models of the ocean and atmosphere which will provide the basis for increased accuracy, timeliness, and geographic precision of environmental forecasts;

(3) Expand seabed assessment activities to permit better management—domestically and internationally—of marine mineral exploration and exploitation by acquiring needed knowledge of seabed topography, structure, physical and dynamic properties, and resource potential, and to assist industry in planning more detailed investigations.

(4) Develop an ocean monitoring system to facilitate prediction of oceanographic and atmospheric conditions—through design and deployment of oceanographic data buoys and other remote sensing platforms;

(5) Improve worldwide data exchange through modernizing and standardizing national and international marine data collection, processing and distribution; and

(6) Accelerate decade planning to increase opportunities for international sharing of responsibilities and costs for ocean exploration, and to assure better use of limited exploration capabilities.

As you must recognize, the goals which I have just quoted are rather broad in their scope, and much of the effort during this first year has been devoted to refining an operating philosophy for the conduct of the program and in identifying more specifically, scientific problems upon which we should focus our attention.

First, I would like to outline three basic points of philosophy which have been used

to shape the program and which we will use for the management of the projects during the coming years.

(1) The goals assigned by the vice-president were, in my opinion, well chosen in that they all involved an examination of man's interaction with the oceans. We recognized that a fledgling program such as ours would have to be designed carefully to avoid duplicating the prerogatives and even the assigned responsibilities of on-going Federal agency programs. This meant, for example, that we should not involve ourselves with research into tsunamis, tides, mapping and charting, fisheries research or operational prediction systems, all of which are responsibilities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Nor would we involve ourselves in detailed geological surveys which are rightfully the task of the U.S. Geological Survey; nor in an examination of the environmental quality of rivers and estuaries which, at first glance, are the responsibility of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Federal Water Quality Administration. Having blocked out those areas which were not our concern, we then attempted to arrive at an operational philosophy which would take advantage of existing talent and resources, to stretch the money available to IDOE as far as possible in attaining the goals outlined. We concluded that IDOE and other agencies could enhance each other's activities. This could be done with the Department of Defense and other agencies by encouraging cooperation on research projects. For example, the Navy in pursuit of an oceanographic environmental prediction capability, might support research in air/sea interaction; the IDOE, charged with the task of improving environmental forecasting for the benefit of mankind, would also need to examine the processes involved in the exchange of matter and energy between the atmosphere and the oceans. If we could combine our interests and our support in looking at large-scale air/sea interaction processes, it would benefit the goals of both the Navy and the decade programs.

The other method by which we could stretch our resources, and which was an inherent part of the decade program, would be to encourage and foster international cooperation in programs to which all participating countries actively contribute. Thus, we will seek joint support of the IDOE scientific investigations from other countries whenever it is mutually advantageous to do so.

(2) We have attempted to identify, within the broad goals outlined by the vice president, rather specific scientific problems

which are—at this time—particularly susceptible to a concerted attack by the research community. This may be occasioned by the state of our theoretical understanding of a problem, or by recent advances in our technological capabilities to examine the problem, or by some combination of these and the scientific community's present involvement in them.

(3) Having identified the problems which are particularly amenable to solution by a concerted effort, we would then focus the necessary scientific talent on the problem, and provide enough resources, in terms of technology, equipment, and technical assistance, to offer the hope of really obtaining the answers to significant questions. The combined results of these philosophies is a program which focuses on a very few carefully identified scientific problems and which involves most of the scientists concerned with those problems on an inter-institutional, inter-agency, international basis.

Those philosophies then are the major operating tenets of the program.

I would now like to address the programmatic aspects of the IDOE. Three of the six goals outlined by the vice-president fall into categories which I would define as support functions:

(1) The first of these is the development of technology for monitoring the environment. While we recognize the importance of applying truly modern technology to oceanic investigations, we do not believe that the level of funding presently available to the program will permit the support of technological development in the general sense. Instead, we will support that technology required by the IDOE scientific programs as necessary. This will involve participation by industry wherever possible. As the program grows in size and sophistication, increasing involvement of the technological excellence of industry will be required. In addition, we will foster the growth of the national oceanographic instrumentation center by supporting that organization's direct involvement in the testing, calibration, and engineering evaluation of the instruments to be used in the scientific program.

(2) The second support function involves the improvement of national and international data exchange through modernization and standardization of our present systems. Once again we decided that it was not feasible to support such a program in general terms, but that it would benefit the scientific research efforts as well as the existing data management organizations if we were to involve the data centers directly in the scientific projects. Accordingly, we have made arrangements by which the environmental data centers of NOAA and the sorting centers of the Smithsonian will participate in the IDOE through the following procedures: (a) the data centers will review the research proposals submitted to the IDOE by the scientific community to insure that adequate attention has been paid to the reduction and processing of the scientific data resulting from the work; (b) the data centers and the scientists will agree on formats for submission of the data and on schedules for delivery of the data to the centers; and, (c) the data centers will estimate the added costs of handling data resulting from the decade program, over and above their on-going responsibilities, so that proper funding for those centers may be provided by the IDOE.

(3) The third support function—which is really more of an objective—concerns international sharing of responsibilities. In a sense the decade program—as we see it—is quite different from previous international cooperative studies of the oceans. For example, the International Indian Ocean Expedition and the International Cooperative Investigations of the Tropical Atlantic con-

cern themselves with cooperative assaults on a given geographic area of the world oceans. The IDOE, on the other hand, will focus on scientific problems which will more properly involve cooperation between various countries on a scientist-to-scientist basis, rather than a broad commitment from each country to mount an exploratory expedition to a given geographic area in an agreed upon time period.

Thus, the major emphasis on international cooperation will be to insure that the principal investigators in this country contact their counterparts in other countries and encourage their participation in the programs whenever possible. In addition, we at the program management level will present our overall program plan to intergovernmental organizations in order to obtain their assistance and support.

Having presented to you our general approach to the management of the decade program, I would now like to describe the scientific programs which we have identified within each of the three broad goals outlined by the Vice President.

Although one of the primary goals of IDOE is to stimulate integrated long-term studies of environmental quality of the ocean, it quickly became apparent to the office that markedly lacking was any set of baseline data or other information against which the validity and objectives of proposals could be weighed. Unless such information is obtained, there is the danger of ending the decade without answering important questions relating to the quality of the environment.

Two National Academy of Sciences panels met in 1970 with the primary intent of identifying pollutants of concern in the marine environment. The first, GNEM (Global Network for Environmental Monitoring—IBP: NAS), listed among the elements and compounds of concern a suite of heavy and transition metals including mercury, lead, cadmium, arsenic, copper, and zinc; oil and hydrocarbons of petro-chemical origin; chlorinated hydrocarbons; and polychlorinated biphenyls. Subsequently, a second panel (NASCO—Williams College) recommended that no monitoring program be supported until the completion of adequate baseline studies which identified sources and rates of input, presence or absence of specific pollutants, and concentrations occurring in the ocean at present. The panel estimated that the goal could be reached in one to two years.

To accomplish the objectives outlined at the Williams College Conference, primary consideration should be given to a study of the area and shore-seaward distribution of pollutants, focusing on sources of injection into the marine environment. Specifically, these include (1) rivers (seaward from their mouths), (2) the atmosphere, and (3) accidental or intentional spillage—the first, best studied where water enters the ocean from areas of high population and industrial density; the second, at points remote from land but under the major wind systems.

Recognizing that associated problems differ from one geographical area to another, the office has invited study proposals with the intent of supporting separate studies in the North Atlantic, Northeast Pacific and Gulf of Mexico. The objectives are:

(1) To identify major suspected and unsuspected pollutants and their sources;

(2) To identify ocean processes affecting the dispersal, sedimentation, and fate of pollutants;

(3) To identify or predict the impact of pollutants on the biosphere as well as their effect on esthetic and commercial uses of the oceans; and

(4) To identify areas of the ocean where one might expect to find high concentrations of pollutants.

Using these guidelines, surveys to obtain

baseline information of the presence or absence of specific pollutants and their concentrations in the biota, sediments, and water will be made preceding the study programs. Once completed, the studies will provide adequate information to permit the logical development of sophisticated research projects to study the biological amplification, chemical reactions, ultimate fate and effect of pollutants and so forth. We have identified responsible groups in the Atlantic and Pacific and are considering the proper approach to the Gulf and Caribbean.

In addition to the pollutant baseline studies, we hope to support a program to determine the present day distribution patterns of all the most important oceanic tracers—both physical and chemical—along north-south transects of the three major oceans of the world. This work will be important to our program in environmental quality, and to our long-range interests in predicting environmental conditions.

In the area of environmental prediction we feel much more comfortable in identifying those scientific problems which hold the most hope for pay-off to the benefit of man.

The progress in both the theory and the measurement of upwelling processes over the past few years has reached the point where a concerted scientific research effort into coastal upwelling systems may give us the capability to make some early attempts at predicting the onset of upwelling. It has been estimated that over 50 percent of the world's fish catch is made in upwelling areas. If we are able to improve our capability to predict the onset of upwelling and to understand the processes taking place within the food chain, it will surely result in an increase in man's use of the oceans as a source of food.

Another program which presently has the attention of the majority of east coast physical oceanographers is the study of the role of medium-scale eddy processes in ocean circulation. As a result of the work over the last several decades we now know something about the mean circulation of the oceans, but we have no real understanding of the perturbations which take place. We also know that a large percentage of the energy involved in such perturbations occurs on scales equivalent to the quasi-geostrophic eddies which have been observed in the northern Atlantic over the past several years. We hope to support a program which attempts to delineate these eddies with the ultimate goal of understanding the dynamic processes which control their generation and decay.

Another area of environmental prediction which in my opinion holds great promise for pay-off is the study of the large-scale air/sea interaction processes taking place in the North Pacific. We are considering supporting a program of synoptic observations, combined with theory, which will provide us with the understanding of energy exchange between the ocean and the atmosphere. The goal of the program is to provide the proper scientific basis for increasing our long-range weather forecasting both in the marine environment and over the North American continent. Other important parts of our environmental prediction effort are an examination of water mass formation and abyssal circulation which are important in the distribution of heat energy and pollutants in the ocean. In addition, the top layers of sediments from areas of rapid sediment deposition can be used to identify climatic changes which have occurred in the past. A knowledge of such changes will allow us to determine whether man is influencing changes now observed, or, whether they are naturally cyclic events which have nothing to do with our activities.

In the area of seabed assessment we hope to focus much of our attention on the study of the rift valleys of the mid-ocean ridge systems to determine whether the hot min-

eral brines observed in the Red Sea—which is itself a rift valley—might also be taking place in the deep sea. We also considered that the deep ocean trenches should be studied for two reasons: First, men are considering the deep trenches as a place for the disposal of some kinds of wastes on the basis that such waste will be buried as the sea floor slides under the continent; and, second, there is a great deal of seismic activity associated with the ocean trenches and there is a good possibility that mineralization may also be taking place there. We intend, therefore, to support research which will help us determine whether our theories are correct; if they are, an understanding of the generating mechanisms may help us to predict the occurrence of resources on the floor of the ocean.

Our understanding of the geophysical framework of the continental margins under the oceans of the world is by no means uniform. We believe that a search for minerals on these margins will require a knowledge of the geophysics of these areas and intend to support studies along continental shelves. While we may support a few fine grain surveys to look at the geology of selected areas, this will not be a major thrust of our seabed program on the continental margins.

I am personally very excited about the scientific program which I have just outlined because this is the first time we will be able to bring the necessary resources to bear to provide us with the hope of obtaining some meaningful answers from our research. Although I cannot tell you today which individual projects will be funded to carry out this program, I can say that if we expend the money according to our present plan in fiscal year '71, we will spend 2.8 million in environmental quality, 7.3 million in environmental prediction, and 4.9 million in seabed assessment. In 1972 we anticipate that these ratios of expenditures will shift as we begin to undertake full-scale investigations into the quality of the ocean environment.

The philosophies and the scientific program which I have just described have been presented to and approved by the National Science Foundation-International Decade of Ocean Exploration Advisory Panel made up of representatives from academic institutions and industry; by the Interagency Decade Planning Group which is composed of representatives from all government agencies; and, tentatively, by the IDOE Planning Panel of the National Academy of Science Ocean Affairs Board and National Academy of Engineering Marine Board, which was responsible for the drafting of "an oceanic quest." We will continue to seek the advice of these groups as the program progresses.

The true strength and ultimate success of the international decade oceanography program will hinge on the scientific excellence of the research effort. While we will not neglect such important aspects as international cooperation, technological advancement, and the proper management of data, our major effort has been and will continue to be directed toward ensuring that the programs we support are of the highest quality. It is only through this approach that we shall make real contributions to man's understanding, treatment, and usage of the oceans during the coming decade.

**YOUNG PITTSBURGHER SENDS LETTER TO PRESIDENT NIXON**

**HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, recently, one of my young constituents, a high

school student participating in an Upward Bound program, had the opportunity to attend a presidential classroom for young Americans. The presidential classroom is designed to give young Americans a broader knowledge of Government activity, especially Congress. Following this experience in the Nation's Capitol, Kenneth Jackson wrote a letter to President Nixon. I would like at this point to include in the RECORD this young man's letter and his views on what the answer is to our world problems:

MARCH 1, 1971.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Let me introduce myself, I'm Kenneth Jackson, Jr., from the Presidential Classroom for Young Americans.

Mr. President, I would like to see you for a short time, but unfortunately you're too busy to see anyone.

I want to give you some verses from the Holy Bible. When you read these verses, will you please address this letter to the members of the Supreme Court, the Congressmen, and your Cabinets. And also those who need help.

It's not the money that will save and heal America's problems. Some people vision money as there god and power. What this world needs is Jesus Christ. He's the source of all Power.

If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land. II Chronicles 7: 14.

When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice, but when the wicked beareth rule, the people mourn. Proverbs 29: 2.

The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge; but fools despise wisdom and instruction. Proverbs 1: 7.

I'll pray for you and this world.

Love in Christ Jesus.

KENNETH JACKSON, JR.

**THE EMERGENCY DETENTION ACT OF 1950 SHOULD BE AMENDED AND NOT REPEALED**

**HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the recent bombing of our own Capitol Building I am confident no Member of this Congress would care to suggest that extreme acts of violence "can't happen here." The fact is, it has happened here and we are all quite aware that even more outrageous was what happened in Canada last fall; namely, political kidnaping and murder—which also can happen here.

It is in full awareness of the realities of life, however harsh and appalling they may be, that I have joined with others in sponsoring legislation to hopefully strengthen our Nation's security by amending title II—the Emergency Detention Act of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Consider, Mr. Speaker, that Canada cherishes hard-won freedoms as much as those of us here in the United States. Consider that Canada's Prime Minister, Pierre Trudeau, is an avowed liberal whose credentials in this regard are unchallengeable. Time and experience have shown the Canadian people to be generally cool in crises, extremely tolerant

and levelheaded in their reaction to protest and dissent, and notably determined to defend the human rights of the individual living in their society.

By the same token, consider that events have forced Canada to take steps I am sure Mr. Trudeau and most Canadians never anticipated taking.

As this House prepares to face up to the need for sound and sane security legislation, I deem it helpful to have the facts of the recent Canadian situation clearly in mind. Even though much publicity occurred at the time of the kidnapings, I hope you will let me share with you a summary of what has transpired to date.

On October 16, 1970, Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, reflecting an outrage felt by the vast majority of his fellow Canadians, said in a national broadcast:

I am speaking to you at a moment of grave crisis, when violent and fanatical men are attempting to destroy the unity and the freedom of Canada. One aspect of that crisis is the threat which has been made on the lives of two innocent men.

Prime Minister Trudeau went on to outline events that had in 2 weeks shocked—and frightened—almost every person in Canada other than those members and backers of a small band of violent revolutionaries.

Principally they were the kidnapings of two prominent persons: Pierre Laporte, Minister of Labor for Quebec; and a foreign diplomat, British Trade Commissioner James Cross, by a band of revolutionaries known as the Front de Liberation du Quebec—Quebec Liberation Front—or FLQ who sought separation of Quebec from Canada.

In its early efforts to deal with the situation, the Canadian Government somewhat resembled a helpless, handcuffed giant, for it had no legislation on hand to cope with subversion other than the standard criminal statutes which proved inadequate and ill suited.

There was only one possible measure that could be applied and it was an extraordinary, perhaps desperate, one.

But the two kidnapings had united the Canadian people, angered them, and strengthened their resolve.

Therefore, Trudeau did what he had to do and it amounted to a virtual declaration of war against the FLQ.

Declaring, in that October broadcast:

"If a democratic society is to continue to exist, it must be able to root out the cancer of an armed, revolutionary movement that is bent on destroying the very basis of our freedom." Trudeau announced that "for that reason the government, following an analysis of the facts, including requests of the government of Quebec and the city of Montreal for urgent action, decided to proclaim the War Measures Act. It did so at 4 a.m. this morning, in order to permit the full weight of government to be brought quickly to bear on all those persons advocating or practicing violence as a means of achieving political ends."

It was a dramatic move. The act had been employed only twice before in history: World Wars I and II. Not even during the Korean war, when Canadian troops fought on the side of the United Nations, had the Government felt the need for its application.

The series of events that so shocked Canadians and attracted worldwide attention began with the abduction on October 5 of Cross. He was snatched at gunpoint from his Montreal residence at 8:15 a.m., just after breakfast. The FLQ immediately boasted that it was responsible and issued a series of demands incumbent on the victim's release: Payment of \$500,000 in gold bullion, cessation of the police investigation and the freeing of a number of "political prisoners"—FLQ members or supporters serving sentences for conviction of such crimes as murder, assault, armed robbery, arson, and bombing.

Subsequently, authorities received a series of notes, some written by Cross and some by his captors, and discussions began between Government representatives and FLQ contact men.

Five days after the Cross kidnaping, Quebec Justice Minister Jerome Choquette delivered a short statement over radio and television.

He declared that the demands of Cross' kidnapers would not be met. However, he said, the Federal Government would agree to provide safe conduct to a foreign country of the kidnapers in exchange for Cross' release. Half an hour after he finished, the FLQ struck again by grabbing the 49-year-old LaPorte from in front of his suburban home. He was seized by four heavily armed men.

Next morning the FLQ confirmed that it had pulled off the kidnaping and reiterated its demands.

During the ensuing week possibly the most massive police effort in Canadian history was deployed by city and provincial authorities and by the famed Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Canadian soldiers were summoned to guard public buildings and figures, freeing police for investigative work.

Further messages were exchanged between authorities and the FLQ, some of them containing evidence that the two captives remained alive.

A hint of Government plans was furnished by Ontario Premier John Robarts who declared on October 14 that the situation had deteriorated into "total war" and the time had come to "stand and fight."

Meanwhile, Montreal Police Director Marcel St. Aubin prepared a report describing "an extremely dangerous subversive movement" that aimed to overthrow the government by sedition and armed insurrection. The report said ordinary police forces were taxed to their limit and asked for extra powers along with the assistance of "senior governments."

In the pre-dawn hours of the next day, Friday, October 16, Trudeau declared war.

But the FLQ swiftly and pitilessly proved that it was not yet finished. It changed its tactics from political abduction to political assassination. The terrorists left a note saying:

Pierre LaPorte, Minister of Unemployment and Assimilation, was executed at 6:18 tonight—you will find the body in the trunk of the green Chevrolet 9J2420 at the St. Hubert (air force) base. We shall conquer. FLQ.

Just after midnight that night, a bomb expert pried open the car trunk. Inside

lay the twisted body of Pierre LaPorte, strangled by a religious chain he wore around his neck. He left a widow and fatherless son and daughter.

Then the War Measures Act began to be felt. It outlawed the FLQ and authorized extraordinary police powers of arrest and detention. On Friday alone more than 240 people were rounded up. Under the act they could be held without charge for 21 days and without trial for up to 90 days. By Monday, October 19, the number of detainees swelled to 342.

By now Canadian emotions about the abductions and the murder were a mixture of rage and sorrow. A Canadian writer reported from the capital city of Ottawa that on Sunday, October 18:

Hundreds of citizens gathered in sadness and in shame on Parliament Hill in the middle of the night. They sang their national anthem, "O Canada," and fashioned signs saying "We Love Canada, Coast to Coast."

LaPorte's body was taken to a municipal building where it lay in state until the following Tuesday. Hundreds, perhaps thousands, of citizens filed by it, in sadness and in shame.

There was acute concern that the kidnaped British diplomat, Cross, had shared LaPorte's fate but this fear was lessened by an FLQ note saying that Cross was alive and well.

Up until Monday, the War Measures Act had been in force through executive fiat, but now it came up for approval in Parliament and passed by a vote of 190 to 16.

However, the Government anticipated criticism if the act remained in force for long and it was announced prior to the vote that new legislation of a less drastic nature would be introduced within 1 month.

Despite widespread recognition of the necessity for the War Measures Act—or something—to deal with the crisis there was some opposition, chiefly from civil libertarians who felt that the measures put too severe a restriction on civil liberties; and from a handful who publicly endorsed the objectives of the FLQ. All 16 votes against the measure were cast by members of Canada's New Democratic Party. Quite another group, the "Front d'Action Politique," had already endorsed the FLQ's objectives and ideology—although disavowing terrorism.

After LaPorte's murder and the FLQ announcement that Cross remained alive a period began which may best be described as being one of "tense tranquility." Police maintained their massive search both for LaPorte's killers and Cross' whereabouts. Some of the individuals detained under the War Measures Act were released.

Predictably, the act began to suffer mounting criticism from opposition parties, but the general public remained in favor of some form of emergency law and accepted the annoyance of very visible army and police forces with little objection.

As stated, the Government had no recourse for the moment beyond the War Measures Act simply because it lacked statutory authority in the form of written legislation. The Trudeau government, therefore, began drafting laws to deal

with insurrectionary disturbances, but far short of a declaration of war.

By November 14, a total of 447 persons had been arrested and all but 64 released after varying periods of questioning and detention. One of those held, however, was 19-year-old Bernard Lortie, a student, who said he was a member of the FLQ cell that kidnaped the provincial labor and immigration minister. He identified those others, who he said took part in the kidnaping, but told police he knew nothing about the slaying or about Cross' abduction.

During November, proposed new legislation came up for debate in Parliament. Chief spokesman for it was the Honorable John N. Turner, Minister of Justice.

Turner borrowed from Canada's neighbor to the south, the United States, in emphasizing his point, citing from a 1925 Supreme Court decision written by Chief Justice William Howard Taft:

A single revolutionary spark may kindle a fire that, smouldering for a time, may burst into a sweeping and destructive conflagration. It (the government) cannot reasonably be required to defer the adoption of measures for its own peace and safety until the revolutionary utterances lead to actual disturbances of the public peace or imminent or immediate danger of its own destruction; but it may, in the exercise of its judgment, suppress the threatened danger in its incipency.

The quotation came from the majority opinion in *Gitlow* against New York, a case in which the court upheld a conviction for advocating criminal anarchy. Turner said that no less a champion of civil rights than Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes had submitted even his approval of those sentiments.

Turner declared that—

The government recognized and, from the beginning, expressed the opinion that the War Measures Act was "too blunt an instrument."

We recognized the need for a more definite but flexible statutory instrument . . .

The legislation that we have presented in the form of this bill is intended to meet the present threat of the FLQ.

Then Turner said emotionally:

The events we went through make us aware of the vulnerability of our democratic institutions. To the extent that violence breaks out in a democracy, it indicates the failure or weakness of that system. But, as members of the House, we cannot accept the suicide of democracy by remaining passive before violence. Rather we should act.

At this point Turner was interrupted by cheers from the Members.

He continued:

I have already mentioned the genuine concern for civil liberties in these past few weeks. I share that concern. The enduring existence of those rights and freedoms enumerated in the Canadian Bill of Rights, the very essence of our democracy, is beyond dispute. For that reason their existence must be cherished and protected.

However, it is not, and never has been, part of the democratic process that society should refrain from taking such steps as are necessary to protect itself and protect its citizens from being deprived of those very liberties and freedoms by organized criminals and anarchists. The most fundamental right of all, without which no others can be enjoyed, is the right to life itself. In this regard we must not lose sight of one paramount fact, and that is that the members of the FLQ have demonstrated be-

yond doubt their willingness to kill, no matter how innocent their victims might be.

For a government to refrain from taking the required action to deal with an organization like the FLQ would be the height of irresponsibility and folly; indeed, it would be the very negation of the concept of civil liberties as we have come to understand that concept. There are no civil liberties where there is no democratic government to secure them. Mr. Speaker, I cannot state this too strongly: No government entrusted with the security of its people and with the protection of the liberties of the people who conferred the mandate, the temporary power, upon them could have acted otherwise.

No government has a mandate to negotiate away its own existence or surrender the rights of its people. If it did, it would be acting reasonably to its own people while betraying itself.

The House membership again cheered the Justice Minister.

And the legislation under debate, the Public Order—Temporary Measures—Act of 1970 passed the House by a vote of 174 to 31. When it became law it replaced the War Measures Act which then automatically expired as an order in force. The Public Order legislation is scheduled to expire on April 30, 1971.

Whether Canada will draft and approve permanent internal security legislation, either the above act or another version, remains to be seen. Trudeau refused to revoke the act even after the kidnap crisis had passed its peak. At the very least, Canada will have the Public Order Act's language readily available for submission to Parliament and presumably will not have to invoke the War Measures Act in order to confront an internal security crisis again.

The "October Rebellion" as it came to be known had an unexpectedly happy finale. Through a combination of brilliant police work, including excellent cooperation among city and provincial police and the RCMP, and a series of delicate Government maneuvers with Cross' kidnapers, his release was obtained.

The diplomat, in good health but 23 pounds lighter, left soon for London to be reunited with his family. On February 23, 1971, Queen Elizabeth awarded Cross with the Order of St. Michael and St. George for his courage and cool behavior under stress.

The kidnapers, Jacques Lanctor, his wife and child, Marc Carbonneau, Jacques Cosette-Trudel and his wife and Pierre Sequin were furnished a safe-conduct flight to Cuba.

Five alleged members of the FLQ were arraigned under the War Measures Act and charged with seditious conspiracy to overthrow the Government. Five others were arraigned for sedition, conspiracy, and membership in an unlawful association. Fourteen more persons were charged with having been or having claimed to be members of an unlawful association.

Eventually four men were arrested, declared "criminally responsible" for LaPorte's death and ordered held for trial.

May any conclusions be drawn or lessons learned from the unhappy experience suffered by America's northern neighbor?

The most obvious determination to be made is that any nation, no matter how libertarian—Canada reverses civil liber-

ties every bit as much as the United States—will employ extraordinary measures when confronted with crisis. The republic will not sit idly and helplessly by and permit its own destruction to be carried on from without or from within.

Indeed, the danger more probably is of overreaction to crisis rather than otherwise. The United States still suffers from the bitter aftertaste of its incarceration of more than 100,000 Japanese-Americans in reacting to the fear inspired by the attack on Pearl Harbor. The men who ordered and executed that measure were not known either before or after as enemies of civil liberties—in fact, quite the contrary.

The question, it would seem, is whether to have readily available legislation applicable to the situation, or whether to deal with a civil emergency on an ad hoc basis when confronted.

The United States has among its present Federal statutes a measure to cope with civil crisis. Known as the Internal Security Act of 1950, it is of considerably lesser latitude than either of the acts Canada employed during its crisis.

For example, it can be used only in the event of "invasion of the territory of the United States or its possessions; declaration of war by Congress; or insurrection within the United States in aid of a foreign enemy." The act contains no provision for outlawing any specific organization. It has never been applied because the United States has never been threatened with a crisis of sufficient magnitude.

Through study of the Canadian example it would appear that a case can be made for retention of the Emergency Detention Act with revision and improvement of it, rather than outright repeal of title II.

(NOTE: Source material: New York Times, Dec. 29, 1970; Washington Post, Feb. 21, Feb. 7, and Jan. 5, 1971; Canadian Press, Undated Kidnap Chronology, Dec. 3, 1970; The Canada Gazette (War Measures Act) Oct. 16, 1970; House of Commons Debates, Nov. 4, 1970, Dec. 16, 1970; Canada Today, Jan. 1971; Canadian Embassy, Office of Information; Press Release Communiqué "Notes For A National Broadcast By The Prime Minister," Friday, Oct. 16, 1970; The FLQ—A Montreal Star Book, 1970; and Washington Star, Feb. 24, 1971.)

THE MOST IMPORTANT WORDS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois State Senate recently elected Senator Cecil A. Pardee as its president pro tempore. To paraphrase a saying, he is black and brilliant. His 14 years in the Illinois Legislature have been marked by solid achievement, and this most recent recognition by his party and his colleagues is but the most recent acknowledgment of his good works.

In accepting the nomination of his party, he talked about the most important words in the English language.

He said the six most important words were "I admit I made a mistake."

He said the five most important words were "You did a good job."

He said the four most important words were "What is your opinion?"

He said the three most important words were "If you please."

He said the two most important words were "Thank you."

And finally, he said the one least important word was "I." As another example of this remarkable man's capacity to say it like it is, I insert a copy of the spontaneous acceptance speech that he gave on the floor of the Illinois Senate on January 6, 1971, which was recorded as follows:

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH

Gentlemen of the Senate: Before I left my hotel this morning, I made three (3) telephone calls—two of them were happy calls, and one was a sad one.

The first was to my mother and father, in their late 70's, in St. Louis, Missouri, thanking them for the training and encouragement they gave me throughout the years, and also thanking them for living before me, a life worthy of emulation. Another call went out to my wife, a devoted, understanding, helpful and encouraging human being.

The call of sadness went back to Chicago to Mrs. Nettie Campbell, who is the recent widow of my political guide and mentor. Alderman Campbell, who nurtured me politically, departed this life on December 31, 1970, just a few days ago, and was necessarily deprived of the opportunity to see his work product in this august body, in this exalted position today.

I am, of course, grateful to my Party for their endorsement and their confidence.

As I stand here and look out into the State Senate, I am looking at friends. You will observe, that I am not looking on either one side or the other of that aisle, but I am looking at friends on both sides of that aisle. I am looking at new members here, who, I trust, will become friends as time goes on. I have come to recognize a long time ago, that on both sides of this aisle, there are men of talent, there are men of wisdom, there are men of experience, there are men of devotion to that concept, that we categorically define as "Good Government."

As your President, I am sure that we will not forget our Party Labels, but more importantly, that we will put our joint minds, our multi-talents and our combined energies together in the interest of the People of the Great State of Illinois.

One gentleman from the press last night, asked me if I felt that the fact that I was Black would hamper the legislative program of this State. I told him, and I say again here and now, I am an American. I am here to pass, to help pass that legislation which is in the best interest of this State, as it affects people who are rich or poor, black or white, educated or uneducated. I earnestly solicit your cooperation on behalf of the citizens of this great State.

Thank you.

A SALUTE TO "RED" JACOBS

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of Boxoffice magazine published a tribute to Newton P. "Red" Jacobs, the president of Crown International Pictures. The tribute marked the 10th anniversary of

Crown International and Mr. Jacobs' 55th year in show business.

The article appears below:

A SALUTE TO "RED" JACOBS

BEVERLY HILLS.—Crown International Pictures, observing its tenth year as a worldwide motion picture distribution company, has become one of the strongest and most important independent distributors in the industry.

The company was formed ten years ago by Newton P. "Red" Jacobs, a distributor long recognized as knowledgeable, aggressive, reliable and fair.

So, with himself as president, Mark Tenser as executive vice-president, Bob Levinson serving as national print manager, and Chicko Harano as secretary, Crown International came into being and set up offices on the old "Motion Picture Row" on South Vermont Avenue, Los Angeles. The company operated from that location until 1965, when it moved its home office to the present address in Beverly Hills.

Crown's first releases were "Devil's Hand," which starred Linda Christian and Robert Alda; "Bloodlust," with Robert Reed; "Varan, the Unbelievable," and "First Spaceship on Venus"—the latter considered by science-fiction buffs as the most exciting galaxy film ever produced. Six pictures annually was the company's original output; today Crown lists 12 films for its 1971 schedule selected from literally scores offered and screened each year.

"We could have gone ahead faster," admits Jacobs. "But I've seen too many companies mushroom out overnight, then fold because they didn't have good solid ground under foot. Our growth has been very carefully planned, and it's been consistent and steady."

It's true that Crown International has enjoyed a steady, consistent progress. Not by accident is it a company-on-the-move. From selection of the right films through the many facets of preparing and selling the pictures down to the local promotions, Crown does it right.

And, like many leaders in this and other industries, Jacobs believes in surrounding himself with a fine staff. "Nobody does it alone," he says. The original three have now grown to 32 employees with branch offices in every distribution center in the U.S. and Canada and with foreign representatives throughout the world. Favorite Films of California, Inc., the regional company, is owned by Jacobs and, in addition to Crown releases, distributes other product throughout the 13 Western states, including Alaska and Hawaii.

Despite a period of unrest, Crown has been steadily forging ahead, continuing to supply exhibitors with marketable product for excellent boxoffice grosses. And along the way Crown has collected a few honors, the *BOXOFFICE* Blue Ribbon Award for "African Safari" among them.

Observing the Crown operation over its ten-year span, the factors contributing to the company's success are readily noted. Flexibility and adaptability are basic with Crown International. They have confidence and optimism—about their own product, and about the motion picture industry generally. The flexibility and adaptability show up in the way Crown moves with the trends—sometimes following, at other times anticipating them. The former takes maturity the latter calls for a youthful—a "now" approach—and Crown has given evidence of combining the two in a successful format.

Newton P. "Red" Jacobs is certainly a vital part of the motion picture industry. He started his show business career at the age of 12 when he worked as a candy butcher at the Gaiety Theatre in Pittsburgh. He came to the West Coast when he was 18, went to

work in a film exchange office and rose steadily to the top. He's been in the business now for 55 years.

"I'm very happy right where I am, doing what I do," he says. "Distribution has been my life's work; I know it and I love it. The future looks good, very good to us here at Crown."

OPPOSITION TO TRANS-ALASKA PIPELINE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that there is growing opposition being expressed in the news media to the construction of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline. In this regard, the Detroit Free Press ran an excellent editorial, entitled "Pipeline in Perspective," in its February 27, 1971, issue. So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to be aware of the views of the Free Press, I insert the text of the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PIPELINE IN PERSPECTIVE

Credit Rogers Morton, newly confirmed secretary of the Interior, with one of the pleasant surprises of the year. In postponing approval of the controversial Alaskan Oil pipeline, he has sounded notes of caution and care that were sadly missing from previous deliberations. And he's indicated that he's a better conservation man than his credentials had hinted.

Pressures have been intense to get the pipeline approved and underway. Alaskan interests are hungry for oil dollars in their state's economy. Gov. William Eagan argued last week that his government faces no less than bankruptcy if the pipeline isn't operating by mid-1976. The oil companies have been no less eager to tap new reserves.

And the Department of Interior has been cooperative to a fault. An Interior report issued in January recommended construction of the pipeline, and purported to find environmental dangers within tolerable limits. But in fact the document was flimsy, the cited evidence spotty and inconclusive. Public hearings early this year opened with precious few facts to weigh.

The arguments of the oil interests and Alaskan spokesmen have their merit. Without doubt, economic development is important to Alaska, and to the country.

But the country has been too urgently invited to build the pipeline now and reckon the full cost later. Much of the American landscape already testifies that prosperity recklessly pursued can be empty when achieved. Measures taken in more recent years indicate that a prosperous world and a livable one need not be mutually exclusive.

Secretary Morton now shows a desire to avoid false choices in Alaska. The pipeline decision must not be made on a "profit-and-loss" basis, he says, but on a full assessment of "national needs"—including environmental needs. Indeed, he calls for a "national energy policy. All things have to be put into perspective with the demands for energy."

In any case, the Alaska decision will not be made in haste. Perhaps the pipeline must someday be built, and environmental sacrifices made. But any such decision ought to rest on thorough exploration of alternatives, and be accompanied by every possible safeguard. Secretary Morton has provided time to make that effort.

THE ENRICO FERMI EDUCATIONAL FUND

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago 15 young Americans got together in the city of Yonkers and decided that something should be done to assist needy high school students of Italian extraction who desired to continue their education beyond high school. This decision resulted in the establishment of the Enrico Fermi Fund of Yonkers.

This fund, which relies on the efforts of citizens of Italian descent, has since its creation in 1964 provided scholarships to 18 highly qualified but needy high school students.

The efforts of this fund are in the fine tradition of pride and dedication to education and the arts which have for many centuries characterized people of Italian extraction.

It is altogether appropriate that this fund should bear the name of Dr. Enrico Fermi, the great Italian American physicist and Nobel Prize winner. For, without scholarship assistance, Dr. Fermi, himself, would never have been able to complete his own education.

Fermi, born on September 20, 1901, in Rome was extremely proud of his heritage. His father, Alberto Fermi, worked as a manager in the Italian railroad system, and his mother, Ida de Gattis, was a schoolteacher before her marriage.

He was very conscious of the fact that his parents had worked all of their lives to make his life a little better. Therefore, he determined that he must dedicate himself to completing his education, and to rising to great heights to justify his parents' dedication.

Throughout his life, Fermi was the recipient of support from his Italian countrymen, who recognized his extraordinary intelligence and his great need to serve mankind.

Perfectly well aware of his unusual mental qualities, Fermi remained a simple and unassuming man, husband, father, and friend. He liked to expound and explain physics, and there are numerous stories concerning his incredible ability of giving extemporaneous discourses on the most detailed and abstruse phases of his beloved subject. He was keenly competitive and enjoyed winning games, tiring out younger companions on walks, climbs, and swims.

He habitually associated with young people and remained young in spirit throughout his life. His inner stability and calm arose from complete confidence in his own ability to steer a successful course through the vicissitudes of life. He became embarrassed and uneasy if treated as a person to whom special privileges should be given; he was punctilious in his observation of the rules and regulations to which all were subjected during the war. At the laboratory he was among the first to arrive in the morning and the last to leave in the evening, inspiring his coworkers by his outpouring

of boundless intelligence and energy during each day.

Death ended one of the greatest scientific careers of all time. Fermi, the modest, unassuming Italian American genius, will be remembered forever in the history of science along with such other great Italian scientists as Galileo, inventor of the telescope; Marconi, inventor of the wireless; Volta, inventor of the battery, and Torricelli, inventor of the barometer.

Americans of Italian extraction can be justly proud of their heritage, which includes such men as Enrico Fermi. It is altogether fitting therefore, that the Fermi Educational Fund of Yonkers should provide the inspiration and financial support to assist Italian children today, so that they might have the opportunity to contribute to mankind in the tradition of their Italian ancestors.

**NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES AND NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES SUPPORT REVENUE SHARING**

**HON. JACK F. KEMP**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, on February 19, 1971, a historic meeting took place in the city of Indianapolis. For the first time, leaders of county government and municipal government from each State met to consider problems of the American federal system. At this meeting, sponsored by the National League of Cities and the National Association of Counties, the following resolution in support of the President's revenue-sharing proposal received unanimous support:

Whereas, the National League of Cities and the National Association of Counties have supported the concept of revenue sharing for more than five years; and

Whereas, Revenue Sharing provides a distribution of power and resources that will strengthen the Federal system and lead to a revitalization of state and local governments; and

Whereas, the fiscal plight of local government of all sizes has grown more acute and is beyond the capacity of local governments to solve without assistance from the Federal government; and

Whereas, the local and state governments worked closely with the Administration in the development of a new general revenue sharing proposal which the President has adopted and forwarded to Congress for action:

Now therefore be it resolved that those members of the National League of Cities and the National Association of Counties meeting in Indianapolis, Indiana, February 19, 1971, reaffirm their long-standing commitments to general revenue sharing, commend President Nixon for his leadership in offering this vital and long overdue proposal and call upon the continuation of bipartisan efforts in the Congress to immediately enact the \$5 billion general revenue sharing measure.

**NEW HAMPSHIRE AIR NATIONAL GUARD, RECIPIENT OF DeBRIER TROPHY**

**HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN**

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, since its founding, this great Nation has relied in times of stress on its citizen-soldiers. They have consistently rallied in time of need and have provided our country with a defense that has been second to none. Minutemen, doughboys, GI's—by whatever name they have come to be known—these brave men have formed the backbone of our national defense effort.

The present day version of the citizen-soldier is reflected by the many Army and Air National Guard units in the several States. Their members volunteer time and energy to maintain the high level of proficiency required to operate modern weapons systems which form a vital part of the United States defensive arm. It is with pride that I call to the attention of Congress the fact that the 157th Military Airlift Group of the New Hampshire Air National Guard is this year's recipient of the DeBrier Trophy for "the highest degree of readiness, progression, and achievement" among the 13 Air Guard units assigned under the jurisdiction of the 21st Air Force of the Military Airlift Command.

Mr. Speaker, since before the birth of the Nation in 1776, New Hampshire's fighting men and women have proven time and time again what devotion and duty to one's country means and implies. I am particularly pleased with the performance record of the 157th Military Airlift Group and wish to bring to my colleagues' attention their achievement which deserves recognition.

In this connection, the attached article which appeared in the March 9 edition of the Manchester Union-Leader is self-explanatory:

**157TH HAILED FOR EXCELLENCE: NHANG UNIT TO RECEIVE AWARD**

PEASE AFB.—The 157th Military Airlift Group, N.H. Air National Guard, will receive the 21st Air Force's top award for operational excellence among Air Guard and Reserve forces.

Maj. Gen. Gilbert L. Curtis, commander of the Military Airlift Command's 21st Air Force at McGuire AFB, N.J. announced, selection of the New Hampshire Air Guard as recipient of the 1971 DeBrier trophy.

Selection of the Granite State unit, Gen. Curtis said, recognizes the 157th Military Airlift Group as having "the highest degree of readiness, progression and achievement" this past year among the 13 Air Guard and Air Reserve units assigned to the 21st Air Force.

The award, a large engraved silver bowl on a black lacquered base, is named for its donor, Brig. Gen. Daniel DeBrier, a retired Air Force Reserve officer who is now an attorney in Atlantic City, N.J.

Presentation of the award to officers and airmen of the N.H. Air National Guard is scheduled for Saturday, March 13, at Pease AFB when the unit conducts its monthly training.

**OTHER WINNERS**

Established in 1966, the award has previously been won by Air Guard and Reserve units in Virginia, Pennsylvania and Minnesota. The DeBrier trophy has twice been won by the Minnesota Air National Guard's 133rd Military Airlift Group in St. Paul-Minneapolis, a sister unit of the 157th Military Airlift Group. The New Hampshire Air Guard was runner-up for the award in 1967.

The New Hampshire unit airlifted more than 900 tons of equipment and more than 2,600 military passengers for the Air Force and the National Guard this past year, and received special commendation during the unit's annual general inspection last fall.

Nearly 950 officers and airmen are assigned to the New Hampshire Air Guard, operating and maintaining nine C-124 Globemaster aircraft used in the dual roles of training Air Guardsmen while performing actual airlift missions for the armed forces.

**WHAT CONGRESS IS SAYING**

**HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I think that all of the Members of the Congress would benefit by having available to them recent comments made in the Near East Report, a Washington letter on American policy in the Near East. This excellent weekly of which I. L. Kenen is the distinguished editor, gives a balanced, comprehensive, and objective presentation of news on a regular basis with regard to the problems of the Middle East. The following item is taken from the February 17 issue of Near East Report:

**MUSKIE**

Sen. Edmund S. Muskie (D-Me.) urged Israel's neighbors "to recognize that Israel is here to stay" and that "the United States is and will remain committed to Israel's security. . . . And that is what I did say, both in Cairo and Moscow."

In a speech in Cleveland on Feb. 10, the Democratic presidential hopeful told the Jewish Community Federation that peace depends on "honest negotiations to establish secure and recognized boundaries"; "the right to navigation through international waterways in the Middle East"; and the solution of the refugee problem "in a fair and equitable manner." He said that the only formula which "can lay the foundation for peace is one which is hammered out by the parties immediately concerned. That is why we should do what we can to encourage progress in the Jarring talks."

In an ecotonal account of what he saw in Israel during a January visit, Muskie said he was impressed by kibbutzniks on the Golan Heights "building a new community"; by the absence of war propaganda in Kibbutz Geshet, which is frequently a target of terrorist rockets; by former Premier David Ben-Gurion, who was unforgettable; by Premier Golda Meir speaking "without bitterness about Israel's neighbors"; and by Defense Minister Moshe Dayan displaying greater understanding than anyone else about refugee camps.

He said that Israel provides a model for Americans who "have lost a sense of direction" and "have grown suspicious and fearful of each other. . . . To visit Israel is to know that this need not be."

## JACKSON

Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.) warned against the reopening of the Suez Canal under the conditions proposed by Egypt: that Israel withdraw from the east bank of the waterway.

In Los Angeles, Jackson declared that such a move would not be in the interests of the United States, nor in the interests of a peace settlement, which, he said, must come first.

"With the Canal back in operation," he pointed out, "one of the chief incentives the Soviets have to make concessions on other outstanding differences will vanish."

## BAYH

At a press conference in Israel last week, Sen. Birch Bayh (D-Ind.) also cautioned against an Israel acceptance of the Egyptian proposal before an overall settlement is reached.

A "partial solution," he said, would spark a new round of hostilities. He stressed that the settlement should be negotiated by the parties—not imposed by the Great Powers.

## ON SOVIET JEWS

Five more Soviet Jews and their families have finally received permission to emigrate to Israel; Jewish sources revealed on Feb. 14 that the five, who had continually pressed for permission to leave, have obtained exit visas.

The departure of this latest group means that 30 of the 40 Moscow Jews who signed the first well-known collective protest last March will have gone to Israel.

Among the latest emigrés is Yosif Kazakov, who was one of the first Soviet Jews to make public his demand to be allowed to leave. His son, Yasha, staged a hunger strike last March outside of the UN in an attempt to get the USSR to let his family go. Kazakov was one of four signers denounced by name in *Izvestia*.

The Soviet Jewish sources have estimated that about 200 a month left in 1969, only 100 a month went in 1970, and that only 70 have left for Israel so far this year.

Congress continues to make its voice heard in protests decrying Soviet anti-Semitism.

Since the new Congress convened last month, there have been many speeches and resolutions calling for a reversal of the Soviet anti-Jewish policy.

## IN THE SENATE

Sen. Edward W. Brooke (R-Mass.) declared that Soviet Jews bear an "intolerable burden." The refusal to permit Jewish emigration was the "most illogical of all" Soviet harassments, he said.

Sen. Claiborne Pell (D-R. I.) entered a statement of concern signed by eight Rhode Island ministers into the Congressional Record. The clergymen deplored "the accusation of 'treason' applied to Soviet Jews who wish to emigrate to Israel, their spiritual homeland."

Pell urged the Administration to bring the question of Soviet anti-Semitism before the UN Human Rights Commission, pointing out that the right to emigrate is a principle of the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights which the Soviet Union had ratified.

Sen. John G. Tower (R-Tex.) declared that Russian Jews must have the choice of living in the Soviet Union "free from prejudice" or of emigrating.

Sen. James B. Allen (D-Ala.) also called for a change in the Soviet policy of discrimination.

Sen. Clifford P. Case (R-N.J.) said continuing pressure on the Soviet Union could change its attitude. "The onus of world-wide condemnation," he added, could make the political cost "too great to bear."

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.) recommended that the Administration bring a formal request before the Council of the In-

tergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM) "to approach the Soviet government on the question of free emigration and the use of ICEM's service to facilitate the potential movement of Soviet citizens to Israel and other receiving countries."

Sen. Richard S. Schweiker (R-Pa.) termed Soviet anti-Semitism "an extension of their foreign policy—to seize control of the Middle East."

Sen. Jacob K. Javits (R-N.Y.) said that recent events "have focused sharp attention on the threat to the world's second largest Jewish community, which, if nothing is done to save them, runs the risk of becoming a modern lost tribe of Israel."

## IN THE HOUSE

In the last month, the following House members introduced resolutions and made statements on the Floor calling for an end to Soviet discriminatory practices and urging the Russian government to allow Jewish emigration:

Representatives Frank Annunzio (D-Ill.), Edward J. Derwinski (R-Ill.), William J. Green (D-Pa.), Frank Horton (R-N.Y.), James J. Howard (D-N.J.), Joseph M. McDade (R-Pa.), Thomas M. Pelly (R-Wash.), Bertram L. Podell (D-N.Y.), Melvin Price (D-Ill.), Roman C. Pucinski (D-Ill.), William F. Ryan (D-N.Y.).

## BIRTH OF A NEWSPAPER: THE ATTLEBORO SUN-CHRONICLE

## HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, two old and outstanding daily newspapers in my district, the 10th Congressional District of Massachusetts, have recently joined forces through a merger to create the Attleboro Sun-Chronicle. I want to congratulate them.

It will be of particular interest to my colleagues to know that our late and great Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., who was my predecessor in the Congress, launched his own distinguished career "as a reporter for \$10 a week" on one of these papers, the Attleboro Sun, and was later editor and then publisher and president of the other, the North Attleboro Evening Chronicle. Speaker Joe Martin, a great American and great legislator, was also a great newspaperman.

The birthday of the Sun-Chronicle was March 1. The merger of these two newspapers was almost inevitable. Like Topsy, the communities of Attleboro and North Attleboro just grew—ever closer together, the result of continuing urban development. I think the merger was logical since the citizens of the Attleboros have increasingly become part of a unified community with a multitude of common interests and a plethora of problems which can best be resolved by working together. I sometimes worry that a merger of nearby newspapers will destroy a healthy rivalry between them, but I read that this will not be the case with the Sun-Chronicle—at least on the sports pages, which will retain a separate identity. Local fans, I am pleased to note, will continue to enjoy the boisterous

battle of words preceding the annual turkey day high school football games.

We may regret the passing of the Evening Chronicle, which was 101 years old, and the Sun, which was 82 years old, but there is a rich challenge in combining the best of both in order to provide even finer service to these communities. In an editorial, Guy S. DeVany, publisher of the new Attleboro Sun-Chronicle, expressed its goal this way:

Fundamentally, our efforts will be to provide an increasingly comprehensive news coverage of the area, to editorially lead where leadership seems needed, and to extend our service over a wider radius that Attleboro and North Attleboro may be better served.

I want to offer my best wishes for success to Mr. DeVany, the distinguished publisher; Paul A. Rixon, the dynamic general manager; Clarence D. Roberts, beloved and astute editor, and to the entire staff as they embark on this exciting new venture.

I am pleased to insert in the RECORD a story from the new Attleboro Sun-Chronicle announcing the merger, which follows:

## SUN CHRONICLE COMBINATION OF DEDICATION, TRADITION

Two newspapers, each of which has served with a policy of dedication and distinction, have combined their talents and traditions in a single newspaper serving the Attleboros and surrounding towns.

With today's issue, The North Attleboro Evening Chronicle, now in its 101st year, joins the 82-year old Attleboro Sun to form the Sun Chronicle. This merger mirrors the development of the two communities whose progress have brought them together both physically and as economic entities.

Only a few decades ago, Attleboro and North Attleboro were separated by farm and forest, meadow and moor. Now as a result of industrial and residential growth, the two cities have become contiguous communities woven together by a common network of highways, commercial interests, and urban challenges.

The consolidation of their newspapers reflects these realities. A new and expanded newspaper with a circulation of 18,000 has emerged and promises to more effectively serve its readers.

A review of their histories reveals names of men and women who have contributed markedly to the progress of both cities through the newspapers which they served.

## FIRST ESTABLISHED

A man's lifetime ambition and his wife's birthplace were responsible for the establishment of the Attleborough Chronicle, the first newspaper to serve this area.

Walter Phillips, an employe of a Providence daily, had dreamed for years of owning his own newspaper. His wife, the former Francena Capron, was a native of Attleboro and through her Phillips became well acquainted with the town. With confidence in himself and the community, he moved his family to Attleboro, started canvassing the town, and succeeded in collecting \$1,900 in advance subscriptions. And while he actually started the business in 1870 the first issue of the Attleborough Chronicle, a four-page weekly went on sale Feb. 3, 1871.

To accommodate the growth of the paper, Phillips sought larger quarters. Unable to find them here, he continued his search in North Attleboro. He found them in the new Kendall Block and on January 18, 1873 the Chronicle moved into them. At the same time Phillips took on a partner, Eugene Dunbar. Shortly thereafter, Phillips sold his share

of the business to Dunbar and became general manager of the United Press (now UPI). He developed the Phillips code which all press telegraphers used for a generation.

**SOLD TO HUNT**

After Phillips departure, Dunbar also took on a partner, Abiel Coddling. In 1879 Dunbar sold out to Elliot Hunt. Four years later Edgar Perry bought Hunt's holdings and W. H. Barnes joined him. Later he bought out Coddling. At that time the paper sold for four cents a copy or \$2 a year.

During these changes in ownership, the Chronicle became a semi-weekly. Three years later, when Attleboro and North Attleboro became separate towns, the masthead was changed from the Attleborough Chronicle to the North Attleboro Evening Chronicle. Shortly thereafter, the Chronicle became a daily.

In 1902, the paper's supremacy was challenged for the first time by a competitor. A group of businessmen formed a newspaper called The Leader.

It was at this time that Joseph W. Martin Jr., who was to become Speaker of the House of Representatives, entered the newspaper field. To quote from his book, My First Fifty Years in Politics, he recounts:

"One of its (The Leader's) principal financial backers was my friend Edward Price. When he invested in the Leader, he said that I was to be given a job on the newspaper. While I was still in school, therefore, I worked on the side as a copy boy, reporter, printer's devil, and handyman. I even used to clean the presses. When the commencement exercises were over, I moved into a full-time job there.

**JOINED SUN**

"It soon became obvious, however, that the Leader could not make the grade. Shortly before it folded, I was offered a job as a reporter for ten dollars a week on the Sun in Attleboro..."

Not long after the turn of the century, Harry Hunt, father of Jarvis Hunt, purchased the Chronicle. He became its publisher and at the same time he was appointed postmaster of the town by Theodore Roosevelt.

It was during his tenure as editor that the Chronicle building on Church Street was erected.

But Hunt was having his difficulties. He had been engaged in a political struggle for leadership in the local Republican party. The faction which opposed him offered to take the paper off his hands.

The price Hunt asked was \$10,000. A group of nine businessmen, eight of them Republicans, got together and put up \$1,000 apiece.

According to Mr. Martin, "Then they came to me and asked if I would subscribe a like amount and take the job of editor of the paper under the new management. I was twenty-four years old. As it happened I had just \$1,000 which I had accumulated through a combination of New England thrift and a succession of jobs that went back almost to my sixth birthday.

"There I was, an ambitious young fellow with \$1,000 in the bank, great enthusiasm for newspaper work, and enough experience to know how to put out a small daily. I accepted the proposition, and I never made a better investment."

Eventually, Mr. Martin bought out all the other stockholders.

**FAMILY AFFAIR**

For a number of years, the Chronicle was in the hands of three Martin brothers. Joe served as publisher and president; Charles was active in the management and Albert was in charge of news coverage. With the death of Charlie in 1954, Edward joined the company for a short time.

For several years prior to Joseph Martin's death on May 6, 1968, Albert Martin assumed full management of the paper. This arrangement obtained until about a year ago when the Attleboro Sun became the owner of the Chronicle.

The first edition of the Sun appeared on September 3, 1889.

At the newspaper's inception, the management changed several times and the office had two or three locations until 1903, when Virgil Blackinton was named manager and George P. Randall, editor. In 1906, John H. Vallette, a Providence advertising man, took over the management and Charles C. Cain Jr. of Traunton, who joined the editorial staff in 1904, was named editor.

The printing plant and office was moved to the Odd Fellows Building on Bank Street, where it was destroyed by fire March 9, 1918. New quarters were soon established at the present address, 34-38 South Main Street, a building which had been vacated by the Attleboro Post Office.

By 1924 the Sun Publishing Co. was incorporated. As the newspaper grew, its job department was merged with the Perry Printing Co. and the Attleboro Print was established on Railroad Avenue, leaving room for the newspaper to expand in the South Main Street building.

The death of Publisher Vallette in 1929 was followed by the election of C. C. Cain Jr. as publisher and general manager.

Early in 1937 the Sun purchased the Norwood Messenger, a semi-weekly newspaper and converted it to a daily, the first issue of which appeared on January 29. This venture was short-lived. However, it did make possible the maintenance of the Sun's record of uninterrupted publication, when in the 1938 hurricane, Attleboro was without power. The Sun was able to print at its Norwood plant.

On October 25, 1953, the Sun's pressroom and paper storage area in the basement of the building was swept by fire. Because the press was damaged the paper was printed at the North Attleboro Chronicle and the Providence Visitor plants.

Shortly thereafter a new street-level addition was erected on the Railroad Avenue side of the Sun office. The addition contained two new presses with 32 page capacity.

In 1957, the board of directors voted to sell the newspaper to an Attleboro group.

In 1963, the building was extensively remodeled and the adjacent lots and buildings were acquired.

The ownership of the Sun changed hands in July of 1969 when it was acquired by the Attleboro Sun Publishing Corporation.

Guy S. DeVany, who had been vice president of the predecessor corporation, was appointed president and publisher of the Sun. Robert V. Olson of Attleboro and Gerald E. Riley and Donald LeStage, Jr., both of North Attleboro, are directors of the corporation which is affiliated with the Kenosha, Wisconsin, News.

In March of 1970 the Chronicle and Sentinel Corporation was acquired by the Attleboro Sun company, with Gerald E. Riley named president; Paul A. Rixon was named publisher of the Chronicle and the Franklin Sentinel.

DeVany will be publisher of the Sun Chronicle, Rixon, general manager, and Clarence D. Roberts editor.

The total complement of personnel of the combined Sun Chronicle consists of 82 full-time and 39 part-time associates. The newspaper will be delivered to area homes by 362 carriers.

The commercial printing plant managed by Raymond F. Cassels and the weekly Sentinel at Franklin will continue to be operated by the Chronicle-Sentinel Publishing Corporation, a subsidiary of the Attleboro Sun Publishing Corporation.

**DISSONANCE WITH THE ALLIES**

**HON. JOHN BUCHANAN**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article, which appeared in February in a West German publication. This article is illustrative of the controversy continuing to rage within the Federal Republic itself over Bonn's new policy toward the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, as evidenced in the Soviet and Polish treaties.

The article follows herewith:

[Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, Frankfurt, Germany, Feb. 1, 1971]

**DISSONANCE WITH THE ALLIES**

(By Guenther Gillesen)

The NATO-Ambassador of one of our more important Allies showed his German discussion partner with criticism of the Bonn Ostpolitik (policy toward the East), that it was making joint efforts to obtain concessions from the Soviet Union more difficult, that it was arousing concern about the Federal Republic's political objectives, and that it was paving the Soviet Union's way for driving America out of Europe. The most interesting of all was the warning which he expressed in closing: If the German NATO Ambassador would ask him about the attitude of his Government, officially in the NATO Council, he would maintain the contrary and say that the Government of his country was welcoming the objectives of the Bonn policy and was supporting its efforts. "But don't believe a single word of it."

The case is typical of the general changes in the atmosphere prevailing inside the Alliance. In reality, the Federal Government is actually not being supported. The approval that it has been garnering in the exchange of communiques with friendly governments has had holes in it. In many cases it is obviously governed by the desire not to come into open conflict with Bonn. The bewilderment on the part of many Allies by the changes in the European situation that have occurred and even more so, those that are still expected to occur, because of Bonn policy has increased, without being noticed by us Germans who are caught in our own political controversies at home.

Anyone having an opportunity sometime in the next few weeks to listen around, for example, in the NATO headquarters will find his head spin from the contradictory statements coming not only from the military headquarters of SHAPE, but also from the political center in Brussels. The individual arguments differ greatly and many of them are based on obvious misunderstandings. But the solidarity inside the Alliance has, at any rate, been psychologically damaged. The strongest proof of it, stronger than all the whisperings in the NATO cloakrooms, is the change in the U.S. policy concerning the stationing of American troops. All the efforts put forth by Bonn over the years to achieve a coupling of the American troop withdrawals and equally meaningful troop reductions inside the Warsaw bloc of nations and continuous warnings by Germany about the Soviet Union's military superiority have been unable to curb the trend to reduce the American presence in Europe. This trend has now been checked.

The turning point that came this winter will have to be attributed, if not exclusively, then to a certain extent, to the German policy toward the East. Is this an indication that

America is having doubts about the common sense of her major European ally? The other reason for maintaining the presence of American troops in Europe must certainly not be held back: the realization in Washington that America's forced withdrawal policy in East Asia bewildered the European Allies in their turn and that it was necessary to resist it.

There were many things that the Allies were unable to understand: Bonn's hurry, the obvious forgoing of coupling this policy in turn with Soviet equivalent considerations, the concept of a reconciliation with East Europe "as Adenauer had done toward the West," which was considered mistaken, the obvious ignoring of the Soviet interest in a lasting consolidation of the Communist position in Central Europe and in the attempt to drive the Americans out of Europe; they could not understand, finally, Bonn's self-fascination by its policy toward the East, hoping, though it is hard to understand, that a relaxation of tension could be brought about in and for Germany while elsewhere, on the shores of the Mediterranean, on the oceans, in the arms race, and even in Germany herself. In Berlin, an intensification of the Soviet struggle for power can be noted. A German policy of reconciliation with a partner who focusses politically on expansion, though not on aggression, is obviously just as difficult to bring home to the Allies today as it was to bring home to us at the time the attempts made by Macmillan, Kennedy, and de Gaulle.

Not all the contradictions in NATO headquarters should be taken at face value. The interest of the parties concerned in the cohesion of the Alliance is reflected in such (divided) opinions. Yet even if the criticism coming from the NATO center is taken with the corresponding grain of salt, enough contradiction remains that must be taken seriously. If, as it looks, the German Ostpolitik remains, wheels spinning, stuck in the sands of Soviet resistance, the damage would first be limited to the area of domestic policy. If, however, the relationship of trust in the Western Allies, which had been built up laboriously over many years and which will be in jeopardy any time for at least a generation were to experience a setback, this damage would be doubled.

For the time being, the suspicion of the Allies, aroused by the East-West see-saw policy of the Germans, remains alive. It is not entirely unfounded, if one notes the re-emergence, as music accompanying this policy toward the East, of updated political concepts of Germany's central position which belong into a no longer existing Europe, or the characterization of our interests as a bridge between East and West, and even as a mediator between two social systems. Could we carry out this too egocentric role better today than in the time of Emperor William II? Both together—the policy toward the East and the policy toward the West—conceived and attempted in similar qualities of political mobility, that is "something that the Germans cannot take. That is more than they can handle." These were the closing words of one of these skeptical observers in Brussels.

#### MRS. SUZMAN PLEADS FOR SOUTH AFRICAN POLITICAL PRISONERS

**HON. DONALD M. FRASER**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Helen Suzman is the only Progressive Party member of the South African House of

Assembly. She consistently has been a voice of reason in that body. On February 17, Mrs. Suzman made a plea in behalf of political prisoners. I think all Members will be interested in reports of that debate:

[From the Cape Times, Feb. 18, 1971]

VORSTER, MRS. SUZMAN IN "RED PALS" ROW

The Prime Minister, Mr. Vorster, clashed with Mrs. Helen Suzman, Progressive Party MP, in a long series of exchanges across the floor of the Assembly yesterday afternoon while she was pleading for the Republican Festival amnesty to be extended to political prisoners.

Mr. Vorster denied that South Africa possessed any "political prisoners" and he accused Mrs. Suzman of having communist friends.

A Nationalist backbencher, Mr. P. T. C. du Plessis (Lydenburg) called her an "agitator"—a remark he was made to withdraw—and the Nationalist MP for Vanderbijl Park, Mr. J. M. Henning, suggested that democracy might have to be reviewed "so that this type of speech in the House will not be allowed".

Mrs. Suzman said that the amnesty granted to prisoners in 1961 and 1966 had excluded all "political" prisoners, of whom there were now about 800.

"I see no reason why it should be less in the public interest to release a person serving a sentence for a political offence than to release a person who has committed some other crime," she said.

Mr. Vorster interjected: "Why use the term 'political prisoner'?"

Mrs. Suzman: That used to be the term and it was often used by the Prisons Department.

Mr. Vorster: Surely you know they are not political prisoners.

Mrs. Suzman: Well, they are convicted because of political crimes, let us put it that way. Some of them are convicted of sabotage.

Mr. Vorster: Crimes of violence.

Mrs. Suzman: Not all of them, by any means.

#### CRIMES OF VIOLENCE

Mr. Vorster: Most of them are crimes of violence, and they are all contraventions of the law.

Mrs. Suzman: Some of them have committed no violence whatsoever. Some of them are serving sentences and pretty severe sentences, as the Prime Minister certainly remembers from when he was Minister of Justice.

Mr. Vorster: It is altogether misleading to talk about political prisoners.

Mrs. Suzman: No, I am not misleading anybody. A number of them are serving long sentences for crimes such as belonging to a banned organization.

Mr. Vorster: Yes, communist organizations.

#### IN RETROSPECT

Mrs. Suzman: Yes, these organizations were banned in retrospect, incidentally. People belonged to that organization when it was still a legal organization. They were then found guilty of being in possession of pamphlets. These are not crimes of violence.

Mr. Vorster: Of communist origin. Yes, of subversive origin.

Mrs. Suzman: Coming from the Prime Minister, all I can say it is quite ironical to hear from the Prime Minister especially when one thinks of his past.

Mr. Vorster: I am prepared to compare mine with yours.

Mrs. Suzman: Oh, mine is very blameless. "AGITATOR"

Mr. Vorster: Especially your communist friends.

Mrs. Suzman: I have all sorts of friends. I even have Nationalist friends, but I chal-

lenge the Prime Minister to find me guilty of one single crime in this country. He would have the greatest possible difficulty to do that.

It was at this point that Mr. P. T. C. du Plessis interjected: "You are an agitator."

The Speaker made him withdraw the remark.

#### MRS. SUZMAN PLEADS FOR POLITICAL OFFENDERS

Mrs. Helen Suzman (Prog., Houghton) made a strong plea yesterday to the Minister of Justice, Mr. Felser, to consider granting amnesty and clemency to prisoners convicted of political offences when the granting of amnesty at the tenth anniversary celebrations of the Republic was considered.

She had asked the Minister recently if he was considering granting such amnesty and, if so, whether he would also consider granting it to political prisoners. The Minister had replied that the matter was still being investigated.

She hoped she could put forward an argument which would persuade the Minister to take a different line to that which had been taken with the establishment of the Republic in 1961 and the fifth anniversary in 1966, when all political prisoners had been refused amnesty.

She hoped that this would not be the case again.

She wished to make it quite clear that she was not asking for a general amnesty, but was merely asking that political prisoners should not be disqualified en masse.

Prisoners who had been convicted of other offences were eligible for parole whereas political prisoners were not. It seemed, as a general rule, that prisoners who were convicted of grave crimes were better off when it came to the granting of amnesty.

According to the latest figures available to her, about 800 people served sentences for political offences in September last year.

Eleven of these were White and included people such as Bram Fischer and Goldberg, who were serving life sentences, and others who were serving sentences of seven years or more.

Two of these were due to be released this year—one shortly and one later in the year. One of them had already served six years of a seven-year sentence and, in any other circumstances, he would already have been released.

#### ROBBER ISLAND

There were 400 to 500 non-White political prisoners on Robben Island.

The Prime Minister, Mr. Vorster, interjecting, asked Mrs. Suzman why she called them political prisoners. This was misleading. The people had committed crimes of violence or had belonged to communist organizations, he said.

Mrs. Suzman replied that this was ironic, coming from the Prime Minister, with his past.

Mrs. Suzman said that there were four people who were restricted by banning orders and it was her submission that they should be considered when the question of amnesty was considered.

The latest available figures showed that there were 280 people who were still banned.

The Minister of Justice, Mr. Felser: They were not banned, but were restricted.

Mrs. Suzman: All right, restricted, if you like.

She said she did not wish to argue about the terminology, but about the question of amnesty.

#### HELEN JOSEPH

Some people had subsequently come off the list while others had gone on, including the 19 who had been acquitted at the terrorist trial. These people were under various degrees of restriction—some to a small de-

gree and some to the all-encompassing house arrest.

There were at present at least 35 people under house arrest, including Mrs. Helen Joseph, for whom she wished to make a very special plea.

Mrs. Joseph was 65 and would be 67 when her period of house arrest expired.

This was a singularly ugly spectacle of a government persecuting and bullying an aged woman.

There were others who had been served with removal orders and who should also be considered for clemency.

Mr. J. M. Henning (Nat. Vandervijl Park) said Mrs. Suzman, who was supposed to be a responsible member of Parliament, was pleading for a threat to South Africa.

He was not allowed to call her speech incitement, but it came close to that.

"I wonder whether democracy must not be reviewed, so that this type of speech in the House of Assembly will not be allowed."

TWO VIEWS ON NIXON'S FOREIGN POLICY

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach herewith two articles—one by C. L. Sulzberger, foreign affairs writer for the New York Times, and an article by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, now retired but who has served as Ambassador to Vietnam and as a special consultant to the President, 1965-69. I know that many of my colleagues will be interested in reading both of these very penetrating analyses on foreign affairs. The follow:

MR. NIXON IN THE MIRROR  
(By C. L. Sulzberger)

WASHINGTON.—The most interesting thing about President Nixon is that he regards himself as a genuine but practical pacifist who is slowly building a world which may never see another war. He attributes this urge to his maternal Quaker but he views his approach as necessarily pragmatic, cautious and based upon wide international experience.

For him there are two quintessential problems: how peace can be achieved and how it can be preserved. But he insists it isn't enough just to be for peace; one must also do something about it. In his own effort to "do something" he considers himself hampered by oppositional extremes he labels as superdoves and superhawks.

He is in fact just as much of a One World advocate as was Wendell Willkie or, one might add, Lyndon Johnson. Furthermore he obviously considers it ridiculous to think that the United States can escape its inherited responsibilities.

Therefore he opposes both the rightwing and left-wing advocates of what he sees as neo-isolationism. He doesn't think a fortress America (for him, the aim of the superhawks) could exist as a reality. And he doesn't think a benevolent, weak America, relying not on its ultimate defense abilities but on the goodwill of others, could endure.

He insists not only that he intends to end the Vietnam war but that he is already engaged in doing just that. For him, he says sadly, the hardest task is awarding posthumously medals of honor. He professes the highest possible regard for peace—not just for today but for tomorrow and the indefinite

future. But, he underscores, this is an immensely difficult process and virtually all corners of the world are in one or another way involved.

Another interesting aspect of the President when he talks in relaxed fashion is his evident populist feeling. He cherishes deep mistrust for the Establishment, comparable, perhaps, to his predecessor's mistrust for "East Coast liberals."

Although Nixon is obviously sad to find among his bitterest political enemies today some of those who were in the forefront of American internationalism after World War II, he trusts the judgment of the common man. He feels the instinctual beliefs of the people at large will sustain him in applying a program often savagely attacked by Establishment leaders.

It is quite fascinating to observe his introspective efforts to link the cautious pragmatism of his fairly tough current approach with memories of his boyhood. Somewhat sadly he says: "The kind of relative peace I envision is not the dream of my Quaker youth. But it is realistic."

As he describes it the big question he faces is: "Will our Establishment and our people meet their responsibilities?" He insists he will meet his own: not only terminating the Indochina war in such a way that South Vietnam has a realistic chance of surviving; but maintaining a sufficient military posture to keep the world in balance while negotiations gradually wind down tensions.

Everyone knows the President is an expert politician. Nevertheless, he takes pains to stress that the fundamental program he now pursues is not dictated by political reasons but by the long-range national interest.

Nevertheless, he clearly relishes the thought that some of those now vying for next year's Democratic nomination indicate they will make Vietnam a major issue. For Nixon it is folly to develop an issue for the voters which is going to be a non-issue by the time they vote—and it is his full intention that this shall be the case.

Thus it is obvious from conversations such as the writer has had more than once with the President that when he looks in the mirror he sees a different Nixon from the image so often hammered by political opponents, editorial writers and cartoonists. For them he is a right-wing war-monger, a brinksman par excellence who ignores pressing social problems of a schizophrenic and tormented nation.

But the Nixon seen by the President himself is a pragmatic Quaker who not only wants peace but is patient enough to do something about it in a realistic way, even if it takes a long time during which he has to experience the "vicious crossfire" of those who disagree with his policies.

LET'S UNITE ON VIETNAMIZATION: CAMBODIA AND LAOS INCURSIONS CAN ADVANCE AMERICAN WITHDRAWAL

(By Maxwell D. Taylor)

WASHINGTON.—Notwithstanding our past divisions over Vietnam policy, is it not possible for us to rally behind the President's Vietnamization program long enough to give it a fair trial?

It is hard to oppose the objective of Vietnamization: an expeditious disengagement of American forces on honorable terms, without the sacrifice of important American interests. It is difficult to challenge its feasibility which derives from two important developments.

First, the constantly improving battlefield performance of the South Vietnamese attests to the success of the prolonged American effort—dating back to the Eisenhower Administration—to build up indigenous forces to the point that they would be able to take over full responsibility for the defense of their country. At the same time, while South Vietnam's strength is increasing, the heavy

battle losses suffered by the Communists from 1968 to the present have drastically reduced their combat capabilities.

These favorable developments justify considerable confidence in the ultimate success of Vietnamization, which has the added advantage of containing elements of appeal for most shades of American opinion.

Since our involvement in Vietnam, there have been only three strategic alternatives from which to choose—to advance, to retreat, or to stand fast—although variants may be formed from elements of all three. Unfortunately, since 1967 it has been impossible to rally public opinion behind any one of these alternatives. To advance offends the doves, to retreat offends the hawks, and to stand fast exasperates the impatient who constitute the national majority.

For the doves, Vietnamization promises an immediate reduction in American combat participation and battle casualties. The hawks cannot view it as a dishonorable retreat for Vietnamization is essentially a changing of the guard which, if conducted prudently, need cause no loss of combat effectiveness. For the impatient, it offers a way to circumvent the stalemated negotiations in Paris and proceed toward a termination of American combat participation despite Hanoi's obstructionism.

The cross-border operations into Cambodia and Laos have created opposition to Vietnamization among those who see these operations as regrettable expansions of the war. Actually, the incursions and Vietnamization are related only by the fact that the former facilitates the latter, and both are made possible by the improved military situation noted earlier—the growing military strength of South Vietnam and the declining strength of the enemy. It is possible to oppose the Cambodian and Laos incursions—I do not—and still to unite behind Vietnamization.

Vietnamization is not without its disadvantages and uncertainties. It is too slow for some and operates on no fixed schedule. It does not promise in itself a complete withdrawal of all Americans or a complete termination of American military or economic aid. Indeed, there is a strong intimation that both will continue for some time. Nor does Vietnamization provide answers to such troubling questions as the fate of Cambodia and Laos and the safe return of American prisoners of war.

Despite these imperfections, the many advantages of Vietnamization warrant it a serious trial. It is sure to produce results quicker than would negotiations even if Hanoi were to change course and demonstrate a sincere desire for substantive talks. But even with goodwill on both sides, it would take months, possibly years, to reach agreement on such complex issues as a cease-fire which offers no advantage to either side; the withdrawal of North Vietnamese forces from the South; a guarantee of political rights for those Vietcong who accept amnesty; and the disposition of prisoners held by both sides.

For those in a hurry to get out of the war, I would recommend support of Vietnamization as the shortest and fastest way to disengagement.

The uncertainties about Cambodia, Laos and our prisoners of war are with us regardless of what course we elect to pursue. Under any circumstances, Hanoi will try to use our prisoners to extract some kind of ransom. To be prepared for such tactics we need a posture of increased strength derived from South Vietnamese military superiority over the North and a strong U.S. strategic reserve outside Vietnam ready for contingencies.

The successful implementation of the Vietnamization program contributes to this posture and, at the same time, presents Hanoi with the prospect of having to work out the final settlement primarily with their uncompromising enemies in Saigon.

## COMPUTERS AND PRIVACY

## HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the course of the recent hearings before the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary concerning Government invasion of privacy through collection of personal data, a most informative statement was presented by Dr. Jerry M. Rosenberg on the role of computers in the decline of individual privacy. Dr. Rosenberg is a resident of the 23d Congressional District of New York, which I represent, and is a practicing psychotherapist and management consultant.

Dr. Rosenberg's paper emphasizes the difficulties in developing surveillance-proof computer systems and urges creation of an Institute for the Responsible Use of Technology to help instill greater responsibility in this field. I am sure many Members and readers of the RECORD will find Dr. Rosenberg's views provocative and stimulating. The text of his testimony before Senator SAM ERVIN's subcommittee follows:

COMPUTERS AND MAN'S PSYCHOLOGICAL  
SUBMISSION AND LOSS OF PRIVACY

(By Jerry M. Rosenberg, Ph. D.)

Mr. Chairman, thank you for inviting me to submit my thoughts on the matters of your current concern, the question of protecting personal privacy from being reduced under the influence of computerization.

I would like to say that my particular emphasis, supported by my psychological training and research efforts, has been the impact on the individual of pressure generated by advancing technology. My recent book "The Death of Privacy—Do Government and Industrial Computers Threaten Our Personal Freedom?" was specifically concerned with the erosion of individual privacy, both from direct application of computer designs as well as from a more subtle loss of psychological independence, often unknown to the person affected.

At present, computers in and out of government have an almost limitless capability to store, intermingle and, at the push of a button, retrieve information on persons, organizations and a variety of their activities, all without the knowledge of those involved. Even now, stacks of punched cards and tapes store statistics about us that we may not know exist. We might never escape in time or distance the bureaucratic machinery keeping tabs on us.

With present technical capability, it is possible to develop a composite picture of an individual that can be stored in a single information warehouse. Each year we offer information about ourselves which becomes part of the record. It is often scattered across the continent and is usually inaccessible except after considerable effort. It begins with our birth certificate and is followed by a series of medical notations. Early in life we are documented as an added income tax deduction by our parents. Then there is information on what high school, public or private, and what college, public or private, we attended. At school, records are made of our abilities, grades, tests of intelligence and attendance. For some, there will be car registration and driver's license, draft status, military service or Peace Corps. Then job history is recorded—working papers, Social

Security number, a first job, our performance with each employer, recommendations, and references—all this makes an interesting dossier. Then, perhaps, a marriage license, a home mortgage, and when children come, the cycle begins anew. Should we divorce, the court records will be added. These would increase should we be arrested, convicted or serve time in prison. And of course, when we die, a last footnote is made.

In our daily activities we leave behind a trail of records: the credit card carbon for a luncheon meeting, the receipt from the hotel where we spent last night, our airline ticket, the check we cashed in a city bank, and the bill for the toys we charged for our children.

There are also government dossiers including tax returns over a number of years, responses to census questionnaires, Social Security records, passport files, and perhaps, our fingerprints and military intelligence reports. If we have worked for a defense contractor or for the federal government, there are lengthy files on us that may note our associations and affiliations.

Information is power. These records may at various times be of considerable interest to people outside a specific government agency. Years after our birth, for example, an interested party may be happy to pay for information from our birth certificate which is officially confidential. And in a number of cities there are entrepreneurs who obtain and sell this information as well as hospital records, police records, immigration records, and so on.

Confronted with the erosion of his privacy, the individual American has until now had the consolation that all these files have been widely dispersed and often difficult to put together. It has been a time-consuming, expensive proposition to compile a sizable file on any individual. Giant computers with their capacity for instant recall of a great variety of available information are changing all this.

The evolution of computerized complexes without effective public participation and protest can have a serious impact on our democratic process. Under our present system, individuals are expected to make fundamental choices where the future welfare is at stake, as would be the case in an election. By alienating the people from the decision-making process, control of the computer technology is left in the exclusive hands of those in possession of organizational power.

The public itself should question the drift of these technologies. We should want to make certain that human dignity, psychological well being and civil liberties remain intact. We should demand to know the precise nature of the information that will be stored and who will have access to it. The public has the right to know who will have the power to control the computers and most importantly, how confidentiality and individual privacy can and will be protected.

Liberty is never gained once and for all. It is forever in conflict with civilization—a conflict which has no clear-cut solution but which reappears in cycles, usually in different forms. Each succeeding generation must win it anew. Each must defend it against ensuing dangers. This is necessary because we are constantly changing our life environment; society may be altered so frequently that safeguards that in the past adequately protected our liberties become obsolete.

Science and technology are of immense benefit to society. And I for one, am a champion of the computer. These advances are so important to us that we would not want under most circumstances to impede their movement in advancing our knowledge of the world. But they may also expose us to potential danger—to a pollution that could curtail our anonymity, solitude and privacy. Unless certain practices in the technological exploitation of scientific knowledge are restrained,

they will cost us more than we should be willing to sacrifice.

And we must constantly evaluate these technologies which are tools developed to increase man's power to understand his world. The mere fact that an innovation presents itself does not mean that we should surrender years of experience and values to its authority. Let it be difficult to bring social pressure to bear against the control of potentially dangerous technologies. One reason is that those who have the use of the technology are influential enough to prevent societal, or for that matter, legal restraints.

Today's college generation, in particular, is challenging the apparent complacency and indifference of its senior leadership. That privacy will forever remain because it is implied in the Constitution and Bill of Rights is not credible to the new adult population. With growing hostility toward the dominating technology and the establishment, a segment of this group fear that the documentation of their so-called acts of rebellion will only show that the freedoms once assumed have been surrendered. Should our older citizens in power fail to come to grips with the issue of preservation of privacy, it can be expected that the last struggle will be made by those who question how their present behavior, if documented, could be used against them at some future time.

The computer cannot be blamed for the loss of privacy. It is but an instrument created by man. Computers and other advanced machine systems are not permitted to be in error, but man is not a machine and does not have to be as efficient as the tools he has created to serve him. If man loses his right to be wrong, will he react by withdrawing from society? Will his curiosity to experiment with life falter? If this happens, man truly becomes nothing more than a machine.

Of course, not all computerized systems contain potentially damaging information. Some operations merely act as accounting systems and high-speed calculators, while others at more sophisticated levels are depositories for internal decision-making; some store research information from diverse sources; and some are documentors for the purpose of assimilation and distribution of pertinent data to a large community.

Not all computerized complexes contain the "sensitive" or potentially "threatening" information that might be found in a computerized system designed to collect personal data. But the possibility of incorporating such information does exist. Even the rather elementary, antiquated computer has the potential for being an information storage center. It doesn't matter whether it is formally called a "bank" or a "single unit processor"—any capacity to collect, store and retrieve data instantaneously upon request may, if misused, infringe on personal privacy.

There is little doubt that as computerized systems spread throughout the nation and world, surveillance by data processing is bound to increase. If the trend continues, it will soon be possible to have personal information about an individual gathered on a continuous basis and held indefinitely until requested. The snowballing effect is quite pronounced here. When the decision is made to purchase a computer, more data are gathered about the employees, customers or taxpayers who are of interest to an organization. Although this may provide for better services, improved decision-making and policy-programming, it also provides personal information about individuals never known before the advent of computers.

## ALONG THE ROAD TO PSYCHOLOGICAL SUBMISSION

Today man lives in an atmosphere dominated by the machine. He brushes his teeth with an electric toothbrush; prepares his meals with mechanical toasters; ovens and broilers; works in an atmosphere of motors,

switches, fans, typewriters; goes to and from home by car, bus and train, reduces the chores of home life with sewing machines, washing machines and drying machines. In the past only the craftsman used the tool. Today all of us take machinery for granted. As long as machines served us and did not threaten our rights as persons, we welcomed technology.

The charm of the horse-drawn buggy yields to the modern automobile; the candlestick maker is not needed in this day of electric power; the complexities of the abacus are incorporated into the computer's memory unit. Often we are glad to say goodbye to what we leave behind because many innovations free man from monotony, physical effort and waste of energy.

Computers are part of this advance, aiding us in ways that are valuable for our everyday living and essential for progress on all levels. Much of what has been achieved in medical research and outer-space exploration would have been impossible without the wide range of sophisticated computers.

Unfortunately, sacrifices frequently accompany these changes. With all the splendid wonders of the computer we find ourselves asking: has man become submissive to the computers of today? Can each individual profess to be more human in his actions than the complex system he has developed to assist in daily endeavors? Will there be a growing tendency to create a world where we treat each other as machines? Are we building more barriers which prevent the individual from having the opportunity to evolve his own unique potential—to be self-realized?

Man submits more and more as his ability to make choices about and control his future is gradually taken away from him. He is willing to have the machine make numerous decisions for him about his future; he is willing to permit the machine to build towers of brick and metal, hoping that it will not fall him when he has to live or work in them; he is willing to have the machine process his life's facts, hoping that it will be accurate and objective.

It seems that we are not aware of what is happening to us—that we are losing a little each day to the machines. We are usually too busy to think about matters which seem on the surface not to be so "important" as whether our cars are safe, or the price of bacon or the way taxes are skyrocketing.

From the psychologist's point of view, there is an observable area of change in a computerized atmosphere. The fact that information can be processed in fractions of seconds with tremendous accuracy forces the rethinking and redesigning of the use of people. With greater integration, control is further centralized and the autonomy of groups reduced.

A study, that I directed in the spring of 1967 while on the faculty at Columbia University, on the question of computers and people's concern over loss of their privacy, found that the public is troubled over how much of their lives—their thoughts, emotions and personal facts—they are encouraged to share with others.

What is most disturbing to the American population is the undemocratic process which starts at birth to make people believe that they are unable to say "no" to divulging personal information, thus perpetuating a collection of data that will follow them for the remainder of their lives—"frozen in time and the computer."

People want to determine for themselves in every particular situation of life just how much of their complex beliefs, attitudes and actions they choose to disclose. To the American, this data is more than just statistics. It is the data of judgment, a possible last judgment that can affect their schooling, employment possibilities, promotion, or role in the community. The citizens of this country

want to have the right to a personal diary that is away and free from the organization's outstretched hands. They plead the case that if all their actions were documented, including their mistakes, it would be difficult to close a page of one's life and start anew. It would be a tyranny over mine and destiny.

To maintain their dignity and fill their needs for psychic distance, people construct mental walls around themselves. To be a total psychic being, with stability and confidence, forces people to reject being intruded upon without permission. Psychologically, privacy demands a delineation of the self, the acceptance that each of us are unique and separate from all others. It recognizes an empathy toward the finer qualities within man. It demands the perpetuation of a private psychic domain, displaying a defensive shield against psychological penetration, unless authorized.

There is a growing antagonism against people desiring power, who will through mental coercion try to intrude upon our concealed thoughts. Unfortunately, we have learned that the man who wishes to gain control will employ various techniques to influence and force individuals and groups into submission.

People have a right to remain unique and different. But there are many, and indeed the number is growing, who intentionally or by title of their office, are against the solitary man. They may envy his uniqueness. They want to keep a close watch on his behavior so as to anticipate future moves, often defended in the name of science or national priority. They too often regard his privacy as a denial of their own mechanized psychology which has a stereotyped and oversimplified answer for everything.

Raymond Katzell, Chairman of the Psychology Department at New York University, has spoken about protecting privacy. Confining men in close quarters physically and socially, as in submarines, he points out would make them particularly prone to peevishness and mutual hostility. Employing the phrases "getting away" and "letting go," Katzell suggests that vacationers are really seeking to avoid the pervasive inspection by society. "In short, there is reason to believe that a modicum of privacy is a necessary condition to mental and emotional well-being. Conceivably, a society which fails sufficiently to preserve the individual's privacy may become characterized by undesirable behavior patterns such as irritability, mistrust and hostility." Campus disorders, including the bombing of computer centers, may be related to this growing phenomenon.

#### COMPUTER AND PRIVACY PROTECTION

A major problem in protecting our privacy is that too often we believe in the principle that the ends justify the means. When we consider that the goal is the greater good of our people, we cannot understand why a specific intrusion should be prohibited. The result: gradual erosion of the value we place on individual privacy. Sometimes we are confused and become easily convinced that a particular device that may lead to personal intrusion is warranted on other grounds, such as purposes of security. This is an inadequate argument I believe.

I will not attempt to explore with you many of the legal and Constitutional questions raised by the issue of computers and privacy. My book "The Death of Privacy," documents these areas quite thoroughly.

As computer networks spread throughout the country and world, science and privacy must be able to thrive together. We will be collecting thousands of facts about everyone, depositing these details into the unforgetting computers of the future. To date there are no adequate legal protections to safeguard the individual against computer leakage. Furthermore, laws alone will not offer satisfactory protection in the face of widespread

use of these systems. Although laws can impose penalties for violation and can set the limits of proper safeguards, legislative actions have not always been effective in the control of surveillance activities like wiretapping and eavesdropping.

There is reason to hesitate before passing new legislation that might in fact backfire. Laws that give special agencies or departments the responsibility of investigating those who break the law would be introducing yet other bodies that decide who can know what, thus putting a new decision-power in the hands of a few.

We have to make sure that information given to a specific organization will not be shared in such a way that the person's identity will be discovered. It is necessary to specify those who may use certain technological devices. Neither the principal of a school nor a personnel director should be allowed to enter at will the dossier on a potential or present student or employee. The question of duration of surveillance is most important. In addition, we need to determine what kinds of electronic devices are appropriate and permissible.

What is a major concern of Senator Ervin—we must define the penalties that would be imposed on those who disclose information improperly or without authorization, and we must regulate the use of information for purposes other than those for which it was originally obtained.

We must also bear in mind that we are dealing with a super-technology that will become increasingly complex and difficult to evaluate. It is safe to assume that probably the only persons who will understand the complexities and operations of these systems will be the computer designers and systems engineers who are directly responsible for the evolution of the industry.

Safeguards can be inserted into a system already in use, but it would be more efficient and less costly to build them in at the time the computer is designed. The burden of a great deal of the responsibility must lie with the computer manufacturers. If they want to avoid external regulations, they will have to start thinking about how to design systems with built-in safeguards.

To date, the best attempt to identify the relationships between computer surveillance and invasion of privacy has been outlined by Petersen and Turn of the Rand Corporation. They visualize two types of disclosures of information—accidental disclosures resulting from failure of the computer, and deliberate disclosures from infiltration of the system. They suggest countermeasures to prevent surveillance of data within a computerized system.

Unfortunately, essential safeguards are not as easily attained as is suggested by some of these outspoken specialists. It is one thing to design countermeasures as they apply to the "general" concept of computer leakage; it is quite another matter to build in protections for a specific computerized system.

For example, few can find fault with Petersen and Turn's countermeasures but they are merely a theoretical framework for the complex changes that are needed. These countermeasures offer little assistance to those attempting to design a surveillance-proof computerized system in the medical field, in an educational community, for a corporation or for a government repository. Examples of a specific computer utilization within a defined framework are necessary. The rules that apply for one computer installation might be inadequate for another or might fail to respond to the more crucial or pressing needs.

Prior to the formal establishment of critical data complexes, an appropriate structure could be developed in the form of a superagency composed of representatives from government, law, the social and behavioral

sciences, public interest, computer sciences, corporations and the computer's users. At the outset, they should review any of the proposed computer legislation and, after considerable study and approval, submit their recommendations to the proper authority. Before a government data center is approved, everyone should be satisfied that only summary tabulations of data will be included, in which individual's names are protected against leakage, and that appropriate safeguards exist. Should a computerized repository be established, this group would remain responsible for the physical operation of the center; the procedures for selecting those who will survey the computers; the decision on what data can be stored and retrieved; the control of validity; and the perennial watch for data leakage.

As an alternative to a new government agency to supervise the expansion of computerized data systems, I advocate the establishment of a non-profit, private organization that might be referred to as the Institute for the Responsible Use of Technology. Among its activities, the Institute would:

Conduct research studies to determine how man's rights are being submitted by technological advances and computers;

Present to the public major issues and findings of studies conducted;

Act as a channel of communications between the public and appropriate organizations where individual rights and the needs of society might be violated;

Publish reports on pertinent issues affecting citizens;

Identify and publicize the means for protecting the human dignity of man as he interacts with technological changes and computers; and

Act as an "early warning system" of potential technological "dangers" to the well-being of man.

There are certain general rules of conduct pertaining to all computerized data centers that should be followed in order to increase confidentiality and reduce information leakage:

1. Let people know what their records contain, how they are used and protected, and who has access to them.

2. Employ a verification process to insure accuracy of data; in addition, permit the individual to review the data for accuracy, completeness, current application, and freedom from bias.

3. Categorize all stored information as intimate, private and therefore non-circulating (such as physical, psychiatric and credit information); pertinent, but confidential and having limited distribution; or public, and therefore, freely distributed.

4. Regard personal data as personal property, requiring permission for its use, and punishment for its improper use.

5. Appointing an ombudsman agency—or a committee that represents all levels of the organization—to take major responsibility for hearing and responding to complaints, and to determine appropriate measures to minimize leakage.

6. Record each request for access that is made, along with the authorization.

7. Make security checks on computer personnel.

8. Assess, from time to time, people's attitudes toward and anxieties about the issue of invasion of privacy. Such studies could be useful in determining what form of records would be most acceptable.

9. Periodically review and update the adequacy of the physical safeguards. Employ capable outside consultants to attest to the safety of the systems used, and to assist in the development of appropriate technical devices (such as scrambled data and code names), and

10. Allow psychological seclusion and withdrawal from accountability to remain as a

permanent stronghold of our value system. The individual must freely choose whether or not he wishes to become submissive to the power of the computer.

A creative response by the computer industry to its technology will probably serve, and satisfy, the public better than rewriting our laws. In fact, one can doubt that legal measures—although necessary—will be as effective as technological adjustments in the protection of the public's privacy.

What is needed before the establishment of large government computerized centers is a rigorous research effort to answer the following unresolved questions:

1. What are the purposes of a computerized central facility? What kinds of information are strictly relevant to these purposes?

2. How much information about an individual is required to guarantee that such services are useful to the person, community and nation? How accurate, objective and challengeable is the information?

3. What are the procedures for inter-agency cooperation in the system?

4. How will individuals be protected from the creation and distribution of derogatory data caused by clerical mistakes or computer malfunction?

5. Will procedures be developed to permit individuals to see their files?

6. Will the cost of such a facility be justified in terms of future savings?

7. Will there be adequate safeguards to prevent penetration from the outside?

8. In whose backyard should computerized centers be physically established?

9. Will a computerized center officially created as a statistical system eventually become a storehouse of personal information?, and

10. Does the concept of computerized data centers suggest a changing value system and further government intervention in the lives of Americans?

The burden of proof of the security of the data facility should lie primarily with those who propose it. They must demonstrate that they can create a virtually unpenetrable and incorruptible system and justify its greater economy and expanding service.

The dialogue has just begun. The right to preserve privacy is a right worth fighting for. Computerized systems offer great potential for increased efficiency; yet they also present the gravest threat of invasion of our innermost thoughts and actions. As we charge, or are billed for, more and more of the services and goods we buy, all these transactions of our personal movement and financial status will glut the records of our lives and offer a very up-to-date picture of how we conduct ourselves in private. Some see this trend as leading to an Orwellian nightmare with Big Brother watching over us and reporting to the central record-control authorities any behavior adjudged out-of-line with stated policy.

We are slowly drifting into a world of nakedness. Each year an increasing number of technological devices invade the world that once we considered private and personal. In spite of this, we are still confident that our lives, activities, ideas, thoughts, and sensations are shared with no one unless we so chose. Will this confidence be perpetuated?

Traditionally this cherished belief has been based on an expectation that governments would set the pattern that the rest of the nation would follow. In fact, within the decade, unless governments intervene, there will be few questions left to ask about privacy; we will have taken for granted a society in which everything about us may be revealed. It will be difficult to protest unguarded data surveillance if governments fail to set themselves up as a safety model against information leakage.

The snowballing effect of computers is very real indeed. The more you know, the more you want to know and the better your

methods will become to get and integrate this information. In the end, will there be any place to hide?

Computers may continue to prove themselves the worthy servant of man. But the servant must yield to his master, and the necessary thought must be given to developing essential safeguards. The computer manufacturers have thus far shirked their responsibility, but they cannot long remain bystanders if they wish to continue to make their own decisions. Both the manufacturers and then the consumer must seek ways to control the all-documenting, all-remembering computer systems and demonstrate that machine technology need not necessarily bear the stamp of increased surveillance.

The ultimate submission must be of the machine to man. If we fail to act immediately to preserve our claims to anonymity, psychological independence and seclusion we may develop a permanent fear—a fear to enjoy the fuller opportunities of life. We will hesitate before experimenting with the challenges of the world. We could become carbon copies of one another—conforming, dull and psychologically equivalent to the computer—heartless and non-emotional.

#### PROTECT AREAS FOR NONSMOKING PASSENGERS ON COMMERCIAL TRANSPORTATION

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, our colleague, the Honorable C. W. BILL YOUNG of Florida, introduced a bill (H.R. 4776) aimed at requiring airlines, trains, and buses to set aside a protected area for nonsmoking passengers.

From across the Nation, the reaction has been overwhelming. Letters, cards, and telegrams—even telephone calls—have poured into Congressman YOUNG's office in support of this legislation.

The bill places no burden on the smoker, but does provide relief for the nonsmoker who is distressed or made ill from having to breathe smoke from someone else's cigarette.

Many Americans feel strongly that their rights are being violated. The majority of our citizens, in fact, do not smoke.

I join Congressman YOUNG in his concern that nonsmokers should not be forced to endure the distress and health hazards resulting from a buildup of smoke in the confines of public carriers under Federal regulation.

No one should be forced to smoke—even indirectly. No one is entitled to pollute the air we breathe in confined spaces.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join in passing this needed legislation promptly.

A sample of the editorial support Congressman YOUNG's measure has gained, follows:

[From the St. Petersburg Times, Feb. 27, 1971]

AIR FOR NON-SMOKERS, TOO

Smokers are polluters.

Their cigarette and cigar puffs may not seriously befoul the atmosphere, but they often make the immediate environment un-

comfortable for the non-smoking public, especially travelers.

U.S. Rep. C. W. Bill Young thinks relief is needed. He proposed a law to require airlines, railroads and bus companies to provide protected areas for non-smoker passengers.

The St. Petersburg Republican rightly wants to protect "the person who prefers not to be exposed to exhaled smoke and smoke from the burning end of a fellow passenger's cigarette."

Since transportation companies of all kinds have been aware of such irritations for years and have done nothing to solve the problem, indeed retreated from smokers' sections in railroad cars, Congress should pass Young's bill immediately.

No one should have to bear smoky plane cabins, train coaches or buses any longer.

[From the Sarasota Herald-Tribune, Feb. 23, 1971]

BREATHING RIGHTS

It takes more than a single choked and offended congressman to make it law, but it takes only one to introduce a bill to prohibit the pollution of the air on public conveyances by smoking passengers.

And the one necessary congressman has just stood up.

He is U.S. Representative C. W. Bill Young of St. Petersburg, and after getting off an airliner the other day coughing, wheezing and with tears in his eyes, he declared that it is time for the Congress to come to the aid of the non-smoking traveler.

So this week he is introducing a bill requiring airlines, railroads and bus lines to establish areas where passengers will not be forced to breathe used tobacco smoke.

"My bill," says the freshman Republican from Florida, "places no burden on the smoker, but it does provide relief for the person who prefers not to be exposed. . . . The non-smoker is entitled to relief and protection."

The assumption, of course, is that there will be enough customers with a strong desire to smoke to make it worth extra expense to the carriers to provide separately ventilated smoking areas. If not, then the law Young proposes would restrain the carriers from letting the tobacco-addicted impose on others.

The proposal does not go as far as the U.S. Surgeon-General would. Dr. Jesse L. Steinfield wants to outlaw smoking in all confined public places, including theaters and restaurants—except, presumably, when separate smoking areas would be provided where their exhaled smoke would not disturb or offend non-participating patrons.

But the law Young proposes would be a bold step in that direction.

It will be argued, of course, that non-smokers don't have to attend entertainments. Of course they don't. And smokers don't have to smoke either—certainly not where it offends and disturbs others. That's basic.

We are reminded of a recent call from a reader who had been hospitalized with a respiratory ailment and assigned to a room with a constant smoker. On complaining about the smoking to a hospital official, the patient was advised to consider the "rights" of the smoker! What twisted logic!

Putting first things first, we all have a right to breathe. But those who insist on breathing tobacco fumes don't have a right to do so where it forces others to breathe the fumes too. It makes many people ill.

To some people it is as painful as a kick in the stomach or a punch in the nose. Nobody has a right to treat others in that fashion for the sake of indulging in a habit—and an unhealthy one at that.

Congressman Young doesn't smoke. As a practicing politician, however, it must be

evident that he has endured and survived long hours in smoke-filled places. But it got to him on the flight from Florida to Washington when bad weather forced the plane to circle and nervous fellow passengers puffed the air blue until the congressman began to feel himself getting actively sick.

He calls the experience "extremely distressing." His most welcome legislative proposal would save others from the same acute discomfort.

We hope it can be enacted into law.

SURVEY OF SIXTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, I undertook a survey in my congressional district for the purpose of determining the feelings of my constituents on the major issues facing us today.

I feel that it is my duty as the elected representative of these people to bring these results to the attention of this body. With this in mind, I should like to record these findings.

I believe one will find, in looking at this survey, that a constant factor in the opinions of these citizens is that they wish our Government to deal with the problems facing us in a positive, effective manner. This is plain to see in examining the solutions which they feel will be effective against today's problems. Following is a compilation of some of the propositions posed to my constituents in the Sixth Congressional District of New York, together with an indication of how many favored or did not favor the proposition.

FAVOR

[In percent]

Increased health, drug control, pollution funds .....	79
Strengthening controls over exaggerated TV ads.....	89
Fighting crime by reforming the courts and speeding up trials.....	93
Tougher penalties for polluters.....	90
Imposition of sanctions on all countries that aid airplane hijackers.....	89
Requiring of exhaust-control devices on all cars.....	87
Putting detector devices in all airports to stop hijackers.....	84
Licensing of auto mechanics.....	84
Abolishing electoral college and electing President by direct vote.....	74
Hiring more police, training and paying them more.....	73

DO NOT FAVOR

Escalating our military actions in Vietnam .....	69
Legalizing marijuana.....	66
Continuing present welfare system with no change.....	76

I think that the importance of this information lies in the fact that 10,000 of 150,000 questionnaires were returned. This response is much greater than anticipated and higher than that of a typical professional poll. I feel that it is possible, through this means, to acquire the feelings of a significant segment of my district. With this guide for my ac-

tions, I believe I can be a more effective legislator and represent the interests and concerns of the people. So that my colleagues may compare these results with their own constituents, let me give a description of the more than 10,000 respondents:

As indicated by the computer, more men, 52 percent, responded than women, 48 percent; more Democrats, 36 percent, than Republicans, 31 percent; more conservatives responded, 13 percent than liberals, 7 percent. In addition more college graduates responded, 57 percent, than did high school graduates, 39 percent. Although the age levels of the respondents were somewhat evenly divided, 60 percent were over 40 years of age. Although no fine lines can be drawn with regard to political affiliations and age, it can be seen that the concern for the community and the Nation cuts across the differences inherent in any community and peoples.

I think it pertinent to keep in mind that the questions enumerated thus far were merely highlights in the questionnaire which circulated. When pressed upon budget spending, 55 percent of those polled felt that defense spending should be cut, while 52 percent felt that the present welfare program of categorical assistance should be cut back. An increase in spending for housing programs, 56 percent, as well as an increase in law enforcement funds, 61 percent, and funds for education and manpower spending, 55 percent, met with approval of the majority of those responding. As regarding the situation in the Middle East, half of those answering the questionnaire felt that neutrality should be maintained and more than half, 59 percent, advocated withdrawing immediately and unilaterally from Vietnam.

Periodically, it has been my practice to poll constituents to get their feelings about the major issues of the day and about pending legislative matters. This is what democracy is all about. I shall regard these results as an invaluable guide for forthcoming legislation, and in closing would urge my colleagues to undertake similar polls so that the benefits which may be reaped from them be not confined to any small segment in our society.

There are more issues and more responses to my questionnaire, but I do not wish to take your time in repeating all of them. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall simply include them in the RECORD following these comments:

Responses to questionnaire

OTHER QUESTIONS

[In percent]

Reduction of penalties for use of marijuana to a misdemeanor:	
Yes .....	48
No .....	45
Maintain present penalty—a felony like heroin:	
Yes .....	40
No .....	47
Keeping the present lottery system:	
Yes .....	44
No .....	32

*Responses to questionnaire—Continued*

Adopt administration proposal for an all-voluntary army:	
Yes .....	47
No .....	30
Establish a national service alternative, like VISTA:	
Yes .....	35
No .....	30
Undecided .....	25
Authorize police to enter without knocking:	
Yes .....	40
No .....	46
Enact tighter money policies:	
Yes .....	44
No .....	31
Undecided .....	16
Stop development of supersonic transports:	
Yes .....	42
No .....	41
Undecided .....	13
Male .....	52
Female .....	47
Republican .....	31
Democrat .....	36
Liberal .....	7
Conservative .....	13
RESIDENCE	
Self-owned .....	47
Rental .....	45
Cooperative .....	5
EDUCATION	
High school .....	39
College .....	37
Graduate school .....	20
AGE	
15 to 19 .....	2
20 to 29 .....	20
30 to 39 .....	15
40 to 49 .....	22
50 to 59 .....	22
60 and up .....	16
BUDGET EXPENDITURES	
Defense:	
Increase .....	13
Decrease .....	55
Remain the same .....	29
Income security/public assistance:	
Increase .....	22
Decrease .....	42
Remain the same .....	32
Education/manpower training:	
Increase .....	55
Decrease .....	15
Remain the same .....	27
Space:	
Increase .....	15
Decrease .....	37
Remain the same .....	45
General government/law enforcement:	
Increase .....	61
Decrease .....	4
Remain the same .....	32
FAVOR	
[In percent]	
Provide jets and other arms to Israel .....	60
Grant economic assistance to Israel .....	56
Put armed guards in all passenger airplanes to prevent hijackings .....	73
Continue phased withdrawal from Vietnam and Vietnamization .....	67
Negotiate a settlement in Vietnam .....	67
Congressional approval before President commits American troops to combat on foreign soil .....	64
Establishment of consumer courts .....	70

Enactment of harsher penalties for crimes .....	68
Permit preventive detention of criminal suspects .....	51
Cut in Federal spending .....	67
Setting wage-price controls .....	52
Provide more tax incentives for industry to rid pollution .....	71
Adopt the President's proposed guaranteed annual wage with work incentives .....	68
Cut back present system of categorical assistance .....	52
Federal Government turning back to the States a percentage of the Federal taxes to be used as the State sees fit .....	68
DO NOT FAVOR	
Maintaining strict neutrality in Middle East .....	50
Withdrawing immediately and unilaterally from Vietnam .....	59
Renew the tax surcharge .....	62
Replace corporate tax with a national sales tax .....	65

## RUSSIA'S TECHNOLOGICAL GAP WIDENING

**HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with our concern for keeping ahead of the Soviet Union in national defense, I believe we should also take note of the serious shortages and deficiencies within that country today.

In virtually every domestic and industrial field, Soviet technology is increasingly removed from the more rapid pace of the developed nations of the world. With its paranoid fear of technological secrets from the weapon and space industries being leaked to the Western World, the Russians have theoretically cut off their noses to spite their faces. Information that could benefit domestic industry in the Soviet Union is withheld by the military and space scientific establishments. The resultant lag in progress denies the Russian people the advances a more reasonable government would surely seek to provide.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Dornberg of Newsweek Service, published an article in the San Francisco Examiner recently which discussed the Soviet technology gap. I bring it to the attention of my colleagues today with the belief that they will find it an important measure of Soviet concern for the Russian people.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dornberg's article follows:

### RUSSIA'S TECHNOLOGICAL GAP WIDENING (By John Dornberg)

After decades of boastful predictions about the inevitability of Russian industrial and economic dominance, the Soviet Union today is faced with an alarming and potentially devastating embarrassment: a technological gap in relation to most of the world's advanced nations.

Russian officials may brag about taking second place to no country in terms of nuclear weapons, but in terms of just about everything else technological, the Soviets take second place to almost every industrialized country.

Even more disturbing to Soviet technocrats, the gap is not only not being closed, it is widening with gathering momentum.

In the field of nuclear-generated electrical power, for instance, Russia two years ago produced 11 percent of the world's total. By 1977, that percentage is expected to drop to about 4, or roughly the same amount Sweden will be producing.

But the evidence of the gap is not visible merely in complex terms like megawatts. It is obvious in almost every area of the Soviet economy.

In computer science, for instance, the nation that sent the first man into space is still shockingly primitive. It is a safe guess that in all of Russia there are only about 5000 working computers—nearly all of the old "second-generation" capability—while the U.S. has well above 50,000 newer, more versatile machines.

The computer gap alone, according to Soviet physicist Andrei Sakharov, the father of the Russian hydrogen bomb, "is so wide that it is impossible to measure it. We simply live in another epoch."

In other fields, Russia might be better off living in another epoch. Communist leaders claim proudly they are building 630 miles of new railroad line every year. What they neglect to mention is that in the 42 years of Czarist rule preceding the 1917 revolution, new tracks were laid at a rate of 927 miles a year.

Under the Soviet political system, average citizens are kept in the dark about the nation's economic and industrial output, but they have only to step outside their doors to see that progress hasn't come along as fast as predicted.

There are only 283,000 miles of surfaced roads in the entire country—or less than a tenth of the pavement covering the small U.S.—and the lack has a direct impact on the general economy. Trucks (of which there are precious few) can average no better than 18 miles an hour on Soviet roads. The Daily Sovetskaya Rossia has estimated that the annual loss due to poor urban roads alone costs 500,000 rubles—in delays, damage to vehicles and increased fuel consumption.

Factories, shops, construction sites and laboratories must wait weeks or months for supplies—which costs the economy hundreds of millions of rubles in lost production. And when a truck or a tractor breaks down, replacement parts are so scarce that it is easier to cannibalize the remains for another vehicle.

"Anything that can't be assembled or repaired by banging on it with a hammer," says one Western economist, "is just left outside to rust."

Finally, in terms of consumer goods, Russia is almost a backward nation. On a per capita basis, Russia has only half as many television sets, a quarter as many telephones, and a fortieth as many automobiles as the six countries of the European Common Market.

Considering Russia's raw potential, it would be logical to assume that once a gap was admitted, the Soviet government would make massive plans to increase productivity. Instead, it is behaving exactly like a young emerging nation—selling natural resources and raw materials in return for technological know-how.

French, German, Italian, British, Swedish and Finnish companies have been brought in to build automobile plants, fiber and plastic factories, paper mills, computers, food processors and machine tools. Even the vaunted Russian merchant and fishing fleets—among the world's largest—couldn't exist without ships made by Poles, Finns, French and East Germans.

The reason for the technological gap are directly traceable to the Soviet political sys-

tem, which has fathered a stunningly inept bureaucracy, established priorities based on nothing but gross quotas and insisted on absolute secrecy about nearly every development.

Theoretically, administrative secrecy is intended to conceal military developments from foreigners. But it is so thorough that the average Soviet industrialist is often less well informed than a foreign embassy staff.

Consequently, discoveries and developments which benefit the military or space programs are almost never reapplied to domestic industry. Such discoveries virtually have to be re-made before they can benefit the economy as a whole, so applications of military breakthroughs take between six and eight years to be applied domestically.

By contrast, the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration has a service which will provide any applicant with instantaneous computerized retrieval of any of more than 200,000 recent developments in the space field.

The technological gap may appeal to some American chauvinists, but many more thoughtful U.S. officials are deeply worried lest it get too much wider.

"It's great to crow about how great we are and how backward they are," says one Kremlinologist. "But in the long run, a hefty increase in the Soviet standard of living is a lot better deterrent to war than all our ABMs."

**RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM—AN AFTERTHOUGHT**

**HON. JOHN C. CULVER**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, after waiting for 2 years for the President to implement constructive rural development programs, we have finally heard from him. However, I fear that the administration's rural community development program was an afterthought—an afterthought forced upon him after rural

America recognized that they had been taken for granted and consequently gave his administration a vote of "no confidence" last November.

The President's proposals consist of what he terms "new" funds for the future. What rural America has needed is not promises of "new" moneys at some later date, promises premised on the possible enactment of revenue sharing, but release of the hundreds of millions of dollars he has frozen, and signing of the bills he has vetoed. During the last 2 years, he has slashed out the heartland of rural America's budget by—

Freezing \$56 million of the \$100 million Congress appropriated for rural water and sewer grants;

Freezing \$68 million of the \$98 million Congress appropriated for rural water and sewer loans;

Cutting the 502 Rural Housing Insured Loan program from \$1.4 billion to \$946 million—and only restoring the funds after strong congressional pressure was applied;

Cutting the REAP agricultural conservation program by \$44.5 million, almost a quarter of the \$195.5 million appropriated by Congress;

Vetoing the \$18 billion Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970;

Vetoing the \$4.42 billion Education Act of 1970;

Vetoing the \$2.79 billion Hill-Burton hospital construction program;

Cutting out the school milk program; and

Vetoing the family medical practice bill.

This money—much better than any promised funds—could have helped the 7,300 rural communities that, over the past 3 years, had their loan and grant applications returned because the Farmers Home Administration could not assist them in the immediate future because of lack of funds. This new-found money could still help fund some of the 129

pending applications, totaling \$31 million in loans and \$6 million in grants, for sewer and water systems in my own State of Iowa.

The problems of rural development are now, not tomorrow. If the President has new-found money, he should release existing rural development funds and stop tantalizing rural America with the promises of new funds as a basis for politically sugar-coating the concept of revenue sharing.

The President's package of Rural Community Development with capital letters is only a portion of what is needed for sustained, substantial rural community development. Funds for Government programs, whether through grants or revenue sharing, can never take the place of a sound agriculture program, adequate housing and employment, and ample business development. And it is in these latter areas that the last 2 years' policies have been most disastrous.

The administration became the first since World War II not to send Congress a farm message. Last year it opposed a farm bill supported by all major farm organizations. And this year, seeing that parity had dropped to its lowest level since the Depression, achieved "prosperity" by changing the way you compute parity so that the country can now be told that parity stands at a healthy 91 percent when it is really only 68 percent.

More hocus-pocus. When Iowa's unemployment is the worst in 13 years, when rural education and medical assistance lag far behind national norms, when farmers must struggle from one crisis to the next, we do not need new mathematical models for parity nor sleight-of-hand with rural development funds. What we do need is the release of funds that Congress had appropriated to provide rural Americans their fair share of assistance and to begin at once the imperative task of revitalizing rural America.

I include the following tables:

IOWA—WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL APPLICATIONS ON HAND, FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION, FEB. 22, 1971

Name of applicant	County	Type of project	Funds		Name of applicant	County	Type of project	Funds	
			Loan	Grant				Loan	Grant
<b>First Congressional District:</b>					<b>Fourth Congressional District:</b>				
Libertyville	Jefferson	Water	\$100,000		Leland	Winnebago	Water	\$60,000	\$45,000
Hillsboro	Henry	do	90,000	\$22,000	Rake	Winnebago	Water	140,000	32,000
Milton	Van Buren	Sewer	220,000	56,000	Plymouth	Cerro Gordo	do	170,000	100,000
West Point	Lee	Water	200,000	120,000	Ventura	do	do	160,000	
Letts	Louisa	Sewer	191,000	125,000	Woolstock	Wright	Sewer	120,000	80,000
Parnell	Iowa	do	80,000	30,000	Garner	Hancock	Water	365,000	
Libertyville	Jefferson	do	103,000	65,800	Raymond	Black Hawk	Sewer	240,000	160,000
Nichols	Muscatine	do	99,000	70,000	Geneva	Franklin	do	94,000	60,000
Birmingham	Van Buren	do	30,000		Rudd	Floyd	do	234,000	100,000
Columbia City	Louisa	do	110,000	65,000	<b>Fourth Congressional District:</b>				
Bonaparte	Van Buren	do	180,000	90,000	Deep River	Poweshiek	Water	100,000	
North Liberty	Johnson	Water	120,000	60,000	Davis	do	do	28,000	10,000
West Liberty	Muscatine	do	100,000		Numa	Appanoose	do	80,000	70,000
Do	do	Sewer	165,000		Williamson	Lucas	do	55,000	35,000
Wellman	Washington	do	220,000		Van Wert	Decatur	Sewer	90,000	55,000
Buffalo	Scott	Water	260,000	100,000	Clutier	Tama	do	130,000	94,000
<b>Second Congressional District:</b>					Van Wert	Decatur	Water	90,000	78,000
Wadena	Fayette	Sewer	101,000	46,800	Promise City	Wayne	do	95,000	55,000
Goose Lake	Clinton	do	58,000	30,000	Lineville	do	Sewer	150,000	114,000
Prairieburg	Linn	do	75,000	25,000	Seymour	do	do	200,000	65,000
Aurora	Buchanan	do	76,000	25,000	Melrose	Monroe	Water	70,000	50,000
St. Olaf	Clayton	do	100,000	75,000	Afton	Union	do	200,000	50,000
Greeley	Delaware	do	100,000	55,000	Walford	Benton	Sewer	90,000	45,000
Aurora	Buchanan	Water	60,000		Woodburn	Clarke	Water	140,000	40,000
Stanley	do	Sewer	80,000	70,000	Hartford	Warren	Sewer	140,000	60,000
Dyersville	Dubuque	Water	390,000		Ollie	Keokuk	do	100,000	80,000
Delmar	Clinton	Sewer	278,000	120,000	Oley Public Utilities	Marion	Water	90,000	70,000
<b>Third Congressional District:</b>					Elberton	Tama	Sewer	110,000	95,000
Marble Rock	Floyd	do	170,000	39,000	Hamilton	Marion	Water	47,000	28,000
Coulter	Franklin	do	90,000	55,000	Derby	Lucas	do	66,000	27,000
Bassett	Chickasaw	do	70,000	30,000	Decatur City	Decatur	do	100,000	50,000
Beaman	Grundy	do	83,000	49,600	Dallas	Marion	do	130,000	60,000
Holland	do	do	105,000	55,000	Kellerontion	Ringgold	Sewer	90,000	30,000
Frederika	Bremer	do	75,400	42,300	Agency City	Wapello	do	112,000	70,000
Chester	Howard	do	90,000	70,000	Urbana	Benton	do	180,000	80,000
					Blakesburg	Wapello	do	130,000	95,000

IOWA—WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL APPLICATIONS ON HAND, FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION, FEB. 22, 1971—Continued

Name of applicant	County	Type of project	Funds		Name of applicant	County	Type of project	Funds	
			Loan	Grant				Loan	Grant
Fourth Congressional District—Continued					Wesley	Kossuth	Sewer	170,000	85,000
Kent	Union	Water	\$50,000	\$30,000	Cherokee County Rural Water System No. 1.	Cherokee	Water	1,330,000	
Exline	Appanoose	do	90,000	70,000	Fostoria	Clay	Sewer	\$110,000	\$70,000
Killduff Development Corp.	Jasper	do	50,000	40,000	Salix	Woodburg	do	110,000	70,000
Davis City	Decatur	Sewer	144,000	96,000	Osceola County Rural Water Association.	Osceola	Water	2,250,000	
Grand River	do	Water	75,000	75,000	Fenton	Kossuth	Sewer	117,000	77,000
Monroe County Rural Water Association.	Monroe	do	500,000		Calumet	O'Brien	do	55,000	28,000
Wayne County Rural Water Association.	Wayne	do	1,800,000		Smithland	Woodbury	do	110,000	80,000
Appanoose County Water Association.	Appanoose	do	950,000		Seventh Congressional District:				
Town and county water district.	Ringgold	do	300,000		Shambaugh	Page	Water	60,000	49,000
Lucas County Rural Water Association.	Lucas	do	1,500,000		Yorktown	do	do	50,000	25,000
Fifth Congressional District:					Pacific Junction	Mills	do	100,000	60,000
Callender	Webster	Sewer	190,000	60,000	St. Charles	Madison	Sewer	119,000	51,000
Vincent	do	do	96,000	72,000	Kirkman	Shelby	Water	50,000	20,000
McCallsburg	Story	do	110,000	50,000	Conway	Taylor	do	40,000	28,000
Dayton	Webster	do	40,000	20,000	Bridgewater	Adair	Sewer	100,000	70,000
Clarke	do	do	70,000	45,000	Kimballton	Audmubon	do	83,000	37,900
Harcourt	do	do	138,000	92,000	Pisgah	Harrison	do	140,000	40,000
Barnum	do	do	78,000	50,000	Adair County Water Corp.	Adair	Water	4,600,000	
Gilbert	Story	Water	240,000	50,000	Tennant	Shelby	do	24,000	20,000
Moingona	Boone	do	30,000	30,000	do	do	Sewer	51,900	20,000
Sixth Congressional District:					Bradyville	Page	do	61,000	30,000
Paton	Greene	Sewer	170,000	70,000	Halbur	Carroll	do	115,000	10,000
Rock Rapids	Lyon	Water	100,000		Arcadia	do	do	55,000	26,000
Mallard	Palo Alto	Sewer	190,000	90,000	Portsmouth	Shelby	do	50,000	40,000
Brunsville	Plymouth	Water	45,000		Knierim	Calhoun	Water	10,000	
Oto	Woodbury	Sewer	89,000	56,000	Minburn	Dallas	do	350,000	250,000
Wallingford	Emmet	do	87,000	54,000	Twin Lakes Utilities and Pollution Control.	Calhoun	Water & sewer.	40,000	
Archer	O'Brien	Water	26,000		Blencoe	Monona	Water	320,000	140,000
Okoboji	Dickinson	do	150,000		Bayard	Guthrie	Sewer	40,000	40,000
Rural Water System No. 2.	Lyon and Sioux	do	1,260,000		Imogene	Fremont	Water	100,000	
					De Soto	Dallas	do	20,000	50,000
					Dexter	do	do	1,800,000	
					West Central Rural Water Association.	Carroll, Crawford & Shelby.	do		

	Loans	Grants
1st.....	\$2,268,000	\$303,800
2d.....	1,318,000	446,800
3d.....	2,266,400	917,900
4th.....	9,172,000	1,817,000
5th.....	990,000	469,000
6th.....	6,369,000	680,000
7th.....	8,685,900	1,066,900
Total.....	31,069,300	6,201,400

### HUSBAND SERVES—WIFE BACKS HIM UP

#### HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter today from a young wife of a serviceman from the town of Portal, Ga., who is serving his country in Vietnam.

This 19-year-old Army wife has written me of her intense attitudes and feelings as to what her husband's Vietnam tour of duty and of what her country means to them and I was deeply impressed. So impressed, in fact, that I want my colleagues to share in this truly warm and meaningful expression of patriotic pride and love of country that Mrs. Richard Jones reveals in her moving letter:

PORTAL, GA.,  
March 6, 1971.

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: My husband is one of the many young soldiers in Viet Nam.

I would like to express my views on the war in Viet Nam.

I don't enjoy living without my husband. My 9 month daughter probably can't understand who I'm talking about when I mention her daddy. In view of these facts, I

am still not against the war. I believe in America. She's a great country. It's up to us to keep her strong. My husband is doing his share, and I feel I'm doing mine. The women of America have an obligation to their country, too. We'd be poor help on a fighting front, but we've got a job to do at home. And that is keep the home sacred and safe. We have to fill our men's shoes, not run them over.

I wish there was another way to obtain peace in this world, but apparently, there's not. Therefore, I say the war is not all wrong. If it were, God would see fit to stop it.

We get aggravated because it seems things don't move fast enough. I for one, would like to express a vote of confidence in our lawmakers. Good or bad, we elected them—now we should trust them to know what they're doing is best for all concerned.

My vote is: If we can't bring our boys home to a country where they won't have to fight from their own doors within a year or two—keep them as safe as we can while they protect the land they obviously love.

Please, if you think my thoughts will help any—pass them to anyone who'll listen. By the way, I'm 19 yrs. old. My husband isn't quite 21 yet and he's very proud of the job he's doing. He was drafted, but he believes in his country enough to give his life if necessary. I pray to God that will never happen, but if it should, I hope He will give me the strength to carry on and make some sacrifice for my country to match that of my husband.

Sincerely,

Mrs. RICHARD JONES.

### SEEKS TO AMEND SOCIAL SECURITY LAW

#### HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining my colleagues in introducing legislation which would amend

the social security law so that women with 30 years of coverage could retire at 62 years of age with full benefits. Under the present law women who retire at the age of 62 are eligible to receive only 80 percent of their retirement benefits.

Women may start getting benefits at age 60, but full benefits are not paid until age 65. Women who start getting benefits between ages 62 and 65, however, receive progressively larger amounts.

Up to now we have provided full old-age benefits to widows only. I believe that the woman who has worked most of her life, also, should be entitled to full retirement benefits.

Mr. Speaker, when the present provisions for paying benefits to women workers were proposed in this House in 1955, the Committee on Ways and Means recommended, and the House adopted a provision which would have paid full retirement benefits to women at age 65. It was the Senate that proposed paying reduced benefits. And, under the prevailing conditions, the House yielded to the Senate.

The 1956 provision was a compromise dictated by financial considerations.

The change we are proposing is a compromise, too. It is directed at those women who have worked the most and who have paid the most.

At the present time it would benefit relatively few women because social security coverage started only in 1937; no more than 34 years of coverage is possible. Moreover, the coverage of the original program was limited and major expansions were not effective until 1950 and 1954. Thus, the full effect of my proposal would not come for another 10 years, or so.

It would seem that the very financial considerations which in 1916 led to the

payment of reduced benefits at age 62 would in 1971 be considerations in favor of my proposal. Adoption of the proposal would have little effect on the cost of the program, while at the same time, it would provide significant benefits to those who could qualify for the higher benefit payments.

This proposal has been with us too long. It should have been enacted some time ago, but having been before the Congress for some time, it is gathering additional supporters. In the 91st Congress it had about 100 cosponsors and there are, of course, many other Members who would support the measure. With support like this, I would hope that the Committee on Ways and Means which is now considering H.R. 1, this year's social security amendments, would see its way to report a bill containing the substance of our proposal so that full retirement benefits can be paid at age 62 to women who have spent most of their lives working and paying social security taxes.

#### JANE TOMCZAK ON THE ISSUE OF THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

#### HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, there is no more controversial issue before the Congress than the SST. My mail has been very heavy on this subject and is about evenly divided. I am giving careful consideration to every argument, pro and con.

I was most fortunate to have Miss Jane Tomczak on my staff for 2 weeks under the auspices of the Washington Workshop Foundation. Jane is a senior at Mount St. Joseph Academy in Buffalo and chose to do research on the SST while working in my office.

Jane completed a research report for which Mount Vernon College has awarded three academic credits. Jane was an outstanding intern and I include her paper at this point. I want to point out that it is critical to evaluate the views of our young people and commend her remarks to the attention of my colleagues:

#### THE ISSUE OF THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT (By Jane Tomczak)

In the next twenty years, the volume of commercial air traffic can be expected to be multiplied by a factor of six. This will be the result of an increase in population, business activity, personal income, and leisure time. The SST is the logical and inevitable step forward to meet these growing demands. Internationally, airlines are already shopping around for and looking over the foreign SST's now in existence. Presently, United States airlines have placed 38 reservations for delivery of Concorde's while non-United States airlines have placed 36 for this Anglo-French model of the SST, totalling 74.<sup>1</sup> Several airlines are also interested in the Russian TU-144. Thus, if the United States does not build an SST, foreign ones will be purchased. The

age of supersonic travel is undoubtedly upon us now. The question is now not whether the SST is to be, but which one is to be flown.

The SST is needed to preserve United States leadership in aviation. It is important to be certain, as indicated by the President's Ad Hoc SST Committee, that prestige is not an issue. In order to have other programs—human resource programs—the United States must also have programs which generate revenue and keep up the balance of trade. Civilian aircraft represent one of the major exports of our country. In 1969, it accounted for \$2.2 billion in foreign trade sales. In the years 1964-1969, our favorable balance of trade has dropped almost 90%,<sup>2</sup> and without our 3 billion dollars aircraft sales, the United States' balance of trade would have been a critically negative figure by over 1 billion dollars. Aircraft also had the highest ratio of exports to imports: 10:1.<sup>3</sup> The United States now has 84% of the free world aircraft market, but this will not necessarily remain true without the SST. Airlines require a variety of different crafts for their different routes and tend to purchase an entire line of aircraft to save on training and maintenance costs, obtained when single-source buying is done.<sup>4</sup> Thus, the absence of the SST in the American line would shift our existing subsonic sales to the European industry, harm; possibly negate our balance of trade, and deplete our funds for domestic use and internal economy. The estimated total damage to the balance of trade by 1990 would be at least 17 billion dollars to 22 billion dollars.<sup>5</sup> More than 600,000 persons are now employed in the industry, many of whom would become jobless.

If the SST program is successfully carried out, the United States can expect to gain nearly \$20 billion of the anticipated \$25 billion world market through 1990.<sup>6</sup> The entire government investment of \$1.3 billion required for prototype development will be returned by the time 300 aircraft are sold out of an expected market for 500.<sup>7</sup> The potential return to the United States Treasury if 500 SST's are sold is 1 billion dollars more than the total original investment. Including the generated federal, state, and local taxes, the return is potentially five and a half times greater than the government's expenditure.<sup>8</sup> At prototype development peak in 1971, 20,000 jobs will have been generated, 50% of them under subcontractors, scattered throughout 46 states. Employment in the production phase will number approximately 50,000 direct employees and an additional 100,000 in allied services.<sup>9</sup>

Financing the SST program of the United States requires funds which are not currently available to manufacturers on any reasonable basis because of the \$1.5 billion cost throughout the development of a prototype. This is more than the total worth of the Boeing Company. In addition, private lenders would not wait eight or ten years for repayment except with very high interest rates which would increase the cost of SST. So, no manufacturer could finance the SST development through normal commercial channels because of the financial resources required, the long development time required, and the absence of a prototype aircraft by which the production risk can be evaluated.<sup>10</sup> The government has always aided the aeronautical developments through military programs, regulatory actions, and airports and airway facilities. The United States government has already invested 864 million dollars in the SST prototype development.<sup>11</sup>

The United States 2707-300 SST will be superior to the Russian TU-144 and the Anglo-French Concorde. It is made of titanium, rather than aluminum, eliminating metal fatigue danger anticipated. It is larger, carries more passengers, travels at a higher

speed and greater altitude, and has a shorter takeoff distance. Also, unlike the makers of the TU-144 and the Concorde, the GE and Boeing companies have taken into account the various environmental concerns from the start in designing the SST.

The SST would be the only aircraft program to have a noise limitation written into its contract. The SST is smoke-free; its power enables it to climb away fast, taking its noise with it, up and away from the community; it will be compatible with today's airports fitted for many present, subsonic jets; and since airports consume relatively little land space, the SST is a major development in, by far, the most land-conservative mode of transportation.

The passenger safety of the SST is needlessly doubted. Landing and acceleration effect is similar to that of many presently operating jets. Control will be completely by instrument. The SST will be the first airplane to limit ozone environment and the airconditioning will make the environment superior to that of any present airplanes. Passengers will also be exposed to less radiation; although the radiation level is actually higher there, at that altitude, the great speed remedies much of it. Much of airplane design has been improved for the SST, including cabin pressure which will be maintained even in the case of a window blowout, an occurrence which has never been experienced in an airplane.<sup>12</sup>

Special requirements and facilities are neither a source of discouragement. Regardless of whether or not the SST operates, new airports will be badly needed to handle the ever-growing volume of air traffic. Congress has already authorized over \$5 billion for these new facilities. Contrary to expectations, the SST will not require longer or thicker runways. It requires a much shorter runway than the 707, DC-8, or Concorde, and most airports already have runways 50% thicker than need. A faster plane does cost more for fuel, but it also requires less labor cost, and labor costs rise much faster than fuel costs. Air traffic conditions will not be aggravated either because the SST will fly at a brand-new air level and shorter travel time also means more flexibility in arrival and departure times and thus, a less congested terminal. The SST is coming at a time when it can greatly benefit from a greatly improved air traffic system prepared to meet the constant growth.

The United States SST, with its passenger capacity  $\frac{2}{3}$  that of the 747, and three times its speed, works out to be just about twice as productive in a given amount of time.<sup>13</sup> This greater productivity will serve to offset the rising cost of airline operations. Greater productivity has always helped to reduce fares and will do similarly for the SST. SST fares will not be greater than present jet fares.

There are many unfounded fears concerning the development of the SST. Some assume that the motivation of those seeking United States world aviation leadership is desire for prestige. They complain that the \$1.3 billion cost to government is too big a risk because of formidable technological problems and that business with the Boeing Company is moving towards socialism. They fear their money will never be recovered and that no citizen benefit will come of it. The most serious fears seem to be of those who claim that there are environmental hazards, the potential unknown danger of which are tremendous. They fear that changes in the upper atmosphere will affect the climate and that ultraviolet radiation will be capable of stripping the earth of its life. They believe that sonic booms will shake their houses, destroy their monuments, and disrupt their daily peace.

"The arguments waged to date, . . . are

Footnotes at end of article.

in many instances based on technical inaccuracies, statements taken out of context, or on the 'bleatings' of the omnipresent pseudo-scientists who make a profession out of 'nit-picking' useful programs to death."<sup>14</sup>

In reference to proclamations that SST will contribute to the pollution of the air, the SST can not be expected to produce any visible carbon emissions. It operates on one of the most efficient gas turbine engines. The gasses produced by SST at 1780 miles per hour carrying 900 passengers, are no more than those generated by three cars at 60 miles per hour. They also dissipate and become virtually undetectable at ground level. Surface vehicles convert 30-50% of their fuel burned into pollutants, which have immediate impact on the environment, while the less than 1% emitted by SST barely even reaches our immediate surroundings. The SST poses less threat to the air than any other means of transport existing.<sup>15</sup>

John Volpe: "I will see to it that the production program will not proceed—period—if tests of the prototypes indicate serious damage to the fabric of the natural world."<sup>16</sup>

The sonic boom seems to be the most universal concern involved. The most intense, or damaging sonic booms have been those at low altitudes; usually accidents, near the airport. However, the FAA has held, and will continue to hold the position that any sonic boom over a populated area is unacceptable, regardless of the magnitude. As a result of this regulation, which is based on and only alterable by public interest, by design, the SST will only fly supersonically at very high altitudes only reachable after flight far away from the populated areas. This will be 80-100 miles off a coastal airport and farther, if necessary, inland. It is the Administration's policy that flights will not be permitted over populated areas at speeds that will produce sonic booms, so supersonic flight will be permitted only over the oceans, routed to avoid inhabited islands, and north of the arctic circle.<sup>17</sup> Most people living in the vicinity of airports will be exposed to less noise from the SST than they hear today, because the takeoff and lift is great enough to carry the noise away quickly, before it reaches the community. Sideline noise, principally on the airport itself, is a problem to be solved and further progress will be made over the next 8 years by the multi-million dollar current dollar intensive noise reduction program.

Then, there is concern that the sonic boom will be harmful for marine life if produced over the ocean. Tests have proven acoustic energy to be inefficiently transported through the atmosphere to the ocean causing insignificant pressure, thus only trivial, no harmful or unusual effects on marine life. It has been said that the pressure is no greater than that produced by a fisherman's spinning lure hitting the water. Also, through ten years of supersonic testing of military aircraft, no complaints have ever been registered due to flight over the ocean.<sup>18</sup>

Secretary John Volpe has stated, "before we make a production commitment, we will demonstrate . . . the commercial SST to achieve noise levels consistent with those required." He also recently cited there major developments which have greatly improved the outlook on SST noise: 1 recent tests indicate less noise than originally expected and that 2 the wings are capable of greater lift, thus reducing takeoff distance; 3 high performance suppressors have been developed and tested successfully to reduce sideline noise.<sup>19</sup>

There has been emotional concern about condensation trails, increased amounts of water vapor in the upper atmosphere, and the formation of a layer of clouds, resulting in alteration of the weather. It is feared that a change in the average surface temperature of 2° to 3° might set off a chain reaction, re-

sulting in a drastic change in average surface temperature and melting of polar ice caps or creation of a new ice age. However, it has been noted that contrails do not form above an altitude of 60,000 feet<sup>20</sup> and virtually all SST travel will take place at an altitude of 65,000 feet. Also, the point has been made that previous changes in average surface temperature of up to 9° (1880-1940) and deposits of one cubic mile of sea water into the atmosphere—it would take an SST fleet 500-1000 years to inject this amount assuming the entire amount remained in place—(1883 explosion of Krakatoa island) have been recorded with none of these unusual results (only some green sunsets for the year of 1883.)<sup>21</sup>

Another contention is that water vapor may, through a series of photochemical reactions, reduce ozone traction, which shields the earth from the ultraviolet radiation of the sun, and life on earth would be harmed or destroyed. Possible increases in skin cancer supposedly are threatened. Many responsible scientists have concluded that ozone-water vapor effects would be insignificant or non-existent. Others emphasize that this, as the weather theory, must be admitted to be purely speculative, but that further extensive testing is needed to determine the effects, if any, of the interaction of water vapor and nitrogen oxides, although evidence that water vapor will accumulate in such great amounts has been questioned extensively.<sup>22</sup>

On a normal day, the moisture level in the air weighs about 150 trillion tons, and each cubic mile contains 4000 pounds of water vapor.<sup>23</sup> If billions of tons of water deposited in the air by an SST fleet in a year could be added to the air in a single second, it would add one ten thousandth of the water normal to the atmosphere.<sup>24</sup> Normal fluctuations in the atmosphere's water content exceed this one hundred-fold. Before clouds can form, 152000 pounds of water must be added to each cubic mile of air. An SST will deposit 75 pounds of water in 45 days into the atmosphere throughout its flight level.

At this rate, it would take 250 years if no air movement occurred for a layer of clouds to form.<sup>25</sup> The daily stratospheric water input would be about that of a large thunderstorm, 3000 to 6000 of which are going on in the world constantly.<sup>26</sup> The vapor claims have also been based on the assumption that the water vapor would remain in the atmosphere for a period of ten years. Data, however indicate the circulation time to be nearer one and a half years, which seems to rule out any significant accumulation of water vapor. Authorities have thus concluded that in the natural balance of atmospheric moisture, this vapor is but a miniscule addition. The National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences and the Office of Meteorological Research conclude that up to 1600 SST flights per day would be environmentally safe, and all seem to agree that there would be no danger whatsoever with the testing of two prototypes.

The SST is undoubtedly desirable as a means of transport. It will make it possible to leave the United States at seven or eight o'clock in the morning, spending eight hours in Paris or London, or anywhere in Europe; or ten hours in Hawaii, and returning to the United States by ten o'clock at night. This can bring nations closer and broaden the world scope of the individual. Because of the moderate fares, those who could not afford a long trip abroad could perhaps take a very short one and make it worthwhile with the aid of the SST.

It is inescapable that it is needed for the economy because of the Concorde which will sell if we do not make available an alternative. It is important to produce this alternative also in order to be certain that every measure and investigation is carried to insure

protection of environment. We have the assurance of important men in the program and the administration that extensive measures will be taken to be sure that we produce no further harm to our natural world. The limitations and standards will be met before production, during prototype development.

"The purpose of the prototype program is to provide the basis for the eventual development of a commercial United States Supersonic Transport which is safe for passengers, economically sound for the world's airlines, and whose operating performance is superior to that of any comparable airplane . . . The U.S. SST program, according to the draft environmental statement, is also committed to developing an SST that will be compatible with sound environmental practice."<sup>27</sup>

"Before we go into production, we will have the kind of answers that will assure the public of no degradation in the environment. As a matter of fact, at this point in time, I know of no scientist in the free world anywhere who will say there is fear of a serious degradation of the environment from a fleet of SST's."<sup>28</sup>

There are some doubts about the environmental effects which will be resolved before production. If we halt the prototype development, nothing will be done to investigate and the Concorde will still be flying over our heads. We cannot ignore the SST. "We can influence the supersonic era, however, by reasserting the 30-year leadership of our industry by building the 2707-300 SST. It is now in prototype development. Throughout our environmental safeguard program, we can give the peoples of the world the best assurance that widespread use of the SST in the 1980's will not be degrading the quality of life. In so doing, we will create jobs, we will keep the aviation industry healthy and technologically pre-eminent, and we will maintain the aircraft export advantage with its advantage to our balance of payments."<sup>29</sup>

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> House Republican Research Committee, *The SST Program*, August, 1970, p. 1

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Mike Gravel, "The Supersonic Transport—the Ecology and Economics" *Aerospace* (July 1970, Aerospace Industries Association of America Inc., Washington, D.C.) p. 3.

<sup>7</sup> Department of Transportation News, SST Fact Sheet, *The U.S. SST (Environment)*, Washington, D.C. p. 5.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> Gravel, op. cit.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>11</sup> DOT, op. cit. (fact sheet).

<sup>12</sup> Republican Research, op. cit.

<sup>13</sup> Gravel, op. cit.

<sup>14</sup> Personal letter from G. Wayne Hawk to Senator Charles Goodell, August 25, 1970.

<sup>15</sup> William Magruder, SST Development Director, DOT, "The Facts About The SST," *The Machinist*, pp. 6 & 7.

<sup>16</sup> John Volpe, DOT News, message from The Office of the Secretary, February 8, 1971, Washington, D.C.

<sup>17</sup> Magruder, *The Machinist*, op. cit.

<sup>18</sup> Gravel, op. cit., p. 2.

<sup>19</sup> Volpe, op. cit.

<sup>20</sup> Gravel, op. cit., p. 2.

<sup>21</sup> Horace Sutton, "Is the SST Really Necessary?", *The Saturday Review*, (August, 1970).

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>23</sup> Boeing Company Commercial Airplane Group, Supersonic Transport Division, *The Supersonic Transport and the Environment*, January, 1971

<sup>24</sup> Republican Research, op. cit.

<sup>25</sup> Boeing, op. cit., p. 4.

<sup>26</sup> Gravel, op. cit., p. 2.

<sup>27</sup> Personal letter from Charles Orlebeke of HUD to William Magruder, November 5, 1970.

<sup>28</sup> William Magruder, interviewed with William Proxmire by Jules Bergman and Roger Peterson, "ABC's Issues and Answers", Sunday, September 13, 1970.

<sup>29</sup> Magruder, *The Machinist*, op. cit.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. The Boeing Company Commercial Airplane Group, Supersonic Transport Division, *The Supersonic Transport and the Environment*, January, 1971.
2. The Department of Transportation News, SST Fact Sheet, *The U.S. SST (Environment)*, Washington, D.C.
3. Gravel, Mike, Senator from Alaska, "The Supersonic Transport—the Ecology and Economics", *Aerospace*, July, 1970, Aerospace Industries Association of America Inc., Washington, D.C.
4. Hawk, G. Wayne, Executive President of Moog, Inc. to Senator Charles Goodell, August 25, 1970.
5. Magruder, William, "The Facts About the SST", *The Machinist*, pp. 637, July 23, 1970, Washington, D.C.
6. Magruder, William E. Proxmire, William, interviewed by Jules Bergman & Roger Peterson, "ABC's Issues and Answers", Sunday, September 13, 1970.
7. Orlebeke, Charles J., Deputy under Secretary—Dept. of HUD, to William Magruder, November 5, 1970.
8. Schloss, Leon, "To Be or Not To Be: The U.S. SST" *Government Executive*, 64-73, September, 1970, Washington, D.C.
9. "Showdown on the SST—Will the United States Stay in the Running?", U.S. News and World Report, September 7, 1970.
10. Sutton, Horace, "Is the SST Really Necessary?", *The Saturday Review*, August, 1970.
11. "United States Supersonic Transport Program: Special Report", *Aviation Week & Space Technology*, McGraw-Hill January 5, 1970.
12. House Republican Research Committee, *The SST Program*, August, 1970.
13. Volpe, John, D.O.T. News, Message from the desk of the Secretary, February 8, 1971.

## WE ARE GOING TOO FAR ON CONSUMERISM

## HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the President's consumer message and the multitude of bills being submitted make it obvious that Congress will be devoting a great deal of time during this session to consumer issues. This is necessary. It is commendable and worthy of our time and efforts.

As we do consider these issues, however, I hope we can approach them with objectivity and good sense. I have noted some of the attacks on the business community of late by various "consumerists." Many of these attacks are based almost entirely on emotional appeal and have the effect of blanket indictments against industry. We, in Congress, must be on guard against being caught up in such shortsighted onslaughts.

Too often, Congress and the public are carried away by blaring headlines accusing this manufacturer or that industry of some supposed wrongdoing without giving any attention to facts which the industry might want to present. Unless we can maintain a proper balance here, a

willingness to probe for the truth, to keep things in proper perspective, I fear that the bombardments of one-sided, flamboyant charges may lead to hasty, ill-advised legislative, and regulatory actions.

We must be careful not to let this sort of thing distract us to the degree that we pass legislation that will unfairly penalize or restrict legitimate business operations. My attention was called to this danger by an article in the February issue of Reader's Digest by Thomas R. Sheppard, Jr., the publisher of *Look* magazine. In the piece, entitled "We're Going Too Far on Consumerism!", he makes the point that in our zeal to protect the consumer and by taking every consumerist charge as truth, we are throttling our economic system. I want to bring that article to the attention of my colleagues:

## WE ARE GOING TOO FAR ON CONSUMERISM

"FREE ENTERPRISE: An economic system under which private businessmen were permitted to make and sell whatever products the public wanted, under a pricing structure based primarily on supply and demand. Free enterprise disappeared in the late 20th century, superseded by a network of government control boards."

Far-fetched? Not at all. Free enterprise is a relative newcomer as a method of commerce. It could vanish as quickly as it came, and there are signs that it may be on the way out. Already, according to Prof. Yale Brozen of the Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago, "free enterprise in this country is one-quarter dead and one-quarter strangled—only half alive." And since he said that, over 150 pieces of legislation designed to regulate business have been introduced in Congress. This avalanche of prospective laws—much of it instigated by consumerists—recalls the New Deal legislation of the 1930s that launched us toward Big Government.

One of these bills would permit the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) to establish performance standards for all products. Another would permit any disgruntled consumer to file a class-action suit in a federal court against any manufacturer on behalf of all that manufacturer's customers—"an invitation to legal blackmail," Caspar Weinberger, former FTC chairman, calls it. A third bill would create an independent consumer agency with authority to advocate consumer causes before federal agencies and in the courts—"a continuing engine of business harassment," in the words of a White House spokesman.

Meanwhile, self-anointed consumerists press for stronger and stronger regulations under laws that already exist. One group told a Senate subcommittee that steps should be taken to prevent food companies from advertising "nutritionally inferior breakfast cereals." A White House conference on Food, Nutrition and Health proposed that foods be labeled in terms of nutritive quality. Betty Furness, new chairman of the New York State Consumer Protection Board, wants a law requiring manufacturers to tell "not only what they know about a product but also what they don't know!"

Senators Abraham A. Ribicoff of Connecticut and Philip A. Hart of Michigan complain that our federal agencies are not tough enough in regulating private industry. And the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions has proposed a new federal constitution, under which there would be an agency with broad powers to govern industry and standardize production.

And these activities barely hint at the

scope and depth of the movement. Meanwhile, there is the almost daily output of new regulations from the FCC, the FTC, the FDA, the IOC, the Justice Department, the Commerce Department, the Labor Department, the myriad state and city agencies—regulations affecting the price manufacturers may charge for their products, or the ingredients they may contain, or the way they are allowed to be packaged or marketed.

If free enterprise in the United States is not dead or dying, it certainly is sick enough to attract any reasonably alert undertaker.

Is free enterprise worth saving, then? Experience has proved that despite its faults free enterprise is the best system yet devised for the production, distribution and widespread enjoyment of goods and services.

It is more than coincidence that virtually all of mankind's scientific and technological progress came in the 200 years when free enterprise was the prevailing system throughout the Western world. It is more than coincidence that most of that progress was achieved in the nation regarded as the leading exponent of free enterprise: the United States of America.

For in these past 200 years—an eyeblink in the history of mankind—an America geared to a system of private industry has made available to every citizen luxuries and comforts that only a short time ago were beyond the reach of the most powerful aristocrat. Foreign travel at the speed of sound. Music and drama in one's own living room. Exotic foods and clothes. The wonders of the world at your fingertips. And by developing quick-cook meals and providing the average housewife with time-saving appliances, American industry has done more to liberate women than all of the placard-wielding Betty Friedans and Gloria Steinems combined.

But even more important than the practical benefits is the advantage found in the word "free." Free, as in "freedom." I never cease to be amazed that so many outspoken champions of freedom—jealous guardians of the right of every man to act and speak without government restraint—when it comes to commerce, are perfectly willing to replace freedom with rigid government controls.

Let us not minimize the value of freedom of commerce: the freedom to buy one quart of milk at a time, even though some government economist may think gallon containers are more efficient; the freedom to buy a loaf of white bread, even though some government expert feels that whole-wheat is more nutritious and that white should be banned; the freedom to buy a yellow convertible, even if federal investigators believe black sedans are more practical.

Anyone who doubts the importance of this element of freedom ought to spend some time in countries where the government decides what should and should not be marketed. In Russia, for example, government bureaus see to it that the populace is fed, clothed and housed according to scientific standards. Why then does just about every Western visitor to Russia—and I've been one of them—remark about the glumness of the people, about how drab and empty their lives appear to be? I suspect that the Russians are suffering from a severe and chronic case of controlled enterprise.

And the disease is spreading to our shores. Take the food industry. The consumerists have launched a powerful campaign to limit the number of sizes in which food products are offered. They argue that processors purposely use a plethora of odd-size packages to keep the poor housewife from figuring out which is the biggest bargain. Actually, there are often practical reasons for the odd sizes. For instance, a certain pudding mix comes in a 3¼-ounce package. This is the precise amount of powder which, when mixed with two cups of milk, produces four half-cup servings of pudding. If the mix were sold in

an even three-ounce size, the housewife would have to add 1 11/13 cups of milk, and would end up with 3 7/16 servings.

If the consumerists succeed, this is exactly the kind of nit-picking insanity the shopper will have to put up with—along with being forced to buy more of a product than she really needs because somebody in government has decided the smaller size is confusing, or uneconomical.

Then there is the government control that makes the consumer buy something he doesn't want, like the seat belt in automobiles.

Once, if you wanted seat belts you ordered them—as optional equipment. Then came the consumer-lobby pressure, followed by the government regulation requiring seat belts in all new cars. Now you get them—and pay for them—whether you want them or not. Yet national studies consistently reveal that only 35 percent of all motorists with seat belts in their cars actually use them. With two thirds of all new-car buyers paying for seat belts they neither want nor use, it means a waste of almost \$250 million a year.

Now I happen to believe in the value of seat belts. I use them myself. But I also believe in the freedom of people *not* to use seat belts, particularly since failure to use them hurts only themselves.

Of course the consumerists and their representatives in government are well-meaning people, sincere in their belief that by shifting control of industry into the hands of a beneficent government commission, they will make it possible for Americans to lead happier lives. But freedom has many facets. It includes an individual's right to live in a manner of his own choosing, even if his selections are not the most efficient or the most salubrious or the most esthetically pleasing in the eyes of a government bureau. It includes his right to buy and eat the *least* nutritious breakfast cereal, if he happens to like the taste. He may even buy a product that is not the most economical of its kind. It's *his* decision, *his* choice, *his* responsibility.

Take away those options, and you deprive a man of part of his liberty. And the fact that your motive is altruism of the highest order does not mitigate the loss.

It is not the businessman alone who suffers when government takes over the reins of business. If free enterprise dies, the consumer's freedom dies with it.

#### IMPORTS HURT IF IT IS YOU, STEEL MEN SAY

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, there is continuing and growing concern over the import of foreign steel into our country. Once again we see foreign steel having a damaging effect on domestic industry, particularly in relation to specialty steels. There is additional concern over the effectiveness of the voluntary restraint agreement presently in effect with certain foreign producers. There is growing and considerable doubt that such an agreement assures the United States of "fair trade" with foreign manufacturers.

Of course, the other side of this controversy has not remained silent. We have heard again from those who loudly protest that any action by this country to protect its own will rupture trade and

diplomatic relations with other governments.

Both views are most important. But, both views cannot be right. It is vital that the Congress consider both views in making any determination to curb steel imports. But, I often wonder if the experts do not speak on too lofty a plane. They talk eloquently in terms of impact percentages, millions of tons, billions of dollars, and international repercussions. I fear the mechanical quoting of cold facts and statistics, however, drowns the voice of the steelworker, much like the forest sometimes hides the trees.

After all, Mr. Speaker, it is the steelworker who will be the ultimate victim of whatever action Congress does or does not take. He talks in terms of feeding his family, educating his children, paying off his mortgage. It is his job; his life is at stake in this issue. He should be heard. He must be heard.

Recently, Mr. Edward Verlich, labor editor of the Pittsburgh Press, wrote a story about the steelworkers and what they are saying about the import problem. Their comments, while not couched in lofty phrases or bolstered by columns of figures, are nonetheless most eloquent and carry a message. I am inserting Mr. Verlich's article in the RECORD and invite my colleagues to read it—and be informed:

#### IMPORTS HURT IF IT IS YOU, STEEL MEN SAY (By Edward Verlich)

"If this continues, my daughter won't graduate from college," is the way Daniel Amorose said it.

"I am aware of this situation and as chairman of the Pennsylvania Congressional Delegation Steering Committee, I have today written to President Nixon," is the way U.S. Rep. Thomas E. Morgan, D-Fredericktown, put it.

"The first two or three weeks are okay," said Amorose, "but after that things start thinning out. Take the living end of it. In my case, there's the mortgage, car payment, taxes due. You got to live."

Amorose referred to the layoffs that have hit him and his steelworker buddies due to imports of specialty steels.

Morgan said he asked the President to "take cognizance of the situation in specialty steel as a special case in the over-all steel import problem."

#### THE 1,350 JOBS AT STAKE

Jack McGrogan, president of United Steel Workers (USW) Local 178 at Cyclops Corp. in Bridgeville, said, "It's a joint company-union effort to curb imports or 1,350 jobs will be down the drain."

With McGrogan in the union offices on the second floor of the Bridgeville Trust Co. Building were his vice president, Virgil Colucci; Herbert Taylor, general superintendent at the Bridgeville plant of Cyclops, and 10 other steelworkers, including Amorose.

Colucci and the other steelworkers have many things in common:

They have been employed at Cyclops for 19 to 22 years. They have been laid off since October. It's their first layoff in 10 to 19 years. They are all married, and they all have children.

Morgan's comments were in a letter to Mike Resetar, a crane operator from Canonsburg. "I think he (Morgan) is sincere," Resetar said.

Taylor said Cyclops' payroll has dwindled from 1,750 employees at the Bridgeville and Pittsburgh plants five years ago to 1,350 now.

And 330 of the latter figure are not on lay-off.

#### IMPORTS BLAMED

The general superintendent said the layoffs are due to imports of specialty steel from foreign nations, especially products made by Cyclops—stainless steel wire rod and stainless drawn wire.

Foreign companies have 68 per cent of the rod market and 52 per cent of the wire market in the United States.

Rudolph Ringel, a chemical laboratory technician, asked:

"How much deeper is this country going to sink before it realizes the damage being done by imports—not only steel, but textiles, shoes and other products."

"If we can cut imports, we can cut relief rolls. What's the unemployment rate in Japan?" he asked.

#### ORDERS USUALLY HEAVY

McGrogan injected, "This is a contract year at Universal-Cyclops. This is usually a pick-up period with heavy orders. But we're in this (layoff) position because of imports."

Chester Krawczynski, a welder with four children, is running out of Unemployment Compensation and Supplemental Unemployment Benefits (SUB) checks and is looking at welfare and food stamp programs.

"I've never made over \$6,000 to \$7,000 a year in my life. How can we build up other countries and knock ours down. If we'd buy our own stuff, the imports would lay in the markets."

"When I go shopping, I buy everything made in the U.S. because I know our people made it," Krawczynski said.

Jacob "Jack" Shadish, a shipper from Bridgeville, said he is "surviving. I'm not saving anything. This is a nickel cigar." He pointed to his stogie.

#### "FAIR TRADE ISSUE"

Tom Boris, a crane operator, said he believes in free trade as long as there is "fair trade."

"We're a totally self-sufficient country. We don't need other nations as much as they need us. Yet, other countries import only absolute necessities from us and flood us with their products," he charged.

William F. Nelson, a cold roller from Scott Twp., said he views the import situation "with alarm."

Nelson said tax increases have boosted his mortgage payments from \$119 a month when he bought his home in 1958 to \$151 a month now.

He said he can't understand why "our people help build up the steel industry in foreign countries. We have all the technology and we can't do it for our own people. They're taking care of theirs."

#### WIFE GOES TO WORK

Richard Pintar said, "I pushed my wife out to do a little work while I have to babysit. I've been trying for years to save for college for the kids, but I guess eating comes first."

"When you get to my age (47), nobody wants you," Pintar said.

Thomas Gates, a grinder, said the \$90 a week most of the men average on UC and SUB "doesn't go too far. The economy is going downhill while mortgage payments are rising. We're caught in the middle."

"I get called back to work for a week then I'm laid off again. Free trade is all right, but not when there's unemployment," he added.

Matthew Norak, a gang leader when working at his regular job, said, "We fought and won the war, but now we're losing everything else. They're all coming in here and taking everything from us."

Colucci interjected, "They're recovering off our backs. People are buying foreign prod-

ucts and not realizing it. We should have a 'Buy American' consciousness. The public is being fooled by advertisements."

McGrogan said the union and the company want what Morgan proposed to President Nixon—to make the Japanese and other nations adhere to the 1969 Voluntary Limitation Agreement.

While agreeing to limit the tonnage of steel sent into the United States, the foreign nations have shifted the product mix to the high-cost, high-quality specialty steels.

As imports reduced from 18 million to 13.5 million tons last year, their dollar value reached a record \$2 billion.

Morgan and his steering committee want the voluntary pact extended to cover specialty steels.

The seemingly insignificant specialty steel import problem "is causing an enlarged hole in Pittsburgh pocketbooks," McGrogan said.

TAKING ANOTHER LOOK AT THE TRUTH

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, a recent commentary on ABC news by Howard K. Smith provided me with an insight into why some universities seem to be engaged in an endless turmoil of politics rather than education.

Distortion of the truth has often enabled campus radicals to lead others in violent acts. Can we afford to have university presidents using the same deceitful talent to spread their personal political beliefs.

The commentary follows:

ABC EVENING NEWS COMMENTARY

(By Howard K. Smith)

Right next to mayors of cities, the people who deserve most sympathy are college presidents.

One recently illustrated his trials with a story: a college president died in his sleep and was condemned to hell. And it was six weeks later before he realized he wasn't still at his desk doing his regular work.

I feel for them. But not enough to let them distort truth. One flagrant case among several was the suggestion last year by Yale's Kingman Brewster that a black man can't get a fair trial in this country. The statement was made in sympathy for Black Panthers, who—a study by the New Yorker magazine shows—have been dismal liars in their stories about mistreatment by our law institutions.

Today, the New York Times prints a letter from the president of Stanford which is worse. He says the war is badly damaging Democracy in America.

How utterly false. Even our British cousins suspend free elections in war. We never have, and don't now.

During this unhappy war, we have actually expanded the vote—to blacks in the great Voting Act of 1965 . . . and recently to 18-year-olds.

Dissent has never been so free. Men like Senator McGovern are seen dissenting on this and other news reports with a frequency out of all proportion to their importance.

It is certainly just to criticize the war. But it is unjust for leaders of institutions designed to teach truth . . . to propagate untruths about it or about us.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION CAL-  
ENDAR OF EVENTS, MARCH 1971

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the RECORD the calendar of events for the Smithsonian Institution for the month of March 1971. Once again, the Smithsonian Institution has planned a wide variety of events and exhibits, and I urge all who can to visit the Smithsonian during this month.

The material follows:

MARCH AT THE SMITHSONIAN

What's new? The Museum of History and Technology has found a way to answer that question. Five special exhibit cases have been installed behind the pendulum on the museum's first floor to highlight recent acquisitions and interesting items from the study collections that the public would otherwise not get a chance to see. Each case features items from one of the museum's departments—Applied Arts, Cultural History, Industries, National and Military History, and Science and Technology. Contents of the cases will change every month to give a continuing picture of the museum's scope.

MONDAY, MARCH 1

Festival of the Arts. Drama, dance and music presented in a series of performances by D.C. elementary, junior high, and high schools throughout March at the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum. For a daily, evening and weekend schedule call 581-1300.

Sale: Museum Shops Sales-Exhibition. One-of-a-kind pieces from over fifty countries including handloomed fabrics, carvings, jewelry, folk dolls, masks, and ceramics are offered at vast price reductions. Arts and Industries Building.

TUESDAY, MARCH 2

Films: The American Realists—History of American art in two parts, 18th-19th centuries and 20th century; and Yankee Painter—The work of Winslow Homer. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates. 8:30 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium. Public invited.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 3

Lunchbox Forum. Reminiscences of an Aerospace Reporter. Informal discussion led by Jerry Hannifin, Time, Inc. Arts and Industries Building, Room 2169. Noon—Bring your lunch.

TUESDAY, MARCH 4

Creative Screen: Emak Bakia—Directed by Man Ray (1927) who describes his working progress . . . an assemblage of deforming mirrors . . . spiral lamps . . . using all tricks that might annoy certain spectators: Dada—The words and works of the Dadaists, including a presentation from Cabaret Voltaire in Zurich where Dada was born. Four showings at 11 a.m., 12 noon, 1 p.m., 2 p.m., National Collection of Fine Arts.

Seminar in Marine Biology: Circadian, Tidal and Lunar Rhythms in Marine Organisms. Lecturer: Beatrice M. Sweeney, University of California, Santa Barbara. Fourth in a series of graduate level lectures on current research in marine biology jointly sponsored by the Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area and the Smithsonian Institution. A question and answer period follows each program. 7:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium. Public invited.

SATURDAY, MARCH 6

Creative Screen: Emak Bakia; Dada. Repeat. See March 4 for details.

Concert Series: Music from Marlboro. Five artists from the celebrated Marlboro Festival of Vermont present music featuring rarely heard works by Beethoven and Messiaen in the last concert of this series. Musicians will be Craig Sheppard on the piano; Isidore Cohen, violin; Nobuko Imai, viola; Nathaniel Rosen, cello; and Richard Stoltzman, clarinet. Presented by the Division of Performing Arts, 5:30 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium. Tickets \$4.50 and \$5. For information call 381-5407.

TUESDAY, MARCH 9

Concert: United States Air Force Chamber Ensemble. Featured will be music by Villa-Lobos, Ravel, Dutilleul, Brahms, and Schubert. 8 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium.

Illustrated Lecture: Feathers and Fashion. Endangered species and the feather trade controversy of a hundred years ago will be discussed by Robin Doughty, Research Associate, Smithsonian Office of Environmental Sciences. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates. 8:30 p.m., Natural History Building Auditorium. Public is invited.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10

Lunchbox Forum: Iceland: Volcanoes, Geysers, and Fish (Aircraft and Space Survey). Informal discussion led by Kurt Stehling, Staff Advisor, Executive Officer of The President. Arts and Industries Building, Room 2169. Noon—Bring your lunch.

THURSDAY, MARCH 11

Seminar in Marine Biology: Vocalization of Marine Mammals. Lecturer: William E. Schevill, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. See March 4 for seminar details. 7:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium. Public invited.

Concert: United States Air Force String Orchestra. 8 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium.

FRIDAY, MARCH 12

Folk Concert: John Roberts and Tony Barand, both natives of England, in a program of English and American folk music. Sponsored by the Folklore Society of Greater Washington and the Smithsonian Division of Performing Arts. \$1 admission for non-FSGW members. 8:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium.

SATURDAY, MARCH 13

Kite Lectures: Kites and How To Make and Fly Them, by Paul E. Garber, Historian Emeritus, National Air and Space Museum; Kites and the Space Age, by Francis Rogallo, recently of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates as a part of the annual Smithsonian Kite Carnival. 1:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium. Public invited.

Workshop: Macrame for Teenagers. Under the direction of Joan H. Koslan Schwartz. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates. By subscription only. For information call 381-6159.

MONDAY, MARCH 15

Audubon Lecture: Flora of Alaska, by Stanwyn G. Shetler, Associate Curator of Phanerogams, Smithsonian Department of Botany, and Secretary for Flora North America Project. The remarkable adaptations and geographic relationships of Alaska's flora will be shown. Sponsored by the Audubon Naturalist Society. 8 p.m. only, National History Building auditorium. Public invited.

Concert: Frans Brueggen, recorder virtuoso. Mr. Brueggen's program will include works by Corelli, Loeillet (with harpsichord) and solo works by van Eyck, Luciano Berio and Frans Brueggen. Presented by the Division of Musical Instruments and sponsored by

the Smithsonian Associates, 8:30 p.m., History and Technology Building, Hall of Musical Instruments. Tickets: \$3 Associates, \$3.50 non-members. For information call 381-6158.

#### TUESDAY, MARCH 16

Lecture: Ming Porcelain in Review. By John A. Pope, Director, Freer Gallery of Art. Fifth lecture in the 18th annual series on Oriental Art, 8:30 p.m., Freer Gallery of Art.

Viewpoint India: Impressions of India in Slides and Sounds. Ronald H. Goodman, artist-craftsman and former Fulbright Scholar, surveys arts and crafts in India. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates, 8:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium. Public invited.

#### WEDNESDAY, MARCH 17

Lunchbox Forum: Fighting Gliders of World War II. Informal discussion led by Col. James E. Mrazek, USA (Ret.) Arts and Industries Building, Room 2169. Noon—Bring your lunch.

#### THURSDAY, MARCH 18

Creative Screen: Chromophobia—Whimsical animation and music tell a story of suppression and ultimate victory of the free spirit symbolic use of colors; Sculpture Today—The multiple styles of modern sculpture with emphasis on the expressive potential of various materials. Continuous half-hour showings beginning 11 a.m., last showing 2:30 p.m. National Collection of Fine Arts.

Concert: United States Air Force Woodwind Quintet, 8 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium.

#### FRIDAY, MARCH 19

Illustrated Lecture: Life on Aldabra Atoll, by Dr. Jay C. Shaffer, Assistant Professor of Biology, George Mason College. One of the few men in the world to know intimately the small Indian Ocean atoll, Dr. Shaffer, through his illustrated lecture, will provide a study of all forms of animal and plant life there. Sponsored by the National Parks and Conservation Association, 8 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium.

#### SATURDAY, MARCH 20

Creative Screen: Chromophobia; Sculpture Today. Repeat. See March 18 for details.

#### SUNDAY, MARCH 21

Concert: Smith College Choir, 6 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium.

#### MONDAY, MARCH 22

Exhibition: Unique Systems for Living: Furniture 1971. Sixty-seven entries chosen from a furniture design competition held to produce new ideas in low-cost furniture. Models represent furniture that is aesthetically pleasing, of simple structure, and designed for multiple uses. Sponsored by the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. At the National Collection of Fine Arts through May 16.

#### TUESDAY, MARCH 23

Illustrated Lecture: In Search of Lost Oceans, by Dr. Richard H. Benson, Smithsonian Institution, Department of Paleobiology. Dr. Benson will examine the current biological evidence of continental drift. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates, 8 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium. Public invited.

#### WEDNESDAY, MARCH 24

Lunchbox Forum: Observations from the Police Helicopter. Informal discussion led by Officers R. W. Miller and Charles MacDonald of the Washington, D.C. Metropolitan Police Department, Arts and Industries Building, Room 2169. Noon.

#### THURSDAY, MARCH 25

Seminar in Marine Biology: Coral Reef Biology. Lecturer: Robert Johannes, Univer-

sity of Georgia. See March 4 for seminar details. 7:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium. Public invited.

Lecture: Contemporary French Art in the United States, 1850-1870, by Dr. Lois Fink, National Collection of Fine Arts, 2 p.m., Lecture Hall, NCFCA.

#### SATURDAY, MARCH 27

Kite Flying Contest. A contest with homemade kites, judged by age groups in twelve categories. Commentary by Paul E. Garber, Historian Emeritus, National Air and Space Museum. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates as part of the Annual Smithsonian Kite Carnival, 12 noon to 5 p.m., Washington Monument Grounds (Rain date April 3). Award ceremony at 4 p.m. Public is invited.

Lecture: The European Background, 1902-1914, by Dr. Joshua C. Taylor, Director, National Collection of Fine Arts, 3 p.m., Lecture Hall, NCFCA.

#### MONDAY, MARCH 29

Exhibition: D.C. Elementary Art. Approximately 75 creations by students of the public elementary schools in the District of Columbia. Presented by the D.C. Elementary Art Department and the National Collection of Fine Arts. Through April 28, NCFCA.

#### WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31

Lunchbox Forum: Japanese Bombing Balloons—WWII. Informal discussion led by Robert C. Mikesh, Curatorial Assistant for Aeronautics, National Air and Space Museum. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Institution National Air and Space Museum, Arts and Industries Building, Room 2169. Noon—Bring your lunch.

#### Demonstrations

##### Museum of History and Technology

Musical Instruments—from the Smithsonian's collection. Monday, Wednesday, Friday, 3 p.m., Hall of Musical Instruments, 3rd floor.

Power Machinery—steam engines and pumping engines. Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, 2-3:30 p.m.; Saturday and Sunday, 10:30-noon and 1-3:30 p.m., Power Machinery Hall, 1st floor.

Spinning and Weaving—Monday and Thursday, 10-4 p.m., Tuesday and Friday, 10-noon. Textile Hall, 1st floor.

#### Tours

(Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates by Subscription Only)

Winterthur and Odessa, March 6 or 27. One-day tours. For information call Mrs. King, 381-5157.

Florida Marine Biology, April 16-21. A six-day collecting study trip at Placida, Florida. Time will be equally divided between boat and shore collecting and laboratory work on specimens collected. Additional study will be devoted to the island habitat. Phone Mrs. Kilkenny, 381-5159.

Strawberry Banke and Portsmouth, N.H., May 23-26. A unique opportunity to view in depth a fascinating historical preservation and restoration project and to study the different period involved. Phone Mrs. Kilkenny, 381-5159.

#### Foreign study tours

Tours concerned with archaeology, the arts, museums, private collections and natural history are available to national and local Associates in 1971.

East Africa Safari and Cruise: March 20-April 15. Five days in game reserves; two-week cruise from Mombasa to islands in the Indian Ocean. A few spaces still available.

Cyprus and Turkey: May 11-June 1. Waiting list.

Architectural and Historical Tour in Scotland, Wales and Ireland: May 31-June 20. Waiting list.

"No-Tour" Tour: May 26-June 16. Air France Exclusion-Dulles/Paris/Dulles. Mem-

bers make their own arrangements for travel in Europe.

Roman Archaeology: July 1-22. Inexpensive excursion for students, teachers and parents.

"No-Tour" Tour: July 15-Aug. 3. Qantas excursion—New York/Frankfort or Vienna (destination to be decided by group interest)/New York. Tour will include one night, lodging free, in London en route. Members make their own arrangements for travel in Europe.

South America: Aug. 2, 21 days. Brazil, Peru, Ecuador and Colombia, with emphasis on archaeology, old and new architecture, museum and private collections plus a short visit to the upper Amazon.

"No-Tour" Tour: Sept. 9-30. BOAC Excursion—Dulles/London/Dulles. Members make their own arrangements for travel in Europe.

Russia: Sept. 20-Oct. 12. Directed by Dr. R. H. Howland and Prof. George Riabov. Tour full. Second group departs Oct. 25 (through Nov. 19).

For itineraries and details, please write to Susan Kennedy, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560.

#### Hours

Smithsonian Museums: 10 a.m.-5:30 p.m., 7 days a week.

Cafeteria: 11 a.m.-5 p.m. daily, MHT.

Snack Bar: 10 a.m.-3 p.m. daily, MHT.

National Zoo buildings: 9 a.m.-4:30 p.m., 7 days a week; 9 a.m.-6 p.m., weekends beginning March 15.

Anacostia Neighborhood Museum: 10 a.m.-6 p.m., weekdays; 1-6 p.m., weekends.

#### Continuing exhibitions

Anacostia Neighborhood Museum, 2405 Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue, S.E.: Toward Freedom. A review of the civil rights movement from 1954 to the present. Through March 28.

Arts and Industries Building, 9th and Jefferson Drive, S.W.: Apollo 14. The current Apollo mission is explained—its purpose, destination, participants, etc.—with text, photos and a lunar relief map. Through March.

Astronautical Art. Realistic illustration, impressionistic and abstract paintings and sculpture inspired by the space program. Included are works by Norman Rockwell and other well-known artists. On display through Easter.

Freer Gallery of Art, 12th and Jefferson Drive, S.W.: Whistler's Landscapes and Seascapes. Forty paintings show Whistler in his forgotten role as an avant garde artist. On display indefinitely.

Museum of History and Technology, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W.: Poetry of the Body. Combining the techniques of medical illustrator and creative artist, Dr. Paul Peck has created a set of paintings of parts of the body that are both medically accurate and visually appealing. Dr. Peck, who earned a PhD degree in medical illustration from Johns Hopkins University, spent ten years on the project. Seven of the paintings from the series will be on display indefinitely in the Hall of Health.

American Holidays. Commemorating Washington's and Lincoln's birthday. Through April 15.

Do It the Hard Way: Rube Goldberg and Modern Times. Featuring cartoons, writings, sculptures and cartoon "inventions." On display indefinitely.

Iron and Steel Hall. Exhibit of the American iron and steel business dealing with modern practices and some of the historical background. On display indefinitely.

Museum of Natural History, 10th and Constitution Avenue, N.W.; Moon Rock Research. Findings of research on lunar samples by Smithsonian scientists. On display indefinitely.

National Collection of Fine Arts, 8th and G Streets, N.W.: Venice 35: More than 30 prints produced in the Smithsonian's Graphic Arts Workshop at the 35th Venice Biennale, and photographs of the workshop activities. Through March 14.

Romaine Brooks: 'Thief of Souls'. Thirty portraits by Romaine Brooks, including a self-portrait, as well as highly self-expressive drawings and associative material on the artist. Through April 3.

Lady Macbeth. A marble sculpture by Elisabet Ney, on loan to the NCFCA under the auspices of the Texas Fine Arts Association and Elisabet Ney Museum, Austin, Texas. The sculptor's last work, cut in Italy in 1905.

The John Henry Paintings. Twelve paintings by Palmer Hayden retell the legend of John Henry and the dramatic contest between the steam drill and the steel driver. On display through March 14.

National Portrait Gallery, 8th and F Streets, N.W.: John Muir, 1838-1914. Through portraits, photographs and a film, the exhibit presents the life of an early conservationist and his efforts to preserve the American wilderness. Through June 1.

James Weldon Johnson. Portraits, photographs, death mask, manuscript, and recordings of voice and song present Johnson's contributions as an educator, songwriter, poet and civil rights advocate. A biographical approach to black history.

*Radio Smithsonian*

Radio Smithsonian weekly presents conversation and music growing out of the institution's exhibits, research, and other activities and interests. The program is broadcast in 34 states, Canada, and throughout many other countries in the world via the Armed Forces Radio and Television Service.

Radio Smithsonian is broadcast every Sunday night on WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5) from 9-9:30 p.m. The program schedule for March:

7th—Indians, Part II. A long look at a major area of Smithsonian scholarship, the American Indian, his culture, and some of his problems today.

14th—What If the Pacific Flows into the Atlantic?, Dr. Ira Rubino, Assistant Director for Marine Biology, Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, Canal Zone; the Unicorn Is Alive and Well, Living in Washington (also Kansas City, London and Mars), Dr. John White, author and specialist in mythical animals.

21st—The Birds and the Bees. A program presented by Radio Smithsonian in honor of the coming of spring.

28th—The American Museum, Ian McCalum, Director of the American Museum in Britain; I'll Give You a Dollar for that Penny, Dr. and Mrs. Clain-Stefanelli, Curators of Numismatics.

In the Washington area, the program is also heard on WAMU-FM (88.5) Tuesdays at 6 p.m.; WETA-FM (90.9), Mondays at 9:30 p.m.; and in New York City on WNYC-AM/FM.

Dial-a-phenomenon—737-8855 for weekly announcements on stars, planets and worldwide occurrences of short-lived natural phenomena.

Mailing list requests and changes of address should be sent to the Smithsonian Calendar, 107 Smithsonian Institution Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20560.

*Museum tours*

*Walk-In Tours*

Museum of History and Technology (meet in Pendulum area): Tues.-Fri. 10:30, 11:30 a.m., 1 p.m.; Sat. and Sun. 10:30 a.m., noon, 1:30, 3 p.m.

National Collection of Fine Arts—Mon.-Fri. 11:30 a.m., 1 p.m.

National Portrait Gallery (meet at F Street information desk): Mon.-Thurs. noon.

School or Adult Group Tours by Appointment

Museum of Natural History, National Collection of Fine Arts—381-5019; 381-5680.

Freer Gallery of Art—381-5344.

National Portrait Gallery—381-6347.

National Zoological Park—332-9322.

Dial-A-museum—737-8811 for daily announcements on new exhibits and special events.

The Smithsonian Monthly Calendar of Events is prepared by the Office of Public Affairs. Editor: Lillas Wiltshire. Deadline for entries in the April Calendar: March 5.

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the separation of legislative, executive, and judicial powers is an established principle of American government, written into our Constitution and reaffirmed consistently by our courts. In recent years, however, that principle has been seriously compromised by the alarming expansion of the executive branch; today we too often find the policymaking powers of Congress in the hands of seemingly self-sufficient administrative agencies of the Federal Government.

By far the worst offender in this area has been the National Labor Relations Board. As long ago as 1962 a member of the Board stated unequivocally that—

The Board is . . . a policymaking tribunal.

He continued to say that—

The present Board has freed itself from self-inflicted dedication to *per se* rules.

This type of presumption characterizes the expansion of the executive branch: Measures passed by Congress are not laws demanding compliance, but starting points for future policymaking by the agencies. Time and again NLRB decisions have ignored or circumvented the clear language of law and the intent of Congress in enacting it.

In 1967, for example, the Board legalized product boycotts, which Congress had expressly prohibited in the 1959 amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act. Although the language of the specific amendment is unambiguous and although the boycott activity under review clearly fell within its terms, the Board decided nonetheless to examine the legislative history to see if Congress meant what it said. Then, relying heavily on statements of those who opposed the 1959 measures—instead of those who wrote and supported it—the Board concluded that Congress actually did not mean what it had said.

In its decision the Board claimed that the product boycott in question was legal and not covered by the 1959 amendments because the object of the boycott was to preserve work for employees.

But there is no reference in the amendment to work preservation as an exception to the ban on boycotts. In other words, this theory is nothing more than a Board-legislated proviso to the 1959 amendment. It has no congressional sanction, yet, for all practical purposes, it has the force of law.

Too often the NLRB twists laws made by Congress in such a way as to favor one or another special interest group. Most people assume that this is just another matter of labor versus "big business." In fact, it is not. Those who usually suffer from the distorted rulings of the Board are the individual workers, small unions, small businessmen, and the public at large, not "big business" and certainly not the large labor complexes. In case after case we find clear evidence of bias against those groups which cannot exert a strong enough influence on the Board. These groups will continue to suffer as long as the NLRB is allowed to tailor national policy to the needs of its favorite clients.

I do not believe we can question the right of the NLRB or a similar body to interpret the law in deciding a case, but we must certainly question their right to ignore or twist the provisions of that law. Adjudication cannot become policymaking.

We must have a judicial unit that is not subject to pressure from outside interests and, therefore, will not take on the legislative powers of the Congress. For that purpose I have introduced a bill to abolish the NLRB and replace it with a 15-man Labor Court.

The Labor Court would be designed to provide fair, impartial application of labor laws made by Congress. Like the district courts, the Tax Court, and even the Supreme Court, the labor unit would not be subject to the pressures brought by political and special interest groups. And like these other judicial bodies, the Labor Court would interpret laws, not make them.

Mr. Speaker, in a time when all our institutions are being examined and reformed and when the roles of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches are being carefully redefined, I believe we can no longer tolerate the assumption of policymaking powers by a biased administrative agency. I urge that my bill be given the most careful consideration.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—  
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 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?

## NAVY COST-CUTTER GETS MEDAL

## HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 12, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, we hear a great deal about waste and inefficiency in the operation of the Federal Government.

I have myself pointed to examples of this from time to time. Much of this kind of criticism is justified.

However, I feel that it is important that we recognize the contribution made by the many dedicated Federal employees who work hard to conserve the taxpayers' money.

One such employee is Mr. Philip Camberg, who recently was credited with having saved the Government \$4.8 million. The Navy has awarded Mr. Camberg its second highest civilian decoration for his economy efforts as an employee of Naval Air Systems Command Pacific.

In an interview published by the Associated Press, Mr. Camberg stated his philosophy of economy, which is commendable and represents the attitude of many Federal employees who seek to reduce or eliminate unnecessary expenditures.

Mr. Camberg had this to say:

I believe in economy and hard work. I have hounded people. After all, it's Uncle Sam's money.

I commend Mr. Camberg, and all the other Federal employees like him, to whom the taxpayers of the United States owe a great debt.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of an Associated Press article concerning Mr. Camberg's achievement be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Roanoke Times, Feb. 17, 1971]

## NAVY COST-CUTTER GETS MEDAL

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.—The Navy credits Philip Camberg with having saved the government \$4.8 million and has awarded him its second highest civilian decoration for his penny-pinching efforts for the Naval Air Systems Command, Pacific.

"I've got a keen interest for the savings," said the Scottish-born Camberg in explaining Tuesday why he won the award.

His superiors reckon that in 18 months Camberg, 58, saved the command \$4.8 million at North Island Naval Air Station and contributed to a \$20.5-million savings in the entire Pacific area. Camberg is the command's director of the "Resources Conservation Program."

Camberg has saved money in various ways. For example, he discovered that half of the technical libraries which the Navy provides contractors was never used. He ordered the publications given a new look and ended the publishing of useless ones.

He discovered the Army was stocking helicopter gun turrets that were the same as the Navy was buying from a manufacturer, so he started buying from the Army.

Camberg was a college-trained chemist and engineer before he went to work on research and development of ammunition components for the British government. After coming to America, he became chief test engineer for development of the propellant system for the

Navy's Polaris missile and then was asked to take a key role in the Navy's cost reduction and value engineering programs.

Last Friday Camberg was given the Superior Civilian Service Award by the Navy.

The citation calls him a wizard in salvaging aircraft parts and a shrewd shipper of materials.

"I believe in economy and hard work," said Camberg. "I've hounded people. After all, it's Uncle Sam's money."

Married, the father of two children, Camberg makes \$17,000 a year in what his military supervisor calls a thankless job.

Says Cmdr. Frederick Johnson, director of the engineering division for the Naval Air Systems Command: "Camberg is perfect for this, pushing people to do their best, particularly the engineers who by nature don't worry about saving money."

## SIXTY-FOUR PERCENT OPPOSE FUNDING SST

## HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, congressional hearings began this week on whether or not to continue with the Federal funding of the commercial supersonic transport airplane.

We have all received a great deal of information in recent days and weeks, both pro and con, on this significant issue. The month of March will produce a great deal more debate on the Federal role in this strictly commercial venture—a venture which has raised vital questions on the potential effect on the environment.

The Minnesota Poll of February 22, 1971, points out the switch in attitude on the part of the people of Minnesota. A year ago 69 percent felt the United States would lose a great deal if it stayed out of the SST competition. Today, 55 percent hold an opposite opinion. Likewise, those opposing further Federal funding of this project have risen from 49 percent to 64 percent.

I am inserting the full text of the Minnesota Poll article in the RECORD today so that all Members of Congress will know the attitude of the people in at least one Midwestern State.

The article follows:

## SIXTY-FOUR PERCENT OPPOSE FUNDING SST

The supersonic jet transport (SST) project has lost much appeal for Minnesotans during the past year, according to surveys by The Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota Poll.

Fifty-five percent of the 600 men and women interviewed in January said the United States would not lose a great deal if it stayed out of the SST competition. A year ago, 69 percent of persons questioned in a Minnesota Poll held the opposite view.

Those opposing government funding of SST development have increased from 49 percent a year ago to 64 percent in the current survey.

About half the persons polled this year said the project should be dropped even though some \$700 million of the \$1.3 billion already has been spent.

Three out of four in the current survey feel that there is no need to have a passenger plane capable of supersonic speeds. More than half said there are reasons, other than cost, why the plane should not be built.

Last year after lengthy debate, Congress agreed to extend the SST program through March 30. The Nixon administration has asked the current session of Congress to appropriate \$235 million to the program for the fiscal year 1972.

To measure Minnesota's attitudes on the SST program, interviewers asked:

"Supersonic jet passenger planes are being developed which will fly at 1,800 miles per hour. Do you think there is or is not a real need for supersonic jets?"

The replies for all adults and by men and women:

	[In percent]		
	All adults	Men	Women
Is need for SST.....	21	27	15
Is not a need.....	74	68	79
No opinion.....	5	5	6
Total.....	100	100	100

"France and the Soviet Union have made test flights of their SST jets which are scheduled to be in commercial service by 1974, while the United States could produce SSTs by 1978. Some people feel the United States would lose a great deal if it does not develop its own model. Do you agree or disagree?"

	[In percent]		
	All adults	Men	Women
Agree, United States would lose great deal.....	36	38	35
United States would not lose.....	55	56	54
No opinion.....	9	6	11
Total.....	100	100	100

In December 1969, the results of a similar question showed 69 percent felt the United States should develop its own SST and 24 percent felt it should not. Seven percent were undecided.

Interviewers next asked:

"Aside from the cost, do you think there are any reasons why the SST should not be built?"

	[In percent]		
	All adults	Men	Women
Yes, are reasons.....	52	53	50
No, are not.....	46	45	48
No opinion.....	2	2	2
Total.....	100	100	100

Reasons cited by the 52 percent were: unnecessary, don't have to travel that fast (41 percent), noise pollution and sonic boom damage (33 percent), effect on the environment or health (32 percent), air pollution (12 percent), impractical because plane is too big or airports can't handle (9 percent) and plane is dangerous (7 percent). Four percent said the money could be used for more constructive things and 3 percent said it was being done only for prestige.

Eleven percent gave other reasons and one percent were indefinite.

"Do you think the federal government should or should not pay most of the \$1.3 billion to build the first two test planes for commercial use?"

	[In percent]		
	All adults	Men	Women
Yes, Government should finance.....	29	32	27
No, Government should not.....	64	63	64
No opinion.....	7	5	9
Total.....	100	100	100

A year ago, Minnesotans also opposed government, but not as strongly. Forty-five percent said Congress should not vote money for the project and 44 percent said Congress should. Seven percent had no opinion.

In the current survey, interviewers next explained where the program stands now to the 64 percent who said the government should not pay for development. The explanation was phrased in the following question:

"About half of the \$1.3 billion already has been spent on the test planes. Under those circumstances, do you think the government should continue its investment or drop it?"

Even under these conditions, 48 percent of all the men and women interviewed still hold that the project should be dropped and 41 percent said it should be continued. Eleven percent were indefinite.

WHAT MINNESOTANS SAID

The SST should not be built because:

"I'm starting to rebel against the whole fast pace of life. People have got to become less occupied with mechanical progress and more concerned about people." (Minneapolis woman, age 32).

"The major environmental hazards—the possible effects on global weather and major noise problems." (Moorhead man, age 36)

"I don't feel the rest of the populace should be antagonized with the noise factor just so a small percentage of the population can get some place quicker." (Eden Prairie man, age 50)

YADKIN FARMER HONORED

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce to my colleagues that one of my constituents, Mr. Winnie W. Johnson, of Boonville, N.C., is a farmer whose corn production has brought him considerable fame and respect in the agriculture industry.

A story chronicling Mr. Johnson's achievement appears in the March 4, 1971, edition of the Yadkin, N.C., *Ripple*, and I include the article in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

YADKIN FARMER HONORED THIS WEEK FOR HIGH LEVEL OF CORN PRODUCTION

Yadkin County's champion corn grower is in Chicago today being honored for his outstanding record in production last year.

He is Winnie W. Johnson, Boonville, Route 1, who left by jet plane Tuesday morning with his wife on an all-expense paid trip paid by the DeKalb Seed Company.

The Yadkin man, top winner in the southeastern United States, is with the elite "200 Bushel Club," farmers from over the nation who have met or approached the coveted goal. He will take part in a panel meeting and give a summary of his operations for farm press representatives, as well as receive a reward.

Johnson's record last year was 188 bushels per acre, using DeKalb XL 64 for seed. His record yield was picked from a field which contained about 20 acres, picked wet with the moisture then removed.

When he first started shooting for high yields four years ago he recorded 160 bushels. The next year, he hit 162, and his 1969 yield was 175. In the state contest his yield for 1970 was recorded at 190 bushels, but a different method of computing it was used.

CXVII—405—Part 5

He does not irrigate his corn but has built up his field to a high level of minerals.

He and Mrs. Johnson will return tonight or Friday morning.

RARICK'S POSITION ON THE DRAFT EXTENSION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I include my statement to the House Armed Services Committee with regard to H.R. 2476, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN R. RARICK, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM LOUISIANA, BEFORE THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, MARCH 5, 1971

Mr. Chairman, members of the Armed Services Committee, I am thankful for the opportunity to present a statement in consideration of H.R. 2476.

There are views and ideas that thus far have not been aired. Alternatives are never as simple as "yes" or "no" and the same old arguments and cliches have worn thin.

I believe that any country has the right to conscript every qualified citizen for military duty to defend the nation and its institutions from invasion and armed attack and in all wars declared by Congress. This is the price of citizenship.

Likewise, I believe that any country owes reciprocal duties and responsibilities to its citizens, which in this instance I shall limit to its draft-age young men. First, that the draft not be employed except in cases of invasion, attack, or a proclaimed national emergency accompanied by a Constitutionally declared hostility. Second, that drafted men not be enjoined by the nation, preventing them from concluding the hostility as soon as possible so that the citizen-soldier can return to his home, family, and vocation.

I regard as un-American and immoral all exploitation of our manpower in so-called "no-win wars"—"Police actions"—"diplomatic wars"—and the prolonged misuse of drafted men to carry out such missions.

I cannot find any moral, ethical, or legal justification for drafting men for military service in an army of occupation 27 years after cessation of armed hostilities. In such prolonged service, the men are reduced to the role of mercenaries, performing at best the mission of serving as political pawns or honorary hostages to pacify foreign diplomacy.

I do not oppose a draft, per se—nor for procurement of manpower for training and military preparedness, but I do feel that extending the draft for a continued abuse of our manpower as has been demonstrated is an immoral blot on the Constitutional integrity of our nation.

The men of our nation are a great national resource. They must be conserved and protected as any other strategic weapon. Young draftees do not enter military service with its discipline cheerfully, but do so with great hesitancy and reluctance. And understandably, for they understand that they are required to give up their individuality, adopt a new pattern of life, and in many instances sacrifice their lives.

Most Americans are sick and tired of the Vietnams and Koreas—not that they oppose helping free people from aggression but because most are disgusted at their sons being forced to fight in a far-off war while being repeatedly told the war must not end in victory. The American people know better. They know that in war, there is no second best—a

country either wins or it loses and if it doesn't win, it loses. Which raises the thought-provoking question as to why should any representative vote to continue drafting his men for battle in a foreign land under such pre-conceived conditions?

Any question as to the Constitutionality of the war is ignored as being academic and irrelevant because it is said we are already at war. But is it irrelevant?

Look at the extreme division among our people and the lack of public confidence in our leaders, which supplies fertile ground for exploitation in America today. Could it not be that, because the Founding Fathers foresaw turmoil from unpopular wars, they provided for Congress alone to declare wars? Treaty wars and international "peace-keeping" agreements be hanged.

Does the end justify the means? Can we allow ourselves to succumb to the emotions that the Constitution can be ignored because we are said to be fighting Communism? But, are we really fighting Communism? If so, where and under what handicap?

In his State of the World message, the President shocked the morale and trust of our free world allies by confessing that his administration last year had authorized trade with the Communist Chinese. At page 85, of his statement, he said—and I quote, "In April we authorized the selective licensing of goods for export to the Peoples Republic of China."

Let us examine the dramatically publicized threat of Communist Russia. Soviet nuclear armed subs ply in the Gulf of Mexico—a novel "fishing armada" floats off the Atlantic Coast—a host of Soviets are housed at the Embassy not too far from this hearing room—and Russian spy satellites circle overhead. Certainly there is sufficient evidence to induce reasonable men to imminent concern over the Soviet threat—to play the game to win.

Yet the latest Export Control report for the 4th quarter or 1970 clearly states, and I quote, "Computers and parts valued at \$7.3 million were licensed; primarily to the U.S.S.R., \$3.2 million; Hungary \$1.1 million; Rumania, \$0.7 million; and Czechoslovakia, \$0.5 million."

Earlier Export Control reports indicated automatic piston machines, automatic crankshaft grinders, as well as industrial furnaces, cold-rolled carbon steel sheets and electronic equipment made in the U.S. were licensed by the present Administration for sale to Russia and other Soviet Satellites in Eastern Europe.

Does this sound like our leaders are concerned over Communism?

Perhaps the top echelon decision to sell computers to Russia is felt necessary to create an arms parity in the interest of a balance of power—the USA must be made not to appear superior in sophisticated equipment such as computers which the Russian technology must not yet have achieved.

That these business deals with Communist countries continue without even a condition that our P.O.W.'s be released is inconceivable and unconscionable.

Even a school child knows what trading with the enemy is called—especially when his fellow countrymen are at war. It is little wonder that our diplomats and presidential advisers do not want a declared war.

As for a Middle East crisis, what interest could the majority of the American people possibly have in the Middle East? If there is no American interest, then it can only be political interests—balance of power threat because the Russians are giving arms to some of the Arab nations? It is a strange crisis created over a balance of power when we consider that our President is trading with both the Russians and Red Chinese.

And any appeal that should be made toward a pending national emergency in the Continental USA offers small persuasion when one recalls that most of our men are scattered about the world.

I am as ready as anyone to bring a halt to Communist aggression and intimidation but utilizing drafted young men merely to provide numbers for sensitivity training in social change, race relations, and "no win" inferiority doesn't justify extending the draft. Our leaders do not by act or deed demonstrate any crisis situation, especially when present political goals preclude any victory over Communism.

The prolonged misuse of the draft in the absence of a declared war or an exhibited national crisis, I fear has become despised as a form of involuntary servitude in our country. Because we have allowed our "experts" to blatantly divert Constitutional guarantees concerning the war power, we now find our youth disenchanting with us and the system.

If the previously granted power to draft has been misused we must anticipate that extension of the power will continue to be misused unless we in Congress limit conscription to the conditions I have outlined. Congress must regain its Constitutional war-making authority. Until then, I hold serious conscientious reservations as to casting my people's vote favorably for the extension.

Any drafted American is at least entitled to know the identity of the enemy.

Mr. Speaker, since giving my statement on extension of the draft, a most interesting article on draft dodging has appeared in the VFW magazine for March 1971.

It further appears that should the Congress, in its wisdom, deem an extension of the draft necessary in the best interests of our Nation, then it will also need to put some teeth into the law if it is to be respected.

I insert the VFW article at this point in my remarks:

[From the VFW Magazine, March 1971]

**DRAFT-DODGING MUSHROOMS—IT RANKS FOURTH AMONG FEDERAL CRIMES**

(By Karl Edgerton)

More Americans are behind prison bars today for refusing military service than any time since 1947 when the number of selective service violators still reflected swollen World War II draft calls.

For those who think courts might be more lenient now that the war in Southeast Asia appears to be de-escalating, there is little comfort in reports that federal judges in many districts are meting out much stiffer sentences—an average of 37.3 months in comparison to 13.4 months in 1950 and 33.4 in 1944, the latter the longest on record up to the Vietnam Era.

However, the number of cases referred to the Justice Department for prosecution has mushroomed in the past five years. In the first four months of fiscal 1971, as an example, there were 1,320 indictments under the Selective Service Act. This figure becomes dramatically significant when compared with 369 cases instituted for the entire fiscal year of 1965.

At present there are 1,200 indictments outstanding against registrants believed to have fled abroad, 900 of them to Canada and the balance to other countries such as Sweden.

Government attorneys scoff at reports of up to 50,000 draft evaders finding refuge in Canada.

At the present time the Justice Department has 4,000 draft cases pending. This makes selective service cases one of the top

four federal crimes, just behind narcotics, immigration and auto theft.

And according to William S. Sessions, chief of the Government Operations Section, Criminal Division, of the Department of Justice, draft violators may top the list by the end of the year.

U.S. Attorney David Nisson, who heads the team of government lawyers which prosecute draft violators in Los Angeles, Calif., has stated "there is no doubt that this is the major area where people are ignoring the law today."

One newspaper reported draft defiance has reached epidemic proportions in California and the government is unable to do much about it. The paper cited the period between October, 1969, and May, 1970, when the state's draft quota totaled 7,828. To fill it, local boards mailed induction notices to 18,027 young men between the ages of 18 and 26.

More than 39% failed to appear as ordered. That represented a 66% increase over the 24% failure figure which was the case only 18 months earlier.

Although these cases are referred to the Justice Department for prosecution, only a fourth eventually will be indicted. These are the 1-A's who actually refuse to be inducted into the Armed Forces. Of the number prosecuted, 70% are convicted. But comparatively few of the great majority of cases sent to the Justice Department are prosecuted because in most instances—even though it is apparent that the men involved are deliberate "non-cooperators"—some part of their processing was done incorrectly by the local draft board in their hometowns.

In these cases the youth's file is returned to the draft board and his case begins all over again. When this happens, the defiant young man will have up to two years before he is faced with the choice of jail or military service.

And despite some impressions to the contrary, most of those who chant "hell, no, we won't go" actually do when faced with the alternative. When all due process is exhausted, "grinding down" as it is called by the Justice Department, less than 1% of all draft eligibles are convicted as felons.

Compounding the problem of draft law enforcement is the effort being made by individuals and organizations to counsel registrants on procedures which will enable them to avoid induction. A special House Subcommittee on the Draft pointed out last fall that California is one of the major problem areas.

The committee was advised that approximately 100 attorneys in the San Francisco area volunteered to handle indigent draft cases for a \$500 fee which comes from federal funds set aside for court-appointed defense.

A lawyer in Los Angeles who heads a panel of attorneys working full time keeping men out of the armed services is reported as saying "any kid with money can absolutely stay out of the Army—with 100% certainty."

Main reason for the lawyer's confidence is the legal delays at their disposal. But first the client has to go to Seattle for his physical. For some reason, the exam is reportedly easy there.

When and if all delays are exhausted, the sharp lawyer knows which judges are prone to be the most lenient. They sit in California's northern district around Oakland and San Francisco. As a leading defense attorney in a draft case remarked, "I'm winning cases here with defenses that got laughed out of court in New York."

If an accused draft dodger does not win acquittal, the judge normally places him on two-year probation. Only the most outspoken of revolutionaries in northern California are likely to get a prison term. And sentences are lighter in San Francisco—18 months as op-

posed to three years elsewhere in the country.

The fact that judges will pass sentences differing greatly for the same offense—depending on the locality—is just one part of the system that is unfair. But as one Justice Department lawyer explained, "A convicted rapist in a Southern town would probably get 30 years while one in Washington, D.C., if convicted, would probably only spend a few months behind bars."

Officials in both the Justice Department and Selective Service headquarters aren't opposed to draft counseling. They want a young man to know just what his rights and obligations are "and what might happen" if he is convicted as a draft felon.

Contrary to some reports, there have been relatively few cases of professional persons, such as doctors and dentists, deliberately attempting to defraud the draft system. The reason is that most professional men today make a good living and aren't apt to jeopardize it and their reputation by skulduggery. Cases have been investigated, but these are described as "negligible" by officials.

However, the government has admitted, that it is faced with a "continuing, open, obvious expressed intent by many groups to absolutely swamp the system, the courts and the Department of Justice."

But these attempts are being met with only limited success. The Selective Service System has maintained an impressive 99.6% of call (requests by the military for manpower). According to William C. Holmberg, Selective Service deputy for public information in Washington, the biggest disservice the draft-dodger is doing is to his own peers—young men in his own age bracket who are shouldering his share of the burden and responsibility.

The most publicized convicted draft-dodger in the country is Cassius Clay who was sentenced to five years in prison and a \$10,000 fine. He has exhausted all appeals up to the Supreme Court and still remains free to earn more in an hour than most Americans do in a lifetime.

Although the law requires that draft evasion cases be "expedited" in prosecution, the Supreme Court's apparent reluctance to follow the letter of the law and expedite Clay's case will undoubtedly result in time enough for the title fight which will net him nearly \$1 million.

V.F.W. Commander-in-Chief Herbert R. Rainwater has termed the Clay affair an affront to American veterans, American servicemen as well as all other Americans. He has stated that if the Supreme Court overturns Clay's conviction it will mean that all those who were drafted and served in World War II, Korea and Vietnam did so illegally. "It will also mean an end to Selective Service" he has predicted.

Although the government is moving toward an all-volunteer armed force, which the V.F.W. opposes, Selective Service has requested Congress to extend the draft for another two years, in line with V.F.W. Mandate 162.

"It is the only way to go," explained one official. He bases his remark on a tour of South Vietnam made two months ago by Curtis W. Tarr, new director of Selective Service.

Tarr reported that he talked to more than 1,000 men serving in Southeast Asia and they were unanimous in support for the lottery system as the only fair way. They also said that student deferments should be abolished since it is better to complete military obligations as soon as possible.

"There were some in every group I talked to who disagreed with me on many subjects but not on the lottery system," he reported when he returned shortly before Christmas.

There is agreement, too, among those re-

sponsible for filling monthly draft quotas for the services. They believe, to a man, it is better for the country to have the youth in uniform, meeting his obligation, than to have him behind bars.

Their thinking is reflected in the number of draft dodgers in the nation's prisons today—approximately 500 as compared to 5,000 during World War II.

**ST. LOUIS PRIESTS MANUAL SPREADS CREDIT UNION IDEA IN AFRICA**

**HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have supported the growth and development of credit unions in the United States are always delighted when the credit union idea is "exported" to underdeveloped areas of the world by missionaries, peace corps men and women, U.S. foreign assistance program officials, and by the American credit union movement itself. I have been enlisted on several occasions in the past by St. Louis enthusiasts of the credit union movement to help obtain clearance of assistance from the Agency for International Development in establishing credit unions in various parts of South America, and have been deeply impressed by the results.

Yesterday, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch carried an excellent article by one of the staff writers of its Washington bureau reporting on the activities of a young St. Louis Catholic priest, the Reverend E. A. Barnicle of the St. Joseph Missionaries, who has been pioneering in the development of credit unions in West Cameroon and other parts of Africa, and has written a manual on the subject which has been published with foreign aid funds.

I am indebted to the Post-Dispatch Washington Bureau for this insight into the effectiveness of credit unions in that part of the world where, according to this article, loanshark transactions at as much as 2,000 percent annual interest were previously the only avenue for the villager to obtain any financing.

**KIKAI KELAKI CREDIT UNION LEADS TO 95 OTHERS**

Father Barnicle started his first credit union in 1965 in Kikai Kelaki, in the grasslands area of West Cameroon, the Post-Dispatch reported, where the average family income was \$100 a year. The credit union flourished, and now has 170 members who have saved \$8,500 and lent more than \$25,000 to each other since 1965. This credit union, the article further states, has served as the pilot for 95 other credit unions, and was a factor in the establishment of the West Cameroon Cooperative Savings and Credit Association in 1968, and Father Barnicle is now regional counselor for the African organization, and will soon be traveling through Senegal, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Ivory Coast, Upper Volta, Ghana, Togo, Dahomey, Nigeria, Kenya, Ethiopia, and the Cameroon on this assignment.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note in the Post-Dispatch article that when Father Barnicle initiated the plan for the formation of the West Cameroon Co-operative Credit Union League in 1966, the American Ambassador, the Honorable Robert L. Payton, also of St. Louis, provided help and assistance. I am also pleased that our State Department helped in publishing Father Barnicle's manual on credit unions which teaches the "how" of credit union formation. It is good to know that our foreign aid officials recognized the tremendous value of helping the people of underdeveloped nations to help themselves through the credit union idea.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as part of my remarks, the article from Sunday's St. Louis Post-Dispatch on Father Barnicle's credit union leadership, as follows:

**CHAMPION OF AFRICAN FINANCING**

WASHINGTON.—In pursuit of social justice for Africans, a young St. Louis Catholic priest is ranging far and wide these days as regional counselor for an organization known as ACOSCA—the Africa Co-operative Savings and Credit Association.

The priest is the Rev. E. A. Barnicle, an energetic member of the St. Joseph Missionaries who was described by a West Cameroon credit union official as "our most gallant apostle of the movement."

Father Barnicle was born in University City. He took an engineering degree at St. Louis University in 1955 and entered the priesthood after three years in the Air Force and a few months as an industrial engineer with Atlas Cement Co. in Hannibal.

"The timing is right and the field is fertile—they are moving all over Africa from a subsistence economy to a money economy," Father Barnicle said with quiet enthusiasm during a recent interview in Washington.

**FUND FOR EDUCATION**

He was supporting the idea of a credit union in an effort to raise funds for education. He was close to the departure date for an African tour that will take him from Senegal to Kenya.

When Father Barnicle first went to Africa in 1964, he had studied philosophy for two post-graduate years at St. Louis University and then done work at Mill Hill, in London. In 1965 he started a credit union in the village of Kikai Kelaki, in West Cameroon.

Kikai Kelaki is in grasslands country. The money crop is coffee. Average family income in the village was \$100 a year. When people had to borrow money, the interest rates ran as high as 2000 per cent.

"We decided to save our money together," Father Barnicle said, "to lend to each other from our accumulated savings, and to pay back at low interest rates."

At first Father Barnicle looked after the money and taught bookkeeping to villagers. The Kikai Kelaki union flourished. It served as a pilot for 95 other credit unions. The United States Information Service made a film about it and the film has been distributed in four languages.

**\$25,000 IN LOANS**

There are now 170 members in the Kikai Kelaki union, representing 30 per cent of the families in the village. The villagers have saved \$8500 and have lent more than \$25,000 to one another.

In 1966 the West Cameroon Co-operative Credit Union League was organized under auspices of the Cameroon government. Father Barnicle's friend and fellow-St. Louisan, Robert L. Payton, the United States Ambassador to the Cameroon, gave help.

The newly organized Cameroon league sent a delegate in the fall of 1968 to Nairobi, in Kenya, where the Africa Co-operative Savings and Credit Association was formed. The association now has ten full members and 13 more in sight.

Africa's growing credit union movement had received encouragement and assistance from the United States and Canadian governments, the Credit Leagues of North America and Europe, and a number of religious and philanthropic organizations.

Father Barnicle's itinerary this spring and summer indicates the scope of the movement. His tour includes Senegal, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Ivory Coast, Upper Volta, Ghana, Togo, Dahomey, Nigeria, Kenya, Ethiopia and The Cameroon.

**WROTE MANUAL**

Father Barnicle wrote a manual that was published with American foreign assistance funds arranged by Ambassador Payton. It is a practical "how to do it" book that also traces the history and philosophy of the credit union idea.

The book has an incisive account of the origins of the movement in nineteenth century Germany, where a country mayor named Frederick William Raffeisen helped deliver long-suffering farm folk from the hands of usurious money-lenders.

Father Barnicle's manual is full of examples of Cameroon farmers and villagers who had to pay astronomical interest to loan sharks, when a credit union would have charged reasonable rates.

But loan sharks are not the only hazard. One citizen of Kikai Kelaki lost more than 200,000 francs, the priest said, when he hid his paper money in his house and it was eaten by white ants.

**UNITED PARENTS ASSOCIATIONS WEEK**

**HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, for over 50 years the United Parents Association has been a vital force, working for the improvement of our public school system.

In New York City, March 15-21, 1971, has been proclaimed United Parents Associations Week—a week in which the citizens of the city are asked to pay tribute to the contribution of these associations and their 450,000 members.

I consider such recognition and tribute an excellent and timely idea. I have always been in close contact with the associations in my area district and know, first hand, the excellent work they do. Our schools more than ever before need the active support of this dedicated group.

It is with pride that I place into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the proclamation that designates the week of March 15-21 "United Parents Associations Week":

**PROCLAMATION**

In its first fifty years, the United Parents Associations of New York City have served our schools with intelligence, commitment, and common sense. They have helped to make public education a force for progress in the life of our city and the lives of our children.

During the difficult, tense moments of recent years, the United Parents Associations

have worked to bring our city together, to heal divisions, to forge a partnership for effective reform. They have proved that teachers, school officials, and the community can cooperate for the sake of our children.

"The New York City school system stands at a crossroads. We now have the chance to build a future of excellence in public education. That effort requires the best from each of us. It requires the kind of meaningful parent participation exemplified by the United Parents Associations. They can help us reshape our schools and improve the quality of our city and our society.

Now, therefore, I, John V. Lindsay, mayor of the City of New York, do hereby proclaim the week of March 15-21, 1971, as "United Parents Associations Week" in New York City. I urge parents, during that week, to pause and reflect on their role in the education of their children—and I urge all New Yorkers to pay tribute to the contribution of the United Parents Associations to the evolution and improvement of our public schools during the past fifty years.

#### FOREIGN POLICY

### HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 12, 1971

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in his recent foreign policy messages, President Nixon has set forth the direction and goals of U.S. foreign policy. I have consistently supported the President's commitment to ending the war in Southeast Asia and to facilitating a peaceful settlement of the Middle East crisis.

In an interview by C. L. Sulzberger, published in the New York Times on March 1, Mr. Nixon further discusses the role of the United States in foreign policy. His remarks demonstrate a candid understanding of the forces, including public opinion, which shape our foreign policy. I ask unanimous consent that this article be inserted in the RECORD.

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

EXCERPTS FROM THE INTERVIEW GRANTED BY PRESIDENT NIXON ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

WASHINGTON, March 9.—Following are excerpts from an interview with President Nixon conducted here yesterday by C. L. Sulzberger, foreign-affairs columnist of The New York Times. The transcript which is unofficial, was prepared by Mr. Sulzberger from his notes.

I would strongly commend to you my second foreign-policy report, which I think you should read carefully. I have noticed in some quarters a tendency to discuss this matter sneeringly or condescendingly, saying there is nothing new in it.

But that isn't so. It sets forth new policy directions and outlines, the goals we hope to achieve—the goals not only for this Administration but for subsequent administrations. This is a long-range effort. It doesn't get into a country-by-country analysis except in connection with the Soviet Union.

However, everything you see there is a new philosophy of United States policy. It is the most complete and accurate description of the Nixon doctrine. This doctrine is designed for the specific purpose of maintaining a U.S. policy role in the world rather than a withdrawal from the world and international responsibilities.

The irony today, for those who look at the Washington scene, is that the great internationalists of the post-World War II period have become the neo-isolationists of the Vietnam war period and especially of the period accompanying the ending of that war. And it is ending.

This is also true of the attitude of those former internationalists with respect to our defense posture and defense spending. And, for some, it is even true of our foreign trade policy. There, of course it depends on individuals. For example, Senator Javits is an all-out free-trader and a "European," but he takes a dim view of the United States role in Asia. He would also be for a lower defense budget. I merely cite him as an example of what I mean and the varying attitudes I mention.

The point is, why has this happened? Why have many former internationalists developed neo-isolationist tendencies, at least in some degree? Part of the answer is simply that Americans, like all idealists, are very impatient people. They feel that if a good thing is going to happen it should happen instantly.

And a great many of these people are very disillusioned with the United Nations. I am not, personally, because I never expected it could settle all problems involving major powers but could nevertheless play a useful role in development and in peacekeeping in areas where the superpowers were not directly involved.

The older a nation and a people become, the more they become conscious of history and also of what is possible. Now I will explain to you what I mean. I rate myself as a deeply committed pacifist, perhaps because of my Quaker heritage from my mother. But I must deal with how peace can be achieved and how it must be preserved.

I know that some national leaders and some countries want to expand by conquest and are committed to expansion, and this obviously creates the danger of war. Moreover, some peoples have hated each other for years and years.

Look at the divided peoples of India and Pakistan. Look at the situation in the Middle East. You can't suddenly eliminate these differences, these hatreds, just because some political leaders get together. All you can hope for is to bring about a live-and-let-live situation.

With this in mind, I am deeply devoted to a desire that the United States should make the greatest possible contribution it can make to developing such a peaceful world.

It is not enough just to be for peace. The point is, what can we do about it?

Through an accident of history we find ourselves today in a situation where no one who is really for peace in this country can reject an American role in the rest of the world. Of course, we had our own period of colonial expansion as typified by Theodore Roosevelt and the idea of Manifest Destiny. But that period is fortunately gone.

Since then this country has fought in four wars which we didn't start, and really what they have in common is the effort to bring about a better chance for a peaceful world.

And this applies for the Vietnam war as well as the two World Wars and Korea. Obviously it was a political temptation when I started office to state simply that we would get out right away without any responsibility for what came next.

But I knew too much about history, about Asia, about the basic feeling in the United States. If we failed to achieve our limited goal—to let a small country exercise the right to choose its own way of life, without having a Communist government imposed upon it by force—if we failed to achieve this, we would not help the cause of peace.

For a time, perhaps, we would be seen as a kind of hero. But soon it would be

seen that we had left behind a legacy of even greater dangers for Southeast Asia and for the Pacific region. And, after all, we are a Pacific power.

#### AMERICAN TRING OF WORLD ROLE

In 1966 and 1967—culminating in 1968—the American people began to tire of playing a role in the world. We had fought four wars, selflessly and for no gain. We had provided some \$100-billion in foreign aid, much of it to former enemies who are now our competitors, like Japan.

And we found ourselves committed in Vietnam, in a war where there are no heroes, only goats. Our people became sick of Vietnam and supported our men there only in order to get them out—after this period of change in mood. Somewhere a great change had taken place.

We had used our power for peace in four wars but this new attitude gained force: "If we can't handle this one, to hell with it."

We got caught up in a vicious cross fire, and it became increasingly difficult to make people understand. I must say that without television it might have been difficult for me to get people to understand a thing.

The cross fire I referred to was this. The superdoves opposed our commitment in Vietnam and all world responsibilities—Korea, the Philippines, the Middle East, Europe. This was the kind of isolationism of those who felt the United States shouldn't have played any role at all in Southeast Asia from the very start. For these people Vietnam was a distant, small, foreign country in just the terms that Chamberlain mentioned concerning Czechoslovakia at the time of Munich. These were the superdoves.

But on the other side, the opposite cross fire came from the superhawks. This group stood by their Commander-in-Chief, the President, but became fed up with the war for their own reasons. They felt that if the United States can't handle a distant little war, why then let's just pull out and build up our strength at home. Their logic also favored isolationism, but from another angle. And they want to develop a Fortress America at home and cram it full of missiles while the superdoves want us to pull out of the world also, but reducing our strength at home.

#### AND THOSE IN THE MIDDLE

In between there are those of us who stand in the middle of the cross fire. The superhawk feels it is his duty to support the President even if that same superhawk isn't sure he wants to see us do what we are doing. The superdove has a different attitude.

He is a good-hearted fellow, but when he looks around and sees the problems of the poor, the blacks, the Indians, the poor whites, the pot-smoking kids, crime in the cities, urban slums, the environment, he says: "We must get out of the war right away and concern ourselves only with our problems at home."

The fact is, however, that there has never been so great a challenge to U.S. leadership. This war is ending. In fact, I seriously doubt if we will ever have another war. This is probably the very last one.

In any theoretical question of a war on the basis of "either them or us," I am sure everyone in the country would join in behind me. But this is not the case in a small country so far away involved in a situation so difficult to explain.

I am certain a Gallup poll would show that the great majority of the people would want to pull out of Vietnam. But a Gallup poll would also show that a great majority of the people would want to pull three or more divisions out of Europe. And it would also show that a great majority of the people would cut our defense budget.

Polls are not the answer. You must look at the facts. The Soviets now have three

times the missile strength (ICBM) of ourselves. By 1974 they will pass us in submarines carrying nuclear missiles.

MRS. MEIR UNDERSTOOD HIM

All of these things are very directly related. For example, when Mrs. Meir, the Israeli Prime Minister, visited me, she understood me right away when I said that if America winds up the war in Vietnam in failure and an image is developed that the war was fought only by stupid scoundrels, there would be a wave of isolationism. This would embrace the U.S. role everywhere—including the Middle East. Mrs. Meir saw the point immediately.

As I see it, we have to take certain specific steps. First of all, what we now have to do is end the war—as we now are doing—in a way that gives South Vietnam a reasonable chance to survive without our help. But this doesn't mean we would withdraw all our responsibilities everywhere.

As I stated in first explaining the Nixon doctrine, our idea is to create a situation in which those lands to which we have obligations or in which we have interests, if they are ready to fight a fire, should be able to count on us to furnish the hose and water.

Meanwhile, in Europe, we can't cut down our forces until there is a mutual agreement with the other side. We must stand with our European friends if they will only do a little more themselves in NATO—as they have indicated they will do.

And we cannot foolishly fall behind in the arms competition. In the United States, we remain ahead in the Navy and in the air, but the Soviets are ahead in ICBM's and soon will pass us in modern submarine strength.

But each has a kind of sufficiency. The Soviets are a great land power opposite China as well as having far-reaching interests elsewhere. We are a great sea power and we must keep our strength. I am a strong Navy man myself. I believe in a strong conventional navy which helps us to play a peacekeeping role in such areas, for example, as Latin America.

These are all elements that must be considered with respect to each other. The main thing is that I'd like to see us not end the Vietnamese war foolishly and find ourselves all alone in the world. I could have chosen that course my very first day in office. But I want the American people to be able to be led by me, or by my successor, along a course that allows us to do what is needed to help keep the peace in this world.

We used to look to other nations to do this job once upon a time. But now only the United States plays a major role of this sort in the world. Our responsibilities are not limited to this great continent but include Europe, the Middle East, Southeast Asia, East Asia, many areas whose fate affects the peace of the world.

We must above all tend to our national obligations. We must not forget our alliances or our interests. Other nations must know that the United States has both the capability and the will to defend these allies and protect these interests.

Unless people understand this and understand it well, the United States will simply retreat into isolationism, both politically and diplomatically. We would, of course, continue to be an economic giant; but that is not enough.

Let us look at the world today. There are two great powers facing us, Russia and China. They are great powers and great people. Certainly neither of them wants war. But both are motivated by a philosophy which announces itself as expansionist in character. This they will admit themselves.

And only the United States has sufficient strength to be able to help maintain a balance in Europe and other areas that might otherwise be affected.

U.S.-SOVIET COOPERATION

What I am saying is not a cold-war philosophy. I hope that we can further develop our negotiations with the Soviet Union. For, although we recognize that their ideology is expansionist, they know what it means if the genie comes out of the bottle and that their interest in survival requires that they avoid a conflict with the United States. This means that we must find a way of cooperating.

For obviously pragmatic reasons, therefore, we can see peace slowly shaping up. First, as we are doing, we must end the war in Vietnam. We must continue our Soviet negotiations and open the door of cooperation to China. And in this way there will be a chance of building a world that is relatively peaceful.

I deliberately say relatively peaceful. That doesn't mean everyone will be disarmed, safe and loving everyone else. The kind of relative peace I envision is not the dream of my Quaker youth. But it is realistic, and, I am convinced we can bring it about.

Yet, to do this, we can't heed either our superhawks whose policy would ultimately lead to war or to our superdoves who believe that only they are capable of achieving peace and that everyone else is a heretic. The trouble is that their policy of weakness would also quickly lead to war.

The day the United States quits playing a responsible role in the world—in Europe or Asia or the Middle East—or gives up or recedes from its efforts to maintain an adequate defense force—on that day this will become a very unsafe world to live in.

I can assure you that my words are those of a devoted pacifist. My very hardest job is to give out posthumous Medals of Honor.

I don't question the motives of those who oppose me. But I know this world. I have traveled about and talked to many leaders, and I know we have a chance to play a role in this world.

Another thing: People should be under no illusion that you can play a role in one area but wholly ignore another. Of course we're not going to get into every little firefight everywhere. The Nixon doctrine says only that we will help those who help themselves.

Sometimes people tend to forget the real situation prevailing today. When considering Asia, the great problem is that everyone overlooks the fact that non-Communist Asia—excluding India and Pakistan—produces three times as much as China. Why, Japan alone produces twice as much as China.

What is going to happen if we ignore such basic facts? The United States, as I said earlier is a Pacific power. And the SST will be built—if not by us, by someone else. And then we will be only three hours' flight from Japan.

There will be 400 million people in non-Communist Asia relying ever more upon us. Why Prime Minister Sato said not so long ago that Japan depends on the U.S. nuclear field.

In past times the No. 1 nation was always in that position because of military conquests. But the mantle of leadership fell on American shoulders not by our desire and not for the purposes of conquest. But we have that position today, and how we handle ourselves will determine the chances of world peace.

Do you know, in all my travels, not one leader I have talked to ever said to me in private that he feared the United States as a nation bent on conquest. And I have met many Communist leaders, as you know. Whatever some of them may pretend in public, they understand our true troubles and they are also thankful that the United States wants nothing—nothing but the right for everyone to live and let live.

CONFIDENCE IN THE PEOPLE

The big question to my mind is: Will our Establishment and our people meet their responsibilities? Frankly, I have far more confidence in our people than in the Establishment. The people seem to see the problem in simple terms: "By golly, we have to do the right thing."

But the real problem, what worries me most, is: Will our Establishment see it that way? I am not talking about my critics but about a basic, strange sickness that appears to have spread among those who usually, in this country, can be expected to see clearly ahead into the future.

These are the people who, after World War II, supported the Greek-Turkish aid program, the Marshall Plan, NATO. But today they are in disarray because of two things. They are terribly disillusioned about Vietnam, which is so hard a problem to understand. And they have an enormous concern with home problems of a sort and a degree that did not face us a generation earlier.

I understand these factors. There is a vast need for reforms, for improvements in health, education and environment. But we have to assume our responsibilities both abroad and at home. We have to do both. After all, if we manage to improve the environment and living conditions in this country we must also assure that we will be around to enjoy those improvements.

FOLLY OF U.S. BOYCOTT AGAINST RHODESIA

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 12, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Shreveport, La., Journal for March 9 contains an editorial pointing to the folly of the U.S. participation in the boycott against Rhodesia.

The editorial correctly points out that our embargo against Rhodesia, undertaken in line with United Nations policy, is depriving us of our main supply of chrome ore. Chrome ore is a strategically important commodity for the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Boycott on Rhodesia Endangers United States," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks. The editor of the Shreveport Journal is George W. Shannon.

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

BOYCOTT ON RHODESIA ENDANGERS UNITED STATES

One of the most powerful voices in the United States Senate—that of Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr.—has been raised against the senseless economic boycott America has applied to Rhodesia. Senator Byrd's warning that the United States is playing into Russia's hands by allowing the Soviet Union to maintain a stranglehold on our supply of chrome ore—a material vital to our national defense—coincides with this newspaper's own oft-expressed views.

The threat to America's security, as noted in a speech on the Senate floor Mar. 4 by the Independent senator from Virginia, stems from participation in United Nations economic sanctions against the small African country which is the source of two-thirds of the world's supply of chrome ore.

Now the Congress is being asked by the Administration to release chrome ore from the national stockpile to ease the shortage of this commodity resulting from the Rhodesian embargo.

We agree with Senator Byrd that release of chrome ore from the stockpile is not the appropriate remedy for the present situation of the United States.

The correct step for this nation to take would be to end its foolish policy against Rhodesia and resume trade with that nation.

The story leading up to our present shortage of chrome, and our dependence on the Soviet Union, goes back more than five years.

On Nov. 11, 1965, Rhodesia declared her independence of Great Britain.

The United Nations Security Council, at the urging of Great Britain, adopted a resolution condemning Rhodesia as "a threat to international peace and security." The resolution called on the Security Council to take steps to end Rhodesian independence.

Despite the fact that Rhodesia, in declaring independence, was only taking the same step that the United States took in 1776, the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations actively supported the resolution against Rhodesia.

Pursuant to the UN resolution, our government severed diplomatic ties with the Ian Smith government and invoked a boycott of Rhodesian products.

On July 31, 1968, the President of the United States issued Executive Order No. 11419, barring all United States imports from and exports to Rhodesia.

The Smith government still survived. As a matter of fact, the economic sanctions are a failure.

But if the sanctions are a failure, they nevertheless have had serious consequences.

For one thing, Senator Byrd points out, imposition of a mandatory embargo brings the United Nations just one step short of armed intervention.

Is the United States prepared to take part in a war to bring the Rhodesian government to its knees?

While the United States has gone along with the British-sponsored embargo of Rhodesia, ships flying the flag of Great Britain have continued to carry cargo to North Vietnam.

Last year 40 British ships called at Haiphong. In 1969, the total was 74; and in 1968, it was 114.

In line with the economic sanctions policy against Rhodesia, the United States last year closed its consulate in Salisbury; but Britain maintains its consulate in Hanoi.

It would seem, says Senator Byrd, that so far as the British are concerned, cooperation in policies of embargo is a one-way street.

Prior to the imposition of the sanctions, Rhodesia furnished approximately 85 per cent of the imports of metallurgical chrome ore coming into the United States.

With the sanctions in effect, the United States has had to turn to the Soviet Union for chrome ore.

The Russians are well aware of the importance of this commodity to the United States. They are charging us more than twice the price which we formerly paid to Rhodesia for chrome.

And more important, the Soviets could easily shut off our supply in the event of an emergency.

Today, as a short-term measure, the Office of Emergency Preparedness is seeking to withdraw chrome ore from the national strategic stockpile.

The national strategic stockpile now has 4,500,000 tons of chrome ore. The Administration is seeking release of 1,300,000 tons, which would leave 3,200,000 tons on hand.

This 3,200,000 tons would be only about 100,000 tons more than the amount required to fulfill the so-called "strategic objective," or emergency reserve, for the United States.

Many of the points raised by Senator Byrd were noted in a series of articles written by the editor of The Shreveport Journal following a visit to the Republic of South Africa and Rhodesia last October. Senator Byrd is hopeful that pressure from the metal industry, members of Congress and, above all, the American people will be so great that President Nixon will lift the boycott on Rhodesia.

"We have followed a foolish policy toward Rhodesia," Senator Byrd declares. "Morally, it is wrong. Legally, it is dubious. Economically, it is costly. And it could jeopardize the security of the United States."

The Journal joins Senator Byrd in urging President Nixon to reverse our present policy and resume trade with the peaceful African country of Rhodesia.

#### REVENUE SHARING—THE TAX SPENDER'S RELIEF

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the 1972 elections, like all elections, will be decided on the issues. The question will be raised, "Did you support the President's revenue-sharing proposal?"

Currently, there is much controversy surrounding this issue. Those that would be expected to "carry the ball" for the President are not in sight. Those that one would expect to espouse the virtues of the President's plan are condemning revenue sharing as a highly undesirable plan to separate the level of Government which collects taxes from the level which spends the money collected because this makes it so difficult to call Government to account for how it uses or misuses the money it takes.

The Elephant's Roar—A Gazette for Republican Leaders is in the forefront of those opposing the President. Thus, in 1972, when the issues come to light, I feel that this bipartisan opposition should not be forgotten.

I feel that the blame for the defeat of revenue sharing—if it is defeated—should be laid to rest at the feet of those forces in the President's party who have deserted the President in his hour of need.

The article in the March 6, 1971, issue of the Elephant's Roar—A Gazette for Republican Leaders follows:

#### REVENUE SHARING—THE TAX SPENDER'S RELIEF

Throughout America today, and particularly in California, resounds the demand for tax relief. In vote after vote the people have made it clear that they think their government costs too much; that the last thing they want is more taxes and more inflation to continue the seemingly endless expansion of government programs.

The greatest impact of these votes has been at the local level of government, where the people either have the right to vote directly on increases in the tax rate—as in the case of school taxes—or at least can see firsthand not only where their tax money is coming from, but also where it is going. The result is that the inevitable clamor for more money to meet government "needs" (read "wants") has been met by a still louder outcry of "Stop!"

So now the spenders have come to Washington in force looking for relief—not for the taxpayer, but for themselves. They want more money in a less visible form. And in Federal revenue sharing they think they have found the magic carpet to carry them over the angry ranks of aroused taxpayers. They are all but beating down the doors of Congressmen to get their hands on the \$5 billion President Nixon would offer them—with no strings attached.

The rhetoric of "revenue sharing" pleases many supporters of limited government because it speaks of returning more authority to lower levels of government. But this talk is utterly meaningless unless Federal authority, or Federal taxes, or local taxes are reduced as a result. The revenue sharing proposal now being presented to Congress would reduce none of these. It would simply add \$5 billion more on top of everything else government at all levels is now spending.

It is highly undesirable to separate the level of government which collects taxes from the level which spends the money collected, because this makes it so difficult to call government to account for how it uses or misuses the money it takes. This point was made in our editorial two weeks ago, and deserves repetition and even greater emphasis as the drive for "revenue sharing" escalates. Local government programs financed by Federal funds are for all practical purposes out of the people's hands, and quickly become bureaucratic nightmares.

Congressman John W. Byrnes of Wisconsin, senior Republican on the House Ways and Means Committee and a leading opponent of the "revenue sharing" proposal, has pointed out that in Germany during the 1920's, before Hitler came to power, a "revenue sharing" system was in effect. The disastrous results were explained in an official report in 1930 by S. Parker Gilbert, Agent General for Reparation Payments:

*"The Government of the Reich collects the taxes, but does not feel the full responsibility for them since it must pass on a large share of the proceeds to the States and communes . . . The States and communes, on their side, spend the money without having had any of the responsibility or odium of collecting it, and they have fallen into the habit of expecting the Reich to provide more and more money for them to meet their recurring budgetary deficits . . . The financial relations between the Reich and the States and communes will not be on a sound basis until the responsibility for raising the money by taxation has been reunited with the responsibility for spending it."*

There is substantial and growing support for Congressman Byrnes' position—which is also mine—among House members of both parties who do not feel that they should vote relief for local tax spenders trying to evade the voters' verdict on their liberality with other people's money.

#### LARRY FANNING—A NEWSPAPER GIANT

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of Mr. Lawrence Fanning, publisher of the Anchorage Daily News, was a tremendous loss to all Alaskans, and to all those in the field of journalism who recognized him as a man of major stature in the profession.

Perhaps his greatest contribution to journalism was his sponsorship and en-

couragement of young journalists. While the executive editor of the Chicago Daily News, he provided the initial guidance for what is now a distinguished roster of nationally known columnists and reporters. Among them are Joseph Kraft, Carl Rowan, Pierre Salinger, Peter Lisagor, Ann Landers, and Nicholas Von Hoffman. Most of these men and women felt a personal debt to Larry Fanning and maintained intense pride in their relationship to him.

As the publisher and executive editor of the Anchorage Daily News, he surrounded himself again with a staff of young, talented reporters and columnists. These young men, including Stanley Abbot, Tom Brown, Joe Rothstein, Will Lawson, and C. Robert Zelnick, are all following the successful path so well marked out by Larry Fanning.

Perhaps no one better than one of these young men can express the impact of Larry Fanning, and the great loss caused by his death. The following article, written by C. Robert Zelnick for a memorial edition of the Anchorage Daily News, expresses beautifully the sort of man he was in his own world of journalism.

A FORMER FANNING REPORTER  
WRITES ABOUT HIS EDITOR  
(By C. Robert Zelnick)

WASHINGTON.—It is difficult to write of Larry Fanning without lapsing into the sort of cliché he would have penciled out of copy reaching his desk. He was a supremely talented, gifted man, a great reporter first and then a great editor. He knew a story when he saw one—often before anyone else—he saw the outlines of the forest when others lost themselves among the trees, and he could tell what he saw with an elegant simplicity born of perfect integrity.

Working the desk, he wielded his thick lead pencils with the aplomb of an editorial Picasso. A few scratch marks, a caret or two, and here and there a hyphen or comma, and bloated copy became lithe and readable.

As a publisher, he concerned himself with what readers should know as well as what they wanted to know.

With a constituency hell-bent for rapid economic development, he urged caution and study. In a growing upper middle class white community, he pointed to the misery and despair among the Native population. In 1970, the year of the backlash on the Native land claims, his paper repeatedly pounded home the necessity for responsible state participation in the settlement.

The Fanning credo was to turn out a superior editorial product, and to hope that the demand for such a product eventually became the norm of the community.

Larry Fanning opened shop in Anchorage in September, 1967, as custodian of the second newspaper in a one-newspaper town. It was a forbidding task in a forbidding county. Yet it showed the mettle of the man, as well as his humility. For Larry Fanning was no never-do-well to whom Alaska was the stop before oblivion.

At the time he came to Anchorage he was already a man held in deep national esteem throughout the journalistic profession, an esteem earned over the course of 20 successful years as managing editor of the San Francisco Chronicle, executive editor of the Chicago Sun Times, and editor of the Chicago Daily News. (During one of his gloomier moments in Anchorage, I asked him why he didn't just can the whole Alaskan operation and take one of the numerous outside offers that came across his desk. "I've done everything I ever wanted to do on a major metro-

politan daily," he replied matter-of-factly. "But if this little bastard makes it . . .")

So much for the clichés about the public Larry Fanning. There was another side to Larry, a private side that those of us who worked for him and loved him got to know in stages:

There was the tough Irish kid who wanted to go into the priesthood until he discovered that all the fathers at the high school academy loved Franco.

There was the cocky young intellect who once lost his tongue during a high school address in front of a packed auditorium, almost committed suicide over the shame of it—Larry Fanning held himself to a standard of excellence which no human being could approach—and who could never do anything but read a speech in public again.

And there was the patriot who watched Joe McCarthy wreck the lives of other patriots during his heyday, and who decided then that when a reporter catches a politician lying, the place to say it is on the front page in bold type and not buried with the editorial page copy that only a handful of people read.

There was the perfectionist who could brood for hours over minor errata in his paper, who blamed himself rather than the guilty reporter or desk man for every mistake that appeared in print, who had disciplined every ounce of personal motive or bias out of his product without ever depriving that product of a point of view.

And there was the man who worried himself sick about other people's problems, the man with more compassion than his body could contain, the universal donor, the soft touch, a man so distrustful of his own human potential for abusing power that his office often resembled a sitting room for crackpots, malcontents, and every form of community paranoid with a chip on his shoulder or an ax to grind. Larry was more than a publisher; he was a public ombudsman.

For the reporter, the greatest problem in working for Larry Fanning was that you knew you had achieved Nirvana and would never be completely happy working for anyone else. You were coddled. You were given countless opportunities for self expression. Larry would see that you got to where the action was whatever the cost. When he worked the desk, he would polish your copy like a precious gem. If you turned a five-inch story into 30 good inches, he would find a place to fit. When he felt the need to correct or reprimand you, he would lecture you for 45 minutes in his office, the first 44 of which were devoted to a discussion of his own failure. He never asked for a favor; nor did he ever deny one. The kid who had almost become a priest became a father confessor for every one of his staff. When the time came you felt you had to leave, it was like going away from home. And when you got to wherever you were going you invariably found that Larry had paved the way so you would not enter your new surroundings as a stranger.

Such indulgence was uncommon in a world as curt as ours. But it worked for Larry Fanning and his flock. A list of those whose skills he nurtured, whose careers he pushed along could well be mistaken for a list of "Who's Who in American Journalism." Pierre Salinger, press secretary to John F. Kennedy worked nine years for Larry at the San Francisco Chronicle. Peter Lisagor covered Washington for Larry and the Chicago Daily News. Syndicated columnists Joseph Kraft and Carl Rowan owe no small measure of their success to Larry's patronage. Chicago's irreverent Mike Royko literally learned to write under Larry's tutelage, and Nicholas Von Hoffman, the Washington Post's ambassador either to or from the New Left, was a brooding sociologist when he first came under Larry's wing in Chicago.

Larry worked 12 or 14 hours a day, sometimes more, often seven days a week. He was advised not to work so hard or care so much,

but it was like advising a cow to spend her time producing something other than milk.

Critics said that Larry led too often with his chin. But he didn't. He led with his heart and his heart gave out last Wednesday for good.

Those whose lives he touched most directly will miss him a lot. A picture of his beaming face—eyes twinkling with a promised mischief that never materialized, pipe clenched firmly between his teeth, collar open, bow tie laying unknotted tracing his collarbone, will always live within us. His inspiration has already been built into our work.

"They give birth astride of a grave, the light gleams an instant, then it's night once more," Samuel Beckett wrote in "Waiting for Godot." Larry Fanning's night has come. But his light will continue to gleam in the souls of those who knew him best.

#### BASIC VALUES OF TRUE DEMOCRACY

### HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 12, 1971

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks a column entitled "Perspective On America," written by the distinguished King Features Columnist Prof. John P. Roche, of Brandeis University, and dated March 9, 1971.

Dr. Roche is again demonstrating himself to be one of the most effective and eloquent spokesmen in our country for the basic values of true democracy.

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

#### PERSPECTIVE ON AMERICA

(By John P. Roche)

Because I refuse to consider the United States a repressive, fascist, imperialist, racist nation, a number of correspondents have accused me—often quite vividly—of "selling out to the conservatives," or some such crime. It is quite true that, with all its evident failings, I love this crazy country, but not just because I was born here, or because "The Star-Spangled Banner" hits me where I live. Indeed, professional patriots turn me off even faster than New Leftists.

No, my affection for the American people has been a function of experience, of watching for over 30 years the growth of American commitment to freedom, justice and equality. The America of my childhood was constitutionally racist. The Supreme Court had defined "equal protection of the laws" to include mandatory segregation. It was casually and customarily racist: I didn't know the polite words "Jew," "Negro" or, for that matter, "Italian," existed until I was about 14. I recall political posters in New York City in 1938 urging all and sundry to "Vote Dewey, Not Jewey." (In fairness to Thomas E. Dewey, these reflected the views of local leaders, not Dewey's, towards Herbert Lehman.)

When I entered grade school, there was no significant trade union movement in the United States. It was the era of the "open shop" when workers were simply treated like commodities. Every time union organizers attempted to remedy this condition of pure exploitation, some judge or other would issue an injunction. Some injunctions! They even forbade organizers to make speeches that might incite workers to violate "yellow dog" contracts, that is, contracts which included a promise not to join a union. If that didn't

work and the unions got uppity, out would come the National Guard to enforce the injunction.

As far as justice was concerned, an individual had no rights protected by the Constitution against his state or local government. A radical whose views offended his listeners was customarily arrested for violence—the proof of which was that this audience had beaten him up.

Yale President Kingman Brewster's statement that he didn't think a Panther could get a fair trial in the United States of 1970 was an accurate description of reality about 40 years ago—only it could then be extended to include all Negroes accused of crimes against white society. (Crimes against fellow blacks were generally ignored by the police; like gangland killings they were considered private rather than public business.)

Admittedly this is a view from the bottom, but most Americans lived on the bottom. In 1934, about 15 million Americans were unemployed, and millions more semi-employed; the South was a disaster area; most farmers were bankrupt; more than 4,000 banks, with uninsured deposits, had folded; and the Gross National Product had dropped to \$58 billion. It was a great world to grow up into—and just over the horizon was World War II.

However, this is not an exercise in generational self-pity. My point is that throughout this incredible era (when many feared native fascism) freedom not only survived, but expanded. New Deal legislation, inadequate as it was, began to redress the inequities in our society. In the postwar period, the first real steps were taken to admit Negroes to the political community, and in general the federal courts began protecting minority rights in unprecedented fashion. Finally, under President Johnson's leadership, even Congress got in the act. In short, freedom has flourished as never before in our history.

There are a number of things left on the agenda: A good "Soak the Rich" tax structure, a thoroughgoing reform of our whole system of criminal justice (including prisons), a nationally administered and funded program of income maintenance to eliminate the welfare monstrosity, a resuscitation of our cities (a precondition for racial equality)—to mention only a few.

Perhaps liberals will get the American people to support these measures. Maybe we won't. But we know one thing for certain: we have the freedom to assault "the System," the freedom to mobilize for our cause, the freedom to rebuild America when people are persuaded. If you think I am naive or an Establishment apologist, invite a 50-year-old Negro or unionist to lunch.

**PROTECT TAXPAYERS' FUNDS FOR CANAL; LAKE OKLAWAHA ATTRACTS 340,000 VISITORS TO CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL**

**HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, Jacksonville, Fla., my hometown, is the Atlantic Ocean exit for the one-third complete Cross-Florida Barge Canal, a project which the House Appropriations Subcommittee for Public Works said in June 1970, would bring about a long-term gain in the environmental quality.

The citizens and taxpayers of Jacksonville, Florida's largest city, have con-

tributed over \$6.5 million toward the canal project, which was authorized by the Congress for national defense reasons and is economically justified.

Ten percent of what the Congress has appropriated since fiscal year 1964—\$60 million for construction of the 107-mile waterway—has been contributed by Jacksonville taxpayers for right-of-way along the canal route, traversing a little-used area of Florida, and until the canal project was started, almost unavailable for recreation or environmental pleasures by the almost 7 million citizens of Florida and the 23 million visitors to our State annually.

A 13,000-acre lake created at the Rodman Dam as part of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal, now known as Lake Oklawaha, has attracted 340,000 visitors over the last year. This new recreational oasis is a prime spot for outdoor-hungry Floridians and out-of-State tourists for fishing, boating, camping, picnicking, and other activities.

Attached is an article by Bob Cloaninger of the Jacksonville Journal of February 26, 1971, titled "340,000 Rodman Visitors in 1970," which I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I also include an article from the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, March 9, 1971, indicating the support of the city of Jacksonville's city council in efforts to retain the Canal Authority of the State of Florida to protect Jacksonville taxpayers and their \$6.5 million in tax funds paid for the canal:

**340,000 RODMAN VISITORS IN 1970**

(By Bob Cloaninger)

Recreation facilities at Rodman Reservoir, which could be drained in the near future, were used by more than 340,000 people last year.

The 13,000-acre lake was constructed as part of the Cross Florida Barge Canal and while construction on the canal has been stopped, the lake is becoming a focal point for recreation in Putnam and Marion counties.

There are now five outdoor recreation sites bordering the lake, complete with boat-launching ramps and picnic facilities. There's also a camping area near the dam.

Halting construction of the canal has made quite a dent in Florida's big business economy and draining the lake would apparently cut deeply into the pocketbooks of several small businesses.

Fish camps as far away as Welaka have been utilizing the lake and bait and tackle shops in Palatka and small communities near the lake report increased business because of Rodman.

"Frankly, I don't think I could make it if they drained Rodman," said Scotty Craddock, manager of Andersen's Fishing Lodge at Welaka. Craddock said fishing has fallen off so drastically in nearby Lake George and in the St. Johns River that his guides now depend on Rodman to produce strings of big bass for the tourist fishermen.

It's an hour and a half trip by boat from Welaka to Rodman, cruising up the St. Johns to the abandoned canal, up the canal and then through the lock into the lake.

Craddock said all of his guides now fish Rodman exclusively and practically every boat that leaves his camp heads for the reservoir.

Other small businesses closer to the lake have noted increased sales in fishing tackle, soft drinks, beer and foods used by picnickers and fishermen. Service stations on routes leading to Rodman also report numerous

sales to people going to and from the reservoir.

Although Rodman hasn't gained a national reputation as a great fishing hole, this writer interviewed anglers from North Carolina, Illinois and Georgia on the lake within the last week. None were greatly impressed with the fishing, but all expressed an interest in returning when "fishing gets better."

The fate of Rodman has not yet been finalized, but conservationists have expressed a desire to see the lake drained and the Oklawaha River, which was dammed to form the reservoir, returning to its primitive state.

The great difference in what is there now and what was there four years ago is primarily that existing facilities are open to the public. A majority of the Oklawaha River prior to construction of the canal was private land without public access.

As a navigable waterway the public could use the river for boating and fishing, but boat ramps were few. However, during periods of low water it was all but impossible to get a boat through some stretches of the river and during the annual high water navigation was again nearly impossible.

Conservationists point out that the Ocala National Forest borders a long portion of the Oklawaha and therefore this section was available to the public. True, the forest did border several miles of the river—the same holds true now for Rodman—but some of this land was leased to individuals for construction of vacation homes.

Conservationists have argued that considerable wildlife habitat has been destroyed by the lake. Deer, bear and other dry-land animals, were forced out of the river bottom, but other wildlife is now making good use of the area.

At least seven bald eagles are known to have moved into the area since the lake was established. Florida and Alaska seem to be the final stronghold of the national emblem and these great birds at Rodman should certainly be protected.

Also, Dave Bowman, wildlife biologist at Rodman, said he has counted 47 limpkins around the lake. Limpkins are a rare and endangered species of wading bird that feeds almost entirely on apple snails, which are in the lake in large numbers.

At least six pairs of osprey (an endangered species of exceptionally large fish-eating hawk) have selected the lake as a nesting area. There are two large rookeries holding numerous egrets, anhinga (water turkey or serpent bird), and other marsh and water birds. There are also a number of great blue herons, little blue herons and cranes living around the lake.

Alligators are making a comeback in Rodman and wild ducks have already started using it as a winter home.

What has happened is that one form of wildlife has already replaced another. If the lake is drained the animals that now reside there will be forced to hunt for a new home—or die.

While draining the lake has been mentioned several times by the conservationists, no one has come up with the solution of what to do with the land. An attorney for the Florida Canal Authority said if the lake is drained the land would probably have to be returned to the original landowners.

UNIT

(By Paul McGinty)

City Council addressed itself to Tallahassee last night in resolutions urging that nothing be done to kill the canal authority and that something be done to get back the shipping the state's oil spillage law is said to be driving away.

Noting that Duval County has invested over \$6.5 million in the canal, council quickly and unanimously urged that neither the

governor, the Cabinet nor the state legislature take "any action which would restrict the Canal Authority of Florida in seeking a solution to the numerous legal questions which have been raised as a result of the President's order stopping the construction of the (Cross Florida) Barge Canal."

"The interest of Duval County and other interested counties and agencies in the tax monies contributed by Duval County can only be properly represented by the continued existence and freedom of action of the canal authority," states the resolution.

## THE SST AND THE ENVIRONMENT

### HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 12, 1971

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, throughout the long debate on the supersonic transport—SST—the principal argument used to oppose the development of this aircraft has been based on the allegation that it would have a disastrous impact on our environment.

I have long supported the development of the SST for several reasons. Our continued economic well-being and technological leadership are closely linked to the successful completion of this project.

I have never been dissuaded by those who have characterized this aircraft as an ecological monster. It should be realized that not a single environmental argument raised by the opponents of the SST has stood up under careful examination.

On March 8, 1971, the National Observer published an article on the subject. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

#### ENVIRONMENTAL SCARE OVER SST EVAPORATES (By Jude Wanniski)

The environmental arguments against the supersonic transport (SST) are now in tatters. As a result, chances have improved that later this month Congress will decide to go ahead with the airplane. Of all the horrifying concerns raised by the environmental lobby against the SST, not one has survived a barrage of intense scientific scrutiny.

In hearings last week before a House Appropriations subcommittee, the Coalition Against the SST showed its desperation. The most serious ecological warning came from Dr. James McDonald, a University of Arizona physicist, who argued that a fleet of SST's would cause atmospheric changes that would expose Americans to greater radiation, that exposure would cause an extra 5,000 to 10,000 cases of skin cancer in the United States.

This theory was too much for Rep. Silvio Conte, a Massachusetts Republican who last year voted against the SST. Mr. Conte asked Dr. McDonald if the physicist also believes, as Mr. Conte was told, that flying saucers may have been responsible for the power brown-outs in the Northeastern United States.

"I've kept the same open mind on UFOs as I have on the SST," said Dr. McDonald, who thereupon urged Mr. Conte to scour the Air Force archives for himself to see the evidence that points to the probability of the existence of flying saucers. "I wish I had the time," sighed Mr. Conte.

The most important testimony came from

Dr. William Kellogg, associate director of the National Center for Atmospheric Research. Dr. Kellogg last year chaired a symposium of physicists that reviewed the climatic effects of the SST. It concluded that although some additional research was needed, there is no concrete reason for holding up SST prototype development.

Dr. S. Fred Singer, deputy Secretary of the Interior and the chairman of the American Geophysical Union's Committee on Environmental Quality, also gave the project a green light. He told the subcommittee he is "95 per cent sure" the SST would have no significant harmful effect on the environment. And within two years, before the United States would have to decide whether or not to go from prototype to production of SSTs, he believes he can be "99.99 per cent sure."

The environmental lobby should be delighted with its success to date. Through the lobby's pressures, the Administration has ruled out SST flights over land, eliminating the sonic-boom problem. It has also pledged that should the SST fail to get a clean bill of health from the scientific research of the next two years, the plane will not be built. Further, the contractors now promise that the SST will be cleaner and quieter than any of the commercial jets now in use. And if it doesn't meet these higher standards, says the Administration, it will not be certified.

But the lobby, the Coalition Against the SST, is not happy. It simply doesn't want the airplane built. A year ago, the coalition—which includes the Sierra Club, the Friends of the Earth, the Environmental Defense Fund—argued that the SST sideline noise was too high, that it measured 124 EPNdb (effective perceived noise in decibels). The coalition insisted the SST be required to meet the new regulations for subsonic jets, 108 EPNdb. The engine contractor, General Electric, redesigned the engine. It now says it will meet the 108 EPNdb standard. The Sierra Club now insists the requirement be made 98 EPNdb.

#### REACTION AGAINST PROGRESS

Dr. Singer has a theory about these objections. "Why has there been so much fuss raised about the SST? Why is the conflict focused on this particular new technology? I think the answer is complex, but perhaps one of the important reasons is that the SST has become a symbol. In my view, we are witnessing here a general reaction against all technological progress, and against basic science itself, on the part of a coalition of people which—paradoxically—includes scientists."

In this view, the environmental opposition to the SST is largely unreasoning, more a visceral yearning to see technological progress frozen while a way is found to cleanse water and air. Of course, this is a hopeless ideal, even a counter-productive one, especially since the United States is profoundly enmeshed in global economics. Indeed, only by more rapid advances in the "right kinds" of technology will the nation outrace pollution.

Before the end of this month, Congress will have to decide whether or not the SST is the "right kind" of technology, a decision that should be easier now that the environmental issues have become clearer. The question now: Is the SST an economically sound proposition?

Here, the Administration and the aviation industry acknowledge they will not really know until the prototypes are completed and flight-tested. But they insist the stakes are so high and the odds are so favorable that it would be near criminal not to take the gamble. The Government has already invested \$1 billion; it will take \$300,000,000 to complete the prototypes.

Since the British and French and the Russians are well ahead in SST development, the Administration says there is the real possibility that if the Congress says "no" on the SST a lot of unpleasant things could

happen: a loss of 150,000 jobs in the U.S. aircraft industry; an accumulative loss, by 1985, in the U.S. balance of trade of more than 50 billion; loss to the U.S. Treasury not only the \$1 billion so far invested, which would be repaid through royalties, but more than \$6 billion in corporate and personal income taxes.

Private industry is in no position to gamble another \$300,000,000 to find out if the SST will prove economic. The industry already has a \$139,000,000 investment in the plane, and, if the prototypes show an economic potential, the contractors will have to find more than \$4 billion for production. The Government is playing for bigger stakes. If the SST is not built, industry's loss of potential profits would be small compared with the staggering losses the U.S. Government would face in damage to a basic industry. On this reasoning, the House Appropriations subcommittee last week gave its nod, by a 7-to-2 vote, to the SST.

The environmentalists refuse to recognize the chief reason the SST is attractive to the world's airline companies, although this same reason promises a beneficial impact on the environment: The SST would be twice as productive as the most productive subsonic jet, the Boeing 747. Thus, it would take half as many SSTs as 747s to handle transoceanic traffic.

#### RHETORICAL TRAP

If it had not been for the continuing advances in productivity in commercial aircraft, the skies would be swarming with airplanes to handle the demand and airports would have to be 10 times their current size. William Magruder, director of SST development in the Department of Transportation, points out that it would take 50,000 DC-3s to handle the air traffic now served by the U.S. jet fleet of 3,000.

In a way, the Coalition Against the SST has been trapped by its own rhetoric. It built the SST into "an ecological disaster" of such monstrous proportions—in the process allying itself with forces that don't want the SST built no matter how benign its environmental impact—that it cannot now gracefully back away.

The same coalition, which includes the American Federation of Scientists and the Council for a Liveable World, also came together to lobby against antiballistic missiles. When these groups join together, seeking strength in unity, they give up independence of action. They find they can't peel out from the coalition once they get what they would normally feel is a reasonable compromise. They must fight to the bitter end with nonnegotiable demands.

The coalition will continue to push the skin-cancer theory, but not with any enthusiasm. It recognizes it now must battle the airplane on economic grounds, and last week presented an economic case.

Russell Brown, a young chemical engineer from Idaho, appeared on the coalition's behalf, submitting a paper that "proves" the SST could not compete with the 747. When a subcommittee member praised him for his testimony, Mr. Brown could not resist boasting that he had worked out his calculations "in two evenings at a dining-room table." The arithmetic, he said, was so simple that "any eighth-grader could do it."

#### CONDONING THE GHETTO

### HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago the Kerner Commission reported that our Nation was moving toward two societies—one black, one white, separate

and unequal. Today, the recommendations which the Commission made sit on a shelf collecting dust. And the desperate conditions which the blacks find themselves in are perpetuated. They need not continue. However, they are aggravated by the actions or lack of actions taken by this administration. An editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post Dispatch on March 3 reports that the Commission's recommendations on improving minority housing outside the ghetto have been totally neglected. The article points up the fact that from 1960 to 1970 the percentage of blacks living in the suburbs increased a mere three one-hundredths of a percent.

This administration has not taken adequate steps to integrate the suburbs. The President shrugged off the recommendations made by Secretary Romney to bring Federal action against suburbs which refuses to accept low- or moderate-income housing. The editorial states that:

The President told reporters in effect that government would support the black man who had the money to buy a house in the suburbs but faced discriminatory obstacles, yet government would not use its legal and financial leverage to compel suburbs to accept housing projects against their wishes.

The Nixon position exemplifies what the Kerner Commission stated, that white society condones and maintains the ghetto. The position opposes the thesis of the Kerner report that low-cost housing should be dispersed beyond the core cities. And so racial conflict in this Nation will continue until our Chief Executive learns that he must come to grips with these problems.

I commend to my colleagues' attention the St. Louis Post Dispatch editorial. The editorial follows:

#### CONDONING THE GHETTO

The National Urban Coalition is studying six cities to see how they have fared since the report of the Kerner Commission on Civil Disorders three years ago. Senator Fred Harris, a member of that commission, says government's response has been "almost nonexistent." That is probably what the coalition will find.

In 1968 the Kerner Commission warned that the "nation is moving toward two societies—one black, one white, separate and unequal." Hence it proposed rebuilding urban areas, dispersing low-cost housing beyond the central cities, strengthening law enforcement, developing 2,000,000 new jobs and providing some national program of income supplementation.

About the only response from the Federal Government in three years is to put more money and weapons into the hands of law enforcement. Family assistance as proposed by the Nixon Administration has been held up in Congress. The rebuilding of urban areas has been minor, and recession tends to develop unemployment rather than new jobs.

Probably the key proposal of the commission was to provide better minority housing outside the ghetto. The Kerner report said this: "What white Americans have never fully understood—but what the Negro can never forget—is that white society is deeply implicated in the ghetto. White institutions created it, white institutions maintain it and white society condones it."

So it has been; so it is today. St. Louis has seen its suburbs zone out moderate-income projects that would enable blacks to leave the ghetto and go where there are better

homes, schools and job opportunities. In the 67 largest metropolitan areas of the country, the percentage of blacks in the suburbs increased between 1960 and 1970 from a minuscule 4.2 per cent to a minute 4.5 per cent.

These statistics reflect, as Senator Harris says, federal inaction. The Civil Rights Act passed in the same year as the Kerner report was issued required affirmative government action to open the suburbs to all races. But the Government is not doing its job.

To a great degree the fault lies with the Nixon Administration. Secretary Romney almost alone has argued for use of federal power to withhold federal grants for public projects, or urban renewal money, if the suburbs do not accept low or moderate-income housing. Communities using zoning laws and other devices against open housing have occasionally faced federal suits.

Yet a few days ago President Nixon undercut these ideas and suits. He told reporters in effect that government would support the black man who had the money to buy a house in the suburbs but faced discriminatory obstacles, yet government would not use its legal and financial leverage to compel suburbs to accept housing projects against their wishes.

This clarifies past statements by Mr. Nixon that he would not "force" integration of suburban housing. Unfortunately, history shows that a good deal of desegregation has had to be "forced" by government. The Nixon position exemplifies what the Kerner commission stated, that white society condones and maintains the ghetto. The position opposes the thesis of the Kerner report that low-cost housing should be dispersed beyond the core cities.

In short, Mr. Nixon offers little against the trend toward two societies, separate and unequal. Yet if the nation is ever to compose its tragic racial division, if it is ever to follow the wise guidance of the Kerner report, it will need national leadership to do so. Where is that leadership?

#### INDEPENDENCE OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE

### HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 12, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Norfolk, Va., Ledger-Star of March 10 contains an excellent editorial on the subject of independence of the Federal Reserve.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "The Fed's Independence," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks. The editor of the Norfolk Ledger-Star is William H. Fitzpatrick.

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

#### THE FED'S INDEPENDENCE

When Dr. Arthur F. Burns was sworn in as the 10th chairman of the Federal Reserve Board early last year, President Nixon put great emphasis on the new chairman's independence. And then, perhaps more than half seriously, the President said he hoped that "independently, he (Dr. Burns) will conclude that my views are the ones that should be followed."

As matters are turning out, this hope of Mr. Nixon's is fading a bit, while that part about Dr. Burns' independence is getting some fresh and altogether healthy emphasis.

The emerging difference between the Burns view and the Nixon view arises, moreover, from a change in the President's approach

to economic questions, rather than from any new concepts on the part of the Fed's chairman.

For while the two were seeing pretty much eye-to-eye at the time of the Burns appointment, the President has most definitely shifted economic ground in the past few months, with his proposals for an expansionary budget and the inclusion of substantial deficit spending in an attempt to spur the flagging economy and reduce unemployment.

Then suddenly, there is Dr. Burns, balking and speaking out against Presidential policy with the same candor and firmness as his tough-minded predecessor, William McChesney Martin, who was quick to challenge the White House when he thought the White House was wrong. Specifically, Dr. Burns is worried that the President's economic stimull will be inflationary. And while he is willing to have the Fed expand money supply and credit as needed, he is refusing to approve the more rapid expansion the administration wants.

Well, in this situation Dr. Burns is going to get a good deal of applause from those who simply believe he is on the sounder economic footing, and that the President's pump-priming approach is dangerous. Virginia's Senator Byrd is certainly in this category, and in a statement recently found great encouragement in the braking effect of the Burns position on the new Nixon policy.

But even without arguing the merits of the respective economic theories, there is something most reassuring in the way Dr. Burns is functioning in his key fiscal post—something which Senator Byrd also commented favorably upon. That something is the effective separation of the Fed and its influential chairman from the politics and the day-to-day policy decisions of the administration.

The country is fortunate in the way the power to influence the economy by government action has been divided up by law, so that means are at hand to prevent the massive, one-direction fiscal manipulation which could be wrong—disastrously. The nation is even more fortunate when men of great integrity wield the key positions of power in this situation.

Dr. Burns went into the chairmanship as a Nixon appointee, but he is plainly going to be his own man, regardless of who happens to be President. And, with the new chairman's acknowledged competence in money matters, this independence augurs well for the future of the country.

#### FIRING 57 AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS PROVING COSTLY BOTH TO CONTROLLERS AND TO COUNTRY

### HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the air traffic controller "sickout" last April, 57 controllers were fired by the Federal Aviation Administration—FAA.

Some of those fired have been reinstated as a result of appeals; most of the others have appeals pending. But the tragic result of the dismissals is that our control towers and centers have been deprived of some of their most skilled controllers.

As we all remember, Mr. Speaker, one of the central issues in this dispute was the shortage of controllers, a shortage acknowledged de facto by the FAA when it hired a record number of controller trainees last year. Ironically, the highly skilled men who could contribute sig-

nificantly to air safety, are stubbornly being kept off their jobs.

One of those fired is working as a carpenter thousands of miles from his former home; one is selling insurance; one, an ex-chief with 28 years' experience as a controller, is unemployed.

All this at a time when the remaining controllers are again working overtime hours that tax nerves and lower safety standards.

Moreover, it is possible to total up substantial dollar costs resulting from the firings.

At an estimated cost of \$15,000 to train a new controller, the price tag for replacing all of those fired would run more than \$800,000.

Some of the firings have already been reversed on appeal, either by the Civil Service Commission or the FAA itself, with the men receiving full back pay and benefits for the period between firing and reinstatement—in some cases as long as 10 months.

Many overtime hours now being worked, at a premium cost to the Government, can be attributed to the non-availability of those who have been fired.

Meanwhile, many of those dismissed have suffered economic tragedies while their sophisticated, highly demanded skills go unused.

Many of the problems I have noted were discussed in a thoughtful article by John Cramer in last Friday's Washington Daily News. For the benefit of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD, I include the article in its entirety.

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 5, 1971]

**FAA DEALING HARSHLY WITH CONTROLLERS**  
(By John Cramer)

There's sharp contrast between the way the Postal Service treated the 200,000 postal employes who went out on a wildcat strike last April—and the way Federal Aviation Administration treated the 3,200 air traffic controllers who went on "sick-out" in March and April.

The postal employes struck for more pay—and got it.

The controllers went "sick" (Labor Department later formally declared their action a strike) for greater air safety, including more controllers. They, too, won their point.

But where the Postal Service, as pointed out here Monday, has not penalized a single striking postal employe except to dock them pay for the days they were off work, FAA has taken the tough approach.

**57 FIRED**

It has fired a total of 57 controllers, almost all of them local presidents or leaders of the Professional Air Controllers Organization, which sponsored the "sick-out."

It has suspended some 1,800, the great majority on the basis of two days suspension for each "sick" day.

But interestingly, FAA is having trouble making its stiffer penalties stick.

All 57 controllers have appealed.

Five have been restored, with retroactive back pay, after FAA hearings. (Why didn't FAA hold hearings before it fired?)

Six others have been restored, again retroactively, by Civil Service Commission order.

An additional nine have won preliminary commission decisions in their favor at the regional office level. FAA is contesting these decisions.

Thirty-five appeals still are pending. Only two controllers have lost their appeals at the commission level.

Meanwhile, however, FAA also is finding that at least some federal courts take a dim view of its tough approach. There's large question about the legality of the 57-firings.

A layman may even suspect that FAA's attorneys bungled. And eventually, the Supreme Court probably will decide.

The possible bungling came this way:

About three weeks after the start of the "sick-out", FAA went into 17 federal district courts and obtained injunctions requiring the "sick" to return to work. It argued, among other things, that it desperately needed their services for air safety reasons.

Then, when the controllers returned in response to the court orders, FAA promptly began to fire the first of the 57 local union leaders who allegedly had been most active in promoting the "sick-out".

The union promptly challenged the firings. And several district courts, including those in Denver, New York, and Chicago, sustained the union.

They ruled in effect: "Whoa, now, FAA. We ordered your people returned to work because you insisted you needed them—for air safety. Then you fired them. That wasn't what we had in mind.

"We heard only your side of the story, FAA. Had we known you intended to fire, we would have heard both.

"We ordered a return to status quo. We didn't mean to give you a license to fire—even though the law permits firing of federal employes who strike against the government."

**VARIED RULINGS**

U.S. Courts of Appeal upheld the Denver and Chicago decisions against firing of the strikers. But an Appeals Court in New York overruled the lower court decision there.

Thus, the issue now is headed for the Supreme Court on the basis of conflicting decisions from the appellate courts.

Meantime, the controller "sick-out"—or strike as it has been officially ruled—stand as something unique.

Here were 3,200 relatively well-paid (\$17,000-\$18,000) guys, bearing terrible responsibility, walking off their jobs because they insisted their work conditions imperiled the safety of millions of air travelers they were sworn to protect.

They could cite under-staffing . . . long hours of overtime . . . a minimum of work breaks to ease the strain . . . incompetent supervision . . . group records which proved an exorbitant rate of broken homes, breakdowns and suicides . . . and above all, that searing responsibility for those 98 passengers, landing, on instruments, at a souped-in, stacked-up airport.

**OFFICIAL REPORTS**

They also could cite numerous official reports, and the testimony of at least one former FAA chief supporting their basic contention that safe air control calls for far more controllers, and much more effort to reduce strain.

The controllers won something: Last year, FAA hired 3,600 controller trainees, the greatest number in history. Today, it has more controllers, 10,000 journeymen as against 8,900 last year, and more trainees than ever before.

There will be many take-offs and many landings before the "sick-out" finally is evaluated.

Perhaps someday there will be plaques at major airports to commemorate these men who dared so much—not for themselves, but for others.

Meantime, the controllers can expect little compassion from FAA. But probably a great deal from federal officials, including federal judges, who travel much by air.

**BERKELEY—AN EXPERIMENT IN TAKEOVER FOR A RED SANCTUARY WITHIN THE U.S.A.**

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, there appears a likely possibility that a Black Panther controlled police force and a Marxist-type rule might become a reality in Berkeley, Calif., when the ballots are counted in the April 6 municipal elections in that city.

That such a grave experiment in liberal democracy was allowed to develop can be credited in large measure to extreme U.S. Supreme Court decisions which have taken from sovereign States their people's power to regulate voting, invalidated all laws to protect the internal security of the country, provided extralegal sanctuary to criminals, and handcuffed the police. Now the American people may learn the truth behind the voting rights act, instant voting appeals, instant welfare, and instant public housing—a mobile voting bloc for target areas, and have made a shambles of our Constitution.

However, the Supreme Court is not alone to blame for this most serious development. The learned men who wrote the U.S. Constitution, provided through a system of checks and balances, a means for the legislative branch—the only branch elected by the people—to check the power of a tyrannical Supreme Court in article III, section 2, clause 2:

In all cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction. In all the other Cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.

Congress, therefore, can again save the day simply by passing a law limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and reenacting laws providing for the protection of our people by the arrest and prosecution of those working and calling for the overthrow of the Constitution.

We are witnessing the effects caused by erosion of the U.S. Constitution and the undermining of this great Republic. It is within our power to stop this insanity now—if only we use that power.

If your children and grandchildren and mine must eventually live as slaves in a totalitarian state, they can rightfully hold us culpable for their servitude because of our apathetic inaction. By our failure to act now to stop the subversion by the collectivists and their exploited idealists within our country, we are in effect collaborating in their satanic endeavors.

Because of the tyrannical usurpation of power by the Supreme Court, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 390, which would limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. The thrust of my bill would be to curb the power of the High Court to rule unconstitutional—a right which does

not exist except by judicial usurpation—laws passed by Congress, thereby allowing Congress to go about the business of enacting laws imminently vital to protect the decent productive citizens of this country from the criminal anarchist element which is gnawing from within at the foundations of law and morality upon which our country was built.

I insert my H.R. 390 at this point in my remarks:

H.R. 390

A bill to impose certain restrictions upon the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 81 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:*

"§ 1259. Appellate jurisdiction; limitations  
"The Supreme Court shall not have appellate jurisdiction to—

"(1) decide that any provision of a statute of the United States, a State statute, or a State constitution, is invalid because it is in violation of any provision of the Constitution of the United States, or

"(2) reverse, alter, or modify any decision or rule of law made by the Court, except upon the concurrence of the full membership of the Court."

(b) The section analysis at the beginning of chapter 81 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"1259. Appellate jurisdiction; limitations."

Mr. Speaker, the hour is late. It is high time that we, the people's Congress, arouse from our lethargy and take prompt and positive action to curb the appellate jurisdiction of the runaway Court and then proceed with due haste to enact legislation to repair the damage done by the imprudent and unconstitutional decisions of the High Court.

I fail to comprehend that there could be any lack of concern of this responsible body regarding the internal threat to our Constitution.

In addition to the de facto High Court decisions and the failure of previous Congresses to repair the damage wrought by those decisions, the people of the United States, in the final analysis, must shoulder the responsibility for allowing this liberal's induced environment in Berkeley to ferment and to be tolerated.

During the last half of 1969, Dr. George S. Benson, president of the national education program and president emeritus of Harding College of Searcy, Ark., had prepared and distributed a tape recording of the speeches delivered from the main podium of the Black Panther "United Front" revolutionary conference at Oakland, July 18-20, 1969. In attendance at this conference were approximately 4,000 delegates from over 300 Communist and other anti-American groups. At this conference, such publicized Communists as Angela Davis, Herbert Aptheker, and Attorney William Kunstler spoke and openly called for the overthrow of the government of this country.

An outcome of the conference was a call to establish National Committees to Combat Fascism in cities throughout America. One of the primary objectives of an NCCF was to get community control of the police. Already in Berkeley

enough signatures have been secured to have placed on the ballot an amendment to Berkeley city charter which would give the Black Panthers control of a part of the police department and the power to virtually destroy law enforcement.

In New Orleans, La., the National Committee to Combat Fascism was active in shaking down welfare recipients to finance the NCCF's fascist battle. See my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 116, part 26, page 34971.

Making a mockery of the elective process, thousands of hippies and other unproductive dregs of society have converged on Berkeley to register within the 90-day deadline prior to the election.

In the meantime at the university special interest, noncredit extension courses are offered in such "academic" areas as sex pairing, styles of communes, witchcraft and other high-level psychological offerings to soothe the savage breast and keep the "new voters" on hand with relevant entertainment.

Will the American people be watching the takeover of an American city by a group of Marxists and other radicals while we, their representatives in the Congress, do nothing? May God forbid this.

Again, I say, the time to act is now. I insert at this point a newsclipping on the "new" extension courses at the University of California at Berkeley and Dr. Benson's account of the Berkeley affair entitled "Red Putsch at Berkeley" from the February 1971, issue of his National Program Letter:

#### RED PUTSCH AT BERKELEY

(By Dr. George S. Benson)

Could an American city be taken over by Communists in 1971? Hardly any person in our nation would answer "Yes" to this question. Could a coalition of radical extremists and revolutionaries, dedicated to actions and programs charted by known Communists, seize control of an American city in 1971 through legal political action? Most Americans understandably would say "No." It might happen in South America, the Caribbean, or some Asian country, they would say, but certainly NOT in America 1971.

It may happen in Berkeley, California, in 1971. A few hundred citizens of Berkeley are mobilizing in an attempt to turn back a powerful radical force seeking to seize control of the Berkeley city government. If the citizen movement (of pitiful, small size) falls and the radical-revolutionary coalition succeeds, many well-informed observers in Berkeley, and elsewhere in California, believe Berkeley will in time become virtually a second Cuba, an aggressive fortress of World Communism at the heart of America's intellectual "Athens" and in one of the most strategic areas, militarily, in the nation.

#### WE GO TO BERKELEY

Fantastic? Unbelievable? Yes, we thought so too when we began to get word of the developing showdown in Berkeley between the radical forces, whose "Supreme Command Headquarters" would appear to be the University of California campus, and the people whose families have built such a beautiful little city on the slopes of the Berkeley Hills overlooking San Francisco Bay, the Golden Gate, and the glittering Pacific metropolis of story-book and song.

We decided to go to Berkeley and dig out the facts. After interviews with newspaper editors on the scene, police authorities, and undercover intelligence operatives, members of Governor Reagan's staff, groups of concerned citizens, and a day spent probing the situation on the University campus with its

27,000 students (mostly graduate students) from 50 states and many foreign countries, we don't feel so sure it couldn't happen in Berkeley.

#### IT COULD HAPPEN ANYWHERE

Some of the facts revealed by our reportorial digging in and around Berkeley are, yes, fantastic; certainly unbelievable for most Americans. We hope this report will awaken millions of citizens to some of the perils confronting us inside America—for what happens at Berkeley on April 6 (and thereafter) could be made to happen any and every place in America.

We investigated in depth the Communist-conceived Black Panther referendum in Berkeley for "Community Control of Police;" the larger, more significant effort of the combined radical movement to seize control of the city government; the spread into the hills of northern California of armed "communes" whose members are building well-trained revolutionary cadres to carry on an expanding guerrilla warfare; and the thoughts of police authorities in Los Angeles and San Francisco on a shift in the nature of the revolutionary forces bent on creating chaos and panic as a prelude to seizure of control throughout the nation. The facts will be reported in this and next month's NEP Letter.

#### ALL POWER AT STAKE

One showdown will be on April 6, when Berkeley's municipal elections are held. The Panthers, through their "National Committees to Combat Fascism" (NCCF), already have succeeded in the first step of their strategy, adopted at the Communist-controlled Black Panther "United Front" revolutionary conference at Oakland, July 18-20, 1969 (reported in our Letter frequently in 1969 and 1970). They have obtained far more than the required 16,000 legal signatures and have thus placed officially on the April 6 ballot an amendment to the Berkeley City Charter which would give the Panthers control of a part of the police department (details later) and the power to virtually destroy law enforcement.

The bigger goal of the radical coalition (which includes the Panthers and about 80 other radical organizations) is control of the city government, including the school board, the entire police department, the courts—the very life and resources of this famed university of 113,000 population. The likelihood that the radicals may indeed succeed in this primary objective is what stirs the deepest fears of those people in Berkeley who have fought, so far ineffectually, the gradual growth of Communist power (in a variety of forms) in the University community and in their idyllic city by the sea.

#### SHOOTOUT BY BALLOT

Communists within the leadership of the Black Panther Party, and the Soviet and Chinese agents in America who are reportedly controlling the Panthers, are overjoyed with the recent march of events in Berkeley. What makes the Communists so happy is that even if the Panthers' "Communist Control of Police" referendum fails, its provisions would be activated if the radical candidates succeed in gaining control of the city government, which now seems a likely possibility.

Mike Culbert, Editor of the Berkeley Gazette, told us (when we visited Berkeley last week) that the referendum has about a 50-50 chance of passage and that, due to a truly fantastic election law provision requiring only 90-days residence for voting eligibility, a slate of City Council candidates and a Mayorality candidate backed by a radical coalition has better than a 50-50 chance of winning control of the city; and, if they do, Mr. Culbert says, they would do the things the Panthers want done.

#### A MARXIST-TYPE RULE?

"Make no mistake about it," he said: "The latest drive by the combined Berkeley Left to destroy the Berkeley Police Department

(legally if possible) is a genuine threat to the existence of Berkeley in recognizable form." He went on to say that if the radical slate of candidates running for four City Council seats and the Mayor's office should win, a Marxist-type rule might well become a reality. Another Berkeley citizen, one who is working undercover with various police intelligence units, went further than "might become." He told us: "We would have a completely Marxist-Maoist government in control of our city." This man, whose family for two generations has helped build Berkeley into a beautiful little city, already has made plans to move out of California.

The Black Panther referendum would, if approved, abolish the present police department. It would divide the city into four districts—two in which White residents are predominant; one in which Negro residents are predominant, and one embracing the university community melting pot in the southwest part of the city. Blacks would control police hiring and firing in their area; university students, faculty and "street" people would control their area; and white residents would have control in the two white areas, which are separated by the big Negro district.

#### GOVERNOR WATCHING

Other provisions would, opponents of the measure say, prove destructive to law and order and bring on anarchy in Berkeley. A number of Berkeley policemen have left the force, and a massive exodus is expected if the referendum passes or the radical slate of City Council candidates, and their mayoralty candidate, should win on April 6. A spokesman for Governor Ronald Reagan told us in Sacramento that the Governor is "very much concerned" over developments at Berkeley. "He is getting information from various officials and organizations," he said. "The Governor is very much aware of the situation and very much concerned."

We have heard Bobby Seale, National Chairman of the Black Panther Party, say that "Community Control of Police" should not be viewed by his comrade revolutionaries as an attempt to gain power "within the system." He said it was a "first step" in revolutionary seizure of power, and that, if the referendum did not prove to be a successful instrument for gaining "first step" control in cities throughout the nation, it was nevertheless a powerful device with which the Panthers could attract the Negro masses into a cooperative undertaking. The non-Communist masses, once they are working with the Panthers in such a project, will be better candidates, Seale explained, for recruitment into the Panther's revolutionary ranks and ultimately into the armed force required to overthrow "American Imperialism." More than 16,000 Negroes and whites signed petitions and thus are aiding the Panthers in their Berkeley grab for power.

#### BATTLE FOR BERKELEY

Most members of the present City government and many prominent citizen-leaders are frightened at the mammoth drive being mounted by the radical political elements. The radicals call it the "APRIL 6 MOVEMENT" (apparently emulating heroes of campus radicals, Castro and Guevara, with their "26th July" Cuban revolutionary movement).

Mayor Wallace Johnson, who is quitting his post, has created a committee—"ONE BERKELEY COMMUNITY"—and appointed as his co-chairmen: Wilmont Sweeney, Vice Mayor; Arnold Grossberg, President of the Berkeley Board of Education; Mrs. Carol Sibley, Board of Education member; and Mrs. Elenore Newman, Chairman of the Citizens Commission on Public Safety. Two other city-wide organizations, the BERKELEY CITIZENS UNITED (membership, 600) and CONCERNED BERKELEY CITIZENS (membership, 700) are militantly opposing aims of the radical coalition.

#### RADICALS "STACK THE DECK" AT BERKELEY

The Daily Californian, student newspaper of the University of California at Berkeley, which serves its 27,000 students, several thousand faculty, perhaps 10,000 "street people," and a large segment of the Negro community of Berkeley, has become a powerful voice for the radical political coalition which seeks, with the Black Panther Party and the "National Committees to Combat Fascism," to take over control of the city and its institutions. A January 8 editorial urged that the radical elements: "Seize the City!" The editorial said: "The April 6 Movement, a campus organization . . . has undertaken the task of registering 10,000 voters before the deadline (April 6 city elections), and time is running out. Go to the table at Sather Gate (historic University entrance) to register and volunteer to help . . . The NCCF Community Control of Police measure will be on the ballot, along with four City Council spots and the mayor's office. The present Council and Mayor are scared . . . Too late . . . We want the city and we want it now!"

The present government of the city of Berkeley is indeed frightened. The non-radical citizens of Berkeley are frightened. If the University radicals register 10,000 student-and-faculty voters in addition to present registrations, and if the Panthers and their comrades get the potential radical vote to the polls, they can take over the city legally. Should they bring it off, some of the best informed citizen leaders in Berkeley say the city soon would have "a form of Marxist-Maoist" control.

#### PADDING THE VOTE ROLLS

As of October 14, 1970, there were 75,269 registered voters in the city of 113,000. This is the highest ratio of voters to population in the country. The reason for the record is that hippies, "street people" and radical transients of all descriptions, with just 90 days residence in Berkeley, can register and vote. Among the 75,269 are 51,289 declared Democrats, 15,550 Republicans, 3,151 Peace and Freedom Party members and about 5,055 fragmented and "party not stated." The voting situation for one of the most important city elections in American history is fantastic, virtually "out of control."

#### MASS REGISTRATIONS

It has worsened even since the November elections, when Ed Montgomery, top subversive activities reporter of the San Francisco Chronicle, wrote: "Alameda County (Berkeley-Oakland) District Attorney Lowell Jansen and Edith Campbell, Berkeley City Clerk, agree that as the election code now stands interpreted it theoretically would be possible for 20,000 hippies, say, to converge on Berkeley, register 90 days in advance of an election, from any address bona fide or otherwise, and seize control of the city government in any given election." Theoretically? It is happening now!

The radical groups were so successful in Alameda county in the November elections (with Congressional and State candidates) that 80 have now joined together in a coalition effort to become an overwhelming force in the city elections April 6. At the Sather Gate on the University campus, on the Sproul Hall plaza (where campus violence was first tested, then refined and spread across the country) and on the many streets that fan out from the campus, registration tables have been busy for weeks. The 75,000 city-wide registration total of last October has been passed. We watched one day last week as scores of hippie-types were brought up to the registration tables.

#### CITY OFFICIALS HELPLESS

City authorities say there is really no way a check can be made of the authenticity of addresses given by the "street people" and obnoxious transients who are registering in droves.

Young Negroes in the predominantly Negro

district (approximately 35,000 population) have been signing up registrants in the thousands and getting paid 10-cents per name. Berkeley police picked up a 14-year-old boy carrying a voter registration slip in his name. Juveniles are using voter registration slips as proof of age in buying liquor. When we observed (last week) the outward character of the present U. C. student body, browsed through wide-open Communist bookstores ringing the campus, inhaled the Marijuana clouds drifting down onto the streets from the second-floor hippie "communes" on Telegraph Avenue, and viewed the fierce revolutionary fervor of Black Panther and other radicals stirring up revolt all over Berkeley, our grave fear for the future of Berkeley—and for our nation—was deepened. This is happening at the intellectual heart of America! And it is spreading.

The people we talked with from Southern to Northern California, including intelligence operatives in the Los Angeles and San Francisco police departments, feel that the alienated radical youth in America now constitute the greatest danger to our society. "If a really high calibre leader should arise from among this 'revolutionary culture,'" said Lieutenant Briggs, Chief of Intelligence in LA's Public Disorder Division, "our country would be in for terrible times." More in next Letter.

#### SOME FAR-OUT COURSES

(By Donovan Bess)

A really, really, hip, far-out, mind-blowing, groovy, out-of-sight program of study has been approved by the University of California at Berkeley, a campus whose faculty is almost unbearably distinguished in the realm of academia.

Students in one course (credit allowed) will be treated to songs by the Joy of Cooking rock group and a "musical experience" from the Sweet Smell String Band.

Other students (but not for credit) will hear a psychologist discuss "ways of enriching adult intimacy outside of the marriage relationship."

The psychologist, George R. Bach, has written a book on "Pairing," and when he writes of intimacy he by no means leaves out sex.

#### PROGRAMS

The courses and programs will be offered by the UC Extension from March 13 to June 2. They were approved by campus departments and the Academic Senate Committee on Courses.

Those who sign up will learn about "differing styles of hippie communes," "mate selection," "quite revolutionary modes of psychotherapy," "the roles of music and drugs in the youth culture," the characteristics of "magic, witchcraft and shamanism," "utopian socialism"—among scores of other similar subjects that run smack up against the new socio-psychic frontier.

How did UC get into all this? Simply by trying to keep up with the times. For one thing, the Extension gets no support from the taxpayers so it has to get lots of people to attend who can pay the fees.

#### POPULAR

"We tend to keep abreast of what's going on in popular thought," said Vivian Satcher, one of the 17 programers for Berkeley Extension.

Mrs. Satcher, working closely with faculty members, developed the course on communes that will be held March 13-14, a lecture series on "Systems of Psychotherapy" that will begin on April 1, and a program for single adults, on March 20-21, called "Pairing: The Search for Intimacy."

"These are all ideas and concepts that people are concerned with," she said, and the university wants to use its resources to "bring clarity and light to what people are talking about."

Unlike the Campus "we are not locked into

courses of studies" leading to degree requirements, she observed.

Mrs. Satcher said she cooked up the course on communes after hearing that a young UC sociologist, Benjamin Zablocki, was about to publish a book, "The Joyful Community," based on six years of studying communes.

She said she lined up Bach to give the weekend on "pairing" after hearing the psychologist give an Extension course in "creative aggression." But the UC Department of Psychology declined to approve the pairing course for students wanting college credit, she said.

Mrs. Satcher organized the psychotherapy lecture series after 29 students in a class on theories of psychotherapy said they would like to be involved with the people who do the therapy. So eight Ph. D.'s in her series will give the word on their systems—each of them the latest thing.

#### TITLE

Another programmer, Carol Thompson, developed a class with the title of "In Pursuit of Ecstasy." This came about, she said, "from a conversation with George DeVos," a UC professor of anthropology.

The course will go into such questions as

"The Drug Experience: Can You Bring It Back to Everyday Life?"

Professor DeVos will direct the course. He said another question to be gone into is: "Why Is Astrology So Popular Again? Why Is There This Need for Security in 'Trying To Know The Future?'"

One of his lecturers will be Margaret Locke, a UC graduate student who studied shamanism in Japan. Miss Thompson said the Extension is trying hard to sign up Carlos Castaneda, the author of a best-selling book on his incredible parapsychological experiences with a Yaqui Indian "sorcerer" known as "Don Juan."

Another programmer, Tom Baird, will offer a course on "Mobility of Modern Youth." It will be headed by Paul Heist of the UC Division of Higher Education. This is the course that will give participants some rock music experience.

An elegant team of experts will explore the nature and motivation of "the hikers and wanderers," as well as the new phenomena of students switching continually from college to college.

These days, commented Professor Heist, "people in adolescence now go through more changes in a shorter time than before." And

they are "rejecting their heritage earlier" than previously, he said—for example in the realm of religion.

Which brings up the subject of the sixth of these bold new programs: "The Future of Man in Community: Religious and Socialist Utopias."

#### FAITH

This one was developed by Elspeth Smith because of "the overwhelming success" of an Extension lecture series last fall on "Faith"—it drew more than twice as many participants as expected.

"The unusual thing was that we got so many young people," Mrs. Smith said. "Usually we get older persons—the younger ones can't pay our fees. Religion seems to be what the kids are interested in these days."

Eight lecturers will "search through history for keys to the future of how man can live with his fellow man" and investigate "both religious and socialist models: monasticism, the kibbutzim of Israel and England, encounter-group communities, communes in California, bohemia as utopia and the new political consciousness in Brazil."

The UC Extension address is 2223 Fulton Street, Berkeley 94720.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, March 15, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Let the peace of God rule in your hearts.—Colossians 3: 15.*

Most gracious God, we give Thee hearty thanks for this good land in which we live, for the freedoms we enjoy, for the opportunities which are ours, and for the glory of a great government in which we share. Help us ever to be mindful of our responsibilities, ever true to our trust, and ever faithful to Thee.

Grant unto the nations of the world Thy wisdom and help all countries to promote the welfare of all people. In global relationships restrain jealousy, hatred, and bitterness and awaken the spirit of justice, truth, and good will that men may learn to work together for the good of mankind.

Hasten the day when peace shall reign in every heart and rule in every land.

In the spirit of the Prince of Peace we pray, Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on March 8, 1971, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 337. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the second week of March 1971 as "Volunteers of America Week."

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 4690. An act to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 4690) entitled "An act to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LONG, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. CURTIS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 575. An act to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended; and

S. 671. An act to provide for division and for the disposition of the funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Blackfeet Tribe of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont., and the Gross Ventre Tribe of the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont., in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 279-A, and for other purposes.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON JOINT RESOLUTION MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on a joint resolu-

tion making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes.

Mr. BOW reserved all points of order on the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to the House that the Committee on Appropriations has today reported a joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year 1971 beyond March 30; that the resolution includes approval of a continuation of the supersonic transport program, the SST; that the joint resolution and report on it are available to all Members and the press at this time; and that the printed hearings are available to all Members.

I understand from the leadership that the joint resolution will be before the House on Wednesday next for debate, and for consideration under the 5-minute rule on Thursday next.

I thought that all Members should have the opportunity to know about the status of this matter at this time.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4690, INCREASING PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4690) to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.