

Maj. Gen. William Robertson Desobry, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Lafayette Mabry, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Herron Nichols Maples, xxx-xx-x... Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Leo Henry Schweiter, xxx-xx-x... Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edward Bautz, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Marlon Seignious II, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Richard Logan Irby, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Franklin Milton Davis, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Paul Alfred Feyerisen, xxx-xx-x... Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Richard George Ciccolella, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Francis Hollinsworth, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

To be major general, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. Kenneth Dew Orr, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Hal Bruce Jennings, Jr., xxx-xx-x... Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

1. Brig. Gen. George Shipley Prugh, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (colonel, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army), for appointment as The Judge Advocate General, U.S. Army, as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general, Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3037, 3442, and 3447.

2. Brig. Gen. Harold Edward Parker, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (colonel, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army), for appointment as the Assistant Judge Advocate General, as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general, Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3037, 3442, and 3447.

of the United States, and as major general, Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3037, 3442, and 3447.

U.S. NAVY

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral subject to qualification therefore as provided by law:

LINE

John H. Pedersen Graham Tahler
Richard Freundlich George V. Fliflet
Edwin M. Wilson, Jr. Eddie H. Ball

MEDICAL CORPS

Ben Eiseman

SUPPLY CORPS

Jack F. Pearse

Robert H. Spiro, Jr.

DENTAL CORPS

George J. Coleman

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Ernest F. Haselbrink, to be captain, and ending James G. Zody, to be 1st lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on Mar. 10, 1971.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATOR RANDOLPH STRESSES "RESPONSIBILITY AND FREEDOM GO HAND AND HAND" IN ADDRESS AT WEST VIRGINIA KEYETTES CONVENTION

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 5, 1971

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Saturday, April 3, more than 400 young women, mostly aged 16 and 17, composed the luncheon-meeting audience at the annual convention of the Keyettes, sponsored by West Virginia clubs in Kiwanis International.

These intelligent, attractive, and concerned youth, were a challenge to me as I discussed "Responsibility and Freedom Go Hand and Hand."

The dining room at Pipestem State Park was over-crowded with representatives from 19 clubs. Present also was Douglas Taylor, of St. Mary's, the newly elected Governor of West Virginia Kiwanis Clubs, and James Neri, of Fairmont, who work with young people in purposeful programs.

Miss Frankie Winfree, of Fairmont High School, presided at the general sessions. Other young women presided over panel discussions on vital subjects. The motto of these fine girls, who are sophomores, juniors, and seniors in high school is "Building to Serve."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of my speech.

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

RESPONSIBILITIES AND FREEDOM GO HAND IN HAND

(By Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH)

I must tell you that after communicating with your president, Miss Winfree, about your state convention, I looked forward to

being with you with even greater anticipation than when we accepted the invitation.

In meeting with groups of young people today, some public officials are prepared for disturbances, even as they speak. So the enjoyment of coming here to talk with several hundred well-behaved young ladies is indeed appealing.

Your adoption of the motto, "Building To Serve," tells much about you as individuals, about your acceptance of responsibility and your desire to work to make the world a better place in which to live.

The prospect of confronting so many alert and eager young minds with all the problems of our society presents a temptation. Here is an opportunity for a speaker to unburden himself of many of the current worries, to recite the weighty woes of poverty, pollution, disease, war, civil unrest and deteriorating values.

I am intrigued with the theme you have for this convention; the words, "We have just begun." It is a modest admission, but it's not entirely accurate. The truth of the matter is that you started some time ago, and you are farther down the road of life than any generation in history.

You are aware, I'm sure, of the great number of articles and studies involving today's American youth. Never has a generation been more analyzed and criticized, more praised and pampered, more coddled and condemned—and yet more misunderstood—than the youth of this nation.

You are told that you are the best-fed, best-read young people in the world. We know that, compared to your predecessors, you are more advanced socially, culturally and intellectually. Now there is firm documentation that the physical development of young people is advancing at an accelerated rate. In other words, you're not only growing bigger, but you are growing bigger faster.

Society—or if you prefer, the Establishment—has been slow to recognize this earlier maturation. Many of our laws, originally designed to protect the young, are used to prolong adolescence. In the nearly three decades since I first introduced the bill providing for a constitutional amendment to permit 18 to 21 year olds to vote, only two states moved to enfranchise their young adults. Last year, Congress passed legis-

lation permitting 18-year-olds to vote but the Supreme Court limited such voting to national elections. The court said, in effect, that states have the constitutional right to set their own voter qualifications. In the coming national referendum, it will be necessary for 38 states to ratify the amendment recently passed by Congress. I am confident that this will be done.

Too often we confuse teenagers with adolescence. Too many of us, the label "teenage" actually represents a certain stereotyped or idealized image of a behavior we have come to associate with the young. For example, teenage behavior is supposed to include the inability to defer gratifications; overindulgence, frivolity, promiscuity, indifference to the wishes and needs of others, concern with the body, forms of hedonism, and a general lack of concern for serious social problems.

I suggest that each of these behaviors exist among teenagers, but they also can be observed among almost every group of adults in one form or another. I think what is most disturbing to many adults today is that too many of our young people are refusing to act like teenagers. Youth is concerned with what is happening; it gets involved in political, social and civil rights issues. Young people are insisting on telling it as they see it, even if it means offending their teachers, their parents or their peers.

Many of the conflicts and confrontations that grab the headlines today are simply unskilled excesses designed to get someone's attention, to promote a message and to force somebody in authority to listen.

We hear much discussion about the various "gaps" that afflict our society; there are cleavages in credibility, in communications and in generations. But I submit that the most serious gap of all exists between members of the same generation—between the 45 million Americans in the age group of 15 to 30 years.

This could probably be labeled a "responsibility gap."

There's something about this under-30 generation that is not generally known. And that is that almost half of them—about 21 million—are neither students nor college graduates. Most of them work. They make up one-fourth of the union membership. They marry young, move to suburbia, and they're being pinched by the economic bind of inflation and high interest rates which

impairs their goal of buying a home and starting a family.

This large segment of our population has been dubbed the "invisible youth" because no one paid much attention to them. They don't make headlines by fighting cops, throwing bombs or smoking pot. They pay their taxes, go to church, join service clubs and conduct quiet crusades on behalf of their fellowman.

It wasn't until recently that the "invisible youth and their older contemporaries in the work force were discovered by the intellectual establishment.

The news analysts are making some startling discoveries about this generation of "invisible youth." They are finding that this group has resentments running just as deep and complaints about society that are just as justified as their counterparts on campus. They work hard and feel victimized by the visible dissent on and off-campus by those roughly their own age.

Thomas Kahn, executive director of the American Federation of Labor-Congress Industrial Organizations' League for Industrial Democracy, recently wrote:

"It is not only on the job that the younger worker is restless or resentful. He is bombarded with the prepacked dreams of television commercials and beckoned to share vicariously in the swinging adventures and comic antics of the affluent.

"He sees some of his contemporaries, the sons and daughters of the well-to-do, tear up their campuses with an abandon that only the economically carefree can afford.

"He watches as they dominate the media with a hairy cultural revolution that has nothing whatever to do with him, except possibly violate some of his deepest moral, social or religious codes."

In short, he feels left behind in a changing society.

The population of our world is divided roughly into two parts—those with responsibilities and those who have lost their responsibilities or who never had them. We as a nation are fortunate in that today we bear a heavy and honorable burden of responsibility. There are those among us who believe there is something of freedom in lack of responsibility. We hear it every day—the siren song of the open road. The invitation to cop out, turn off, to tune out and to be free to roam, to do our own thing. This is not freedom—because freedom is responsibility. We have only to look around us at the peoples who are not troubled with responsibilities—the tyrannies and the despotisms with which the free world has long been at odds.

In certain quarters today the word "responsibility" and its close kin, "duty," are under attack. There are theories of government which hold that the state should look out for the individual. But this country was founded on the belief and flourished on the practice that the individuals must look out for the state.

That means that you and I and all the rest of us are plentifully supplied with vital responsibilities. We have a duty to ourselves as individuals. We have duties to our families, to our local communities, to our nation, our world, to our God.

Only free human beings can stand up to those responsibilities, and only the carrying out of those responsibilities can keep us free. For approximately 100 years of America's existence, there were vast acreages of free land to the west. Everyone had not only the right to try, but the opportunity to try to tame this land. Every American, if he so decided, could move west, to succeed or fail—and if he failed, to start over again farther west.

It was this era of endless opportunity which produced what our historians have termed the "frontier frame of mind." In

this climate of permanent opportunity, Americans developed their most important political right: The right to disagree.

At present, this right is in grave jeopardy. We are now in danger of becoming a nation of extremists. The lunatic left and the crackpot right are both challenging our American right to disagree. They are trying to substitute the mental strait jacket of organized emotional fanaticism, for the right of individual personal judgment.

Are we losing our pioneer tradition? Has the frontier spirit gone? I think not. We have new frontiers now, frontiers so vast and far out in space that no one can say where they may be. What about the oft-repeated charge that we tend to mass conformity, to mob action, that we as a people have declined in self-reliance?

Through your presence here through your pledge of "building to serve," you have indicated that you have just begun to fulfill the responsibilities that all Americans should share. You are joined with more than 80 million young and adult Americans who belong to civic and service clubs whose unified aim is to serve and to build a better society.

AN EROSION OF SPIRIT

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1971

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include some pertinent thoughts by Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor-in-chief of the Hearst Newspapers on the recent decision by the House of Representatives to discontinue funding of the SST:

AN EROSION OF SPIRIT

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—The refusal by both Houses of our new Congress to continue test development of an American SuperSonic Transport plane strikes me as a most serious and shameful milestone in the nation's history.

Without getting overly dramatic, I must say that killing the SST has raised some rather frightening thoughts in my mind.

What they add up to is a spectre—the dark vision of an America whose elected representatives, at least, are lacking in the adventurous spirit of pioneer leadership which made this country great.

It is impossible to say how widespread the same loss may be true of the general public. But it is a distressing fact that the lawmakers who decided to give up in the field of superjet development are supposed to reflect the vitality and opinions of the electorate—and generally do.

So something very serious indeed has happened. And it is shameful because it demonstrates how vastly different in outlook and motivation so many present-day Americans have become when contrasted with our early settlers and explorers.

We speak English today because the most venturesome, the hardest and the most tenacious were English. Beginning with the settlement at Jamestown in 1607 and the Mayflower landing at Plymouth Rock in 1620, theirs was a saga of go, go, go—always forward in blazing trails through the unknowns of their world.

This spirit inspired and drove the country for approximately 300 years, as it continued to prevail in the first half of this century. Yet in recent years a kind of erosion has set in—and the death of the SST

could well mark a turning point in our nation's philosophy.

At the very last, the refusal of Congress to continue test work on a United States possible rival to SuperSonic Transports already being flown by the Russians, British and French will, I am confident, go down as an indelible stain on its record.

This is the first Congress I have ever known that has refused to have a look at the future.

It is the first Congress I have ever known to spurn the kind of progressive, exploratory thinking that makes for a great, youthful and curious nation.

It is the first Congress I have ever known to adopt a policy of "go back" rather than "go ahead"—to deliberately surrender world leadership in a tremendously important field.

The 92d Congress, in a word, has disgraced itself.

In suggesting that this nation may have turned a sad corner—possibly a 180-degree turn from its proud past—I am motivated more as an indignant citizen than an aviation buff.

It certainly is true that I have always been a real bug on the subject. There is an old photograph of me grasping the wheel of one of those ancient Wright Brothers-type plane which flew and captivated me at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition in San Francisco in 1915. I first flew solo still in my teens, and ever since have been handling every kind of plane anybody would let me.

Speaking as any aviation fan, I say quite frankly that I don't think the U.S. needs any fleet of the SST at this time.

In addition to its highly doubtful economic practicality, the SST still has a lot of unsolved problems. Its sonic booms, for example, might or might not be capable of being solved.

But this nation most certainly should have gone ahead with research and development of any potentially vital tool for the future. The fact that this particular tool happens to be a special kind of aircraft is only incidental.

What I am saying is that it is a sorry day when America decides it has gone far enough, or high enough, or fast enough, or deep enough in any field where its leadership is being challenged.

When the word "stop" takes over from the word "go" in our nation—as it did with the SST—it will mark the passing of the peak of America's greatness.

Killing the SST test development reflects not only a terribly serious sickness in our national soul, it wasn't even logical.

To be consistent, Congress also must now cut off any further funds for developing SuperSonic military planes—another field where our leadership is challenged by the Russians, among others.

The next logical step if we are going to get out of the big leagues would be to cut out going to the moon and leave space exploration to more venturesome nations.

Logic demands, if ecology is to be the determining factor in our national existence, that we must shut down our facilities—those terrible polluters—and return to an agricultural society.

Logic and consistency require also the banning of all airplanes. And, of course, all automobiles.

Logic and ecology require, in sum, that all of us return to the horse and buggy age.

Such is a logical extension of the illogical and shameful action by Congress in turning its back on the future.

The words of the French lady being trampled by the guillotine—as quoted by Macaulay, the famous British essayist—come to mind:

"Oh Liberty! How many crimes are committed in thy name!"

Progressive-minded, forward-looking Americans might well ask themselves a question

something like this, "Ecology! Environment! How many crimes will be committed in their names?"

SHELBY HIGH AND ITS GRIFFIN BROTHERS

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 5, 1971

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, recently at the University of Michigan's Crisler Arena two undefeated basketball teams met for the Michigan Class C High School Championship.

From southeastern Michigan came Stockbridge High School, an outstanding quintet anchored by one of the best sharpshooters in the State—6-foot, 8-inch Jesse Campbell. Coach Phil Hora's team had a record of 23 wins and no losses.

The opponent was Shelby High School—located in Oceana County near the shores of Lake Michigan.

Like Stockbridge, Shelby had been unbeaten in 23 prior contests.

The underdog in the championship contest, Shelby High, emerged victorious. But, as I see it, the team, its fans, and their great coach, Ed Doudma, had good reason to be confident.

On the Shelby team are two brothers, Al and Paul. In the championship game they combined for 16 of their team's points. Paul also picked off 13 rebounds. Another set of brothers, Kimm and Jack, were very instrumental in Shelby's victory. Kimm topped Shelby in scoring with 22 points and 16 rebounds.

The two sets of brothers are cousins, and they all have the same last name: Griffin.

So far as we know, the famous Shelby Griffin brothers are not related to the junior Senator from Michigan.

It might appear that Shelby is an all-Griffin team. But it should be noted that without 19 points poured through the hoop in that game by Stan Stanford, Shelby would not be State champion today.

Mr. President, during the 1966 Senate campaign in Michigan, many of my supporters belonged to the Griffin Club. The members wore a lapel pin displaying the Griffin of Greek mythology—which was a symbol of strength and vigilance.

The Shelby team has demonstrated that it is a symbol of basketball strength. So, I am sending a Griffin pin to each team member and to their coach, Ed Doudma, as a special salute to Michigan's Class C Champions, Shelby High School.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two articles from the Detroit News concerning this championship game be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNBEATEN TEAMS SET FOR SHOWDOWN— STOCKBRIDGE FAVORED IN CLASS C FINAL

(By Ken Williams)

ANN ARBOR—Stockbridge is pitted against Shelby in the only "perfect" pairing on the four-game state prep basketball tournament final program today at University of Michigan's Crisler Arena.

Unlike the other three playoffs, both squads are unbeaten and both squads have 23-0 records.

But based on the cumulative results and individual statistics of the current season, Stockbridge went into the Class C duel as a slight favorite.

Coach Phil Hora's team has been noted for its tremendous overall balance from the outset of the season. In addition, Stockbridge has one of the finest sharpshooters in the state—6-foot-8 Jesse Campbell.

The other three title games saw Detroit Kettering (20-1) take on Flint Northern (21-2) in the Class A showdown; River Rouge (24-1) meeting Muskegon Heights (16-5) in Class B and Freesoll (22-2) battling Covert (17-6) in Class D.

Campbell, a junior and the key to Stockbridge's offense, is averaging 24.5 points and 26 rebounds. He hit a season's peak of 47 points against Fowlerville and in the state tournament he has scored 33 against Hartland in a District game and 31 in the semifinals against Battle Creek Springfield.

Shelby planned to rely heavily on the towering Griffin cousins, 6-foot-7 Paul, a junior, and 6-5 Kimm, a senior.

"I look for this title game to be decided definitely on the boards," said Hora.

STOCKBRIDGE BOWS: GRIFFIN BROTHERS, COUSINS SCORE UPSET FOR SHELBY

(By Dan Ewald)

ANN ARBOR.—What one Griffin didn't do another did.

Shelby, led by the Griffin family, overpowered No. 1 ranked Stockbridge, 71-57, to win its first state Class C basketball title Saturday at Crisler Arena.

Shelby, which sports two sets of Griffin brothers (the pairs are cousins), scored eight straight points in the first quarter and followed with a 10-point streak in the second to race to a 40-25 lead that put the game under control by the half.

Kimm Griffin, 6-foot-5 senior forward, topped all scorers with 22 points. He hit 17 of them in the first half to give Shelby its big cushion. Kimm also grabbed 11 rebounds. Cousin Paul, 6-7 junior center, also grabbed nine rebounds during the spurts and added six points.

Al Griffin, brother of Paul, added two points, while Kimm's brother Jack played strong defensively during his short stint.

The victory was Shelby's 24th straight and snapped a 23-game Stockbridge winning streak. Both teams were undefeated going into the contest.

Stockbridge, which stayed in a zone defense throughout the game, came out in the second half with a full court press. The pesky play of guards Red Owen and Gary Allen forced the winners into several turnovers and cut the margin to 52-45, the closest it got in the second half.

Shelby, which also stayed in a zone throughout the game, worked the ball under the boards of Kimm and Paul Griffin for the good shot. Paul added 14 points to go along with teammate Stan Sanford's 19.

"The Griffins are a pleasure to work with," said Shelby Coach Ed Doudma. "The only problem I have with them is telling them apart. I have to keep looking at their numbers."

"The Griffin's fathers also played for Shelby and we're sure glad they stayed in the city." Doudma played for the 1962 Muskegon Christian team which won the Class C state title.

In addition to the all-around play of senior Kimm, one of the keys to Shelby's title was the solid defensive game cousin Paul played against Stockbridge's all state center Jesse Campbell.

Although Campbell scored 15 points, he was held to four in the first half when the winners made their big move. Owen and Allen also added 15 points each for the losers.

Kimm Griffin topped all rebounders with 16. Cousin Paul added 13.

| G F T | | | G F T | | | | |
|------------------|----|----|---------|-----------------|----|-------|----|
| Stockbridge: | | | Shelby: | | | | |
| Collins..... | 1 | 3 | 5 | Sanford..... | 7 | 5 | 19 |
| Flannery..... | 2 | 0 | 4 | H. Griffin..... | 9 | 4 | 22 |
| J. C'pbell..... | 5 | 5 | 15 | P. Griffin..... | 7 | 0 | 14 |
| Allen..... | 6 | 3 | 15 | Beckman..... | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| Owen..... | 6 | 3 | 15 | Plummer..... | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| Ludtke..... | 0 | 0 | 3 | A. Griffin..... | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Total..... | 20 | 17 | 57 | Total..... | 28 | 15 | 71 |
| Stockbridge..... | | | 10 | 15 | 20 | 12-57 | |
| Shelby..... | | | 21 | 19 | 15 | 16-71 | |

THE COURT-MARTIAL OF LIEUTENANT CALLEY

HON. JOHN M. SLACK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1971

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, the court-martial and sentencing of Lieutenant Calley has aroused a strong tide of public sentiment, with various pollsters reporting that from 80 percent to less than 50 percent of the people disagree with the outcome.

On the basis of reactions from my constituents I can report that those opposed to the decision in the case must total 90 percent or more. I offer for consideration in that connection two comments, one a letter from a resident of an urban area, and the other an editorial by Mr. Bill Robinson, editor of the Clay County Free Press, who speaks for those residing in a rural area:

MARCH 31, 1971.

Congressman JOHN M. SLACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SLACK: Six men sat in judgment of a young Army lieutenant at Ft. Benning, Georgia, U.S.A. As they listened to voluminous testimony, a page of history was being written for the United States of America. The same United States of America that had been won and protected by the military genius, and compassion, of men like Generals of the Army Washington, Sherman, Roosevelt, MacArthur, Patton and Eisenhower.

Six men. Would the six men that I have just mentioned have voted for the death sentence of a man who was doing his job? Or, would they vote for life imprisonment of this young lieutenant? Or, would they vote to free this member of their profession? Conjecture, yes. But, very interesting conjecture.

I respectfully request that you voice your disapproval of the jury's verdict. Rescind this deplorable action by our military. Restore sanity and high principles to America. We have children keeping an eye on the leaders of our Nation. Give our children a rich heritage. Give voice to the precepts of the past.

America is a child among the nations of the world. Yet, we possess rich heritage and traditions.

America, today, stands on the threshold of preserving the future of the world as a safe and peaceful terrestrial sphere. To achieve and preserve the safety of free men, a strong defense mechanism is a necessity. To condone the action of the military tribunal at Ft. Benning, would rebuke the fighting forefathers of this country.

Six men. Do they remember Plymouth Rock? Lexington and Concord? Boston and the old North Church? Jamestown, Virginia and Manassas, Virginia? Charleston, South

Carolina? Atlanta, Georgia? Pearl Harbor, Hawaii? Guam, Wake, Saipan, the Philippines? Do they remember the words of Nathan Hale . . . ?

God forbid that we should forget our heritage and that we should destroy our traditions. Raise your voice in the hallowed halls of Congress to rescind this deplorable action by the six men at Ft. Benning, Georgia, U.S.A.

Respectfully,

T. D. WINTER.

IF LIEUTENANT CALLEY IS GUILTY—THEN ARE WE ALL NOT GUILTY?

In this day of "Draft Dodgers," "Muhammad Ali's" and various and other products of our culture, it seems incredible to me, that our society can convict a young man, that "we instructed to kill," for doing his job!

I am a World War II veteran. After weeks of training we were sent to do battle in New Guinea, in the South Pacific. A place that I'd never heard of, and I did not want to go! But, go, I did, with all my fears and doubts bottled-up inside me!

On our first invasion with the First Marine Division (of Guadalcanal) we were briefed by a Marine Major and at the end of his briefing he said "Boys look around you, some of you are not coming out of this invasion alive"—I kept my head down and looked out of the corners of my eyes and noticed everyone was doing the same thing, heads down, they would not look at each other. Not one of us wanted to believe that a friend would be killed. As luck would have it, none of us were, except for the Major, he was bayoneted to death the first night.

This was my first taste of combat and I soon learned to "shoot first and ask questions afterwards" if you wanted to see home again—and I sure did!

I personally know of one officer who is as guilty as Lt. Calley and a patrol that is guilty of carrying out the officers order. But I don't believe the officer to be guilty nor do I believe the members of the patrol to be guilty!

Fighting a war is "One hell-of-a-lot different" than sitting at home watching it on television!

It makes a difference if you have a "Son" or "Husband" over there—ask any "Mother" or "Wife" if this is not true!

If you want "your young men" to protect and preserve this country—you'd better tell them "just who in the hell" is the "enemy." The "Gooks" or a bunch of desk soldiers that never saw a man killed! Nor ever saw a handsome young boy, who cried when he got a "Dear John" letter from his girl, shot in the stomach and "die a slow death" because there are no emergency rooms in the front line!

People—you had better think about this Because none of the men out there, protecting you at home, is any "Braver" or more "Courageous" than you are! Most of your "Heros" happen by accident! They do things they would not ordinarily do!

Just as a Marine Private did on my first invasion. He had the tri-pod shot off of his "water-cooled" 50 caliber machine gun and picked it up and cradled it in his arm and retook 3 positions on our front line! When I asked him why? He simply said "They pissed-me off!"

Now! How many more men do you think you'll find to fight for you like this? When, as the gamblers say is, "The Best You Can Do is Lose!" If you don't lose your life over there we'll take "it" away from you when you get back!

I personally don't like these odds; Nor would any gambler.

I know a lot of church goers and other groups are going to write me about the language I have used in this editorial . . . but this is the language I learned in War and the only way I know of to make you "Sit-up" and take notice of what is happening here!

Now, in comparison, I offer you the remarks of Lt. Calley at his sentence hearing . . . I believe he does a magnificent job and is a gentleman!

The text of Lt. William L. Calley Jr.'s plea Tuesday to the military jury deciding his sentence for premeditated murder at My Lai.

Let me know if you can't hear me, sir.

Your honor, court members, I asked Judge Latimer and my other attorneys not to go on and into mitigation of this case. There a lot of things really not appropriate and I don't think it matters what type of individual I am. And I'm not going to stand here and plead for my life and my freedom.

I would ask you to consider the thousand more lives that are going to be lost in Southeast Asia. The thousands more, that is, to be imprisoned not only here in the United States but also in North Vietnam and in hospitals all over the World as amputees.

I have never known a soldier nor did I ever myself ever wantonly kill human beings in my entire life. If I have committed a crime the only crime that I have committed is in judgment of my values. Apparently I value my troops' lives more than I did that of the enemy.

When my troops were getting massacred and mauled by an enemy I couldn't see, I couldn't feel and I couldn't touch; that nobody in the military system ever described as other than Communism—they didn't give it a race, they didn't give it a sex, they didn't give it an age. And they never let me believe it was just a philosophy in a man's mind. That was my enemy out there.

And when it became between me and that enemy I had to value the lives of my troops. And I feel that is the only crime I have committed.

Yesterday you stripped me of all my honor. Please, by your actions that you take here today, don't strip future soldiers of their honor, I beg of you.

Editor's Note: I personally take my hat off to this man. A man that's asked no mercy for himself . . . but mercy for those who are "bound" to follow him!

Sincerely thank you,

BILL ROBINSON,

Editors.

SENATOR RANDOLPH AND REPRESENTATIVE VIGORITO DEBATE DISPOSABLE CONTAINERS IN THE AMERICAN LEGION MAGAZINE

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 5, 1971

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I believe that the concern and active involvement of every citizen is needed if we are to successfully conquer the serious pollution problems that endanger the quality of life in the United States.

Consequently, I am pleased that so many individuals and organizations continue to show enthusiasm for the cause of a clean environment. Essential to this task, too, is an informed public. Without complete knowledge, intelligent judgments cannot be made in the complex issues of environmental enhancement.

Among those groups dedicated to ending pollution of all forms is the American Legion through which large numbers of veterans speak. The American Legion magazine frequently publishes the opposing viewpoints of Members of the Congress on important public questions. I was recently invited to participate with

Representative JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, of Pennsylvania, in a printed debate on the advisability of banning throwaway bottles and cans.

Since this a topic of widespread concern, I ask unanimous consent that the article, published in the American Legion magazine for April 1971, be printed in the RECORD.

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

SHOULD ONE-WAY CONTAINERS BE BANNED?

"YES" SAYS REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH P. VIGORITO

America has become a throw away society. The 1960's saw the American people adopt a buy-use-throw away syndrome that has affected a diverse grouping of items, from diapers to automobiles. More than 190 million tons of this refuse are collected in the United States every year, most of it from households and commercial establishments. This means that every American generates about 98 pounds of refuse per day. Unless much of this refuse is recycled, we will soon bury ourselves under our own garbage.

The nonreturnable soft drink and beer container has become symbolic of the entire solid waste pollution problem. Most beverages were packaged in returnable containers until a widespread industry shift—motivated merely by convenience—to nonreturnable containers occurred in the late 1950's and early 1960's. In many cases, therefore, the mechanical structure and the knowledge to recycle beverage containers already exist.

What would we gain if we were to recycle these containers? First of all we would remove the blight on our roadways and parks. We all have driven through our countryside and been disgusted by the many soft drink and beer containers lying along the road.

A recycling of our beverage containers would save tax dollars. Last year it cost \$176 million to dispose of the 46.8 billion beverage containers produced. This staggering cost does not include the equally staggering cost of collecting these containers.

A recycling of our beverage containers would save the consumer money on the purchase price. It is estimated that Americans could save \$706 million per year if they purchased all soft drinks in returnable, money-back containers. Another \$800 million would be saved if all beer was purchased in similar containers.

A recycling of our beverage containers would save valuable resources. We do not have endless sources of aluminum and tin to make cans. We do not have endless resources to make glass. We must begin to recycle these resources before our supplies become critically low.

More importantly, all this would mark a vital first step in an all-out attack on solid waste pollution that threatens to bury us if nothing is done.

We must not linger, however. The longer we wait, the worse the problem will become. The soft drink industry will produce 95% of all soft drinks in nonreturnable containers by 1975. The brewing industry will far exceed this pace by producing and retailing practically all its products in nonreturnables by 1972.

To paraphrase Thoreau, we must begin to march to the beat of a different drummer before the existing drummer marches us further and further down the path of pollution.

JOSEPH P. VIGORITO.

"NO" SAYS SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH

DOLPH

Among the everyday items that have helped sustain the American way of life at its high level are the metal can and the glass bottle. They have made possible the easy, inexpensive distribution of literally hundreds of products throughout the country.

At the same time, they contribute significantly to the mounting problems we face in the disposal of solid wastes, particularly since the development of the one-way, disposable bottle and can.

From the litter along our roadways it is easy to see not only the extent of the non-returnable containers, but also why they are of great concern, as we try to maintain a clean environment. They are numerous and they are highly visible. Consequently, there is now a movement to cope with the problem by prohibiting the use of one-way containers.

At first glance this may seem to be a quick and effective way to solve the problem. I believe, however, that few long-range benefits would result from the banning of throw away bottles and cans.

In the first place, the public apparently views throw away and returnable bottles in virtually the same light, discarding returnable bottles on which a deposit is paid just as quickly as the cheaper nonreturnable bottles.

In addition to the public's reluctance to use returnable bottles in large numbers is the unwillingness of retailers to assume the added cost of handling them.

The challenge thus seems to be one of finding ways of recycling discarded cans and bottles instead of trying to impose the reuse of containers on a public and business structure that do not want them.

Extensive research and testing over the past few years have developed new methods of separating and recovering many materials that were once simply thrown away. Widespread adoption of these processes would make eminently good sense for several reasons.

First, recycling would solve the problem of what to do with discarded cans and bottles as well as other forms of trash that are now burned or buried. Perhaps equally as important is the fact that the continued heavy drain on our natural resources would be alleviated if materials could be used over again.

I do not underestimate the magnitude or the seriousness of the throw away bottle and can problem. I do not believe, however, that banning one-way containers is the proper way to effectively halt the growing accumulations of trash.

A much more practical solution lies in the immediate adoption of methods of recovering and reusing not only bottles and cans but the many other materials that are now wastefully thrown away.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

RECOMPUTATION OF MILITARY RETIRED PAY

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1971

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to restore the system of basing military retired pay on active rates for those persons who entered the service prior to June 1, 1958.

Many of my constituents have brought to my attention the inequity of the present system of basing increases in military retired pay on the cost-of-living index instead of the former more liberal method of recomputation of such pay. I have given this matter much thought. The more I think about it, the more I am convinced that my bill, which would restore the former system for those who earned it, is equitable and just.

Perhaps there are some who feel that if my bill was enacted, it would set the stage for other groups to seek similar legislation. If this were a new proposal, for which there was no precedent, I could perhaps understand the justification for this viewpoint. On the contrary, my bill does not establish a new precedent; it does not establish a new and unique system for military retirees; it would merely restore to this group a benefit which had, in effect, been held out to them as an inducement to make the military profession their chosen career.

For more than 100 years, the law provided that when our military men retired from active service, their retired pay would be based on a certain percentage of their active duty base pay, and that whenever active duty pay scales were increased, retired pay would be increased correspondingly.

In 1958, the Congress, for reasons which appeared cogent at the time, deviated from the long established principle of recomputation, by granting a flat 6-percent increase to those who were then on the retired rolls of the military services. It is interesting to note that the 85th Congress did not repeal the portion of the military pay laws which provided for automatic recomputation; it simply substituted a different method in that particular act. It was not until 1963, more than 5 years later, that action was taken to repeal the principle of recomputation of retired pay.

I ask my colleagues to consider whether we, in the Congress, have reneged on a moral obligation to our retired servicemen who had dedicated the major portion of their adult lives to the service of our Nation. During the period in which the majority of these men served, active duty pay was relatively low in comparison with pay in other professions, and pay raises were few and far between.

In the more than 40 years from 1922 to 1963, the period during which these men served, active duty pay for the military services was increased only eight times, with six of these pay increases occurring after World War II. Contrast this to the pay increases granted the present active duty forces. Beginning in 1963, active duty pay has been increased nine times, with the 10th pay raise scheduled to take effect next year.

I strongly favor paying our servicemen on active duty a fair and equitable wage. I feel that they deserve every consideration which our grateful country can afford to give them. But I feel that once we have made a promise to them, we must stand behind our word, whether it was given today, 20 years ago, or a hundred years ago.

To hold out promises on the one hand as an inducement to a long career in the military services, and then to reduce or eliminate the benefits to individuals after their service is completed—on the basis that the Government has no legal obligation to fulfill its commitments—at once breaks faith with those who have already retired and raises grave doubts in the minds of those on active duty as to their treatment in the years to come.

In these trying days, when there is so

much disregard for law and order; when it appears to be the "in" thing to trample and burn our flag and to relegate patriotism to the high button shoe era; when misguided mentors of our young men attempt to outdo one another in fomenting ideas designed to tear down the framework of our constitutional government, we turn our backs on those whose sole job was to protect and defend our lives and our Constitution.

The military retirement system was initiated by Congress during the Civil War. It was at that time the basic principle of keeping retired pay geared to current active duty pay schedules was established. This basic principle was not seriously challenged by successive Congresses until passage of the Joint Services Pay Act of 1922, which denied to those already retired—similar to the Pay Act of 1958—the right to recompute retired pay on the basis of the new pay schedule.

However, the 69th Congress, in passing Public Law 204 in 1926, corrected this injustice. Senate Report S-364, 69th Congress, contained this statement:

The 1922 legislation deprived all officers retired prior to that date of said benefits, thereby violating the basic law under which these officers gained their retirement rights. There is no justice in two pay schedules for equal merit and equal service.

In my opinion, this statement is true today as it was more than 40 years ago. There is no justice in two or more pay schedules for equal merit and equal service. It is my feeling, as it was of our predecessors in these Halls of Congress, that military retired pay should once again be linked directly with active duty pay, for those persons who entered the service prior to June 1, 1958.

WHAT GOOD IS A RAIL PASS ON BOB-TAILED RAILPAX?

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 5, 1971

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, by now we are all aware that Railpax, which was supposed to create an improved and complete system of railroad passenger service, will actually leave large sections of the country without any passenger service whatsoever. In my own State of Montana, low-income persons, including widows, pensioners, and college students, will be forced to turn to more expensive and less reliable forms of transportation.

A constituent's letter has brought to my attention another group which has been victimized by Railpax. These are the virtually thousands of people in this country who hold "pass rights" on the railroads, and who rely on the railroads for all their long-distance travel needs. My constituent reports that her husband helped pay for their rail pass through deductions from his wages. Many persons holding pass rights are widows living on incredibly inadequate railroad retirement pension benefits. For them and many others, their only means of visiting their families and keeping in touch with

their friends is their pass which allows them to ride the trains.

But now, Mr. President, Railpax's recent announcement of its appalling meager passenger service compels us to ask "What good is a rail pass if there are no trains on which to use it?"

The answer to this question is contained in this simple, yet dignified letter. It forcefully argues that the pass rights of many Americans will be virtually curtailed with the suspension of the rail passenger service on which those pass rights depend. I suggest that this letter be read by all concerned Americans, for it tells of the fate of many Americans who do not hold a seat on the high councils of the railroad conglomerates or on the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

LIVINGSTON, MONT., March 28.

SEN. LEE METCALF,
State of Montana,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Being a widow, who must try to live on a ridiculously low pension from the Railroad Retirement Board and who, while not abusing the privilege, has relied on my pass rights on the railroad for transportation, especially since the death of my husband, a year ago, it is almost a tragedy to lose, not only the pass rights, but the trains as well. In all the pros and cons of the Railpax situation, I have not seen one word printed concerning these pass rights. My husband worked for the Northern Pacific as an Electrician for 43 yrs and most of that time, worked for less money per hour to pay for our pass rights. How, then, can they just be dropped, along with the trains, without any of us having a word to say about it? I hate to be forever bothering you with letters but this is one time I feel I have to. Aside from personal grievances, there is the Yellowstone Park Centennial next year and the tours in the summer, whereby many, many city folks who don't or can't afford a car, can and do save enough to go and see this wonderful area. There are many retired railroad people who are physically unable to drive the distances from here to either coast but who have sons and daughters and their families they need to visit because these young families often do not have the funds to bring their families to the Grandparents. Are they to be just pushed aside and forgotten in the interest of making more money. The railroads could afford to provide trains, even with no revenue, from the Free lands and mineral rights they were given to give us trains in the first place. It just is not fair and I do hope some of you will be able to do something about it. Thank you sincerely for any efforts you may put forth in Montana's southern route interests. We need a train, even every other day.

Sincerely,

REVENUE SHARING NO BARGAIN
FOR MISSOURI TAXPAYERS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the Missouri public expenditure survey has done a study of President Nixon's general revenue-sharing proposal and I think their comments will be appreciated:

REVENUE SHARING NO BARGAIN FOR MISSOURI TAXPAYERS

The "general revenue sharing" proposal of the national administration now pending in Congress would be no bargain for Missouri's taxpayers. Their share of the cost of financing the proposal would be more than the amount Missouri's state and local governments would receive in federal funds.

Missouri state and local governments would receive an estimated \$96.5 million of the \$5 billion that would be distributed in the first full year under the general revenue sharing proposal.

But Missouri taxpayers' share of the taxes required to finance the program would be \$109 million.

It would cost Missouri taxpayers \$1.13 in federal taxes for each dollar sent to the state and local governments in Missouri.

In addition to the \$5-billion "general revenue sharing" proposal, the administration has announced it will propose a "special revenue sharing" plan under which \$11 billion in block grants would supplant \$10 billion in existing federal aids. The details of the "special revenue sharing" plan have not been put forward as yet.

This publication deals with some aspects of the "general revenue sharing" proposal. Under it, federal funds would be distributed to state and local governments with few federally imposed controls. The "general revenue sharing" proposal would be a departure from the present policy of distributing most federal funds for specific national purposes, often with detailed guidelines.

The "general revenue sharing" proposal would be disadvantageous to Missouri taxpayers in ways other than costing Missouri taxpayers more than would be returned to Missouri state and local governments.

HIGHER TAXES ENCOURAGED

One way is by creating incentives for the state and local governments to increase taxes, not on the basis of need to do so, but as a means of obtaining greater amounts of federal money.

Under the distribution formula in the proposal, the share of federal funds a state would receive for itself and its local governments would be influenced by the level of state and local taxes imposed. In the formula, the "tax effort" of state and local governments would be a factor, along with population and personal income, in determining the amount of federal funds received in each state. States in which state and local governments impose a higher level of taxes for general purposes would receive more federal money.

The formula also prescribes the means of determining how local governments would share in a state's allocation. Under it, the level of taxation plays an even more prominent role. A single factor is used to divide a state's allocation of federal funds with the state government and among its cities, counties and townships. This factor is the general tax revenue. Increases of taxes by any local government producing increased general revenue receipts would increase the share of the state allocation it would receive.

FORMULA FAULT SHOWN

The distribution formula rewards states making greater "tax effort" on the theory that taxpayers in such states are taxing themselves to a greater extent than those of other states. That assumes all taxes imposed in a state are largely paid by residents of that state. That is not true in the case of some taxes. Some taxes, such as severance taxes on oil and gas in Texas and Louisiana, are largely paid by residents of other states where the products are consumed. As consumers of these products, Missouri taxpayers would be contributing toward those

states receiving a larger share of federal funds and Missouri receiving a lesser share.

PRIVATE FINANCING PENALIZED

Similarly, states having lower levels of taxation resulting from some services being more largely privately financed, would receive less under the distribution formula than states where such services are tax financed. In Nevada and Wyoming all college students are enrolled in tax-supported institutions. In Missouri and several other states a third or more attend privately supported institutions. States financing most or all higher education from taxes would have enhanced "tax effort" under the distribution formula. States like Missouri would fare less well under the formula as a result of a considerable proportion of higher education being privately financed.

At the local level in Missouri, the operation of the distribution formula would be influenced as a result of some communities taxing themselves to provide hospitals while others rely entirely on privately supported hospitals.

Their survey of March 1971, then outlines several areas of possible streamlining of local government and then returns to the general revenue-sharing proposal:

WEAKNESS MARKS FORMULAS

The operations of the proposed distribution formula demonstrate what has been found in years of experimentation at all levels of government—namely that it has never been possible to devise a formula that is fair and which will place the money where the need is. The wider the spectrum for which a formula is attempted the more striking the aberrations that occur under it.

The "general revenue sharing" proposal would provide state and local officials with additional dollars for expenditure for which they would not have to tax their constituents. Requiring officials who form expenditure policies also to be responsible for raising the tax dollars is a key means of striking a sound balance between demand for public services and the public's willingness to pay for them. Revenue sharing envisions the expenditure of billions of dollars without that element of fiscal accountability.

This shortcoming in fiscal accountability, combined with the range of human desires for services and benefits from government, assures that local and state governments would soon seek more funds than the revenue sharing proposal would distribute.

Even supporters of revenue sharing fear local officials will devote more time to seeking additional federal funds than putting their own houses in order, once they have a taste of the program. Already, demands are being heard for distribution of more funds than the revenue sharing proposal calls for. Once revenue sharing is started, such demands can be expected to militate against future reductions in federal taxes.

LARGE FEDERAL DEFICIT EXPECTED

The \$5-billion general revenue sharing program would not supplant existing federal grant programs or other federal expenditures. Under the proposal, the amount shared is expected to rise each year and reach nearly \$10 billion by 1980. The program would be initiated at a time when a substantial federal deficit is anticipated.

Critics of the proposal hold that, one way or the other, its cost must be met—either by increasing the national debt, which would fuel inflation, or by increased taxes.

Supporters hold that the program can be financed from the "fiscal dividend" resulting from the federal tax system producing a 1.5-percent increase in revenue for each 1-percent growth in gross national product. They hold that this will provide enough revenue above that required for other purposes to finance revenue sharing. The federal government's record of 24 deficits in the last 30

years is not reassuring on that point, however.

A succinct description of how revenue sharing might be financed has been provided by Rep. John W. Byrnes of Wisconsin, ranking minority member of the House Ways and Means Committee, who said:

"The first path to wisdom is to recognize that all levels of government are squeezing blood from the same turnip, the American taxpayer, and that no gimmick, such as revenue sharing, to disguise which level is putting on the pressure, is going to make it any easier for him."

GLOBAL POVERTY AND UNDERDEVELOPMENT

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 5, 1971

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Members of Congress to a remarkable address delivered by Dr. John E. Rielly, senior fellow of the Overseas Development Council. Dr. Rielly spoke at the Conference on International Justice, Development, and Peace at St. John's University, Collegeville, Minn. His topic was "Global Poverty and Underdevelopment: The Present Situation and the Response of the Developed Nations."

Dr. Rielly has given us a thoughtful analysis of what is happening in the developing countries and particularly the relationship between economic development and population growth. He has reminded us once again of the importance of capital investment and technical assistance, and also called to our attention the dangerous situation which is developing where the gap between the rich and the poor continues to widen.

This thoughtful address deserves the careful reading and attention of every public official, particularly Members of Congress and those responsible for our foreign policy. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

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

GLOBAL POVERTY AND UNDERDEVELOPMENT: THE PRESENT SITUATION AND THE RESPONSE OF THE DEVELOPED NATIONS

(By John E. Rielly)

MARCH 15, 1971.

It is a great pleasure to return to the campus of St. John's University where I spent four of the most peaceful and satisfying years of my life. I am especially fortunate to be able to return to speak to you on a subject which has occupied much of my professional life for the past ten years, a subject which remains central to international affairs in the twentieth century. The specific topic which I have been asked to address at the opening of this Conference on International Justice, Development and Peace is "World Poverty and Underdevelopment: the Present Situation and the Response of the Developed Nations."

It is especially gratifying to see this group focusing on these issues. For today they represent central issues of international affairs which call for a judgment by the Christian and Jewish communities. The judgments you make—the message you carry

can make a decisive difference in the actions taken by governments—here and abroad.

In this paper I will begin with a brief summary of the situation in the developing countries and will then devote the greater part of the discussion to the question of the relationship between the developed countries and developing countries, giving special attention to the relationship between the United States and the developing countries.

When I refer to the developing countries, I refer to South and Central America, the Middle East, Africa and Asia (excepting Communist China). You will note that I do not use the term "third world"—because I do not believe such a thing exists. Finally, I assume in this discussion that Latin America is a less developed part of the Western world, and despite the fact that it shares some of the problems of other developing continents, it has more in common with Europe and North America than with Africa and Asia.

The subject of developing countries has been covered by a number of reports during the past two years. We have had the Pearson Report, commissioned by the World Bank issued in October, 1969; the Timbergen Report or the U.N. Commission for Development Plan issued in 1970; the Jackson Report on the U.N. development program issued in 1970; the Prebisch Report on Latin America; and the Peterson Report of March, 1970 which reviewed the U.S. development assistance effort. While the reports vary in emphasis and coverage, they all conclude that the situation in the developing countries is getting worse. And all agree that the developed countries have an obligation to do more to assist the developing countries.

Although some of the report focus on the whole relationship between developed and developing countries, most of them focus on the aspect of governmental aid. According to their estimates, the real value of concessional aid was reduced by more than 50% between 1962 and 1968. International governmental aid has represented only .4% of the developed world's GNP. The United States' share has fallen even more precipitously. The U.S. gave over 2% of its GNP to the Marshall Plan at a time when per capita income here was only 40% of its present level. Today we give slightly less than one fifth as much aid as a percentage of our GNP at a time when our income is 2.5 times higher than it was in 1948.

What are the facts about the developing countries themselves? According to the World Bank, per capita income levels per year in developing continents as of 1968 were as follows: Asia \$110; Africa \$130; Latin America \$370; Middle East \$330. This compares with the average per capita income in the United States of \$4,000; Canada \$2,500; Germany \$1,900; United Kingdom \$1,800.

The above figures disguise the fact that if the average income for Africa is \$130 per year there are literally millions of people living on half of that. The same is true for other areas of the world. And there is fear that the actual standard of living of millions of people is lower in 1971 than it was in 1960.

Despite these depressingly low income figures for the developing continents, their gross national product grew at an unprecedented rate during the last decade, averaging 5% annually. A higher average growth rate in the 1970's 6% is likely and should increase the total GNP for the developing countries from \$300 billion in 1970 to approximately \$600 billion in 1980.

However, given other trends which I will describe later, the doubling of GNP will still leave hundreds of millions of people in abject poverty. According to present population trends, the present figure of 3.5 billion people in the world will reach 7 billion in the year 2000, and 15 billion by the twenty-second century. Two-thirds of the world

population now lives in the developing countries (including China); by the year 2000 it will be approximately four-fifths. By 2000 at present rates the per capita rate for the United States will be \$8,000 to \$10,000 per year. Yet a continuation of even today's exceptional growth rates in the developing countries indicates that at least one half of the developing world will still have a per capita income of only \$200 a year by the year 2000.

POPULATION-UNEMPLOYMENT

A second major problem for the developing countries in the next three decades is the rapidly growing unemployment problem which is a by-product of the population explosion. With a constant or increasing birth rate and declining death rate, a country like India, for example, now has 100,000 net new entrants into its labor force each week, a figure which will rise to 140,000 net each week by 1980. In a significantly more developed country, like Columbia, 12 to 14% of the present urban working force is openly unemployed and an additional 10 to 12% is so underemployed that they can effectively be categorized as out of work. This unemployment problem is made worse by the increasing use of capital intensive technology and the increasing rate of rural migration to urban areas.

Of the 500 million people expected to be added in this decade to the population of developing countries, approximately 170 million will represent additional entrants to the labor force. Given present population trends, patterns of technological dissemination and urban migration to the cities, the problem is likely to get worse before it gets better.

Unemployment is particularly acute among young people, and among people in the incredibly fast-growing urban centers. During the First Development Decade, most poor nations saw a tremendous increase in unemployment despite a growth in GNP that was sometimes spectacular. Clearly, a further increase of GNP by itself is no answer to this explosive problem. In addition, unemployment presents an especially harsh threat to political stability in the 1970's. The President of the World Bank, Robert McNamara, has stated that matter boldly: "The marginal men," he says, "the wretched strugglers for survival on the fringes of farm and city, may already number more than half a billion. By 1980, they will surpass a billion, by 1990 two billion. Can we imagine any human order surviving within so gross a mass of misery piling up at its base? A by-product of the population explosion, the unemployment explosion will require tremendous creativity and resourcefulness throughout the 1970's if Development Decade II is to have any meaning to human society."

This gives a brief sketch of the conditions of the developing countries, one that does not adequately convey the total picture of widespread hunger, deprivation, absence of educational opportunity, unequal distribution of wealth, the prevalence of disease, not to mention political repression and shocking social inequity in many countries.

What do developing countries need? It is clear that they need more food, more jobs, better distribution of income, new labor-intensive technologies, better access to health and education on the part of all. This means that developing countries need more resources. Even more important it means in many cases, they require a redistribution of resources within the society.

Just to meet the employment problem alone, most developing countries will have to grow at a rate of 6.5% to 8%, not a likely possibility for many of them. Unemployment might, of course, be ameliorated through a distribution of poverty through subsidized rural public works that are labor intensive. However, this would not result in an increase in income per capita. Alternatively, a totalitarian system could pos-

sibly establish full employment and raise the standard of living but at a very high price in terms of political and social liberty. The best alternative is to achieve a high growth rate with a strong political and social system which can redistribute benefits at the same time the economy is growing. This will require a heroic effort for most countries. To achieve a growth rate of say 7% requires a gross investment of 25% of GNP. If external resources could finance 30% of this investment, 70% must still come from internal sources. This would require an increase in the saving rate by 40%. What this means is that if a country like India grew by 5.5% for the next three decades and the United States grew by 4%, the average income in the U.S. would be \$10,000 as opposed to \$200 in India. If India grew 7% a year for the next three decades, her per capita income would be \$400 per head by the year 2000 which would reduce the rate of inequality from 1 to 50 to 1 to 25. And for India, the difference between \$200 and \$400 is the difference between poverty and a tolerable standard of living.

Thus it is clear that the developing countries need more resources. They must create part of these themselves, but part must be received from external sources. Although it is difficult to mobilize the level of resources internally that will be required, one should emphasize that the developing countries did better during the last decade than did the present industrialized countries in their comparable periods. If the developed countries respond appropriately, the developing countries could achieve better than a 6% growth rate in the 1970's.

What else must the developing countries do? First, they must acquire a capacity to feed themselves. Through the possibilities held out by the Green Revolution, there is a good chance that the amount of food needed can be grown. Whether the right distribution can be achieved is something else again.

One thing we have learned in the course of the First Development Decade is that the high growth rates prescribed by economists mean little unless there is some change in the benefit distribution system, some attempt made to increase the access to the benefits of economic growth.

I have briefly described here the situation in the developing countries today. The next question that arises for us in the United States is "Why should we be concerned"? This is the most basic—and most difficult question—why should we bother at all? Though the reasons may be obvious to this group here today—they are by no means obvious to many Americans.

There is a profound sense in which helping the developing countries is no longer a legitimate topic of political conversation in the United States. Favorable references to it in the Congress are limited to a select group of individuals who either have a long-standing commitment to nothing really to lose. In political campaigns, espousing development assistance may not lose many votes for a candidate in most parts of the country, but nowhere will it gain him any either. It is largely a non-issue in American politics.

Before the political work of carrying forward a U.S. role in development can get very far, development assistance has to become a live issue again, with a new rationale that can excite widespread attention. Otherwise, we can expect only "benign neglect"—or worse—and will continue to see development experts talking to one another, but rarely finding a wider audience.

It is clear to anyone who samples opinion either in Congress, in the Executive Branch, or in the country as a whole that the old rationale for overseas development assistance is not persuasive with many people.

First, it is no longer possible to invoke the fears of Cold War, or the argument that

the world will inevitably be divided between the United States and the Soviet Union. Not only did the practical applications of that narrow theory frequently fail—when countries like Egypt learned to use this argument to aid their own development but undermined the Cold War argument that "neutrality" was impossible—but also the waning of the Cold War itself reduced the importance, both at home and abroad, of wooing people in the poorer two-thirds of the world. Regrettably too many people who supported development for other reasons were content to lean on this Cold War rationale without building support on other foundations as well. They found it was convenient, politically attractive, and did the job—for a time. Inevitably, their efforts were left high and dry, both intellectually and politically, when the Cold War arguments lost their punch. Quite simply, Cold War rhetoric is dead as a means for extracting money from the American public to help poor foreigners.

Second, a new school of thought in the United States began to emerge during the trauma of the Vietnam War. There began a general turning away from interest and commitments in the world, and a call for "putting our own house in order first." Necessarily, development assistance was reduced in the concern for reordering priorities.

Third, some revisionist historians made a simplistic connection between U.S. economic involvement in the developing world, the growth in U.S. military responsibility for protecting particular regimes, and the prospect that we would have to fight other wars like Vietnam in the future.

Fourth, there has emerged a growing concern among some Americans—probably including some of you—about problems of "imperialism": the impact of advanced societies on primitive ones; and the problems inherent in the export of Western values. There is no doubt that direct involvement in the development process raises real dilemmas for a responsible U.S. policy: a small example was provided by the kidnapping and murder of a U.S. AID official who was helping to train police in Uruguay. As innocent as his activities may appear, they essentially represent a political act of support for the government in power.

To our cost, we have found that direct bilateral assistance, whether for security or for development purposes, too often involved us directly in the fate of particular governments or regimes than is healthy either for those nations or for ourselves.

Large aid missions in the field have led in many cases to an overpowering U.S. presence, thereby breeding resentment and hostility. Our motives have become suspect even when they are well-intentioned. We have often failed to resist what the French philosopher, Henry Dumery, called "the temptation to do good; the insistence that not only must virtue be achieved—but our particular version in our particular way."

The inadequacy of the old ideas suggests that a different rationale for development assistance must be created during the 1970s if the U.S. is to play a major role in the poor countries, and to overcome the backlog of discredit that has been built up during recent years.

What are some of the basic arguments for a U.S. role in development assistance?

1. *Violence and order.* An important argument for any foreign policy is always that it is somehow in our direct national interest. The Cold War no longer suffices; Vietnam has made us wary of unconsidered involvements. But there is a very real sense in which the United States is deeply and permanently involved in the world. We remain—whether we like it or not—the nation chiefly responsible for preserving some semblance of order in the world. This does not mean that we must intervene in every other country where

we think our interests are threatened—or in every other country to preserve order. But it does mean that we, as the most powerful nation on earth, must take seriously threats both to ourselves and to the overall system of international relations. This is a role that we inherited by chance but have now continued largely by choice. Even if we choose to depreciate this role, it is one for which we will continue to be held responsible by others in the coming years.

It can be argued further that this general sense of international order is threatened by what is happening in poor countries; by threats of chaos, internal warfare, and conflict between neighboring states that ultimately could have profound effects on the rich countries of the world.

Directly, this disruption and violence in poor countries may not threaten the United States for some time. But it may. In the Middle East, the rise of uncontrolled violence has complicated a long-standing conflict there that we have not been able to ignore in our overall concern with international order. This new violence, like the old is partly a product of a failure of economic, political and social development.

This failure is having corrosive effects. Our illusion of safety, like that in Europe before 1914, is being destroyed by acts of violence and intimidation that reach below small developing countries. These acts of violence, including aircraft hijackings and international kidnappings, are not confined to the developing world; but they increasingly dramatize its problems and the urgency of finding solutions.

Indeed, the rising tide of violence throughout the poor countries of the world threatens our ability to trade, to travel, and to invest. And unless we help stem this tide by helping these countries develop, our world may be far less congenial for the rich countries than it is today.

This last point does not necessarily imply that our helping poor countries to develop will lead them to take their place in international society without threatening it. In the short run development assistance can even contribute to disruption, as expectations rise to exceed what is possible. After all, revolution and disorder are classically problems of states and people on the rise and on their fall. Nor is it clear that our long-run interest in a stable world implies opposition to all violence in developing countries particularly where it can lead to the evolution of societies that rest on a firmer basis of popular support.

It is here that we encounter a subject which has been a source of increasing concern in the Christian churches, both Protestant and Catholic. Put simply—How should Christians respond to a situation in which overthrowing the existing economic and social order—by means that include violent action—appears to be the only alternative to the perpetuation of injustice? Related to this question is the growing concern for indigenous cultures and traditions will they be crushed or replaced by the values implicit in the cultural standardization that has come to be associated with technological expansion and economic development? There is a widespread concern that "development" as it has been traditionally defined by advanced countries and the international agencies represents at best an inadequate solution to developing country problems and at worst a manifestation of Western economic imperialism.

Many of you here are familiar with reports published the last three years by SO-DEPAX—the Committee on Society, Development and Peace set up in 1968 by the World Council of Churches and the Vatican, acting through the Pontifical Commission for Justice and Peace. The titles of the reports published after several recent SO-DEPAX conferences suggest the trend of Christian concern: "The Challenge of De-

velopment" (Montreal: 1969); "In Search of a Theology of Development" (Cartigny: 1969); "Peace—the Desperate Imperative" (Baden: 1970); "Liberation—Justice—Development" (Tokyo: 1970); "Partnership or Privilege" (Cartigny: 1970).

All of these reports reflect a single dominant view: that the recipe for the developing countries, as advanced by traditional development economists—is unsatisfactory. The SODEPAX reports reflect the view widely disseminated by the late Louis Lebert that development must be seen as a social process involving ethical values, a process implying ultimately a concept of what man is. Development must be seen within a humanist perspective, and development economics must become a "discipline covering the passage from a less human to a more human phase."

Working from the framework developed by Lebert, many Christian thinkers have come to reject "development" as an adequate concept and have begun to speak of "liberation," of "justice" and "revolution."

A report of the National Council of Churches issued only this month speaks of "World Justice, Liberation and Development". One of the most influential younger Latin American Christian theologians, Gustavo Gutierrez, speaks of a "theology of liberation." Gutierrez accurately describes the views of a growing number of Christian thinkers—and not only in the developing countries—when he says:

"Development should attack the causes of our plight, and among the central ones is the economic, social, political, and cultural dependence of some peoples on others. The word 'liberation', therefore, is more accurate and conveys better the human side of the problem."

We do not have to adopt Gutierrez's term "liberation" to appreciate his concern for the human aspects of social and economic development.

It is this concern that was expressed by Pope Paul VI in a passage in his encyclical, "The Development of Peoples". Here the Pope speaks of "building a world where every man, regardless of race, religion, or nationality, can live a fully human life, free of the servitude that comes from other men and from the incompletely mastered world about him."

Nor need we share all of Gutierrez's analysis concerning the manipulation and control of poor nations or poor people by international economic groups—groups pictured as "oppressors" and "exploiters". We can still accept another of his central points: The need for a fundamental redistribution of political, economic and social power within society, and a restructuring of the international economic system.

At the present time, this economic system concentrates a disproportionate share of the world's wealth in a few countries.

I believe this is the central message of Christian thinkers today as they view the international scene—that justice requires a fundamental reordering of society; and that such a reordering can be accomplished by deliberate political action by an aroused and politically conscious people. This reordering of priorities, which is required to guarantee a minimal level of material goods and human rights to all people, must be accomplished in developed societies as well as in the poor countries of the world.

I am encouraged that at least one of the major reports on international development—that of the Committee for Development Planning of the UNDP (the Tinbergen Report) explicitly recognizes the need to be concerned about the distribution of wealth—not just its overall increase. This report states:

"The world community cannot sit idle when a part of its population lives in great comfort and even affluence while much the larger part suffers from abject poverty, and

when this disparity is increasing instead of diminishing."

It went so far as to recognize that "there will be cases necessitating a sacrifice of the pace of growth in order to prevent social injustice."

Thus the international establishment is being prodded increasingly to modify its approach to the problems of world poverty, to go beyond the traditional goal of accelerated economic growth. The response of the international community so far—particularly the rich countries of the world—is less encouraging.

2. *Interdependence.* A second reason for our being concerned about the developing countries is the growing interdependence of the world. The question of American self-interest in the process of development also has a wider economic and political dimension. There is an international system of trade to be protected and expanded; this can be a stable and expanding international system only if the developing nations are brought into it in ways that are mutually beneficial. It is quite obvious that the United States will play a central role in shaping this system, for good or ill. In fact, by not acting to extend preferential tariff treatment to developing country goods, or by raising new barriers to them, we will have a profoundly discouraging effect on the ability of developing countries to help themselves. And our concern to promote a stable and productive international economic system militates for our giving evidence of good faith to the poor countries of the world. They have little bargaining power: only we have the power to decide whether they will be able to play an active and positive role in the worldwide system.

It is also clear that some problems facing the world will have to be solved in common over the long run, or not solved at all. There is already an awakened consciousness in the United States about the problems of preserving the environment, and tentative attempts to do something about them. At some point the cooperation of the developing countries will have to be enlisted. In fact, it will one day become necessary to protect what is truly a global interest in preserving the environment as a way of protecting our own national self-interest.

3. *Morality.*—For many of you the moral rationale for U.S. involvement in development will be most persuasive. One need not share the Christian and Jewish religious tradition to recognize the force of moral arguments. They even make some appeal to those "hard headed" statesmen who are concerned about self-interest. Many of them also accept that the structure of international relations rests upon a sense of common interest that demands some moral concern for mankind in general.

This point applies particularly to those young Americans who are most concerned about America's moral stance in the world; who wish our foreign policy to be based on more than simple power-politics; who see America's role in the developing countries to be "imperialistic"; and who have many of the same concerns as some of the Christian writers referred to above.

4. *Example.* Finally, it is worth citing the example for us by others, particularly by the other 15 members of the Development Assistance Committee (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development), which includes the U.S., Canada most of Western Europe, Japan and Australia. In politics as in business, competition can be an effective spur for Americans, particularly if it is put in terms of our own self-interest. And in the realm of development assistance, we are clearly being out-distanced. We lag far behind other rich countries in terms of the percentage of GNP transferred to poor countries. Today we rank 11th out of 16 DAC countries in direct governmental aid, and

16th out of 16 in total net aid and private investment.

The example set for us by Europeans and Japanese is also a challenge to exercise in the realm of development assistance the sense of leadership that has held such a significant place in American political goals since the war. This is particularly true of our sense of leadership in promoting the orderly growth of international society. Few Americans, directly confronted, with their country to be second-rate, or to be seen abroad as defaulting on its responsibilities.

These four points represent only a partial list of arguments for an active U.S. role in development assistance. Although none are conclusive, they do point to the new direction in which efforts to stimulate attention, concern, and political support can profitably be directed.

I have described briefly the situation in the developing countries and have offered several reasons why we in the United States should be concerned. I would now like to address the final question: what should be the response of the developed countries—and more specifically what should be the response of the United States. Indeed, what should we do?

First, we must recognize that international economic issues will henceforth increasingly rival diplomatic and security problems as the principle substance of American foreign policy. This shift in priorities reflects the existing accommodation between the super powers, the development of détente, the changing pattern of economic relations throughout the world and the new states as sources of anxiety and conflict. Until now there has been very little recognition of the trend in the U.S.

President Nixon has finally recognized that economic issues are an important part of foreign policy. And the establishment in February 1971 of a White House Council on International Economic Policy is a step in the right direction. Whether this Council will in fact result in a change in priorities will depend in large part on the ability of Mr. Peter Peterson (formerly President of Bell and Howell), the President's choice for the job, to prove a match for Mssrs. Kissinger and Erlichman in White House bureaucratic competition.

But despite the creation of this new Council, the President and his advisors have still not balanced traditional security issues with economic considerations to the extent they need to do.

In the last year, this led to a near collision with Japan on trade questions and has fueled fears in Europe of a trade war between the U.S. and the EEC. And this Presidential neglect has been responsible for preventing the emergence of a clear policy vis-à-vis the developing world. Mr. Nixon has still failed to recognize that what we do today to help poor countries help themselves will reduce the chances that we will be required tomorrow to help defend them with guns and soldiers.

Secondly, we must recognize that the military instruments of American foreign policy have a more limited applicability today. In particular, we cannot much longer pretend that there can be military answers to economic and social problems. This awareness should be reflected in the resources devoted to the military budget. In presenting the Nixon Doctrine as a main outline of American foreign policy, the President has expressed his intention of reorienting America's role in the world by reducing our active role abroad and avoiding military intervention wherever possible in the future. Until now, most analysis has focused on the military aspects of this, particularly on the question, "how do we get Asian boys to fight Asian wars?" However, for the Nixon Doctrine to succeed, we cannot construe our task simply as one of helping others to fight their

own wars. It is clear that we must also have to take seriously the means required by individual countries to cope with the conditions that breed threats to their security. These means largely center around the difficult and ill-defined processes of economic and social development. So far, therefore, the Nixon Doctrine has failed to meet its real test—the test of economic development that could make recourse to arms unnecessary.

Clearly, we need to change direction and stop defaulting on our own self-interest. How many of us realize, for example, that the war in Vietnam—a useless, tragic war—has cost us more than all the foreign aid we have provided for the entire world—including the Marshall Plan.

The prospects for change are not bright. According to the present estimates, the federal budget will increase during the next fiscal year by \$20 to 25 billion. In view of the urgent need to address domestic problems and widespread opposition to much of our involvement abroad, it is most unlikely that the Administration will increase the total resources devoted to overseas programs. Given the present political climate in the country, a substantial increase in American bilateral or multilateral assistance to the developing world would almost certainly have to come from reductions in other parts of the budget devoted to overseas programs—for example, in the continued high level of military expenditures.

Until now there has been no basis for believing the Nixon Administration plans to move in this direction. It is still placing top priority on the acquisition of improved nuclear weapon systems. For the next fiscal year, the Administration has proposed an increase in the military budget of about \$2 billion. It comes at a time when the deescalation of the Vietnam War could make funds available for non-military expenditures overseas. By reallocating only a small fraction of potential defense savings—perhaps \$1 billion—we could undertake a sizable expansion of our overseas development effort. So the second thing we must do is to deemphasize the military aspects of American foreign policy and reduce the military budget.

Third, we must also focus attention on the continuing problem of arms sales to developing countries. At present we continue to give and sell arms to developing countries beyond their requirements beyond any requirements of the Nixon Doctrine. Senator Proxmire in his recent hearings has documented the magnitude of military assistance—at some times exceeding by some billions of dollars our meager economic effort. Worldwide expenditures on defense now total approximately \$200 billion per year. Thirty percent of this represent expenditures by the developing world. In this latter figure, about \$5 billion represents hard currency payments by poor countries for arms. Arms purchases clearly divert resources that these countries could use to develop themselves economically. They can even contribute to conflicts in which the U.S. and other developed countries may become involved. So the third prescription is to curtail arms sales to developing countries.

Fourth, it is becoming increasingly clear that in determining our relations with many of the developing countries of the world, trade is more important than aid. Approximately 80 per cent of the total financial flows from rich nations to poor nations is accounted for by trade, not aid. The U.S. imports 10 billion of commodities and manufactures per year from poor countries. The European Common Market imports \$12 billion. Total exports from poor countries amount to \$50 billion in 1970.

For many countries trade is the real engine of development, and exports represent the chief means for earning the foreign exchange

they need to finance their own economic development. The ability to increase exports to the developed world is seen as the best way to avoid the problems of foreign involvement and tutelage that go along with foreign aid programs.

Therefore, President Nixon's proposals on trade have a special importance for development policy. He has indicated in his recent foreign policy message that he will ask Congress to eliminate import duties on manufactured products exported from the developing countries. This would implement the general preference scheme which has already been approved by both the OECD and the United Nations' Conference on Trade and Development. At the same time, however, the President may be required to deal once again with import quota legislation on such products as textiles and shoes, which if implemented, could undercut many of the liberalizing provisions of the preferential tariff scheme. Protectionist policies came very close to becoming enacted in 1970 in part because of the Nixon Administration's unwillingness to take a strong stand against it. The failure by the White House to oppose these protectionist measures early and vigorously brought us very close to leading to a major crisis in American international affairs. I believe the President must recognize the importance of trade policy and will be prepared to spend the political capital required to preserve the access of developing country goods to American markets. The establishment of the White House Council on International Economic Policy is one indication of some progress by the President in recognizing the importance of trade.

Fifth, we must move to reinvigorate the U.S. multilateral and bilateral foreign assistance effort. We must be prepared to meet the goals stated by the Pearson and Timmerman Commission Reports which call for a contribution from developed countries equal to one percent of GNP in development assistance. Until now there has been little indication that the Nixon Administration is prepared to make this commitment. President Nixon has, however, put forth some sensible proposals for reorganization of the U.S. development effort, proposals following closely the recommendations of the Presidential Task Force on "Foreign Assistance for the 70's" chaired by Mr. Rudolph Peterson. We should move to implement the President's recommendation that U.S. assistance designed for purposes of short-term security, such as assistance for Southeast Asia, should be separated from that designed primarily for humanitarian or development purposes.

As a way of avoiding excessive involvement by the United States government in the internal affairs of developing countries, we should also move to implement the President's recommendation that more of our development resources flow through multilateral institutions—such as the World Bank and regional banks.

Multilateral institutions will not have all the answers to the difficult problems of development. But they will be able to provide a framework within which the pursuit of short-term political goals at the expense of long range objectives is minimized.

Sixth, we should take a thoughtful look at the President's recommendation to invest our remaining bilateral development aid in three new institutions which would replace the existing Agency for International Development: (1) the International Development Corporation, which would be concerned primarily with transferring capital resources; (2) the International Development Institute, which would be concerned with the creation and transfer of technology and the application of new ideas in the developing world; and (3) the Overseas Private Investment Corporation which is now established which would assist in the channelling of private

investments. Although these new institutions were proposed chiefly to win Congressional and public support for a new program, the negative response in Congress thus far suggests that changing the machinery for bilateral aid may produce very limited benefits.

More important, for development institutions to be effective there must be assurance of long-term funding. The test of the President's commitment to development will be his willingness to insist on multi-year appropriations, his willingness to expend the political capital required to push this through.

The question of the President's commitment to development remains the key uncertainty surrounding his recent recommendations about reforming the U.S. development structure. He alone is able to help Americans to understand both their political and moral responsibilities in the developing world. Only the President has the ability to commit the American people to a program of development assistance that will confirm our understanding of the facts of a changing world. Only he can lead us to continue playing a useful and necessary role beyond our borders.

So far, he has not done so. So far his statements fail to strike the note of urgency and commitment that is going to be required if the proposed administrative changes are to work. The President has so far given no clear lead, nor proposed any concrete objectives for the new institutions to reach. In this respect, it should be explicitly added, he is following the pattern set by President Johnson who also gave a low priority to development. These are some of the actions which we in the United States should take if we are to fulfill our responsibilities to the developing countries. In pursuing these objectives, we must always remember that because we are the world's wealthiest and most powerful nation, there is much that we can accomplish.

But after a decade of anguish and unending war in Indo-China we should better appreciate what Dennis Brogan has called "the myth of American omnipotence." We should perceive the folly of earlier efforts to "build the Great Society in Asia" and similar formulations of American cultural imperialism. President Kennedy, we remember, is revered throughout the world—and especially in the developing continents of the world—not so much for what material results he achieved as for the attitude he conveyed. What can be accomplished in a material sense in a short period of time will always fall short of expectations. What is more important is that leaders be prepared to give some evidence that progress is being made, that material betterment is on the way, that there is sound reason for believing that the unmet material problems of society will be solved in the future.

For American leaders cooperating with those in developing societies, it is essential to convey an understanding and respect for the traditions and culture of other nations, a willingness to help combined with a recognition that others may have answers—and not just problems.

In cooperating with leaders and peoples from developing countries, we would do well to approach them in the spirit of the counsel offered by a distinguished graduate of St. John's University, Eugene J. McCarthy.

Speaking of the task of the Christian in political life, he said the following: A man should "make his decisions in the hope that by these decisions an imperfect world may become somewhat more perfect; or that at least if he cannot make an imperfect world less imperfect, he can save it from becoming even less perfect, or finally, from becoming entirely evil and perverted. He can try to prevent degradation, prevent decline, and, if possible, to move things forward and upward toward right and justice."

UNDER THE CONSTITUTION THE
POWER OF THE PURSE BELONGS
TO THE CONGRESS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished columnist Mr. James J. Kilpatrick, in a recent column in the Washington Star, discussed the impoundment by the Bureau of the Budget of more than \$12 billion in funds appropriated last year by the Congress.

This rather mild, scholarly column terms the issue a question of power. However, the action by the Office of Management and Budget in impounding, withholding, and freezing funds in such magnitude is arbitrary, political, and many feel is unconstitutional.

The OMB has set itself up as an "executive supreme court" to rule on the actions of the Congress—ignoring appropriation actions of the Congress which somehow run counter to OMB's own twisted views on priorities.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place the article in the RECORD herewith:

IMPOUNDING FUNDS: THE QUESTION IS POWER

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

One of these years, I keep telling myself, I will retire to the mountains, feed a last sheet of copy paper into this battered Underwood, and undertake to distill a lifetime of political observation into a single sentence of political truth. The sentence will read: *The question is power.*

That is what the game is all about. We are seeing it in a new form in Washington these days—actually a very old form—in the inchoate confrontation between Congress and the White House on this matter of the impoundment of appropriated funds. Senator Sam Ervin, D-N.C., has been holding some mild hearings. The White House has dispatched a spokesman to make a mild response. There is not much drama thus far.

Yet the issue is important. One of the fundamental powers of the Congress is the power of the purse. It is the power to raise funds—to lay and collect taxes, to borrow money, to coin money. It is equally the power to say how the taxpayers' money shall be spent. "No money shall be drawn from the treasury," says the Constitution, "but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

It follows from that stricture that appropriations are in fact laws; and the Constitution also says, in defining the powers and duties of a Chief Executive, that the President "shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

A specific example may clarify the kind of impasse that develops. Consider, if you please, the Florida barge canal. Critics of the project see it as something more than a mere boondoggle; they see it as an absolute disaster, threatening the delicate ecology of the Everglades. Defenders of the project, such as the Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce, hold a different view; they see the canal as a significant economic benefit, and they regard the environmental arguments as vastly overblown.

Put the merits to one side. The point is that Congress has decided the issue explicitly in favor of the proponents. Congress repeatedly has made appropriations for building the canal. These appropriations are "laws" as

surely as the laws appropriating funds to pay a President's salary; they are laws manifesting a specific congressional intent.

But on Jan. 19, by executive order, Mr. Nixon simply nullified the laws appropriating money for the Florida barge canal. Acting on the recommendation of Dr. Russell Train, chairman of his Council on Environmental Quality, the President imposed an effective veto. Does the duty to execute the laws embrace a power to nullify the laws? If so, what dignity and purpose attach to congressional appropriations in the first place?

Consider a different hypothesis. Suppose it were President Proxmire in the White House; he is a steadfast opponent of federal funding of a supersonic transport plane. Suppose the Congress had fought out the question of an SST, and the proponents had won. The fight is over. The appropriation has passed. But instead of vetoing the bill, President Proxmire impounds the money and refuses executive consent to its expenditure. What then? Impeach the President? Sue him? Such remedies have little substance of reality.

The law is unclear. In a major speech to the House on Feb. 10, Florida's Charles E. Bennett cited precedents going back to Kendall v. United States in 1838 to support his conviction that specific appropriations cannot lawfully be impounded. The case involved a small claim of a man named Stokes for carrying mail, and may not be in point. Bennett also cited various law review articles criticizing a President's asserted power to impound.

Manifestly, a President must have some discretion. Existing law permits impoundment to avoid deficiencies, or to effect economies. Custom and common sense support a President's refusal to expend appropriations when circumstances have changed; after World War II, President Truman reasonably nullified outlays for unneeded military hospitals.

None of these exceptions touches a case such as the Florida barge canal. Congress has said it shall be built. Mr. Nixon, without a formal veto, has said it shall not be built. Never mind who is right or wrong, for the question is not a question of wisdom or of folly. Again, in saecula saeculorum, the question is power.

**I AM DEMOCRACY—THE FRIEND
OF MAN**

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 5, 1971

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, there are many ways of expressing love of country—in song, story, deed, and verse. One such patriotic verse has recently been called to my attention.

Entitled "I Am Democracy—The Friend of Man," the poem, composed by Sol Mann of Redondo Beach, Calif., is an appropriate reminder of some of our basic national ideals. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Mann's poem be printed in the RECORD.

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

I AM DEMOCRACY—THE FRIEND OF MAN

(By Sol Mann)

Destroy me if you can,
You lost, confused, unhappy man.
Destroy everyone in this wide, wide land,
But still try to destroy me if you can.

I cannot be killed how e'er you try,
I shall always, always remain alive.
For I am the heart-beat of this land,
I am Democracy, the friend of man.

My strength lies in the lives of men,
Who sacrifice for this great plan,
My heroes many, with ideals supreme,
Gave Democracy its memorable dream.

A dream of right and love for all,
This above else should be our call.
No man too great, no man too small,
All for one, and one for all.

This is America, and its plan,
So destroy me if you can, you lost, confused,
unhappy man.

Destroy me with lies, bigotry and hate,
And even these I'm able to take.

For this stream of right and love will prevail,
In spite of history's constant walls.
Yes, America is the land, and America is the
plan.

So destroy me if you can, you lost, confused,
unhappy man.

I cannot be killed, how e'er you try,
I shall always, always remain alive.
For I am the heart-beat of the land.
I am Democracy, the friend of man.

CREDIBILITY GAP ON TELEVISION

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1971

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer. It is further evidence of a credibility gap on television, the same media that is prone to inform its listeners of what it describes as a "credibility gap in Government."

The editorial states that—

The television industry creates a credibility gap between itself and the public when it allows false evidence to be presented as part of what is supposed to be a factual documentary.

The editorial in full follows:

CREDIBILITY GAP ON TELEVISION

The television industry creates a credibility gap between itself and the public when it allows false evidence to be presented as part of what is supposed to be a factual documentary.

The National Broadcasting Co.'s vice president of corporate information, Robert D. Kasmire, acknowledges this occurred in a January program, "Say Goodbye," dealing with the threatened extinction of various species. It purported to show the death of a female polar bear, shot from a helicopter, as its cubs watched the agony. But the scenes are of different bears at different times and the female bear was being tranquilized for scientific study, not staggering in death throes as depicted. In fact, it is illegal to kill a mother polar bear with cubs.

This splicing was by an outside producer, Wolper Productions, which supplied the program to NBC for its advertising client. But NBC transmitted it without the careful scrutiny documentaries deserve. Now NBC is developing new safeguards. Either a nature documentary discloses it is using a montage of different scenes instead of an actual pictorial event, or the network won't show it.

We think this should be expanded to include documentaries of all types, especially including the war, and all filmed news reports on all networks and stations. Last year

NBC, determined to show Lake Erie was dying, used an old film of fish dying in the polluted Rhine River in Germany—and called it Lake Erie. Vice President Spiro T. Agnew last night raised serious questions of authenticity about two Columbia Broadcasting System documentaries.

The public easily can be misled emotionally by TV. The distinction between a re-enactment or clever splicing or substituted scenes and the real thing should be made plain.

TV's credibility with the public is at stake.

NIXON ON MARKET: IS PROVING CORRECT AFTER 11 MONTHS

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1971

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a little-heralded example of President Nixon's ability to analyze trends and come up with accurate predictions about the future is contained in a recent article in the New York Times.

The story recalls an occasion when the President, meeting with a group of Wall Street leaders a year ago to assess the gloomy state of the financial markets and rampant inflation startled them with this remark:

Frankly, if I had any money, I'd be buying stocks right now.

This single sentence came when the stock market was heading toward a bottomless pit.

Exactly 1 month later the Nixon prophecy looked rather pathetic, as the Times puts it. The market had hit a new low in its decline. The Dow-Jones industrial average stood at a 7½-year low at 631.

But almost a year later the facts are: There has been a spectacular rise in the market. Since that remark was uttered the market has climbed about 179 points; the upsurge from the 1970 low last May has been 43 percent; despite a downturn in mid-March the market neared the end of the first quarter with a gain of some 65 points in the Dow average to slightly above the 900 level. And if investors heeded that Presidential prophecy they would have profited as handsomely as the Dow average did.

In addition the economy is strong and inflation appears to be coming under control. The interest-rate structure "has undergone a fantastic downward restructuring; international shocks are being weathered with greater calm, and the stock market is vibrant and markedly elevated," the Times states.

It is clear that President Nixon is a prophet worth listening to. It is clear, also, that his policies have lent support to his prophecies. I insert the Times article in the RECORD at this point.

NIXON, ON MARKET, IS PROVING CORRECT AFTER 11 MONTHS

(By Thomas E. Mullaney)

Exactly 11 months ago today, when the stock market was deep in the doldrums and still headed toward its 1970 nadir, President Nixon met with a group of Wall Street leaders to assess the gloomy state of the financial

markets and the rampant inflation that was troubling them so much.

Out of the meeting came some confident reassurances that the economy was sound, that progress was being made in the effort to smother inflation, and that the securities markets were basically healthy. No promises were announced of any new initiatives to bolster investor confidence, but the President optimistically remarked:

"Frankly, if I had any money, I'd be buying stocks right now."

A month later, the market reached the bottom of its 18-month tailspin, with the Dow-Jones industrial stock average touching a seven-and-one-half-year low at 631 as investors continued to harbor doubts about the economy and showed concern over the Cambodian operation.

Now, almost one year later, the President appears to be a prophet of considerable prescience. The economy is strong—albeit not so vigorous as Washington would like—and inflation seems to be coming under control. The interest-rate structure has undergone a fantastic downward restructuring. International shocks are being weathered with greater calm. And the stock market is vibrant and markedly elevated.

Despite a small downturn last week, the market is nearing the end of the first quarter with a gain of some 65 points in the Dow average to slightly above the 900 level.

However, there has been a spectacular rise in the market since the President's stock commentary last spring. The day he spoke the Dow average stood at 724.33. His now-famous remark looked rather pathetic a month later, when the average had sunk almost 100 points, but it has since climbed about 179 points, or almost 25 per cent. The upsurge from the 1970 low last May has been about 43 per cent.

If an investor had heeded the President's advice last April 28 and put money into a representative group of 10 blue-chip and secondary stocks, he would have fared just as well as the Dow average. Here is what happened to a sample of 10 stocks over the 11-month span:

| Stocks | Apr. 28, 1970 | Mar. 26, 1971 | Percent change |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| General Motors..... | 67½ | 83½ | +24.4 |
| Standard Oil (New Jersey)... | 53½ | 77½ | +44.7 |
| General Electric..... | 69½ | 111½ | +60.5 |
| Du Pont..... | 106½ | 140½ | +31.8 |
| I.B.M..... | 290½ | 358 | +23.3 |
| Control Data..... | 41½ | 62½ | +51.3 |
| American Brands..... | 34 | 47½ | +40.1 |
| Merck..... | 93½ | 98 | +5.1 |
| Polaroid..... | 86½ | 91½ | +5.7 |
| Lockheed..... | 11½ | 11½ | -1.1 |

Although the President has done well in assessing stock market prospects and taming inflation—consumer prices have risen only 3.7 per cent since last April—the Administration is still confronted with a high unemployment rate, around the 6 per cent level; an economy in need of more zest; widespread criticism of its economic strategy; a budget slipping into a full-employment deficit, and declining favor in public-opinion polls.

Another dark shadow is the continued absence of revived public confidence. Worries about unemployment, apparently, are still keeping public psychology wrapped in a blanket of caution, and, consequently, consumer spending remains extremely reluctant, while individuals continue to enlarge their nest eggs of savings.

While consumer confidence remains rather brittle, there have been some recent indications that it is becoming a bit firmer. The weeks ahead will provide a good test of its mettle, as the public displays its Easter spending mood and its spring-buying inclinations for new cars, durables and other merchandise.

Merchants have been heartened by a somewhat stronger buying pulse in recent weeks and the slightly better tone of the University of Michigan and other recent consumer surveys.

Department-store sales across the nation, which had been rather flat early this year, showed a gain of 4 per cent in the week ended March 20, while total retail sales in the same period jumped 7 per cent over the year-ago week to \$7,039,000,000.

There hasn't been much of a surge in new-car sales as yet, however—at least not enough to assure the 10-million-car year that Detroit has been counting upon after the depressed volume of 1970. Sales during the middle 10 days of March were up only 5.7 per cent, due largely to the gain of more than 11 per cent achieved by General Motors in its continuing catch-up from last year's long strike.

A brighter note, though, appeared in current surveys of consumer attitudes. The quarterly survey of the University of Michigan reported that "consumer confidence improved somewhat during the past three months, but the gains were small." The Sindlinger survey found the confidence level rising, although not as much as it did after the last recession.

But the sounding by the American Credit Company noted that the Commercial consumer "is about to loosen his purse strings, start borrowing again and lead the United States economy into recovery." It predicted spending on capital goods in the third quarter would be 10½ per cent higher than in the 1970 period.

ECONOMIC INDICATORS, WEEKLY COMPARISONS

| | Latest week, Mar. 21 | Prior week, Mar. 14 | 1970 Mar. 21 |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Commodity index..... | 109.7 | 109.5 | 114.5 |
| Currency in circ. ¹ | \$56,213,000 | \$56,300,000 | \$52,459,000 |
| Total loans ¹ | \$83,787,000 | \$83,241,000 | \$81,212,000 |
| Steel prod. (tons)..... | 2,844,000 | 2,810,000 | 2,678,000 |
| Auto production..... | 187,676 | 191,590 | 130,628 |
| Daily oil prod. (bbls)..... | 9,812,000 | 9,882,000 | 9,619,000 |
| Freight car loadings..... | 509,639 | 500,554 | 514,504 |
| Elec. pwr. kw-hr. ¹ | 29,735,000 | 10,430,000 | 25,483,000 |
| Business failures..... | 195 | 270 | 228 |

¹ Statistics for commercial-agricultural loans, carloadings, steel, oil, electric power and business failures are for the preceding week and latest available.

MONTHLY COMPARISONS

(Dollars in thousands)

| | February | Prior month | 1970 |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Employed..... | 78,537,000 | 78,864,000 | 78,822,000 |
| Unemployed..... | 4,847,000 | 5,033,000 | 3,427,000 |
| Industrial production..... | 164.8 | 164.0 | 169.4 |
| Money supply..... | \$217,400,000 | \$214,800,000 | \$199,500,000 |
| Personal income..... | \$828,900,000 | \$825,400,000 | \$777,600,000 |
| Construction contracts..... | 126 | 117 | 137 |

| | January | Prior month | 1970 |
|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Consumer's Price Index..... | 119.2 | 119.1 | 113.3 |
| Manufacturers inventories..... | \$99,708,000 | \$99,698,000 | \$96,165,000 |
| Exports..... | \$3,735,400 | \$3,517,800 | \$3,305,200 |
| Imports..... | \$3,686,300 | \$3,320,400 | \$3,249,700 |

¹ Figures subject to revision by source. Commodity index, based on 1957-59=100 and the consumers price index, based on 1967=100, are compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Industrial production is Federal Reserve Board's adjusted index of 1957-59=100. Imports and exports as well as employment are compiled by the Bureau of Census of the Department of Commerce. Money supply is total currency outside banks and demand deposits adjusted as reported by Federal Reserve Board. Business failures compiled by Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. Construction contracts are compiled by the F. W. Dodge Division, McGraw-Hill Information Systems Co.

BUSINESS INDEX DOWN

The New York Times Weekly Index of Business Activity fell to 365.1 from 370.5 a week earlier. A year ago it was 362.1.

The following table gives the index and its components, each of which has been adjusted to reflect the long-term trend and seasonal variations:

| | Mar. 20 1971 | Mar. 13 1971 | Mar. 21 1970 |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Combined index..... | 365.1 | 370.5 | 362.1 |
| 7 weeks moving average..... | 366.9 | 367.1 | 355.7 |
| Miscellaneous loadings..... | 106.3 | 105.8 | 108.0 |
| Other loadings..... | 54.4 | 52.9 | 55.4 |
| Steel..... | 181.8 | 179.7 | 173.0 |
| Electric power..... | 658.2 | 670.1 | 654.6 |
| Paperboard..... | 508.4 | 502.8 | 502.7 |
| Lumber..... | 99.8 | 105.4 | 92.7 |

While many Wall Street analysts expect last week's profit taking and consolidation in the stock market to run somewhat longer, there is an unmistakable thread of bullishness still woven into most market assessments.

Alan Shaw, vice president of Harris, Upham & Co., said he felt the stock market had become overextended and that it could endure a setback at this time from any surprises in the news.

"I think there has also been some technical deterioration in the market and that we could get a correction of 5 to 10 per cent now," Mr. Shaw said. "But if the small investor gets his courage up, we might see a big speculative market in the summer. The consumer may be forced into the stock market because the interest rates he was getting on savings are going down."

Robert Johnson, vice president of Paine, Webber, Jackson & Curtis, feels there may be "backing and filling for several weeks, with the Dow average in a trading range between 880 and 920, until we see whether the Administration's modified economic game plan is working. Institutions had been working on the assumption it will work, but lately they have shown some hesitancy until they could be certain it would."

Robert Stovall, vice president of Reynolds & Co., predicted a reaction of a little over 5 per cent in the Dow average to the area of 850 but said he looked for tax cuts from the Administration in mid-April that would encourage consumer spending and help lift the Dow back to the vicinity of 950 by the third quarter.

An optimistic assessment also came from Norton H. Reamer, vice president of the Putnam Management Company, on the basis of the expansive fiscal and monetary policy being pursued in Washington, the effects such policy would have in fostering economic recovery and aiding corporate profits, and the strength of technical market factors.

"We are still in the middle stage of a bull market move even though the market has gone up for a long time with no substantial reaction as yet," he said.

In the bond market last week, interest rates continued declining for a time as the economy seemed to be more sluggish than expected and the banking system remained flush with money to lend. Yields dropped almost to the levels reached at the end of January and early in February.

Those lower yields, however, made some bond traders apprehensive, causing them to take some profits and lighten inventories.

In the stock market last week, all the leading averages suffered moderate losses in sharply reduced trading.

The Dow-Jones industrial average declined 9.44 points to 903.48; The New York Times combined average was down 9.38 to 517.59; the Standard & Poor's 500-stock index was off 1.06 to 99.95, and the New York Stock Exchange composite eased 0.50 to 55.19. The losses were the largest in five weeks.

There were 1,049 issues that moved lower for the week on the New York Exchange, 604 that gained ground and 157 that closed unchanged.

Trading on the Big Board contracted to 77.9 million shares for the week from 91.3 million the week before.

CITIZENS ANSWER QUESTIONNAIRE ON SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1971

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I mailed to the citizens in my district a questionnaire about some of the significant issues confronting this Congress and the Nation. The high level of response, I think, indicates the interest and concern of the residents in the Seventh District about these problems. So that other Members may see the results of the poll, I hereby submit them for inclusion in the RECORD:

(1) Primary responsibility for pollution control should rest with:

(In percent)

| | |
|---|------|
| A—the Federal Government..... | 14.7 |
| B—State and local governments..... | 14.1 |
| C—a cooperative effort by all levels of government..... | 67.7 |
| No response..... | 3.4 |

(2) Wage-price controls. The President should:

| | |
|--|------|
| A—impose mandatory guidelines or freeze on wage and price increases..... | 31.4 |
| B—urge voluntary guidelines..... | 19.6 |
| C—intervene personally in specific cases to discourage inflationary increases..... | 34.1 |
| D—not interfere with wage/price structure..... | 9.9 |
| No response..... | 5.0 |

(3) Budget:

| | |
|--|------|
| A—a balanced budget is essential to slow inflation..... | 56.3 |
| B—temporary deficit spending to reduce unemployment is acceptable..... | 28.0 |
| C—maintaining a balanced budget is unrealistic..... | 9.6 |
| No response..... | 6.1 |

(4) Welfare:

| | |
|---|------|
| A—maintain the present welfare system..... | 1.0 |
| B—Federal Government should guarantee minimum annual income..... | 6.8 |
| C—modify present system to provide work incentives and work requirements, without guaranteed annual income..... | 76.5 |
| D—abolish welfare system..... | 12.1 |
| No response..... | 3.6 |

(5) Supersonic transport. The Government should:

| | |
|---|------|
| A. continue development of supersonic transport..... | 24.3 |
| B. continue development, but at slower spending rate per year..... | 17.3 |
| C. suspend development pending further research into possible drawbacks of SST..... | 27.5 |
| D. eliminate development of SST..... | 24.4 |
| No response..... | 6.4 |

(6) Revenue sharing. Federal Government should:

| | |
|---|------|
| A. share tax revenues with States..... | 43.5 |
| B. share revenues only if budget is balanced..... | 22.4 |

| | |
|--|------|
| C. local government should raise its own revenues to solve local problems..... | 27.7 |
| No response..... | 6.4 |

(7) Draft:

| | |
|---|------|
| A. continue the draft..... | 12.6 |
| B. eliminate the draft..... | 9.8 |
| C. insure adequate volunteer Army before eliminating draft..... | 32.8 |
| D. require some form of military or public service for all men..... | 4.0 |
| No response..... | 4.0 |

(8) Health insurance:

| | |
|--|------|
| A. establish federally subsidized health insurance program for all citizens..... | 21.6 |
| B. establish program for persons in need and for catastrophic illness..... | 41.1 |
| C. Federal Government should not subsidize health insurance..... | 32.6 |
| No response..... | 4.7 |

(9) Government reform. Do you favor or oppose President Nixon's proposed restructuring of the executive branch, including merging several Cabinet posts?

| | |
|------------------|------|
| A. favor..... | 73.9 |
| B. oppose..... | 15.6 |
| No response..... | 10.5 |

(10) Mid-East. The United States should:

| | |
|--|------|
| A. aid Israel to maintain balance of power in Middle East..... | 32.6 |
| B. improve relations with Arab nations and protect our economic interests..... | 17.7 |
| C. participate only in diplomatic negotiations..... | 28.8 |
| D. discontinuing involvement in Middle East crisis..... | 14.4 |
| No response..... | 6.5 |

(11) Vietnam:

| | |
|--|------|
| A. President Nixon's policies are the best alternatives..... | 38.5 |
| B. withdraw all troops immediately..... | 17.0 |
| C. accelerate and win as quickly as possible..... | 23.1 |
| D. announce fixed timetable for withdrawing all troops..... | 16.3 |
| No response..... | 5.0 |

A BILL TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE TO INCREASE THE CREDIT AGAINST TAX FOR RETIREMENT INCOME

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing a bill I sponsored in the first session of the 91st Congress to increase the credit against tax for retirement income. This bill is to correct an injustice which has come to my attention.

The credit against retirement income was intended to provide equal treatment under the law for those who receive social security payments, which are totally tax exempt, and those who receive an annuity from some other public retirement system. When increases were provided for social security recipients we did not follow through and increase the tax credit in proportion. This bill will correct that oversight.

Mr. Speaker, I realize this is not the perfect answer to the knotty problem of equalizing tax treatment but it is a step in the right direction. We may possibly

have to approach this problem from a different angle and consider a flat exemption of some part of the retirement income.

I need not remind my colleagues that the rising cost of living has steadily reduced the buying power of those living on fixed incomes. When we consider this factor, along with the realization that many of these retirees retired years ago, when salaries were low and produced small annuities which are now inadequate to maintain an acceptable standard of living, the great problem our retirees face becomes increasingly evident.

It would seem to me that we have a responsibility to correct such injustices and give these former Federal employees a life of dignity.

THE CHIPPEWA FLOWAGE

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1971

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, considerable controversy has arisen over the relicensing of the Chippewa flowage, a private power project in northern Wisconsin. Because of the great interest in the best use of the Chippewa flowage for all concerned, I am pleased to have printed in the RECORD the fine article in Jay Reed's Wisconsin column on the "Chip" in the March 28, 1971, issue of the Milwaukee Journal. I highly recommend this informative article to the attention of my colleagues:

THE "CHIP"

(By Jay Reed)

They're talking about change for the Chippewa Flowage. There have been news stories about it which you may or may not have read. It has something to do with licensing, which I really don't understand. And it has something to do with public ownership and control as opposed to private ownership and control, and I really don't understand that either.

What I do understand is that they are talking about change for the flowage, and when they do that it is as if they were talking about change for my house or my heart.

If you don't know about the flowage, you should. It's a lake, manmade a couple of decades or more ago. It sits like a giant spider with a fat body up among the sea green forests of Sawyer County near Hayward, some 350 miles or so northwest of Milwaukee.

To these old eyes it is the finest body of water in all of Wisconsin except, perhaps, for the Mississippi River, and that really does not count because Wisconsin can't claim the whole river for its own.

But the flowage? That's Wisconsin, man. All Wisconsin. It was conceived in the womb of private intellect and was born with the aid of private money. It became the son of a private industry which sells power.

There are those who complain the annual drawdown hurts the quality of fishing on the flowage. Maybe it does. But the theory is kind of hard to sell to those of us who fish those waters a lot.

It is still the place where a man can go to get enough fish to eat when other lakes are dead as yesterday's sunrise. It is still the place where, in early spring, a fisherman's biggest problem is not catching fish but not catching them too soon so that a limit is reached before the day has really started.

It is the place where the biggest muskie ever taken on hook and line in Wisconsin was caught. It is the place where, pros say, the next world record muskie lives. It is the place which produces more 20 to 30 pound muskies than any other lake in the state.

In short, if the lake could be turned into a better fishing spot than it already is, a man would have to live in fear every time he opened his tackle box. He'd have to bait his hook behind a tree.

Now I'm a fisherman more than anything else and fishermen, mostly, are simple people. So I don't really know for certain if public ownership is better than private ownership. But I have an idea.

They are talking now about having Congress purchase the Chippewa Flowage. That would mean federal (or public) ownership. And the flowage has served its original purpose well.

Now maybe somebody thought of it way back there in the beginning. Maybe some man way ahead of his time figured out that the flowage might become the last real wilderness lake area in the state. Whatever the case, the flowage and its largely undeveloped shoreline became one of the finest gifts the outdoor men of this state have ever received.

To this very day, you can put in on the flowage in summer, and before your outboard motor is warmed up, you'll be surrounded by such wilderness as to make you think you are in the deepest part of the bush country of Canada.

The company that owns and controls it has made it available to anybody with fiber enough to want to test it. There are limited access points, limited parking lots, limited island campsites. That's what the company has done. It hasn't fooled around with the shoreline. It hasn't turned it into a neon raped fake like so many lakes in the North.

It has left the flowage alone, for the most part, except to draw most of the water out of it over winter, which is no more than the original plan anyway. It hasn't really tried to manage the flowage and that, very likely, is why it is such a great piece of country today.

I would recommend, first off, that anyone who believes public ownership of the Chippewa Flowage would be a good thing should take a trip to the Sylvania recreational area north of Land o' Lakes in the Ottawa National Forest. There you can get a good look at what federal ownership of a wilderness area can do.

You can see the forest bleed from fresh cuts of new roads. You can see the sun slant off the roof of a gigantic pavilion, and you can walk the paths to planked outhouses with red roofs. And you can see the stately camping areas with their staked out units and signs and garbage cans.

You can do all this and you can weep, if you have any feeling at all for what once was wild and untouched.

So they are talking about change for the Chippewa Flowage and that makes me sad because, more often than not, once they start talking about change it almost always comes.

Maybe they'll make the flowage a better place. Or maybe they'll kill it. I don't know. But there is one thing about it. If they kill the flowage, they'll never have a chance to make the same mistake again. It is the only place of its kind left in this old state.

OFFICE OF SALINE WATER REVIEWED

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the Capitol's experienced and respected

correspondents, Helene C. Monberg, recently did a wrap-up on the Office of Saline Water as part of her western resources series. The considerable progress of this Office that she chronicles in her study occurred largely during the directorships of Dr. Jack Hunter and Dr. Chung Ming Wong. Presently that Office awaits appointment of a new director. The Monberg article follows:

SALINE WATER PROGRAM

(By Helene C. Monberg)

In its 20th year the federal government's saline water program to convert salty water to fresh water is on the move.

Next month the federal Office of Saline Water (OSW) in the Interior Department will sign a contract with California's Orange County Water District to design, construct and operate a specially-built test module on land leased to OSW by the District at no cost. The module will be so constructed that it can be scaled up to a 200 million gallon-per-day desalting plant to be used by the District if the economics prove out. An 18-month construction contract to construct the \$4.4 million test module will be signed in June. The contractor will be Envirogenics Co., a division of Aerojet-General Corp., of El Monte, Calif.

OSW is asking Congress for \$1,100,000 for fiscal year 1972 to build a 250,000 gallon-per-day plant to desalt sea water, and also for \$1 million for FY 1972 to build a 500,000-750,000 gallon-per-day plant to desalt brackish water. Each plant will have a reverse osmosis test bed. The reverse osmosis process uses mechanical pressure to separate salt from water, and it "continues to show great promise" to desalt both brackish water from inland water sources and sea water, according to OSW. A membrane, or a thin sheet of plastic or other material, is used to separate the salt from the water. OSW wants to use these plants to test out a new family of membranes which can desalt sea water in one and two-pass operations and can desalt twice the amount of brackish water than membranes now used. The brackish water test bed will also be capable of recovering 90-95 per cent fresh water; presently used plants can recover only 50-70 per cent of the brackish water as fresh water.

DUAL PLANT?

The OSW and the Department of Water Resources of the state of California have entered into a memorandum of understanding to conduct a study on the feasibility of building a large-scale desalting plant. Diablo Canyon in San Luis Obispo County, on the Southern California coast, was selected as the site for study on Jan. 12 because San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara Counties offer a water marketing area, and Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is building a nuclear power plant at Diablo Canyon. Thus the door is opened to combine a big desalting plant with a big nuclear power plant. The PG&E nuclear plant will be 1,000,000 kilowatts. If there is a desalting plant it is expected to be from 30-50 million GPD.

William R. Gianelli, the California Water Resources Director, said on Jan. 12, "The state-federal reports" on the joint studies now underway "are to be completed in Jan. 1972. That they will be submitted to the (California) State Legislature and the U.S. Congress for authorization and appropriation to design, construct and operate a large-scale desalting plant. To achieve operation" of such a plant "in 1978 will require that design work begin early in 1973 and construction begin by mid-1974," he said.

In another month OSW should have the results from a study conducted by Dr. A. D. K. Laird of the University of California at Berkeley to identify the most feasible system that might be used to desalt water from geothermal steam in California's Imperial

Valley. OSW authorized the \$69,785 study on March 30, 1970 under the direction of Laird, who is coordinator of the University of California saline water conversion program. Imperial Valley is on the border with Mexico, which has already started to develop its geothermal resource. Geothermal is a geological term or pertaining to heat of the earth's interior; it may be energy or it may be water in the form of steam. There are both in Imperial Valley. "We definitely want to build a pilot plant at least in Imperial Valley." OSW spokesman John W. "Pat" O'Meara said here on Feb. 24.

The Bureau of Reclamation is the lead agency at the Interior Department on geothermal steam, and it has been doing extensive drilling in the Imperial Valley recently. Most of the Bureau's work has been done under contract. The past three years it has been under the direction of Dr. Robert W. Rex, an expert in geothermal resources with the University of California at Riverside. Reclamation put out a glowing release on Feb. 14 indicating that the potential of geothermal steam underlying the Imperial Valley "holds promise of major assistance in solving the critical water resource needs of the Southwest." It was particularly pleased with the high potential of a geothermal well as a source of water at Dunes Anomaly in the Imperial Valley about 25 miles northwest of Yuma, Ariz. Enthusiasts about the potential of geothermal energy and steam in the area believe it can provide up to 20,000 kilowatts of power and a million acre-feet of water annually at a cost for water of \$75 an acre-foot, including desalting. There are informed skeptics who believe geothermal steam contains too many impurities to be desalted and demineralized economically, and only a few areas such as Marysville, Calif., and Reno, Nev., can utilize dry heat as energy economically. In any event, the possibility of a transbasin water diversion from the Pacific Northwest to the Pacific Southwest has faded, both desalting sea water and desalting geothermal steam in the Southwest are being looked upon as likely sources for additional water and are being emphasized in the Bureau of Reclamation's West-wide water study.

STATE AND LOCAL STUDIES

Because OSW wants to learn about practical water problems first-hand, it has embarked on cooperative studies with states and has studied local areas with specific water problems.

It is on the verge of entering into a cooperative study with the state of Arizona, and it hopes to work out a cooperative study with the state of Florida in coming months. It already has cooperative studies underway with the states of Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, California and New Jersey. It has completed a cooperative study with the state of New York and with New York City. And it has joint studies in progress with the Water Resources Council and with sister agencies within DOI.

Because there has been a rise in the salinity of Colorado River Basin water, OSW is doing field testing on 10 typical types of brackish or salty inland waters in the Yuma, Ariz., area. It has completed studies on other strategic locations along the Colorado River Basin: at Laverkin, Utah, on saline mineral springs; at Las Vegas Wash, Nev., on polluted saline surface streams, and at Grand Junction, Colo., on irrigation return flows. Of these tests, OSW stated in its last annual report, "A rise in salinity... has already resulted in a marked decrease in crop yield in areas irrigated by the Lower Colorado... (But) results show that reverse osmosis can effectively reduce the salinity of these sources."

OSW has also made studies of the local well water supplies at Gillette, Wyo., and at

La Junta and Fort Morgan, Colo. "Fort Morgan's local water supply gradually has been increasing in salinity and now contains about 1800 dissolved parts of salt per million parts of water (ppm). Tests have shown that undesirable levels of selenium and nitrates can be brought well below the maximum established by the U.S. Public Health Service," OSW said. Water containing more than 1,000 ppm of salt should not be used for human consumption. Reverse osmosis is effective here too, according to OSW. So is the electro-dialysis process, OSW said. OSW is getting more inquiries from local communities about their water problems because salinity is increasing in a number of areas "due to over-pumping or because pollutants are finding their way into fresh water aquifers," it said.

OSW has five installations, three located along the seacoast at San Diego, Freeport, Tex., and Wrightsville Beach, N.C., and two to study brackish water problems at Roswell, N.M., and at Webster, S.D. The Webster plant is being closed in June 1971, and five pilot test projects there will be gradually phased out after that date. The Roswell plant has now become the center in the United States to test brackish waters found inland throughout the country. The reverse osmosis test bed for brackish water being requested by OSW in the 1972 budget is expected to be located at Roswell, and one of the three OSW sea water installations is expected to get the "RO" test bed to desalt sea water. The test beds—which will be among the largest in existence if Congress approves their construction—will be intermediate-sized plants used for performance-testing of experimental hardware and essential materials.

ORANGE COUNTY AND MWD

The Orange County plant, like most of the other OSW plants, will provide research and engineering information to OSW and will provide a supplemental water supply to Orange County. OSW plans to combine the features of two proved desalting processes, the vertical tube evaporator and the multi-stage flash (VTE-MSF), in the module, or initial segment, of the plant to be built in 18 months, beginning in June, at a cost of \$4.4 million. It is designed for expansion and flexibility, but the initial capability of the module will be 3 million gallons of fresh water per day. OSW experts are extremely high on the VTE/MSF coupling because their studies indicate it can save up to 30 per cent in capital costs and 15 per cent in water costs as compared with an MSF plant. In this Hemisphere the cheapest desalted water is being made by a 7.5 million GPD plant near Tijuana, Mexico for 65-75 cents for 1000 gallons.

Orange County Water District, as OSW's partner, will furnish the steam generator, water intakes and outfalls, office and shop buildings, at a cost of \$3.2 million for the Orange County plant. This is the fastest growing large county in the country. Its population is projected to be 2 million by 1980, as compared with more than 1 million now. Its 1980 water requirement is expected to be 500,000 acre-feet a year. It gets its water supply from the Santa Ana River, mainly as ground water, and from the Colorado River aqueduct. The aquifer underlying the area can store up to 500,000 acre-feet of water, but in times of short water supply or heavy pumping, there is salt water intrusion from the Pacific Ocean into the ground water basin. Thru its Coastal Barrier project, Orange County plans to blend the desalted water from the OSW plant with reclaimed waste water from a waste treatment plant that it will soon construct. This will provide an acceptable grade of water to inject into the aquifer. Whether Orange County will ever build a 200 million GPD plant from the OSW module is pretty iffy. A federal water expert bet this correspondent \$1 that it would never do so for the same reason that

Webster, S.D., is not taking over the 325,000 desalting plant there: too costly to operate.

The Metropolitan Water District (MWD) of Southern California, the water marketing wholesaler for Southern California, would have become a partner of OSW, according to O'Meara, if Orange County had not. Orange County is one of the water districts served by MWD. MWD officials, including John H. Lauten, Frank Clinton and Alan J. Williams, have been in Washington this past week making final settlement on the ill-fated Bolsa Island desalting plant-nuclear plant proposal which went down the drain in 1969. They were publicly noncommittal about the new California desalting projects.

VIEWS ON MALE CHAUVINISM

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1971

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Champaign News-Gazette, of Champaign, Ill., on Sunday, March 28, ran an article by five women in Washington.

One of the women who was chosen to express her opinion was Frances Knight, Director of the Passport Office in the Department of State.

Miss Knight always expresses herself well and is not one who is overcome by men's opinions. But above all, she always has a good idea to express and, as many in the State Department can well testify, she knows how to express them succinctly. I know that my colleagues in the House will be interested in knowing of Miss Knight's views on male chauvinism.

The article follows:

VIEWS ON MALE CHAUVINISM

(By Frances Knight)

My mother instilled in me the idea that I could do a man's work and I tend to think that a woman who does her job well can be just as good as a man, often better. For one thing administrative work is detail work and men hate detail. They also don't like confrontation, which is part of detail work.

When I came to Washington, I had a background in editorial work and newspaper writing. I started as a grade 3, just above a janitor. I wasn't even a clerk-typist, just a typist. One day I was typing something to do with the budget and I came upon a tremendous error running into the millions of dollars. I took it to my boss and pointed it out to him and he was impressed, because this error had passed by many people and no one had noticed it.

After that he began to give me more responsibility and I began working my way up. The job I have now (director of the passport office) is a post that has always been held by a woman.

Generally speaking, men resent working for a woman. I'm willing to wager that every man here thinks in his heart that he could run this place better than I do. They swear they don't feel that but it's in the male animal.

I have met with resistance from men. For one thing, I don't ask for advice as men would wish. When I go to a supervisor I already have a blueprint which I propose to them. It's ridiculous to go hat in hand when you already know what you want. Nonetheless, men resent it when you resolve your own problems—they'd rather you made it look like they solved it for you.

I'm outspoken and wanted to be involved in making decisions and getting things done.

It's hard because the government never gets anywhere—the bureaucracy uses the word "concurrence" all the time because a guy can't stand to be responsible for his own ideas—he wants to spread the blame and say it was John's idea and Joe's idea. I hate that.

When people start out here they start at the bottom. Forget the college degree, they have to work their way up. Of course it's true that the bottom at which men start and the bottom at which women start is not the same bottom . . . but by the time a woman has come up and gets picked for a better job, it's because she's good at the job, not because she is a woman.

A lot of women never get there. Partly, it's that a lot of women aren't interested in making a career, and slough off. You will notice that there are no women in top management positions at the state department. It's a built-in thing there. But also, women are limited, kept down by men in high policy positions, and they will themselves into submission by subjugating themselves to these people.

Many women put themselves into a surreptitiously supplicating position. Women should be able to take the credit or blame for their own ideas, then they could get ahead.

WYOMING WOES

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1971

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a weekend in Cheyenne and Laramie, Wyo., where I found growing grief and sorrow stemming from the decision of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation to eliminate passenger service along the Union Pacific in Southern Wyoming.

Indignation and public wrath over the Union Pacific role in this matter is comparable to the general indignation in the Nation over the Calley trial. The Union Pacific is already the wealthiest railroad in the country, Mr. Speaker, and I would think that the least it could do would be to continue the railroad passenger service until 1973 across Wyoming and from Denver over the short line to Portland, at no net cost to Railpax.

Under Railpax, the Union Pacific can

look forward to the saving of at least \$20 million a year in what it now calls avoidable passenger losses.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this Denver-Portland operation could not possibly have more than \$3 million loss annually for the Union Pacific, a drop-in-the-bucket loss compared to its immense profits. I not only urge the Railroad Passenger Corporation to do what is possible to persuade the Union Pacific to continue its Denver-Portland train at least three times a week through Cheyenne, I believe it should also return a through train to Los Angeles from Omaha by utilizing its trackage east of Cheyenne and across the State of Wyoming into Ogden.

If this is not done, I can report to you that there are very responsible and conservative elements within Wyoming that will be encouraging legislation to increase taxation on all natural resources owned by that land grant railroad of whatsoever nature in such a way to correct the historic inequities that this most recent action has brought about.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, April 6, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God is light and in Him is no darkness at all. If we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another.—I John 1: 5, 7.

Eternal God, our Father, whose ways are truth and love, we begin the morning of this day with Thee in prayer. Cleanse our hearts and clarify our minds that as we make our way through Holy Week we may come to know who we really are and by Thy grace to so amend our ways that we may walk more faithfully according to Thy will for us. Grant that we may live through these hectic days with peace and good will, without faltering and without falling, because we are with Thee.

We pray Thee so to rule the hearts of all our leaders in State and Nation that law and order, justice and peace may everywhere prevail to the honor of Thy holy name, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. Con. Res. 257. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the House from April 7, 1971, until April 19, 1971.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 484. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to classify as wilderness the national forest lands known as the Lincoln Back Country, and parts of the Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests, in Montana, and for other purposes; and

S. 581. An act to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to allow for greater expansion of the export trade of the United States, to exclude Bank receipts and disbursements from the budget of the U.S. Government, to extend for three years the period within which the bank is authorized to exercise its functions, to increase the Bank's lending authority and its authority to issue, against fractional reserves and against full reserves, insurance and guarantees, to authorize the bank to issue for purchase by any purchaser its obligations maturing subsequent to June 30, 1976, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 90-321, appointed Mr. BROCK as a member, on the part of the Senate, of the National Commission on Consumer Finance.

COMMUNICATION FROM MR. DERWINSKI

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from Mr. DERWINSKI:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 5, 1971.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The U.S. Group to the Interparliamentary Union will attend the 59th Conference scheduled to be held this

year in Caracas, Venezuela, the week of April 11.

Our Delegation desires to depart the United States on Saturday, April 10, for Caracas and we will return immediately upon the closing of the Conference on April 18.

The Members of the Delegation from the House are: Representatives Edward J. Derwinski (Ill.), John Jarman (Okla.), W. R. Poage (Texas), Alexander Pirnie (N.Y.), John S. Monagan (Conn.), Hale Boggs (La.), Lee Hamilton (Ind.), Robert McClory (Ill.), and F. Bradford Morse (Mass.).

May I ask you to do me the courtesy of announcing the names of these delegates so that they may appear in the "Congressional Record." There will also be six delegates from the Senate attending the Conference.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. DERWINSKI.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 46]

| | | |
|----------------|--------------|---------------|
| Abourezk | Delaney | Hansen, Idaho |
| Alexander | Derwinski | Harrington |
| Anderson, Ill. | Diggs | Hébert |
| Annunzio | Dwyer | Hicks, Mass. |
| Baring | Eckhart | Jones, Ala. |
| Barrett | Edwards, La. | Jones, N.C. |
| Biaggi | Erlenborn | Jones, Tenn. |
| Blackburn | Esch | Kluczynski |
| Blanton | Flynt | Koch |
| Brasco | Fountain | Leggett |
| Carney | Frenzel | Long, La. |
| Celler | Gallagher | Long, Md. |
| Clancy | Gettys | McCulure |
| Clark | Gray | McCulloch |
| Clay | Green, Pa. | McEwen |
| Collins, Ill. | Grover | McKay |
| Colmer | Haley | Macdonald, |
| Corman | Halpern | Mass. |
| Coughlin | Hanna | Mann |