

31, 1970, and the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers during the 12-month period ended that date. Pursuant to 37 U.S.C. 301(g) to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Submitted December 4, 1970]

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services, House Resolution 1282. Resolution to support for efforts to rescue American prisoners of war incarcerated in North Vietnam; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1671). Referred to the House Calendar.

[Submitted December 5, 1970]

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia, H.R. 19885. A bill to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1672). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted December 7, 1970]

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Science and Astronautics. For the benefit of all mankind. A survey of the practical returns from space investment (Rept. No. 91-1673). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WATTS: Committee on Ways and Means, H.R. 7626. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the tariff classification of certain sugars, sirups, and molasses, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1674). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee: Committee on Ways and Means, H.R. 19670. A bill to suspend the duties on certain bicycle parts and accessories until the close of December 31, 1973; with no amendments (Rept. No. 91-1675). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURLESON of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means, H.R. 19470. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify the nursing service requirement and certain other requirements which an institution must meet in order to qualify as a hospital thereunder so as to make such requirements more realistic insofar as they apply to smaller institutions; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1676). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOLIFIELD: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, H.R. 19908. A bill to amend Public Law 91-273 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1677). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs, H.R. 19911. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1678). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. Investigation and study of the Clifton Terrace project in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-1679). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 17923 (Rept. No. 91-1680). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 19915. A bill to make permanent the existing temporary provision for disregarding income of OASDI and railroad retirement recipients in determining their need for public assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. QUIE, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CONTE, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 19916. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 19917. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 19918. A bill conquest of cancer act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 1293. Resolution authorizing the establishment of six additional positions of

sergeant and one additional position of lieutenant on the U.S. Capitol Police force for duty under the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H. Res. 1294. Resolution to provide for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 18214) the Consumer Protection Act of 1970; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 19919. A bill for the relief of Long Chinh Le; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 19920. A bill for the relief of James L. Gerard, James W. Summers, and William D. Cissel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 19921. A bill for the relief of Mau Duc Nguyen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

644. By Mr. ZABLOCKI: Petition of Civic Awareness of America, Mrs. Alvin J. Emmons and Mrs. Ray Kuffel; Reverence for Life of America, Mrs. David R. Mogilka. In regard to the billion-dollar-population control bill, S. 2108 and H.R. 15159, along with the more than 40 bills and resolutions now pending in Congress. Signed by approximately 10,000 signatories nationwide opposing S. 2108 and H.R. 15159 and any similar population control legislation. "We object to the use of our tax dollars for immoral programs of contraception, selective breeding, sterilization, abortion, euthanasia and infanticide. We object to Federal laws as well as opinions by appointed Federal judges which supersede State laws whereby depriving the individual State of the right of self-determination. We hereby petition our Congressmen and U.S. Senators to vote against any and all federally financed programs of population controls"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

645. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city commission, Kalamazoo, Mich., relative to Operation Headstart; to the Committee on Appropriations.

646. Also, petition of Arthur Baker, Huntsville, Tex., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A FRIEND, A GOOD CITIZEN, LOST IN THE DEATH OF NORMAN FULTON CLEAVINGER, OF DIMMITT, TEX.

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, my life has been enriched many times through the friendships I have made during my travels around my home State of Texas. One friend, Norman F. Cleavinger, a man who was a great inspiration to all who knew him, recently died.

Norman Cleavinger died October 4,

1970, just 19 days before his 75th birthday. He was a farmer for 32 years in the Springlake community of Texas, then, instead of taking his well-earned retirement, he moved to Dimmitt, Castro County, and began a new career. He became a businessman and a developer and made great contributions to the growth of Dimmitt and Castro County.

In addition to being an industrious man, Norman Cleavinger was a good family man, raising three daughters and three sons. He was also a religious man, an active member of the First United Methodist Church in Dimmitt.

For me, Norman Cleavinger was a friend. He helped me; he worked with

me in a joint effort to bring effective representation in Government for the farmers and small businessmen.

Too frequently the Norman Cleavingers of this world do not receive the credit they deserve. But I believe that what made this country great was embodied in the life of Norman Cleavinger.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article "Cleavinger Rites Held" from the Castro County News and the memorial service of worship for Norman Cleavinger at the First United Methodist Church of Dimmitt be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CLEAVINGER RITES HELD

Norman Fulton Cleavinger, one of the area's best-known business men, died at 9:15 p.m. Sunday in Lubbock's Methodist Hospital. He would have been 75 years old Oct. 23.

Mr. Cleavinger had been hospitalized for a week in Dimmitt and Lubbock, following a heart attack.

Funeral services were conducted at 4 p.m. Tuesday in the First United Methodist Church of Dimmitt. Officiating were Rev. Jim T. Pickens, pastor, and Rev. Hugh Blaylock and Rev. Daris Egger, former pastors of the local church.

Burial was in Castro Memorial Gardens, under the direction of Dennis Funeral Home.

Mr. Cleavinger was born Oct. 23, 1895, in Leavenworth, Kan. His family settled in the Springlake area in 1910. After attending West Texas State and the University of Texas, he enlisted in the Army and served as medical corpsman in France. After his discharge in 1920, he returned home and bought a farm near Springlake.

He farmed for 32 years, then moved to Dimmitt in 1952 and opened C&S Equipment Co., dealership for John Deere farm equipment, Pontiac automobiles and GMC trucks.

He also was an active real-estate developer and builder in Dimmitt. A large residential addition in Southwest Dimmitt bears his name, and he built or purchased many of the city's present commercial buildings.

He was well-known in the state's Democratic Party circles, and was a county delegate to several Democratic state conventions. He also was active in the First United Methodist Church.

His survivors include his wife, Gladys; three daughters, Mrs. Carol Dyer of Dimmitt, Mrs. Norma Dawson of Springlake and Mrs. Lois Wales of Dimmitt; three sons, Ronald A. of Springlake, Jim of Dimmitt and Orville of Springlake; a sister, Mrs. Beulah Miller of Canyon; four brothers, Jess of Alhambra, Calif., Eugene of Laguna Hill, Calif., Dutch of Canyon and M. E. of Dimmitt.

Active pallbearers were Tommy Cleavinger, Ken Dawson, Bobby Cleavinger, Mike Cleavinger, Dick Dyer, Joe Andrews, Ray Joe Riley and Kurt Wales.

Honorary pallbearers were J. L. Hinson, H. M. Baggarly, Andy Behrends, Bob McLean, E. C. Hudson, Ed Bennett, Troy Kirby, Stanley Schaeffer, Allan Webb, Tom Jones, J. J. Coker, W. C. White, George Bagwell, Raymond Wilson, F. Lee Stanford, Ray Riley, Jimmy Cluck and Sam Gilbreath.

MEMORIAL SERVICE OF WORSHIP, NORMAN F. CLEAVINGER, FIRST UNITED METHODIST CHURCH, DIMMITT, TEX., OCTOBER 6, 1970

The body will lie in state in the sanctuary for an hour preceding the service. The casket will not be opened after the service begins.

Prelude, Mrs. Dale Winders, organist.

The congregation will stand as the family enters.¹

Scripture Sentences and Invocation, Reverend Hugh Blaylock.

Anthem "Praise to the Lord, the Almighty," Choir. Nolan Froehner, Director.

Old and New Testament Lessons, Reverend Daris Egger.

Pastoral Prayer: The Lord's Prayer (the people praying together).

Solo "Lead Kindly Light," Nolan Froehner.

Sermon "Living the 'Why Not?'," Rev. Jim Pickens.

Quartet "For All the Blessings of the Years," Mr. and Mrs. Dwayne Jones, Mrs. Marie Slover, W. L. Jones, Jr.

Benediction, Rev. Jim Pickens.

The Doxology,¹ The Congregation Singing.

¹ The congregation will be standing during the recessional.

Praise God, from whom all blessings flow;
Praise Him, all creatures here below;
Praise Him above, ye heavenly hosts;
Praise Father, Son and Holy Ghost! Amen.

Postlude and Recessional.

OBITUARY AND SERMON, MEMORIAL SERVICE, NORMAN F. CLEAVINGER, FIRST UNITED METHODIST CHURCH, OCTOBER 6, 1970

Jim T. Pickens, pastor, officiating.

Assisted by Darris L. Egger, Abilene, and Hugh F. Blaylock, Lubbock.

Reading from J. B. Phillips translations, New Testament Lessons:

Romans 1:14-17—"For I am not ashamed of the gospel. I see it as the very power of God working for the salvation of everyone who believes it, both Jew and Greek. I see in it God's plan for imparting righteousness to men, a process begun and continued by their faith. For, as the scripture says: The righteous shall live by faith."

I John 3:1—"Consider the incredible love that the Father has shown us in allowing us to be called 'children of God'—and that is not just what we are called, but what we are. Our heredity on the Godward side is no mere figure of speech—which explains why the world will no more recognize us than it recognized Christ.

"Oh, dear children of mine, have you realized it? Here and now we are God's children."

John 14:15-18—"If you really love me, you will keep the commandments I have given you and I shall ask the Father to give you someone else to stand by you, to be with you always. I mean the Spirit of truth whom the world cannot accept, for it can neither see nor recognize that Spirit. But you recognize him, for he is with you now and will be in your hearts. I am not going to leave you alone in the World—I am coming to you."

Matthew 25:37-40—"Then the true men will answer him: 'Lord, when did we see you hungry and give you food? When did we see you thirsty and give you something to drink? When did we see you lonely and make you welcome, or see you naked and clothe you, or see you ill or in prison and go to see you?' And the king will reply, 'I assure you that whatever you did for the humblest of my brothers you did for me.'"

Old Testament Lesson, Palm 103 (read from the Revised Standard Version).

BRIEF OBITUARY

Dearly Beloved, we have come today in memory of our friend and loved one, and a servant of God, Norman Fulton Cleavinger. He was the son of M. E. and Ellen Ruth Hall Cleavinger, born October 23, 1895, in Leavenworth, Kansas. He departed this physical life in Lubbock October 4, 1970, just a little short of 75 years. He was not a retired farmer; he was an active man interested in business and farming, this church, and a wide range of activities and concerns that relate to all of us. He came to this country with his parents and settled at Springlake in 1910. Gladys Axtell became his bride on August 29, 1923. They remained in the Springlake community where they farmed and reared their family. Mr. and Mrs. Cleavinger moved to Dimmitt in 1952. He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Gladys Cleavinger, three daughters and their families: Mrs. Goldman Dyer of Dimmitt, Mrs. Ed Dawson of Springlake, and Mrs. Charles Wales of Dimmitt; three sons and their families: Ronald Cleavinger of Springlake, Jim Cleavinger of Dimmitt, and Orville Cleavinger of Springlake. His life was also blessed with his sisters and brothers who survive him: Mr. and Mrs. W. E. Miller of Canyon; and four brothers: Jess Cleavinger and his wife of Alhambra, Calif., Eugene Cleavinger and his wife of Laguna Hills, Calif., Dutch Cleavinger of Canyon, and M. E. Cleavinger, Jr., and his wife of Dimmitt; and 23 grandchildren, and a host of other friends,

including all of us. This pastor and others of us who were close to him appreciated his witness in the world and the life he lived among us. So we come today in his memory.

MEMORIAL SERMON: "LIVING THE 'WHY NOT?'"

The writer of the Book of Acts records the occasion in which the disciple known as Peter was preaching at the day of Pentecost when the Holy Spirit had come to Christ's followers in a new and refreshing way. Peter, on that day of Pentecost, spoke this verse quoting from the Prophet Joel, the little book of the Old Testament which bears his name. Peter, quoting Joel, said:

"God says, 'This will happen in the last days; I will pour out upon everyone a portion of my spirit; and your sons and daughters shall prophesy; your young men shall see visions and your old men shall dream dreams.'" (Acts 2: 17 NEB.)

What the Prophet Joel had foreseen in Old Testament times was that in the fullness of time God would make Himself known among His people in a new and creative manner. Interestingly enough, Joel's word came alive! His dreams and his visions centuries later became a reality on that day we know as Pentecost—which some of us observe as the birthday of the church.

Peter stood up and addressed the people who had been blessed by the presence of the Holy Spirit. He also spoke to other people in Jerusalem who had gathered around those oddly acting people known as disciples of the resurrected Lord. His own address was infused with the out-pouring of the Spirit. When the Holy Spirit came upon the Church, he professed that a new day had begun. God's work in history was now being fulfilled in a new way, and Peter testified to that. Pentecost was the beginning of the new age. Now we in the Church are the continuation and part of that same new age that was born on the day to which Joel had prophesied.

That work which was begun at Pentecost is still our work as the Holy Spirit moves us to be God's disciples, His spokesmen, and His instruments in this world. "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son . . .", and you know the rest. So faith in the God of Jesus Christ who transforms and illumines the faith of Israel calls you and me not only to be believers in the Spirit, but we're called to give ourselves as the implements of the Spirit.

No farmer, no one among us, in this enlightened age of technical developments and chemical farming, would go to the field without good equipment. We would not begin a job without the appropriate machinery to do the task. Not any of us of intelligence will begin a task without good equipment for we know we cannot get the job well done without it. But we, being led by the Holy Spirit, are the sons of God and we are the instruments of His work! Every Christian then, in the light of our instrumentality, is called to dream dreams and see visions. We are not called to be content with things as they are. We see them as they are, but we move from there to see things as they could and they should be in this world that God has loved.

George Bernard Shaw wrote these lines: You see things as they are; and you ask "Why?". But I dream things that never were; and I ask "Why not?".

Living the "Why not?" is to translate dreams and visions into realities. Norman Cleavinger was that kind of man. There was a dynamic power in his life that permeated his whole personality which caused him to move and earnestly desire to change things from what they were to what they ought to be—for the good. He was a man of versatile skills and many interests which we all know. His loves and his hobbies ranged all the way

from his family, his faith, his church, to the latest baseball and football games of his favorite teams. He was a man at home in the world of ideas. New ideas did not threaten him or discourage him; they tantalized him, and he in turn would stick needles in the preacher, his family, and the rest of us to respond to new ideas and new ways of doing things. He was not content to give time and energy just to abstract speculations, but he translated the world of ideas in which he was at home into the dreams and visions and realities of providing for his family, in working in the church, in concern about political life, and deeply dedicated to whatever would make our community and our nation greater. He dreamed dreams and worked to translate those dreams into realities.

Although he was nearly 75, his dreams were not dreams of the past, the Prophet Joel didn't know Norman. He was not dreaming about past occasions, but he was dreaming and had visions of new realities that affect all of us and called us to the new possibilities of the fulfillment and the realization of our personalities. He was keenly alert to the tunes and the moods of the present. He yearned for peace in our time. He longed for understanding between generations, and no long-haired hippie bothered him—he loved him, too, as anybody else—like he loved justice and equality for all persons no matter what their color or their ethnic origin.

So we come now thanking God for so many things that were revealed to us in the life of God's servant and our brother and neighbor. He was a man who was unafraid to live the "Why not?". He gave himself and his energies to translating the dreams and visions of both the old and the young into present reality. He would say to you and to me this afternoon—Say "yes" to life all of you, no matter what your age. Say "yes" to life and don't be afraid of death. Even in the last days he was unafraid of that reality but he would say life is involved in another realm of quality of existence.

He would say with the poet, James Bailey: "We live in deeds not years; in thoughts, not breaths; in feelings, not in figures on a dial. We should count time by heart throbs. He most lives Who thinks most—feels the noblest—acts the best."

May God bless his witness and example to our "Living the 'Why Not?'" In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Amen.

RURAL MICROCITY POLICY IS URGED

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, countryside America is close to my heart. It is where I was born and raised; it is what I represent in Congress.

I have long asserted that to cure the ills of the cities, we must develop the potential of the countryside so that we can reverse the migration from the country to the city.

This seems to be the same conclusion reached by Dr. Edward L. Henry, professor of government at St. John's University at Collegeville in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a news story by staff writer John Kelly which appeared in the

St. Paul Pioneer Press about Dr. Henry and his study.

RURAL MICROCITY POLICY IS URGED

(By John Kelly, staff writer)

The next dynamic people movement will be from the suburbs to the countryside, just as the last one was from the cities to the suburbs, according to Dr. Edward L. Henry, professor of government at St. John's University and former mayor of St. Cloud.

"Most of the people in the city want out," Henry said in an interview on the peaceful Collegeville campus. A number of polls indicate this, he said.

"We must create conditions and jobs in the countryside to enable people to move," he said.

A positive public policy for development of the countryside must evolve, he said. The last such policy was embodied in the Homestead Act of 1862.

People want the open space that the countryside can offer, but they also want the comforts and amenities of the cities, he noted.

The only way that both aspects of this desire can be met is through the development of the "micro-cities" of the countryside, or those between 10,000 and 50,000 persons, he said.

To investigate the future of such cities the Center for the Study of Local Government has come about at St. John's with Dr. Henry as its director.

These limits of population were chosen because there are economies of scale to be reaped when cities are large enough and diseconomies of scale when they are too large, Dr. Henry explained.

A recent round of seminars on the future of a dozen cities of this size in Minnesota was undertaken with "report cards" submitted to each on how it was prepared to accept the new role of the rural micro-city.

"It had quite a catalytic effect," said Dr. Henry, with most of the cities becoming concerned about how they were preparing for this new role.

The cities which are under the scope of the micro-city project are Albert Lea, Austin, Bemidji, Fergus Falls, Hibbing, Mankato, Moorhead, New Ulm, Red Wing, St. Cloud, Willmar and Winona.

The reason that these micro-cities are becoming attractive to metropolitans is that they have maintained some of the spirit that the larger ones inevitably lose. "Call it community pride," Henry said.

"Their future is still ahead of them and can still be controlled. At this point they need good data, expertise and bureaucracy—the infra-structure that cannot be supported below the micro-city level."

A lot of things are in motion which will enable the 10,000 to 50,000-person city to offer much of what the metropolitan has come to expect, Henry said.

For instance, welfare programs, which outstate dwellers had long resisted supporting, are becoming standardized by state and federal action, he noted.

Bathroom plumbing, highway maintenance and snow removal are probably on a par with the Twin City area, he said. "In 15 years of commuting to St. John's from St. Cloud, I was snowed out only twice. You don't get isolated any more."

Additional programs which will aid the growth of micro-cities include continued improvements in the transportation network, an educational subsidy to outstate school districts to equalize the quality of education and decentralization of the state college system and the University of Minnesota, Henry said.

Hopefully, the legislature will move this process along, he said.

In order to be a proper "mother-city," each micro-city must have hinterlands for 40 or 50 miles around, he said.

In those regions of the state where no acknowledge mother-city has emerged, the competing hamlets should be careful to get together and decide on one, lest the whole area go down the drain, Henry said.

The three main forces which influence the growth of rural Minnesota are the Higher Education Coordinating Commission, which plans college development, the Highway Department and the private utilities—light and power, Henry said.

(However, should the utilities be taxed at the state level, rather than at the local level, this influence would dim somewhat, Henry conceded.)

Henry said it was probably impossible to define a model micro-city, but that the existing successful ones have definite characteristics.

For instance, it is good to have (a) a medical center, hospital and mental health complex. (b) a junior or senior college or two, a consolidated high school and a vocational school; a center for state and federal agencies (d) a transportation complex, with several highways; (e) lack of an equal city in close range; (f) local leadership, which is essential.

Public investment in the micro-cities of the future can be justified, because "people have a moral right to live where they want to," Henry said.

If this means the building of parks and other amenities, then it should be done from the public purse, he said.

"With proper planning, we can make a new Athens out of an old Podunk," Henry said.

THE HONORABLE RICHARD F. HARLESS, 1905-70

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, my State of Arizona lost one of its leading citizens a few days ago in the passing of the Honorable Richard F. Harless, a former Member of Congress who served from 1943 through 1948.

I knew Dick Harless well. He was a member of my party. About the time I was getting out of law school he decided to leave Congress and run for Governor. I gave him some small assistance in that campaign, but it obviously was not enough because he lost out in the primary. That marked the end of his public service but not the end of his service to the people of Arizona in his capacity as lawyer and private citizen.

Looking back on one of the longest legislative battles in history, it is interesting to recall that the first bill to create the central Arizona project was introduced during Mr. Harless' last term in the House. That project was finally authorized 20 years later.

In his first term Mr. Harless played an important part in passage of the Wellton-Mohawk irrigation project in Yuma County.

While a Member of Congress, Mr. Harless argued a case before the Supreme Court of Arizona on behalf of the rights of Arizona Indians. Through his effective advocacy the Indian citizens of Arizona won the right to vote—an historic victory for that body of Americans known as "Indians not taxed."

Richard Harless was born in Kelsey, Tex., on August 6, 1905. He moved with his family to Thatcher, Ariz., in 1917, and attended the grade and high schools there. He was graduated from the University of Arizona in 1928, taught school at Marana, Ariz., from 1928 to 1930, and received his law degree from the University of Arizona in 1933. He was admitted to the Arizona bar the same year and began practicing in Phoenix.

Mr. Harless served as assistant city attorney of Phoenix in 1935 and was named assistant attorney general of the State in 1936. He served as county attorney of Maricopa County from 1938 to 1942, when he was elected to the 78th Congress.

Following his retirement from Congress in 1948 Mr. Harless resumed practice in Phoenix.

I shall miss Dick Harless, as I know will all those of my colleagues who served with him during the 1940's. I know they join me in expressing deepest sympathy to his widow, Meredith, and their son, Glen.

A TRIBUTE TO ROBERT A. KLOSS,
COLUMBUS, OHIO

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to publicly recognize Robert A. Kloss upon his completion of 25 years as executive secretary of the Ohio Credit Union League. By most measurements of time 25 years is a modest period, however, when one recognizes that the first credit union in the State of Ohio was not organized until 1931, 25 years of outstanding leadership represents a significant period of time.

When the board of directors of the Ohio Credit Union League employed Bob Kloss in 1945, our Ohio credit unions were just emerging from the World War II era. The fortunes of a struggling Ohio Credit Union League were at their lowest level.

The growth figures of credit unions in Ohio provide the best measure of the capacity of Bob Kloss to provide leadership which has propelled the Ohio league into one of the outstanding credit union leagues in our country. In 1945 all credit unions in Ohio reported a total of 188,000 members. In 1945 all credit unions in Ohio reported a total of \$24,225,000 in assets. One needs only to compare these figures with today's figures when all Ohio credit unions report a total of approximately 800,000 members and all Ohio credit unions report a total of approximately \$800,000,000 in assets.

Those of us who have had an opportunity to watch the development of credit unions in Ohio fully recognize that thousands of credit union volunteers and professionals have had a hand in building the organization which these impressive statistics represent. It was those volunteers and professionals who paid tribute to Bob Kloss on Saturday, November 14, 1970, at a testimonial dinner held

in Columbus, Ohio. We join our Ohio constituents and add our tribute to the many others.

The poet, Edwin Markham, wrote these words:

"MAN MAKING

"We all are blind until we see
That in the human plan
Nothing is worth the making if
It does not make the man.

"Why build these cities glorious
If a man unbuilds goes?
In vain we build the world, unless
The builder also grows."

Bob Kloss is one of the great builders of the great State of Ohio.

COMMENTS ON THE RECENT POW RAID

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Letters to the Editor column in the Washington Evening Star dealt solely with reader reaction to the recent attempt to free the American soldiers being held in captivity by the North Vietnamese Communists.

These letters are a striking example of the feelings of the American people toward this gallant effort. Out of 17 letters only one is critical of the operation. This one disparaging letter is written by one Marilyn Lerch, a member of the Washington Peace Action Coalition. Miss Lerch was formerly involved with the Washington Mobilization Committee, the local detachment of the National Mobilization Committee, whom we all remember for its leading role in the assault on the Democratic National Convention. Miss Lerch attended the August 4, 1968, administrative committee meeting of the National Mobilization Committee in Chicago where plans for the assault were firmed up.

On the whole I think these letters are representative of several groups we find in America today. The first and by far the largest, by more than 16 to 1, are those Americans who are not committed to North Vietnamese Communist victory and have the critical judgment necessary to recognize an action consistent with the finest principles of our country. The other is the minority of freaks actively working to assure a Communist victory in Southeast Asia.

The letters follow:

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

(Published letters are subject to condensation, and those not selected for publication will be returned only when accompanied by stamped, self-addressed envelopes. The use of pen names is limited to correspondents whose identity is known to The Star.)

THE POW RAID

ARLINGTON, VA.

SIR: Thanks for your editorial, "The POW Raid." At a time when so many seem to delight in venting their spleen against anything and everything military, your editorial was most heartening. Although unsuccessful, the fact that our government authorized and the brave volunteers of the Army and Air

Force attempted, the rescue of our POWs deep in enemy territory gave me a feeling of pride.

LOYD E. KELLY.

SIR: You expressed what I expect and hope most of us thought and feel concerning the POW raid.

I was sickened by the sight and sound on TV of Senator Fulbright, almost before the 'copters were back, "chewing out" Secretary Laird. Right or wrong, something was done.

MARSHALL GRINDER.

SIR: Since news of the raid was released, I have heard nothing but the screams of narrow-minded politicians twisting the incident to their own political advantage.

I applaud your treating the incident the way all Americans should treat it, regardless of their political view. It was nothing but the tremendous courageous attempt of brave Americans to rescue fellow Americans who are suffering and dying in prison.

T. MICHAEL DYER.

SILVER SPRING, MD.

SIR: Let me commend you for stating there is not a scintilla of evidence to suggest that Hanoi has any interest in the Paris peace talks. But you neglected to reprimand the far left Liberals for labeling the attempted rescue "escalation."

PAUL CHIERA.

WASHINGTON AREA

PEACE ACTION COALITION.

SIR: The massive U.S. bombings of North Vietnam expose once again the basic intent of the Nixon administration of a military victory in Indochina. The POW raid, with its initiator's invocations of honor, duty, pride, morality, was clearly a diversionary tactic to cover a major escalation of the war.

The North Vietnamese have been warned that if they defend themselves, the Nixon administration will respond with stern and unusual measures. Not only does Nixon insist on destroying a people, he also insists they not defend themselves.

MARILYN LERCH.

SIR: Once again we are obliged to be a little proud of our President. He is able, once in a while, to show some backbone.

I could not say what I feel toward the Senators Fulbright, Kennedy and McGovern. These men are traitors in every sense of the word. Lord bless the President. He should put that word "victory" in his vocabulary.

SHARON BRUNK.

Vienna, Va.

SIR: The rescue attempt to free American POW's in North Vietnam was a faint but welcome beam of light in the dark cave of progressive withdrawal from U.S. responsibilities toward these prisoners.

Our POWs have been fully exposed by their captors to the pronouncements of the Pells, the Javits, the Kennedys and the Fulbrights. These pronouncements dismay me, and I'm not even a POW.

ROSS F. ROGERS.

SIR: I resent Secretary of Defense Laird being called on the carpet, so to speak, to explain or atone for his actions in his brave and daring rescue operations for our soldiers that are held prisoner in war camps. I believe we would settle the war much quicker if our "senators" would stop playing politics and leave the administration alone.

Who am I? The wife of a soldier stationed in Vietnam.

Mrs. ROBERT H. WATSON.

SIR: I approved of the commando raid on the American POW camp and am sorry it was

not more successful. The raid was an act of courage and heroism and all involved should be commended.

In our times one has come to expect much controversy on any action involving our military and/or our government. The thing I find incredible is that Senator Kennedy's opinion is sought by the press or that it is even newsworthy.

MAY LOU PRINGLE.

GAYS MILLS, WIS.

SIR: One might take Senator Fulbright's constant whining about our nation's "breaching accepted international understandings" if, when he cited our country's violations, he occasionally mentioned a few of the numerous infractions of hostile nations.

IMOGENE CASHMORE.

SEABROOK, MD.

SIR: Nothing could jeopardize the three ring circus performing in Paris.

Bombing of North Vietnam might prove that the conventional military just might provide the total victory needed to end the war, without the ever mounting peacefully negotiated casualty lists.

Would Sens. Kennedy and Fulbright care to try and swap places with some of our captured servicemen.

A. WILLIAMS.

SIR: All Americans must have thrilled with pride in learning of the daring raid near Hanoi to rescue prisoners of war. President Nixon is to be commended for authorizing the operation.

ROBERT C. THOMPSON.

FAIRFAX, VA.

SIR: If the critics had friends or family dying in one of those camps what song would they sing then? More important, what if the rescue had been successful and a number of POW's were saved? Would the strategy be labeled heroic or would our spineless critics find yet another excuse to condemn?

JOHN H. MCCLURE.

SIR: It was shocking and disgusting to hear some of our "cry-baby" Senators whining and complaining about the administration's efforts to free prisoners of war held captive by the North Vietnamese.

LEIDA M. HORWEDEL.

SIR: Moral support is being provided the North Vietnamese by, of all people, the politicians on the Hill. Every effort by President Nixon is blasted and thwarted by a certain radical group entrenched in the Senate and House.

L. B. BEALL.

SIR: In relation to the "expression of opinion" by Mary McGrory—perhaps she would like to know some Virginia families whose sons and husbands are POWs or missing in action in North Vietnam. To her shock she might find they were filled with a feeling that our President and our leading civilian and military officials do care!

MARY A. BAKER.

ROCKVILLE, MD.

SIR: With the exception of the shape of the table not one positive item has been agreed upon in the more than two years of the "Paris Peace Talks." In spite of this total lack of progress the Nixon critics continue to gnaw away at any effort on the part of the administration to bring reasonable pressure on our enemies, the latest being directed at the unsuccessful attempt to rescue U.S. prisoners held in North Vietnam.

I wonder how much longer these gentlemen intend our country "negotiate" away the lives of U.S. prisoners and their families.

BERT KURLAND.

FACTS, NOT SENTIMENT, SHOULD DECIDE "DELTA QUEEN'S" FATE

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I understand that another attempt will be made this week on the floor of the House to obtain an exemption for the *Delta Queen*.

Although I have given my views to the Members of the House previously, I would like to summarize the reasons why the Members of this House should not permit the *Delta Queen* to continue operations as an inland river overnight passenger boat.

I recognize that there is considerable sentiment supporting the continued operation of this wooden riverboat. The sentiment seems to be that the *Delta Queen* is a link with our past and we should preserve this link to remind us of the good old days. The House, however, should vote on the facts and not on sentiment. The facts are, as I have repeatedly stated in the past, that—

The boat is a firetrap;

It is made largely of wood; and

Wood burns.

The S.S. *Yarmouth Castle*, made largely of wood, burned recently with a loss of 90 lives.

The S.S. *Morro Castle*, made largely of wood, burned with a loss of 134 lives.

The Canadian passenger boat *Noronic* made largely of wood, burned while tied to a dock in Toronto, with a loss of 118 lives.

The *General Slocum*, made largely of wood, burned in New York Harbor, with the bow on the beach but the stern in deep water, with a loss of more than 1,000 lives.

In earlier years, the river steambot *Stonewall* on the Mississippi River, made largely of wood, burned with a loss of 209 lives, in an accident in the Mississippi River—where the *Delta Queen* operates—where the pilot could not reach the banks as the boat went aground on a shoal 150 yards from the bank.

It is against the law of the land to operate such a wooden passenger boat.

The Department of Commerce, which houses the Maritime Administration, opposes continued operation of the boat, in the interests of safety.

The Department of State opposes continued operation of the boat, in the interest of safety.

The Coast Guard, which has responsibility for maritime safety, opposes the continued operation of the boat, in the interest of safety.

Sentiment has its place, but the facts concerning the *Delta Queen* make clear that the Congress should not gamble with the lives of passengers. We have charged the executive departments with certain public safety. The agencies concerned with the *Delta Queen* say it is not safe to operate her further. The Congress should not substitute its judgment for the technical agencies on whom we rely for guidance concerning public safety.

I hope the *Delta Queen* never burns, but if it does, the blood will be on the

Congress, not on the expert agencies which told us to stop the operation. I do not see how any Member in good conscience can vote on this issue on the basis of sentiment instead of facts. Too many lives are at stake.

There is another aspect of this *Delta Queen* issue which disturbs me. By a vote of 307 to 1, the House passed the bill leading to the Merchant Marine Act of 1970. By a vote of 343 to 4, the House accepted the conference report and the statement of the managers on the part of the House following the conference with the Senate on this legislation. During that conference with the Senate, it was agreed by all Members, House and Senate, not to permit the *Delta Queen* to continue to operate. Now if the conference system of the Congress is to have validity, I think the House should vote down the Senate's attempt to make an end-run around that conference agreement.

It also seems appropriate to point out at this time that even the owners of the *Delta Queen* have admitted this vessel has limited safety capabilities.

On October 4, 1970, William Muster, president of Greene Line Steamers, Inc., operators of the *Delta Queen*, wrote me a letter which included the following two paragraphs:

Although we were deeply disappointed that the *Delta Queen* amendment was rejected in conference, we were most pleased by the unanimous decision of the Committee to recommend to the Congress that a construction differential subsidy be authorized for a vessel to replace the *Delta Queen*.

As operators of the *Delta Queen*, we are only too well aware of the operational and safety limitations of our 44-year-old paddle-wheeler. It has always been our intention to retire her into active, but less demanding service as soon as we could build a new vessel.

Mr. Speaker, I remain convinced the *Delta Queen* should not be permitted to operate further as an overnight passenger boat. I hope the Members of this House will agree with me and vote to support existing law, expert advice, and previous action by the Congress—all of which are against continued operation of the *Delta Queen*.

I also feel the official Coast Guard position on the *Delta Queen* should be made public, and at this point I insert in the RECORD a copy of a letter from that agency:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,
U.S. COAST GUARD,
Washington, D.C., September 2, 1970.

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine
and Fisheries, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The following information concerning the river passenger steamer DELTA QUEEN, including our latest thinking on proposed legislation affecting her operation, is furnished in accordance with your telephone call to Captain Kesler on 22 June 1970.

The current Coast Guard position on proposed legislation to extend for two years the existing operation of the DELTA QUEEN is reflected in the enclosed copy of Department of Transportation letter dated 15 May 1970 to your Committee commenting on H.R. 14002; i.e., we are opposed to enactment of such legislation.

H.R. 14002 was introduced by Mr. Corbett in September of 1969 and, if enacted, would provide a second two-year extension (Public Law 90-435, enacted 27 July 1968 provided the first) during which the DELTA QUEEN would be permitted to operate in her present mode without compliance with the incombustible construction requirements set forth in the Act of 6 November 1966 (Public Law 89-777).

Our position today has not changed from that expressed two years ago, both during Coast Guard testimony before your Committee on proposed legislation resulting in the aforementioned Public Law 90-435, and in Department of Transportation letters dated 23 and 27 May 1968 commenting on two proposed bills under consideration at that time. In this regard, I have attached a copy of Rear Admiral Murphy's comprehensive statement of 13 June 1968 before your Committee, as well as a copy of Department of Transportation letter dated 23 May 1968 commenting on Mr. Williams' H.R. 15580. The Department's letter of 27 May 1968 in reference to Mrs. Sullivan's companion bill H.R. 15714 contained the same comments and, therefore, has not been included.

As you know, in addition to H.R. 14002, intended to grant the DELTA QUEEN an additional two-year postponement until November 1972, several other bills have been recently introduced which, if enacted, would completely exempt the vessel from compliance with Public Law 89-777. Our position with respect to these bills remains the same as that expressed on the proposed two-year postponement legislation. In the interest of maritime safety, we are opposed to such legislation.

In addition to copies of Rear Admiral Murphy's statement on the subject and other related correspondence, I have also enclosed for your use a brief fact sheet on the DELTA QUEEN containing, among other things, her tonnage, length, date of build, etc.

It is a pleasure to furnish you this information. If the Coast Guard can be of further assistance in this matter, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

T. R. SARGENT,

Vice Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Assistant Commandant.

COMMUNISTS REFUSE TO NEGOTIATE IN PARIS

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, it should be clear from the recent statements of David E. K. Bruce, our chief negotiator at the Paris peace talks, that negotiation with the North Vietnamese and Vietcong holds no real promise either for decent treatment for our POW's or for an end to the war.

Earlier this week Ambassador Bruce said that "there have never been any true negotiations" at the Paris talks in the almost 2 years of their existence. He also noted that the Communists had given no indication whatever that they are ready to begin meaningful negotiations. This is a very frank appraisal of the situation, and it appears to be absolutely correct.

Yet we still have critics of the war who propose negotiation as their only alternative to the actions the President has

taken. The most recent example came from those who opposed the raid on the Son Tay prison camp. Instead of offering any constructive suggestions to help our prisoners of war, they offered negotiation—which is really a nonanswer to a real problem.

I would suggest that critics of the war devote their energies to bringing forth constructive alternatives that can help get us out of this war. But the idea that more negotiation is the answer, when in fact the Communists refuse to negotiate, should be identified for what it is—simply wishful thinking.

EVERY MANS' HOME IS HIS CASTLE

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, under our system of government we bend over backward to protect the rights of those charged with committing crimes and, in the process, we sometimes soft-pedal the rights of good-living and innocent citizens.

A rather unique reference is made to this paradox in an article written by Mr. Jake E. Teller and appearing in a recent issue of the Real Property News, which is published in Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. Teller takes off on the common-law theme that "every man's home is his castle," and because the article is timely and cleverly presented, I insert it in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

EVERY MAN'S HOME IS HIS CASTLE

(By Jack E. Teller)

You may not agree with me . . . but, . . . I disagree with any law which is designed to protect criminals.

Yesterday I read another legal opinion, which, in effect, says that you cannot shoot anyone who breaks into your house unless he shoots you first.

Not me pal! I ain't about to hold a dialog with anyone who breaks into my house. I'm ready. My house has a very interesting electronic system, and my four rifles and two revolvers are loaded. Any midnight strangers in my house would be wise to visit the confession before entering.

My friends and legal advisers all tell me I will be guilty of murder if this unfortunate confrontation should occur. So, I have figured out a story for the judge. It will go approximately as follows:

"You see, yer honor, I woke up about three am one morning, and, for some reason, it occurred to me that I had not oiled my revolver recently. So I took it from the drawer of my bedside table intending to take it down to my shop and oil it while it was on my mind.

"As I entered by living room, there stood a man. You know how it is these days. Jedge, it is not uncommon to find a stranger strolling around your home—particularly at three a.m.

"Well, sir, I asked the guy if I could be of assistance. He answered, 'no, I'm just waiting for a trolley car'. So I said, 'well, they don't run too often around here but maybe, while you're waiting, you could help me oil my revolver because I don't know very much about revolvers'. 'Well,' he said, 'I

doubt it. I'm a knife man myself. But let me take a look at it anyway'.

"So I handed it to him and he was looking it over and, at one point, sighted down the barrel with the gun pointing toward him. You know Jedge, that thing went off with a hell of a bang and my wife came running down the stairs hollering at me to get that thing off her new rug because it was bleeding all over it.

"Well, sir, I called the police and told them to bring a basket with them to remove some pollution from my living room."

The Jedge will probably say, "that's a ridiculous story. It is quite obvious that you shot the man yourself".

My only answer will be: "well, you know Jedge, the only way you can find out is to ask the guy with the hole in his head—or maybe some of the other people who were waiting for the trolley car."

Obviously, I will be sent to the electric chair.

But, so long as I have a choice (and I still do), I'd rather be murdered by justice than some coked-up criminal who would certainly be released by the courts (or by probation) to continue his mayhem.

It's a hell of an era where law-abiding citizens are considered to be guilty until they prove their innocence and where criminals are considered to be innocent until proven guilty. They get the financial and moral support of government; we can go to see our chaplain (and don't be too sure which side he's on either).

SUBVERSIVES EMPLOYING "REVOLUTIONARY RHETORIC" TO FURTHER THEIR ENDS

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, in this era when we hear of academicians who preach revolutionary violence along with teaching literature, history, and other traditional classroom subjects, it is refreshing to discover one who is aware of and concerned about the danger that confronts this country from within.

I refer to Roy Colby, professor of Spanish at the University of Northern Colorado, who is also president of that institution's chapter of University Professors for Academic Order.

Professor Colby has worldly experience not enjoyed by some other teachers. He is a former Foreign Service officer with service in Brazil, Mexico, and Cuba. He has had the opportunity to witness Communists at their work of subverting governments. He witnessed firsthand Fidel Castro's communication of a nation only 90 miles from our shores.

Professor Colby is the author of a book entitled "Conquest With Words" and is presently compiling a dictionary of communese-English terms that depict how perversion of language promotes the cause of international communism.

In a speech to the University Professors for Academic Order on his campus in mid-October, Professor Colby explained how the subversives in this country are employing what he calls revolutionary rhetoric to further their ends.

This speech is most interesting and informative and therefore I insert it in

the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

SUBVERSIVES EMPLOYING "REVOLUTIONARY RHETORIC" TO FURTHER THEIR ENDS
(By Roy Colby)

The widespread bombings throughout the nation, the sniping, the guerrilla warfare, the murder of policemen, the threatened kidnappings, the violence, the politicization of universities and the rest. You read about them every day.

What is happening to America, the land of the free and the home of the brave?

Revolution. Do you doubt it? Then read this.

On Oct. 14, 1970, thousands of policemen from all parts of the country assembled on the steps of the U.S. Capital in Washington, D.C., calling for stiffer laws against attacks on law enforcement officers. John J. Harrington, national president of the Fraternal Order of Police, told some 3,500 officers and members of Congress, "It's time the people of this country face up to it—there is a revolution taking place."

On August 24, 1970, State Attorney General Robert Warren said, "The bombings of the University of Wisconsin mark the beginning of an outright revolution. . . ."

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover recently noted, "There exists a strong Marxist revolutionary youth movement."

If it is indeed, revolution then Communists everywhere are all for it and are doing their utmost to promote it. For according to the theories of Marxism-Leninism there is, and should be, a revolution taking place on all non-Communist countries of the world—including the United States. The revolution will last until Communists take over the government and seize power.

How is a revolution promoted? First and foremost of all, by words. By assigning Marxist values to ordinary ideas. By revolutionary rhetoric designed to win the support of persons who are gullible, superficial, idealistic, inexperienced and unwise.

The Marxist word-system for revolution, then, may be called "revolutionary rhetoric." How do you recognize revolutionary rhetoric when you hear it or see it in print?

The following is taken from an anti-ROTC leaflet coming from a booth in the University Center of the University of Northern Colorado. The sign above the booth read, "Rocky Mountain Revolutionary Union," and behind the long table filled with anti-U.S. literature—revolutionary literature, if you please—sat five hippie-style students, or at least they were of student age. It was a poorly reproduced mimeograph sheet showing, or purporting to show, the badly burned face of what was described as "after early surgery" to an eight-year-old Vietnamese boy.

"Does not your stomach rebel?" the leaflet asks. "Does not your mind revolt? The napalmed ruins of his body and his ravaged mind are inflicted by the 'honorable' officers of American military might. Yes you should rebel when you join ROTC, when you sanctify the existence of ROTC. You are guilty of the most criminal violence, an accomplice to a degenerately twisted stronghold of legitimized murder. Yes ROTC is a lecherous arm of American imperialism seducing, subverting and corrupting the purity of youth from universal brotherhood. There is no place in a University of Life for ROTC."

Beside the Vietnamese boy's scarred face were printed these words in large letters: "ROTC plus U.S. Imperialism did this."

This is revolutionary rhetoric. This is Marxist rhetoric. Right here. Right here in our own university.

But there's more. At the bottom of the leaflet we read:

"Excerpt From the Program of the Rocky Mountain Revolutionary Union.

"An End to ROTC.

"The way the University complex best serves imperialism is exemplified in ROTC. The chief confrontation taking place is between a world in revolution and amerikkan imperialism. People are rising up to free themselves from amerikkan corporate exploitation. They will no longer passively watch their human and natural resources exploited, their country's chance for economic growth stifled (sic) by amerikkan economic domination and be pacified with care (sic) packages.

"Amerikkkan imperialism is the main structure standing in the way of our brother's (sic) liberation. ROTC supplies over half of the officers for fragmentation bombs, defolleges (sic) and fires the guns all under the guise of fighting for democracy. It trains men in the tactics of counter-insurgency and gives them the manpower to protect and foster the goals of a dehumanizing corporate imperialism. We demand an immediate end to ROTC."

Read that over again and note well certain words. Never mind the spelling—What do you want, good spelling or revolution? Look at them: *University complex, imperialism, confrontation, revolution, amerikkan imperialism, people, exploitation, exploited, economic domination, liberation, under the guise of, and corporate imperialism.*

These words and others similar to them constitute revolutionary rhetoric, the vocabulary of revolution. They are all logical parts of a verbal pattern which is invariable in its make-up. Here are the elements which constitute the pattern.

A revolution is a violent overthrow of a government and is usually abhorred by a majority of the people. How then do you arouse people, convince them the government should be overthrown?

Very simply. You say it is all bad. Therefore, all the things you do and stand for are good.

What do you attack?—the sources of power . . . The University. The courts. The police. The armed forces, ROTC, industrial firms, especially those connected with defense projects. And obviously those who try to stop you from carrying out your objectives.

Now let us see how good words are employed to describe revolutionary activities and bad ones represent the government under attack, its institutions, culture and policies, and its efforts to defend itself.

Please keep in mind the following labels do not necessarily have to bear any resemblance to the facts. Words are cheap. The truth is anything that helps the revolution. In revolutionary rhetoric, words are power tools to persuade, not means to seek and set forth the truth.

Let us suppose you are a revolutionary. You want to overthrow the United States government. What are you opposed to? These things, and you hear them over and over: *exploitation, monopoly, imperialism, colonialism, repression, oppression, aggression, racism, criminal discrimination, police brutality, and so on.*

What are you in favor of—besides an immediate end to all the things you are opposed to? Well, you want *equality, peace, justice, liberation, participatory democracy, a fair share for all* and anything else that sounds good and noble.

Who are you, anyhow? You are the students, the people, the workers, the minority groups—not just some of them, all of them. What are you like? You are *progressive, liberal, freedom-loving, justice-loving, peace-loving*, but at the same time you are also *oppressed, repressed, discriminated against and exploited.*

Who does this to you?—The Establishment, the power structure and their puppets.

Who are the people that make up the Establishment, the power structure and their puppets? Why, the *imperialists, the Fascists,*

the Nazis, the arch-reactionaries, the moronic conservatives, the clique of racists, warmongers and traitors, the extremists in the military-industrial complex, the amerikkan monopolists, the ROTC and the pigs, to name just a few.

You have tried to communicate with the Establishment but they wouldn't listen. They fail to see what is relevant and what is irrelevant. They still cling to obsolete middle-class values. They don't understand the New Morality, new politics, participatory democracy. You have tried non-violence but it did not work. You have no other choice—make revolution. Make demands. Arrange confrontations. Strive by any means available for liberation from all the bad things. Resist. And if the pigs try to stop you, defend yourself!

This is revolutionary rhetoric in operation.

Revolutionary rhetoric is remarkable for the ideas it does not express. Nothing about the rights of the majority. Nothing about whether actions proposed lead to the greater freedom of the individual—not of a class or group of people, but of the individual citizen. Nothing about America's great social progress in the last two decades. Nothing about the responsibilities connected with the exercise of constitutional rights. Nothing good about any non-Communist country. Nothing bad about any Socialist or Communist country.

Please note this point. In revolutionary rhetoric, the government is held responsible for the welfare of the citizens and hence for all the nation's ills. The individuals who comprise our people-run society somehow are held blameless—except the President of the United States. Since the government is not attending to the country's needs, or not doing it fast enough, the government should be destroyed.

Simplistic reasoning? Perhaps so, but too many of our students are falling for it. We, the educators, ought to have some responsibility for the views of our students. What has gone wrong in education when twice as many students believe the government is doing a bad job as those believing it is doing well?

We must come up with ways and means to cope with revolutionary rhetoric and the superficial ideas that lie behind it. If we don't—let each draw his own conclusion.

STRENGTHENING SMALL BUSINESS

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to approve S. 336 as reported out by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This bill would enable small businessmen to sell securities in an offering up to \$500,000 without having to fully comply with the registration requirements of the Securities Act of 1933.

At the present time this offering level is set at \$300,000. This limit was established in 1945 because it was felt at that time that this reasonably met the needs of our Nation's small businessmen. As we well know today though, inflation has plagued the small businessman just as it has harmed other areas of our economy. Capital costs have risen dramatically in the last two decades; operating costs, maintenance costs, and labor costs have done likewise.

Increasing the regulation A exemption to \$500,000 opens new commercial vistas to small businessmen across the country. It will help them revitalize their efforts at precisely the right time to give the general economy a needed forward momentum.

Mr. Speaker, America's small businessmen have been the backbone and the fiber of the free enterprise system. Their efforts and their successes have been monuments to individual initiative and ingenuity. Congress must help small businessmen keep pace with the changing nature of the money market. Congress has the obligation to approve S. 336.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues not to turn their heads away from the needs of the small businessman once this legislation is approved. There is other legislation pending before this Congress which also should be enacted into law. The investment tax credit should be reinstated for the small businessman. This would enable him to expand profitable operations, better serve consumer needs, and better fulfill his historic role as the cornerstone of the capitalist system. The present inheritance laws should be revised so that Federal estate taxes will have a less devastating impact on the families of farmers, ranchers, and small businessmen.

There are but two major bills that focus directly on the needs of the small businessman. There are many others eminently worthy of congressional attention.

THE TARNISHED DOOR

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the famous inscription on the Statue of Liberty in New York harbor reads:

Give me your tired, your poor,

Your huddled masses, yearning to breathe free,

The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, the tempest-tost to me,

I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

The luster of that promise is dimmed somewhat and the gleaming golden door tarnished by an event that recently took place on an American ship in American territorial waters some 250 miles north of where the "Mother of Exiles" stands. A Lithuanian sailor on a Russian ship took us at our word and flung himself across the 10 feet of water which separated him from an American Coast Guard cutter to safety and freedom—or so he thought. He was wrong. Hours later, with the permission of the American captain, Russian seamen boarded the ship, beat and kicked him into a bloody unconscious hulk and hauled him back roped in a blanket in an American lifeboat, to their own vessel. His prayers for help and cries for mercy still hang in the air unanswered.

The story of how and why official representatives of the United States refused asylum to a refugee, in direct contraven-

tion of the Geneva Protocol governing the status of refugees, and furthermore, actually assisted a Russian goon squad in forcibly subduing and returning him to captivity and probable death is a sad and shameful tale of bureaucratic bungling, indecision, and cowardice.

After the sailor, a radio operator known to us only as Simas, hurled himself to the deck of the *Vigilant* at 2 p.m., on November 23, Captain Eustis telephoned the Coast Guard's First District Commander in Boston, Rear Admiral W. B. Ellis. Ellis contacted his Washington headquarters which in turn put in a call to the State Department's Soviet affairs desk. The desk officer, a man named Kilham, was told only that the Coast Guard had a potential defector on its hands. Kilham urged caution and advised the Coast Guard not to "encourage" the defector, as it might be viewed as a "provocation" in view of the delicate negotiations taking place aboard the two ships. However, he instructed the Coast Guard to keep the State Department informed of any further developments.

The Russian trawler, mother ship of a Soviet fishing fleet, and the cutter *Vigilant*, were anchored together to discuss the overharvesting of yellow-tailed flounder. The meeting, arranged at the request of the Russians, was authorized by the State Department primarily for the benefit of American fishing interests in New England.

Two further calls to the State Department ensued at intervals, the second declaring that it was a false alarm and the third, at 7:45 in the evening, reporting that the seaman had already been returned. In fact, Simas was not finally dragged off the *Vigilant* until almost midnight. Adm. Chester Bender, Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, confirmed that the decision had been made by the Coast Guard First District Commander in Boston on his own authority. Under the circumstances, according to Admiral Bender, "the commander * * * felt that it was reasonable and proper that we not permit our ship to be used as a means of defection and that the man should be returned."

No one in the Coast Guard or the State Department can explain the discrepancy between the 7:45 call and the forcible return of Simas at midnight. Nor has the Coast Guard been able to justify making the decision on that basis and at that level without seeking instruction from higher officials in the State Department.

The crux of the problem seems to be the usual bureaucratic bugaboos of bungled communications and misplaced priorities. A State Department spokesman later maintained that, had they been informed that Simas had actually defected, the situation would have been handled differently. That may well be, but the fact remains that there should be clear procedures laid down for dealing with defectors. The rules governing cooperation among government agencies in such cases are inexcusably vague.

What is absolutely certain, however, is the duty of the United States to grant political asylum to refugees who manage to reach American territory. The Geneva Protocol, which we signed in

1968, unequivocally prohibits the expulsion or return of refugees to territories where their life or freedom would be threatened. An American ship in American waters is clearly considered American territory, and we must bear the responsibility for the outrage against human decency and justice which took place aboard the *Vigilant*. For the sake of a few fish, we sacrificed a human life.

Public indignation in the United States has risen in spontaneous protest against this disgraceful action. Americans of East European descent demonstrated angrily against the decision in many cities. The President, who only learned of the incident from weekend news reports, has called for a full investigation. None of this, however, will help Simas. Nor will it reassure millions in captive nations throughout the world who, like Simas, cherished some hope in the American dream. By this dastardly action, we have forfeited something of America's good name and of her proud claim to be mother of exiles and defender of liberty.

This tragic affair must not become one more unfortunate mistake from which nothing was learned. We have seen this scenario played, in different circumstances with different players in different costumes, so many times before. The result is always the same. At Pearl Harbor, during the piracy of the *Pueblo*, and in numerous other fateful incidents in our history, communications faltered, the chain of command broke down, and calamity befell the hapless victims. Why? How many more times must we witness the failure of those in authority, who should have learned from experience but never have?

If the officially expressed regrets of the State Department and others have any sincerity, it should be provided by their concerted efforts to insure that no such shameful incident occurs again. Proper channels of communication should be maintained and adequate procedures for dealing with similar eventualities should be established. Lower echelon officials should know just where to turn for instructions and higher functionaries should have clear policies to guide them. Unless and until these administrative reforms are implemented, there will be other Simases, other victims of ignorance and indecision, of cowardly caution and incompetence. "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil," Edmund Burke warned in 1795, "is for good men to do nothing." It is still true.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE ROSE McCONNELL LONG

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in remembrance of a great and beloved lady of Louisiana, Rose McConnell Long, the mother of Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, who recently passed away at the age of 78.

The news of her passing leaves me saddened, for it was my great privilege to be her friend for more than three decades.

Rose Long was, in many ways, the most remarkable member of one of the most remarkable political families in modern history.

She was a gentle woman, but she possessed a quiet strength and resolve which brought out the best in others and which sustained her family through adversity and personal tragedy.

Throughout her long life, she was loved and admired by the people of Louisiana. She was their friend, their first lady, and, later, their U.S. Senator. It is with the people of Louisiana that her memory will forever reside.

MISSION POSSIBLE: OPENING GREEK JAILS

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD, an article about one of Chicago's outstanding leaders, and his continuing fight for the people of Greece. This article outlines some of the recent activities of this dedicated man. I am sure that my colleagues will find it of considerable interest:

MISSION POSSIBLE: OPENING GREEK JAILS

(By William K. Wyant Jr.)

CHICAGO, June 30.—Anthony G. Angelos, Attorney General John N. Mitchell's candidate for ambassador to Greece, did not get the job. But he is pushing on as a one-man rescue squad for persons detained in Greek prisons.

Angelos, a Chicago banker and philanthropist, flew to Athens last month and interceded with Greek officials on behalf of John Kapsis. Kapsis is a liberal Greek editor jailed by the military dictatorship that runs the country.

"I wouldn't be surprised if they sprang him any day. If I were ambassador, he'd be out of jail," Angelos told the Post-Dispatch in an interview at Chicago's Tavern Club.

Angelos, a Greek-American, grew up a poor boy on the wrong side of the tracks in Chicago. He made it big in real estate and banking, and now he spends his time and money generously in causes he considers good. He is a dynamic man.

He is very disappointed about not receiving the appointment as envoy to Greece. He thought he had the post sewn up, but it went last September to Henry J. Tasca, a career foreign service officer in the Department of State.

Angelos said that Tasca was an excellent choice. But he felt, he himself had extraordinary qualifications as a person who speaks the language, knows the Greek people and is aware of what is going on over there. He feels the State Department snubbed him.

If the United States resumes full military assistance to Greece, or if President Richard M. Nixon names a commission to look into Greek-American relations, Angelos is still hopeful that he could be of service as an American who loves this country and understands Greece.

Non-career people, who receive high diplomatic posts, frequently are wealthy citizens who have made large financial contributions

to party war-chests. Angelos is said to have been generous to the Republican Party in the 1968 campaign but he declined to say whether or how much he had given.

He did say that Attorney General Mitchell, whom he had known for about three years, espoused his cause, and that he had the support of Illinois Senators and of W. Clement Stone, the rich Chicago insurance man who, like Mitchell, is a member of the Richard Nixon Foundation.

Angelos has not allowed his failure to get the Athens job to subdue him or cramp his ebullient style.

Last January, before he sought to assist editor Kapsis, he made a trip to Athens and intervened on behalf of a beautiful American girl, Gloria Root, 21 years old. She had been featured as "Playmate" in last December's Playboy magazine.

Miss Root had been sentenced to 18 months for smuggling hashish. Angelos went to the jail where she was confined on the island of Corfu and talked to the girl for an hour. Her sentence was commuted to six months. She should be out, he said, in a week or so.

Angelos was unacquainted with Miss Root at the time he undertook that mission. He did so at the request of her parents, for whom he brought back a photograph. He borrowed an airplane from Greek magnate Aristotle Onassis for the journey to Corfu, taking with him a Chicago reporter and a Greek intelligence officer.

"I had never met the girl and I knew nothing about her. I felt it could have been my daughter," Angelos said.

Angelos threw himself into the John Kapsis case at the urging of another Chicagoan and business associate of Greek descent, Christopher G. Janus, a Harvard and Oxford man who has harshly criticized the junta of military officers in Greece.

Janus, 59, is a special situations officer for Bache & Co., investment brokers. He is a liberal politically. When his friend, Kapsis, editor of the leading Athens newspaper Ethnos, was put behind bars with a five-year sentence, Janus organized a National Committee to Free John Kapsis.

Angelos readily agreed to do what he could to help. He was the ideal emissary, because he knew the former Greek Premier George Papandreou, who died in 1968, and his son, Andreas, now in exile. Also he had rapport with the military leaders who seized power in a coup three years ago.

He could and did take up the cudgels for Kapsis with Prime Minister George Papadopoulos, a retired brigadier general, with First Deputy Premier Stylianos Pattakos, also a retired general, and with other Greek leaders who might temper the wind for the imprisoned editor.

"I've talked to Papadopoulos and Pattakos," Angelos told the Post-Dispatch. "We can close the doors and talk in the same language."

Angelos said his sessions with Greek leaders sometimes develop into shouting matches at which he says what he thinks very bluntly, a characteristic of his, and gets some frank language in return.

Angelos interviewed Kapsis in Koredaros jail on two successive days. He sneaked a photographer into the jail, and the man took a picture, with Angelos crouching down so he could not be seen through the window. They talked in English. This was on May 10 and 11.

"He told me he is being treated well," Angelos recalled. "No one ever touched him or gave him any mental anguish. He believed there was torture in the Communist section of the prison, but he had not seen it."

Kapsis was writing a book called "Pit of Snakes," for which his jailers had furnished him a typewriter. He told Angelos that it would be an insult to his two teen-age sons if he signed something that indicated he had done wrong, but he was willing to accept

expulsion to the United States, where he would go on fighting the regime.

"John Kapsis is not a Communist, and they know he's not," Angelos told the Post-Dispatch. He found the wardens and captains of the guard apologetic about what is happening in Greece to people like Kapsis. Even the junta's leaders, he said, wanted to help.

Angelos credited Papadopoulos and his deputies with being dedicated men and devout Christians who are trying to do their best for Greeks and Greece. He said they had made it safe for people to walk the streets at night, but they are not diplomats. They will never tolerate a Communist Party.

"I told them, what you need is a good public relations man," Angelos said.

By his own estimate, Angelos has brought to the United States at least 40 persons from around his father's village of Vrina, in the Peloponnese. He has brought tractors for farmers around Vrina, helped equip a school, raised money for a \$60,000 church, and wrought other benefactions.

He had a Horatio Alger career in Chicago. He was an altar boy in the Greek Orthodox Church, went to work when he was 10, selling newspapers, delivering groceries, ushering in a theatre, delivering messages for Western Union, and finally, at 16, making \$30 a week at a Carnegie Steel blast furnace.

Enlisting in the Navy at 17, Angelos served on the battleship Texas as a radioman on the Murmansk run and then was assigned to the U.S.S. Pasadena in the Pacific. He got seven battle stars and the Purple Heart. He then worked his way through Drake University with the help of the GI Bill and graduated in 1951.

Out of college, Angelos started a company called World Wide Services, selling temporary labor to factories. With money from that, he bought slum property which he sold for \$1,500,000 in the early 1960s. He bought stock in the Merchantile National Bank, became board chairman of Guaranty Bank & Trust Co., and finally disposed of his shares, at what he said was triple value, after a proxy fight in 1967.

When Angelos was under consideration to be ambassador to Greece, the Chicago Sun-Times reported that in the 1940s and 1950s he had been in trouble with the law over skid-row flop-houses he owned. His slum property experience gave Angelos an interest in derelicts whom he arranged to feed and house.

He told the Post-Dispatch that he once started to write a book about derelicts, to be called "Roadway to the River."

"I felt sorry for a lot of them," he said. "It's a sickness. They are the loneliest people in the world."

Angelos first went to Greece in 1950 with about \$100 in his pocket. He tried later to get a job with the American aid mission, which was pouring money into Greece. He failed, but looked around and saw a lot.

"The one thing that bothered me most at that time," he said, "was that most of the money wasn't going to the aid of the people, but was going into the pockets of the rich—American and Greek. I would say 70 per cent of it reached the wrong hands."

Angelos married the former Barbara Ge-want of New York City, an attractive redhead, 12 years ago, and they have two children. He is very proud of his family and his father and mother, still living in Chicago.

The Chicago candidate, backed by Mitchell, unquestionably was a serious contender for the job of envoy to Greece last year. Counting against him was the tradition that ambassadors are not often sent to a country of their own ethnic origin.

"I knew the State Department was against me," Angelos said. He also felt, he said, that there was discrimination against a man who came from the wrong side of the tracks and had made good, but did not attend an Ivy League school.

TRIBUTE TO SPEAKER JOHN W.
McCORMACK

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a renowned philosopher once said:

No man has come to true greatness who has not felt that his life belongs to mankind—and that what God gives him he gives for mankind.

Certainly this profound truth applies in full measure to Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK who unquestionably will be recorded in the annals of our Nation's history as one of the great Speakers of all time—a true champion of the people, an outstanding leader, and effective advocate of legislation in the public interest.

Speaker McCORMACK has truly served mankind through his inspired leadership for legislation that has improved the quality of life for all Americans.

As Congress approaches adjournment, it is with sincere regret that I refer to the retirement of Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. I should like to take this means of paying brief but sincere tribute to Speaker McCORMACK as he leaves the House after 42 years of distinguished, devoted, and dedicated service.

Speaker McCORMACK is in the tradition of the great Speakers of the House—Speaker Sam Rayburn, his predecessor; Speaker Henry Clay, Speaker Thomas B. Reed, Speaker Joe Cannon, Speaker Nicholas Longworth and Speaker Champ Clark, among others—men of destiny who guided the House through challenging and momentous times.

Speaker McCORMACK, like all great Speakers, is a fighter and he climaxed his glorious career in the House with effective leadership during this, the 91st Congress. Although senior in years of service and wisdom, he was young in his outlook as he fought for the voting rights bill for 18-year-olds and secured its passage. During the recent national elections, it was Speaker McCORMACK who sounded a national rallying cry for our party and who delivered on this floor a major address summarizing the great accomplishments of the 91st Congress—a campaign document that proved invaluable to Democratic candidates throughout the Nation.

Speaker McCORMACK always rises to the occasion—and the challenge. He has served ably, courageously and effectively during one of the most trying periods in American history—a period of trial, turmoil and upheaval like those which, as the great patriot Thomas Paine said, "try men's souls."

Speaker McCORMACK, in addition to his great abilities and capacity for leadership, is a grand gentleman—a man of unfailing compassion—a kind and thoughtful man whose acts of kindness and consideration are countless.

He is a great leader—a great American—a wonderful human being—and the House will sorely miss his inspired leadership and guidance.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

When a great man relinquishes the mantle of leadership, it is always a sad occasion:

As Edward FitzGerald wrote in the Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam:

The moving finger writes; and having writ, moves on; nor shall you lure it back to cancel half a line.

Time moves relentlessly and inexorably on and as JOHN McCORMACK ends his leadership in the House, there is pain and much regret. However, the imprint he leaves on the sands of time and history as Speaker will remind us all that we were privileged to serve and walk with a giant of history.

Certainly, I want to wish for our beloved Speaker and Mrs. McCormack the best of good luck and success as the Speaker lays down the gavel for a richly deserved rest and relaxation from the stresses and strains of leadership. Our thoughts, our prayers and our best wishes will always be with them.

THE HARE AND THE TORTOISE

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Speaker, the recent achievement by the Soviet Union of an unmanned lunar landing and vehicular exploration of the lunar surface indicates that the competition in space technology is far from over. This point of view is articulated in an excellent editorial by Mr. Robert Hotz in the November 23, 1970, issue of Aviation Week and Space Technology. Mr. Hotz probably is as well versed on our Nation's space achievements and capabilities as anyone else not directly involved with either NASA or the Department of Defense. His editorial follows:

THE HARE AND THE TORTOISE

The Soviet Union has dramatically demonstrated this fall that it is pursuing a broad program of space exploration at as fast a pace as its technical base permits. In a recent 60-day period, the USSR launched 22 spacecraft from its three space centers while only three gantries in a forest of empty steel towers at Cape Kennedy had U.S. spacecraft on launch pads. The Soviets also demonstrated that their space program still has the moon as a major goal by launching three lunar-directed spacecraft that photographed, returned surface samples and explored the lunar topography.

The Soviet achievements on the moon are indeed formidable. But their technology still falls far short of the Apollo system that landed four U.S. astronauts on the moon last year and returned them safely to earth. The Soviet unmanned vehicles are engaged in the same type of preliminary exploration of the lunar environment that the U.S. did in preparation for its manned lunar landings. Zond 8, which photographed the surface on a circumlunar mission is roughly comparable in function to the U.S. Lunar Orbiters of 1966-67. The Luna 16 and 17 spacecraft are similar in function, despite increased capabilities, to the Surveyors the U.S. used for preliminary surface reconnaissance of potential Apollo landing sites. Thus it appears that the Soviets are still pursuing their long-es-

tablished goal of eventually landing men on the moon and establishing manned stations there for scientific observation and exploration. The Zond series of spacecraft is manned, according to Soviet space experts. They will probably be used for final reconnaissance missions preparatory to manned landings in much the same manner that Apollo 8 blazed the trail for Apollo 11 and 12.

Although much of the U.S. lunar data is available internationally, the Russians are clearly operating their own program for acquiring and evaluating data required for their next generation of manned lunar spacecraft. Although they must of necessity follow the same inexorable logic of exploration, they have developed a space technology with the Zonds and Lunas that is as distinct from our Lunar Orbiters and Surveyors as were Vostok, Voskhod and Soyuz from our manned Mercury, Gemini and Apollo spacecraft.

The Soviets have lost their pioneering leadership in manned space flight, but they have lost none of their determination to press on toward their ultimate goals.

They are still building an ever-broader technological base from which to pursue space exploration. There has been no faltering in either the morale of their space scientists and engineers or the support from their political leadership.

The contrast of the last two months of furious Soviet space activity with the shambles of the U.S. space program glaring spotlights a major national flaw in management of technology and waste of national resources. It also offers another valid example of the hare and tortoise racing fable.

The Soviets had the imagination to dream of exploring space and the technical guts to pioneer it. Their Sputniks burst on an astonished world with all the impact of a psychological atomic bomb. Soviet prestige rode high on their orbiting spacecraft. The U.S. embarked on a furious technological spurge to catch up. Setting the manned lunar landing as its major goal, the U.S. space program of the 1960s probably will go down in history as man's greatest constructive expansion of his capabilities in his long sojourn on this planet. The successful lunar landings of 1969 left the world breathless and the Soviets far behind.

No sooner had the tremendous exhilaration of this stunning achievement subsided, than the fleet U.S. space rabbit ambled to the roadside and took a nap under a shady economy tree, confident that the Soviet tortoise could never overtake him. The great science and engineering teams that conceived, built and operated the Apollo system and the other marvelous facets of the U.S. space program were broken up, the facilities mothballed and support of the national leadership dwindled. This rabbit nap at the roadside will also go down in history as an incredible blunder of national leadership and an unnecessary dissipation of a unique national resource.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration is floundering along leaderless. The President has deliberately shrunk the space program as a deflationary economic tool. Congress has become indifferent. After \$24 billion has been spent to develop the system and operational base for manned exploration of the moon, the Apollo flights have been drastically reduced. To save a few million dollars, the bulk of the scientific dividends Apollo could return on this investment are sacrificed.

Meanwhile, the Soviet tortoise plods along the lunar road, surviving technical disasters, changing political winds, international defeats and many other hazards unknown to foreign observers. The Soviets are now working on the moon with their remotely controlled robots. They are developing a substantial military space program of reconnaissance satellites, orbiting bombs and

satellite interceptors. They are developing multi-manned earth-orbital space stations, communications satellites, deep space scientific probes and at regular intervals affirm that their sights are still firmly set on Mars and interplanetary voyaging. The Soviet tortoise is still some years behind the snoring U.S. space rabbit. But it is moving inexorably ahead, albeit at a slower but steadier pace than its principal international rival. Whether the Soviets will ever again overtake and regain world leadership in space technology depends in large measure on how much longer American political leaders and the American people let their somnolent space rabbit languish in idle dreaming.

ROBERT HOTZ.

THE RECENT TRAGIC STORY OF REQUESTED AMERICAN ASYLUM BEING DENIED TO A LITHUANIAN SAILOR MUST NEVER BE REPEATED

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker I, and most every other American, I am sure, was shocked and stunned when I learned of the recent shameful and unfortunate incident of the Lithuanian sailor who attempted defection to this country from a Russian fishing vessel but whose asylum was not only rejected by U. S. Coast Guard authorities but they apparently also permitted him to be beaten unconscious on the deck of their ship by Russian sailors and then dragged back to the vessel from which he had jumped, to undergo a fate that will very probably be worse than death itself.

A more grievous error in judgment and departure from our American tradition of asylum to the persecuted and unfortunate can hardly be imagined.

Upon the revelation of this most tragic blemish upon our American historical character and prestige I urged the President of the United States to initiate an immediate investigation to insure appropriate reprimand of any persons found derelict in their duties and that such a shameful incident would never again occur.

All of us were gratified when the President did announce his initiation of a full investigation and extensive study of the whole matter and his preliminary statement that "under no circumstances" should anyone seeking asylum in the United States be "arbitrarily or summarily returned" to the representatives of the country from which he was fleeing until every opportunity had been granted to the individual to have his asylum request considered on its merits, deserves our unanimous praise.

Irrespective of party affiliation, all of us vigorously support the President of the United States in this grave matter and we earnestly pray that his stern admonition and rigid instructions, regarding any similar incidents, to every representative of the United States, will make it as certain as it is humanly pos-

sible to do so that no other such horrible instance will ever again be repeated.

On this score I would like to include a pertinent editorial in the December 2, 1970, issue of the Worcester, Mass., Telegram and the article follows:

EDITORIALS: SHAME AT SEA

There is something nightmarish in the horror story about a Lithuanian sailor who sought political sanctuary aboard a U.S. Coast Guard cutter, who was denied that sanctuary, and who was beaten senseless by Soviet sailors and dragged back to a Russian fishing boat.

The atrocity was compounded by Coast Guard officials who allowed the hapless man to be transported back to the Soviet ship in a Coast Guard lifeboat.

All this happened with the Stars and Stripes rippling proudly in the breeze overhead.

President Nixon, who first learned of the tragic miscarriage of justice in the newspapers, properly has called for a "very full and immediate investigation."

He and the American people want to know the answers to a number of questions.

During the tragic 10 hours when the fugitive's freedom and possibly his life hung in the balance, why wasn't President Nixon consulted? Why didn't the State Department, when consulted, show more awareness? Do not the high officers of the Coast Guard and State Department understand that this nation spends and has spent millions of dollars to counter Communist propaganda and present America as a ready haven for freedom-loving oppressed? Don't they know the Geneva convention on refugees, which prohibits nations from returning refugees to territories or nations where their life or freedom is threatened? What sort of person could just stand by while the man was beaten before their eyes?

The affair on the cutter Vigilant, in American waters just off Martha's Vineyard, needs a thorough airing so that no such misconception of American policy and intent can be repeated. Those were unworthy rationalizations that balanced this seaman's hopes and life against a conference on fishing problems, that gave credence to Soviet charges of theft, that quibbled about whether the fugitive should have first jumped into the sea.

The President must find the answers, report them to our people and to the world, and make clear just how far the actions swerved from true policies of the United States.

HISTORY OF COMPANY K, 1ST WISCONSIN VOLUNTEERS INFANTRY

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Morris Oesterreich, past commander in chief of the United Spanish War Veterans, has recently brought to my attention an interesting historical roster of Company K, 1st Wisconsin Volunteers Infantry.

In order that the names of these dedicated volunteers be further preserved in the historical record, I submit them for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time:

COMPANY K, 1ST WISCONSIN VOLUNTEERS, INFANTRY

Captain, Thaddeus Wild.
1st Lieut, John Budnik.
2nd Lieut., Peter Piasecki.
1st Sergt, Stan Polewezynski.
Q'Master Sergt., Clemens Borucki.
Sergeants: Ladislaus Cieslaus, Leon Drenski, Jacob Inda, Stan Polski.

Corporals: Jos. Ciskowski, John Czechowski, Frank Domachowski, Lad Galdynski, Frank J. Golla, Ludvik Kanezewski, Felex Michalak, Frank Makowski, Stanley E. Piasecki, Bern Sliga, Thomas Wetzal, J. Zarkowski.

Artificer, John Antoszak.
Musician, Michael Komorowski.
Wagoner, J. Zarkowski.

Privates: Andrejewski, Anthony; Andrezejek, Frank; Bacus, Charles; Biedrzycki, Valentine; Blaszyński, Valentine; Buda, Anthony; Barezynski, Max; Brezeczinski, Frank; Boncel, John; Betanski, Ladislaus; Bemka, Frank; Brzonkala, Apolintary; Boruch, John; Czarnecki, Andrew; Cegielski, Steven; Cichocki, Frank; Czarnecki, Jos.; Czechorski; Roman; Data, John; Duszynski; Felix; Dentkusz, Andrew; Duszynski, John; Ewald, August; Frankowski; Frank; Felski, Valentine; Fennig, John; Galwas, Stanislaus.

Gajewski, Ignace; Glowianka, Bern; Golatka, Adam; Horka, Ignace; Kobe, Jos.; King, G. S.; Knutowski, Barney; Koceja, Joe; Kozolowski, Michael; Kronhelm, Max.

Krzowicki, Adam; Kubacki, Frank; Krolekowski, John; Krolekowski, Stan.; Knitter, Frank; Kucharski, Lad; Kuezynski, Frank; Luezynski, John; Lisiecki, John.

Litza, Jacob; Mchajewski, John; Michalak, Leo; Micklas, Frank; Miller, Lucius; Nowak, Frank A.; Nowalski, Jas.; Joseph Kobs, (transferred to Hospital Corps).

Olbinski, Albert; Pilarski, Ignace; Paszkiewicz, Alex.; Platta, Paul; Patyk, Valentine; Prokop, Michael; Piotrowski, Edward; Rybacki, Frank; Rostankowski, John.

Sliga, Frank; Sobieszozzyk, Bol.; Stachowski, Stephen; Strenka, Stan; Sass, Stephen; Swosinski, Stanley; Tobiewicz, Casimir; Trojanowski, Thos.; Wetzal, John.

Westphal, Frank; Waszkiewicz, John; Woida, Chas. E.; Wojtysiak, Jos.; Warszyski, M.; Zoltak, John; Zbylicki, John; Zachowski, Julius.

Company K reorganized for State Service Dec. 12, 1898;

Several Members of Co. K, joined the new Volunteers for service in the Philippines.

The above "Roster" was obtained from The Evening Wisconsin-National Guard Supplement, dated Jan. 8th, 1900.

Captain; Thaddeus Wild, is a Native of Lemburg, Austria. He came to America in 1881; he graduated from a "Continental Military School," before leaving his native land, and served some time in the Regular Army of the United States, dating from his arrival in Chicago, Illinois. He possesses a thorough Military Training, acquired largely at administrative work. He came to Milwaukee, Wis., in the spring of 1884; and engaged in the profession of Journalism, joining the "Kosciuszko Guards," in the same year. He was commissioned Captain, Nov. 16th, 1894; among the line of Captains in the National Guard he ranks 3rd, mustered out of the State Service May 14th, 1898 at Camp Harvey, Wis. (W.N.G.)

With his Company May 14th, 1898, he responded to the President's call for Volunteers in the Spanish-American War at Camp Harvey, Wis. He was commissioned a Captain, assigned to Co-K-1st-Wis-Vol-Inf., going South with his Company to Jacksonville, Fla., where his Company was distinguished for its splendid discipline and efficiency; upon returning he was mustered out as a Captain, Oct. 19th, 1898.

1st Lieut. John Budnik, enlisted in Co. "B," 4th, Wis. Inf., May 19th, 1890, to May 14th, 1898; mustered out of the State Service, as a 1st Lieut., at Camp Harvey, Wis. (W.N.G.)

Enlisting in the U.S. Volunteer Service in the war with Spain, May 14th, 1898, at Camp Harvey, Wis.; commissioned a 1st Lieut.; assigned to Co-K-1st-Wis-Vol-Inf., going South with the Company to Jacksonville, Fla. He served in that rank until Oct. 19th, 1898; mustered out as a 1st Lieut.

2nd Lieut. Peter Plasecki, was born at Milwaukee, Wis., May 30th, 1876. He enlisted in Dec. 1894, as a Private and served one year in the ranks when he was appointed a Corporal; seven months later attaining the rank of Sergeant in 1896; he was commissioned 2nd Lieut.; later served in that rank until May 14th 1898; when he was mustered out of the State Service at Camp Harvey, Wis., as a 2nd Lieut. (W.N.G.)

Enlisting in the U.S. Volunteer Service, in the War with Spain, May 14th, 1898; at "Camp Harvey" Wis, commissioned a 2nd, Lieut; assigned to, Co-K-1st-Wis-Vol-Inf, served in that rank throughout the Campaign, returning He was mustered out, as a 2nd, Lieut; Oct, 19th, 1898;

2nd, Lieut; Peter Plasecki, saw Service in the World War.

At the call to, Arms, April 26th, 1898; the, "Kosciuszko Guards" heretofore designated (As Co, "B" 4th, Wis, Inf), volunteered in a body and was attached to, the, 1st, Wis, Vol, Inf, as, Co-K-, The Company was mobilized at, "Camp Harvey" Wis, on May 20th, 1898; went to, Jacksonville, Fla, where it remained, until, Sept, 6th, 1898; during its stay at, "Camp Cuba Libre" the Company distinguished itself by its splendid discipline, excellent drilling, cleanliness and orderly behavior. As a reward the Company suffered less from disease, than any other Company, in the Regiment, with only one death.

DECEASED

Private; Ignace Pilarski, of Milwaukee, Wis, aged 26 years, died at, Jacksonville, Fla, Sept, 8th, 1898; of typhoid fever.

Buried in the Polish Cemetery, at Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

W. E. Calkins, Dept. of Wisconsin, (U.S.W.V.) Historian, 1936-37-38-39-40-41- Capt. Wilde's Funeral Set Ex-Leader of Co-K-1st-Wis-Vol-Inf.

Masonic Rites, will be held for, Capt. Thaddeus M. Wilde, former Commander of, Co-K-1st-Wis-Vol-Inf, at 2-P.M. Wednesday, Mar. 24th, 1943; at the Niemann Chapel, 2846 S. Kinnikinnic Ave. Cremation will be at Forest Home Cemetery.

Capt. Wilde died Sunday, Mar, 21st, 1943; at the Soldiers Home, Wood, Wis, where he had lived for 12 years. Excelsior Lodge, F. and A.M. will conduct the Services.

Coming to Milwaukee, Wis., in 1892 after retiring as a Regimental Sergeant Major in the United States Army, he became a member of the editorial staff of the Kuryer Polski, Polish language newspaper. Capt. Wilde was in Command of the Kosciuszko Guards, which later became-Co-K-1st-Wis-Vol-Inf-, when it was mustered into service in the Spanish-American War. The Company was honored in 1912 for its service. It also served in the Mexican border incident and in the last War.

Capt. Wilde was appointed an assistant State Bank examiner by Gov. Schofield, retiring in 1913. Later he was a sales representative. He had made his home in Chicago, Madison and Milwaukee, Wis., in later years.

Born in Poland, he was a descendant of a family that had operated a publishing and printing establishment as early as 1776.

Surviving are his wife, Alma, and a Daughter, Mrs. Ralph Ramsey of Madison.

CXVI—2536—Part 30

BUSINESSMEN: NEW PEACENIKS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, for a long time—and, to a certain extent, continuing to the present time—the antiwar or peace movement was looked upon by many as being made up of kooks, nuts, and impractical little old ladies.

I am not sure which of those categories I fell into, myself, but it has been gratifying to see, over the years, recognition of the fact that opposition to our foreign policy in Southeast Asia was rooted broadly throughout just about every facet of our population.

Harold Willens, a southern California businessman who has served as national cochairman of Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace and who is now chairman of the Businessmen's Education Fund, documents the development of a strong support in the organized peace movement from the business community in a recent article published in the Progressive, December 1970. The article is adapted from his forthcoming book, "Laos: War and Revolution."

I feel sure that my colleagues will find the following article to be of great interest:

BUSINESSMEN: NEW PEACENIKS

(By Harold Willens)

Try to imagine the reaction if several years after public rejection of the Edsel car the Ford Motor Company had attempted to bring it back without as much as modifying a bumper. It would have justified a stockholders' revolt, with fortunate board members hanged in effigy, unfortunate ones in Detroit. The foreign policy engineers who Americanized the Vietnam war saddled the country with a national Edsel. And now, military involvement in Laos could make the Vietnam tragedy seem small by comparison. The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has called Laos "one of the few places worse than Vietnam to fight a war."

Apparently adhering to the theory that even an Edsel can be successfully merchandised if sold with the covering canvas still on, the Nixon Administration, like its predecessors, has tried to keep the war in Laos a secret. As a businessman who began to speak out publicly and on a full-time basis against the Vietnam war early in 1967, I hope to describe the changing public attitude toward the Indochina war and the part played in that change by American businessmen.

After what we have already experienced in Southeast Asia, it seems inconceivable that the public will permit Laos to become another Vietnam. The outcry in reaction to our Cambodian invasion supports this assumption, as does the clear probability that three years ago Senator Stuart Symington would have found it difficult if not impossible to release the transcript of his committee's closed hearings on Laos.

Congress, which passively rubber-stamped escalating American involvement in Vietnam with the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, has at last begun to reassert its constitutional responsibilities. The "expertise" of Lyndon Johnson, Dean Rusk, and Walt Rostow—the men most responsible for depicting a national blunder as a national crusade—appears now as nakedly nonexistent as the mythical emperor's clothes. And businessmen who had

previously kept their silence have begun to put themselves squarely on the record as opposed to allowing Laos or any other Asian country to become another Vietnam.

To me it is especially gratifying to see more and more businessmen come forward and become visibly involved in debating national policy, for I clearly recall how deafening was the silence in the business community only a few short years ago. Businessmen were firmly convinced that foreign policy was the exclusive domain of politicians and soldiers. As I tried to persuade businessmen that a mistaken war which was killing their sons, dividing their country, and damaging their economy was in fact very much their business, I discovered almost immediately that news media people seemed to regard anti-war businessmen as a man-bites-dog story. Whether the press conference occurred in Honolulu, St. Louis, Boston, or Washington, it was always well attended. Soon there were invitations to debate or be interviewed on nationwide television and radio programs.

In various parts of the country, people read and heard the well-documented and well-reasoned public statements of businessmen, many of them company presidents or board chairmen speaking out against the war. In astonishingly little time the country became aware that there were at least some businessmen of stature who were publicly opposing their country's involvement in the Southeast Asian war. Antiwar businessmen appeared before Congressional committees. Mail bearing corporation letterheads landed on White House and Pentagon desks. "Letters to the Editor" cited facts and tore apart Pentagon double-talk.

With growing rapidity in the late 1960s, Vietnam became known as the nation's most unpopular war. Administration boasts of victory diminished, followed soon by apologies and promises to do better and, ultimately, by President Johnson's decision not to seek a second term. This is not to suggest that the appearance of businessmen in the debate made the difference. But that we made a difference is not in doubt. Protesting business authority helped to tip the balance and turn the question from: "How soon will we win this holy war?" to "How soon can we extricate ourselves from this unholy mess?"

But the job is far from done. Republicans replaced Democrats on a vow of peace, and the war goes on. Staggering Pentagon budgets and the persisting death count in Southeast Asia contradict mellifluous vows to end the war. It is plain that additional and longer-range programs to arrest American militarism are needed; that we are rapidly approaching the finish line in a race between education and catastrophe; that to avert ultimate disaster new international realities must replace the fears, fables, and fallacies upon which our foreign policy is based.

It is also plain that businessmen/citizens represent a force of vast potential in the effort to turn the country around before time runs out. The Vietnam war shows that our country pursues a foreign policy dominated by military thinking in which weapons assume greater importance than ideas. It is this type of thinking that wastes money on weapons which don't work and on nuclear weapons which work only too well. And it is the military mentality which inched us into Vietnam, sent us rushing into Cambodia, and now seeks to sink us further in the quagmire of Laos.

The Businessmen's Educational Fund (BEF) came into being in 1969 expressly to bring to the attention of the industrial community, the public, and their representatives the excessive militarization of American foreign policy and the appalling drift to a militarized state. BEF's essential objective is to widen and deepen the idea of corporate responsibility by establishing a channel

through which businessmen can strive for more relevant national priorities and policies. To extricate ourselves from Indochina is imperative. But the Indochina trauma must be recognized for what it is: a symptom reflecting the underlying misdirection of American policies and priorities.

Taking up *Fortune's* editorial appeal for a fresh audit of military spending, BEF has been hammering away at the disproportion between legitimate defense needs and the apparent uncontrollable proclivity of military leaders to seize everything in sight for themselves. What ultimately happens in Laos and the rest of Southeast Asia will be determined by the degree to which Americans succeed or fail in curbing the excessive military influence which brought our country into the Indochina war.

Here and there one notes encouraging confirmation of BEF's essential arguments in publications including *Fortune* and *The Wall Street Journal*. *Fortune*: "The United States is in the grip of a costly, escalating pattern of military expenditures. . . . At staggering costs the military has repeatedly bought weapons and deployed forces that add only marginally to national security."

From the beginning we have stressed the relationship of costs and risks to possible gains in our criticism of the Southeast Asian war. But it is no easy task to begin dislodging the firmly implanted myth that war is good for business. The fact is that during the four years prior to escalation of the Vietnam conflict, corporate profits after taxes rose seventy-one per cent, while from 1966 through 1969 corporate profits after taxes rose only 9.2 per cent. The war has weakened the competitive position of the United States in the world market. In 1964, merchandise exports exceeded imports by nearly \$7 billion. By 1968, the excess of exports over imports had declined to less than one-half billion dollars.

Since 1964, the Consumer Price Index has increased sixteen per cent. Professor James Clayton of the University of Utah has predicted that "the inflationary effect of Vietnam will probably result ultimately in a ten per cent reduction in the standard of living of the average American." High interest rates and tight money have sharply cut the rate of residential construction, while the credit crunch has cut back spending on automobiles and consumer durable goods.

It has been estimated that by 1990 the interest cost on the Vietnam war debt may reach \$35 billion, with the entire principal still outstanding. Perhaps this latter statistic is the most compelling way for a businessman—or any American—to place in proper perspective the economic consequences of a pointless military folly. The only way to hold down the cost of an Edsel is to scrap it quickly.

Even apart from the war, it becomes increasingly clear that military spending benefits relatively few firms while adversely affecting most. A majority of economists today would probably agree with these words of John Kenneth Galbraith: "For the vast majority of businessmen the only visible association with the defense industry is through taxes they pay. Not even a stray sub- or sub-subcontract comes their way, and among the important indirect effects are the starved communities in which they must operate and to whose disorders and violence they are exposed, the manpower and the materials they are denied and the regulations on overseas investments which they suffer because of balance of payment difficulties which in turn are the result of military spending."

The significance of Galbraith's statement is heightened by a statistic which surprises many: during the fiscal year 1970, seventy per cent of the nonfixed portion of our Fed-

eral budget went to military-related expenditures.

To compound the problem, the Pentagon and its industrial partners, having been left virtually free of meaningful accountability have become accustomed to spending taxpayers' money with irresponsible abandon. Air Force officials, for example, called the procurement for the C-5A cargo plane "the best contract ever entered into by the Air Force." Perhaps it was. But the cost overruns of this plane are already substantially in excess of \$2 billion. The MBT tank was to have cost \$250,000 per unit and to have been ready in 1970. The Army has already spent \$2 billion on just one prototype, and present estimates are that production will not begin for another four years. Naval experts told Congress that the Mark 48 torpedo would cost \$65,000 each. Later it was revealed that the price per torpedo will be at least \$1.2 million.

These are just a few examples of the recklessness with which the military spends our money. It is an unfortunate fact that we have now so often heard expenditures described in terms of billions that the vastness of this figure has lost its meaning. It is useful to remind ourselves that a billion (one thousand million) dollars can provide vocational schooling full time for 540,000 youngsters, or send over 100,000 indigent students to a public college or university for four years, including full-time tuition, room, and board. With this in mind we can better appreciate the true cost of the \$23 billion we have wasted on missiles and weapons that were built to be abandoned.

It is now estimated that the B-1 bomber which the Air Force wants would eventually cost between \$15 and \$20 billion. In his role as chairman of the joint chiefs of staff, General Earle Wheeler argued for this plane against many experts who regard it as unnecessary in an age of missiles. General Wheeler said: "The main reason for this generation of bomber was to force the Russians to spend more, spending themselves into bankruptcy."

General Wheeler's words illustrate that in foreign policy we have fallen into what businessmen recognize as the deadly trap of competitor-obsession. Fear of underestimating our competition drives us to overestimate the intentions and capabilities of others; what "they" might do becomes more important than what we should do. The fantasies of our military planners induce escalation of arms which the other side's fantasizers are then compelled to match. Meanwhile, to use a business analogy, our own plant (the environment, the cities, and so on) disintegrates, and our product (free-enterprise democracy) deteriorates.

To a businessman, who most live with reality and review both sides of a ledger, however distasteful, it seems clear that this aspect of our foreign policy is self-destructive. In this instance, the other side of the national ledger reveals that compulsive competitor-obsession keeps us from the most important business of all: preserving and improving our own national plant and product. It makes little sense to surround our cities with missiles while they are crumbling from within.

We are haunted by Cold War visions of a unified Communist monolith, even though clinging to that illusion means shutting our eyes to a world vastly different from that of twenty-five years ago. Our foreign policy rests more on demonology than on current international realities. We remain blind to the significance of a break between Yugoslavia and Russia, to the Sino-Soviet split, to Rumania's enthusiastic reception of President Nixon, and to the obvious nationalistic aspirations and enmities among Communist countries. We have depicted our competitor, whether in Laos, Russia, China, Vietnam, or

Cuba, as totally evil. Therefore those who oppose him must be good. We have thus found ourselves embracing, as though they were Jeffersonian models of democracy, the regimes of such hated despots as Batista, Chiang Kai-shek, Diem, Thieu, and Ky. One wonders how we would respond today to Hitler, that most fervent of all anti-Communist crusaders. In our own self-interest it is time to look around; time to admit that there is both good and evil in all political ideologies. Seeing our adversaries as human beings is a necessary first step to avoiding large-scale war anywhere in Indochina, as well as preventing our own nuclear incineration.

Some time ago, addressing himself to the problem of fanaticism, U.N. Secretary-General U Thant spoke words which are not a utopian vision but a pragmatic prescription for self-preservation: "We have seen how the great religions of the world, after lamentable periods of bigotry and violence, have become accommodated to each other." While the mutual slaughter went on, theological zealots of old were undoubtedly certain that such accommodation could never occur. They were proved wrong. Practical persons must perceive that peace is not a heaven-sent gift but a structure to be created step by step. In military intervention and arms escalation, each step has been matched by the adversary. Is it not then possible that de-escalatory steps will also be matched by adversaries quite well aware that they too are running out of time—and resources?

It is worth a try. For by perpetuating a foreign policy based upon ideological fanaticism we have much to lose at home as well as abroad. Fanaticism inevitably turns its intolerance inward. An overly large, overly rich, and overly powerful military establishment was feared by our Founding Fathers and warned against by Dwight Eisenhower. Such a military bureaucracy could become the most serious threat to the very democracy it is supposed to be protecting. Recently it was revealed that at Fort Holabird in Maryland, the Army was filing and computerizing information on the personalities, beliefs, and lawful community activities of American citizens. Such 1984-type tactics are direct attacks on the Constitution of the United States, the same Constitution every military officer has taken an oath to defend.

Perhaps we have already gone too far to prevent expansion of hostilities to war in Laos, repressive erosion of American freedom, or massive nuclear destruction. On all counts a case can be made for giving up the game as lost. But games which were seemingly lost have been won. At all levels of the human enterprise there are moments of balance when a seemingly irreversible tide can still be turned. Left alone, the tide of present events will sweep away everything we value. Effectively challenged, that tide can be restrained and reversed.

In looking at Southeast Asia and beyond, it strikes me that American businessmen are uniquely equipped to help avert international, national, and personal disaster. I base this statement upon three and one-half years of personal experience in antiwar work as well as two additional considerations. First, since most political leaders follow rather than lead, a relatively small number of enlightened businessmen—to whom people in government are apt to listen—could help bring about constructive change before time runs out. Second, new directions depend upon discarding old orthodoxies, such as fanatical anti-Communism. In exposing these to the light of truth, businessmen can best withstand the attacks to which all heretics have at all times been subjected.

Here, then, is the greatest crisis and the greatest challenge ever faced by American businessmen: the rigor of business judgment—pragmatic common sense—must re-

place unthinking orthodoxy. Our children have the courage to challenge that orthodoxy. But they lack experience and influence. And they are increasingly isolated by the viciousness of certain demagogues in high office. Yet our children are essentially right, as were other powerless heretics, such as Galileo. We cannot blame our best young people for not deferring to the experts who took us into the Southeast Asian war and kept seeing light at the end of the tunnel; experts who invaded Cambodia in search of a nonexistent Communist Pentagon; experts clamoring for many more billions to build ABM's considered useless by the nation's best scientists; experts who are quite literally preparing to MIRV us all to death; experts who gobble up the nation's substance by scaring us into believing that Russia is about to roll over Western Europe and that a China barely able to feed itself is about to conquer the world.

As businessmen, as fathers, and as Americans we are confronted by an inescapable choice: our children—or our experts and their myths. How we choose can help determine how the nation makes this fateful choice. That is the great challenge and opportunity confronting American businessmen today. The following words are almost exactly those used over and over again by some of us since early 1967:

"An end to the war would be good, not bad, for American business. . . . We have more than adequate data to demonstrate that the escalation of the [Vietnam] war has seriously distorted the American economy, has inflated inflationary pressures, has drained resources that are desperately needed . . . and has dampened the rate of growth in profits."

The speaker was Louis B. Lundborg, chairman of the board of the Bank of America, the world's largest private bank, and his audience was the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. We have been waiting a long time for Mr. Lundborg and his colleagues in the top tier of the corporate hierarchy to speak out. Mr. Lundborg said that, regardless of who is responsible for the war, "the rest of us have gone along pretty supinely. If anyone is to blame, it is people like me for not speaking up and not speaking out sooner—for not asking, 'What goes on here?'"

The president of Formica Corporation, Wallace G. Taylor, told a Honolulu audience that the nation's businessmen are "deaf, dumb, and blind to a hydra-headed new American revolution that is tearing this country asunder, value by value." How, he asked, "can a country whose business is business continue to be deaf to its own youth and blind to a war that is rapidly turning this country into one of the poor nations?"

Messrs. Lundborg and Taylor have said it all. They are now involved. Let us hope the contagion of intelligent involvement spreads on the wings of their words to others in the nobility of American commerce. If enough business leaders lead, we may still find our way safely through the most hazardous period in our nation's history—in Vietnam, Laos, and beyond.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 7, 1970

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

WHAT IS IN STORE FOR RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE?

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, in the weeks since Congress passed legislation creating a national rail passenger network, too little attention has been devoted to the means by which the Nixon administration intends to carry out that project. Over the past 30 years, rail passenger service in the United States has deteriorated to dangerous proportions. Whether there is time, even with this new authority, to revitalize what once was a vital force in the Nation's economy, remains to be seen. So far, machinations by both the White House and the Department of Transportation cast some doubt on the success of the new venture. New York Times Columnist Tom Wicker has written a pertinent and keen analysis of what is at stake. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and present it for inclusion in the RECORD, along with a December 6 Times editorial on this urgent matter:

RAILROAD MERCY KILLING

There is an illusion, particularly prevalent among bureaucrats and businessmen who always take airplanes anyway, that the way to improve railroad passenger services is to cut off its hands and feet. In the name of efficiency and cost-cutting, lines are lopped off the dining, parlor, and sleeping cars are eliminated, and schedules are trimmed. When the number of passengers then declines still further, these same "experts" announce that the public just will not patronize the railroads.

These useless experts and this harmful illusion still prevail in the Department of Transportation. The network of passenger train routes made public by Secretary Volpe is patently defective.

On the entire Pacific Coast, there is to be no North-South service between the great cities of San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, and Seattle. There is no service planned throughout the Southwest since the Sunset Route between New Orleans and Los Angeles is to be abandoned. Yet the fast-growing sunbelt states—Texas, Arizona, and Southern California—have increasing numbers of older, retired people who have the leisure and the preference for quality service.

Similarly, central and northern New England, already almost unreachable by train, are now to be abandoned altogether. The surviving trains between New York, Albany and Montreal, and between Boston and Albany are to be killed. Do President Nixon and Secretary Volpe expect the traveling public to stand and cheer this miserable plan which cuts service by nearly two-thirds?

Even worse than the deficiencies of the proposed network are the false premises which underlie it. According to Secretary Volpe's report, the first assumption which guided him and his associates is: "Intercity

rail passenger service will survive only if the demand for it increases sufficiently to reverse the decline in ridership and the resultant mounting losses experienced to date in providing such service."

From this assumption, they further rationalize that available money has to be concentrated on "a limited number of routes which show some promise of profitability." They speak blandly of selecting routes based on "realistic projection of further demand and costs."

These assumptions foredoom the whole effort to failure. Has Congress appropriated \$70 billion for the interstate highway system because it shows "promise of profitability"? What "realistic projections of future costs" did the nation follow when for decades it spent billions developing a network of airports and providing mail subsidies to money-losing airlines?

The answer, of course, is that the nation decided it wanted superhighways and airports. In each case, it built the best, most modern system that money could buy. Naturally, once these facilities were available people used them.

The same would be true of railroad passenger service. The assumption Secretary Volpe and his colleagues should have proceeded upon is the following: "Intercity rail passenger service is essential in a civilized, urbanized society. Its operating deficit, if any, will be supportable if riders are provided with clean, comfortable, conveniently scheduled, dependable service. As with highways and airports, the capital investment in roadbed and rolling stock will be written off by the Government."

It may be that the Nixon Administration, rather than believing in an illusion, knows perfectly well that the present approach will not work. There are cynics who called the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 the "railroad euthanasia bill." If this cynicism is not to be proved valid, Mr. Nixon and Mr. Volpe will have to stop approaching the problem in terms of phony public relations gestures. They will have to stop mouthing support for a "balanced transportation policy" and begin fighting for one.

PASSENGERS OR PIGEONS?

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, Nov. 30.—Congress, the Nixon Administration and Secretary of Transportation John Volpe have made a small, shaky start on redeeming intercity rail passenger service from the limbo into which American railroads and national policy have cast it. The designation of a basic national passenger network, to be operated by a single corporation, offers hope for the future—but at the same time it suggests the immense problems remaining.

The network announced by Mr. Volpe, for instance, includes no North-South lines on the West Coast. This is not only an appalling gap, omitting what many had thought would be the profit-promising corridor route between Los Angeles and San Diego; it is also apparently the product of cost-cutters in the Administration who held down the scope of the system. This does not augur well for their faith in it or in rail passenger service generally.

Mr. Volpe pointed out, moreover, that no new equipment can be expected in operation for at least two years, which is not much less than the guaranteed life of the designated network. Yet it is the provision of clean, comfortable, speedy trains upon which rests any projection of a new public acceptance of rail service.

Moreover, the new rail corporation is expected to operate fundamentally on its own profits. The Federal Government is investing only \$40 million directly in the corporation,

although it will guarantee \$100 million in loans for equipment and roadbeds and another \$200 million in loans to enable railroads to invest in the corporation. It is at best uncertain whether, under these limitations, and after decades of neglect of the passenger by the railroad companies, the new corporation can approach a profit by July 1, 1973. After that date, if it does not, it will be empowered to reduce the basic network now designated.

This niggardly approach stands in stark and utterly senseless contrast to the \$290-million further investment Congress even now is being asked to make in that unnecessary and uneconomic monument to pollution and technological chauvinism, the SST.

The small attention and sparse investment accorded passenger trains make even less sense judged against the action by the House last week in authorizing \$17.3 billion more to complete the 42,500-mile Interstate Highway System by 1978. This not only represents a staggering level of investment for paving a great deal of the countryside, bulldozing much of our cities, and turning a high proportion of the American air blue and noxious; it is also an investment stupendously out of proportion to the low efficiency and poor cost-effectiveness of automobile transportation.

Since it takes only a fourth as much thrust to move a railway car on steel rails as it does to move a rubber-tired vehicle on concrete, a modern train requires only about fifteen relatively pollution-free horsepower per passenger to perhaps ten times that for a pollution-belching auto. One highway lane can handle 1,200 cars, or perhaps 2,000 passengers, an hour—compared to 40,000 passengers an hour on a single railroad track.

Former Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Robert Charles, who now is working with the Geo-Transport Foundation of New England, has pointed out that with an investment of several hundred million dollars in new roadbed, present train technology could provide a Boston-New York rail schedule of two hours fifteen minutes. That would be competitive with the airlines and beat the automobile on a time basis, and leave both far behind in passenger capacity.

At present, Mr. Charles recently told the New England Council, one-fifth of all planes landing at New York's three airports are from Boston and Washington. New York has long contemplated another airport; Boston is now discussing the expansion of its Logan Airport. But the new airport now being built for Los Angeles will cost an estimated \$900 million, while one for Montreal may reach \$1 billion. The provisions of high-speed, comfortable, frequent rail transit between New York and Boston might spare both cities that kind of airport costs and at the same time provide better and more efficient service.

By every such measure, the case for modern rail passenger service in America is overwhelming—if largely unrecognized. Designation of a basic system, even under existing handicaps, was a beginning. The more important step comes next, when President Nixon appoints three or more incorporators to set up the single operating corporation; the incorporators, in turn, must choose the executive management of the corporation.

Those Mr. Nixon appoints, therefore, must meet one overriding standard. They must genuinely believe in the necessity for, and the good prospects of, modern rail passenger service—speedy, clean, convenient, with courteous service, computer-managed ticketing and efficient scheduling. The defeatist attitude that descended on the railroads in recent years will be just as fatal as dirty coaches and slow trains; indeed, it will inevitably produce them.

As for Congress and the Administration, if they continue to give outside preference to the highways and the airlines, nothing anyone else can do will redeem the passenger train from the fate of the passenger pigeon.

GENERAL WESTMORELAND BACKS ALL VOLUNTEER ARMY

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the day before we adjourned for the election recess, General Westmoreland gave an excellent address at the Annual Meeting of the Association of the United States Army.

What makes this particular address so important is the commitment made by the Chief of Staff to the establishment of an all volunteer army.

The steps already underway and those outlined by General Westmoreland for the future are vitally important for the successful achievement of the volunteer army.

As General Westmoreland points out, however, Congress has an important responsibility too. We must provide adequate funds to make the volunteer army successful. With a commitment from the President and the Chief of Staff, Congress must not be the stumbling block. The distinguished chairman of the special subcommittee on the draft has held hearings on all aspects of selective service and the draft. In the next Congress we have an opportunity to move forward on the volunteer army.

I would like to include the full text of General Westmoreland's address at the conclusion of my remarks. I should also like to include an article from the October 15 New York Times which quotes Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower Roger Kelly as saying that with the active cooperation of the armed services, Congress and the country at large we could beat Secretary Laird's mid-1973 target for an all-volunteer army "by a significant margin."

Congress must do its part:

LAIRD AIDE HOPES TO BEAT DEADLINE
SEES ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCES BEFORE MID-1973
TARGET

(By William Beecher)

WASHINGTON, Oct. 14.—A top Pentagon official estimated today that it might be possible to achieve an all-volunteer armed force well ahead of mid-1973, the target established by Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird.

Roger T. Kelley, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, told reporters that, with the active cooperation of the armed services, Congress and the country at large, "we may indeed beat this goal by a significant margin."

On Monday, Secretary Laird promised an "all-out effort" to do away with the need for the draft by July 1, 1973.

Mr. Kelley said that the Army was considering doubling the basic pay of certain recruits to get them to choose training in the combat branches—infantry, armor and artillery. This would be one of many steps to achieve and maintain an all-volunteer force, he said.

He noted that only 4 per cent of those needed to train for the combat forces were volunteers; the rest are assigned.

The Army is seriously considering "proficiency pay" bonuses of from \$50 to \$150 a month to induce recruits to choose this training, he said.

WOULD DOUBLE THE PAY

The money would be paid whether the men served in combat or not, he said, just as proficiency pay now goes to people with certain skills that are in short supply, such as helicopter mechanics. It is not to be confused with "hostile fire pay," which is currently paid to soldiers in a combat zone, whether infantrymen or truck drivers.

A bonus of \$150 a month would virtually double the pay of a young private and could be quite an inducement, Mr. Kelley said. If such bonuses were decided upon for the 215,000 soldiers and 59,000 Marines now serving in the combat arms, this would cost about \$493-million a year.

Mr. Kelley cited a long list of steps that the services were studying in their quest for an all-volunteer force.

He recalled that last April President Nixon said that the defense budget for the fiscal year 1972, beginning next July 1, would include \$2-billion to move toward elimination of the draft. But he said that budgetary and police uncertainties left in doubt the amount to be requested in the budget due to go to Congress in January.

Other officials said that the total would, in all likelihood, be from \$1-billion to \$2-billion.

Other steps that are being seriously considered, Mr. Kelley said, include the following:

Substantial pay increases to bring military pay more in line with rates paid to civilians. The 20 per cent rise requested in the present defense budget for servicemen on their first tour of duty is only a modest step in the right direction, Mr. Kelley said.

An increase of perhaps 3,000 in the 16,000 scholarships currently awarded to college students enrolled in the Reserve Officers Training Corps.

Hundreds of millions of dollars worth of new housing for married and unmarried servicemen.

Special cost-of-living adjustments for servicemen living in high cost areas, such as Washington, D.C., and New York City.

A substantial increase in the number of military recruiters and in the advertising budgets for recruiting.

ADMIRAL'S ORDER CITED

Mr. Kelley said that numerous chats with servicemen had convinced him that correction of a lot of minor irritations could go a long way toward retaining good men in the service.

He cited approvingly a recent message from Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt Jr., Chief of Naval Operations, to all Navy commands directing that enlisted men never be required to stand in line for more than 15 minutes "no matter what."

ADDRESS BY GENERAL W. C. WESTMORELAND, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY, ANNUAL LUNCHEON, ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S. ARMY, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., TUESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1970

I take special pride in addressing the members and friends of this Association today. I welcome the opportunity to be among those who acknowledge the vital role of the Armed Forces in our society . . . who are concerned about the spirit and strength of this Nation's military power . . . and who demonstrate their active support for the United States Army.

Today, I want to discuss what I believe is crucial to the security of our Nation and vital to the future of the Army. This issue is the volunteer Army.

I am announcing today that the Army is committed to an all-out effort in working toward a zero draft—a volunteer force. In accepting this challenge, we in the Army will bend every effort to achieve our goal. But we need support and understanding from the Administration, the Congress, and our citizenry. This Association can help.

As you know, the Army is in a period of sweeping transition. We are redeploying forces from Vietnam, inactivating units, and reducing the size of our support base in the United States in order to come within reduced budgets. And we are still fighting a war. We currently have 300,000 Army troops in Vietnam. By next summer, after the withdrawal of those troops announced by the President, about 200,000 soldiers will remain. This is a large force executing an important and difficult mission. These forces must be supported for as long as the President chooses to keep them in action.

At the same time, this country is reordering its priorities and reallocating its resources. Department of Defense expenditures have declined sharply. The military share of the federal budget is smaller now than it has been at any time since 1950—just before the Korean War. The percentage of our Gross National Product devoted to defense in the next few years will be smaller than at any time in the past two decades, even though we are still at war. In this fiscal year alone, the strength of the Army is being very substantially reduced.

During the remainder of this fiscal year, we must send to Vietnam each month over 20,000 replacements even to meet our decreasing requirements. About 40 percent of these men must be trained in the basic combat arms of infantry, artillery, and armor. Unfortunately, few of our volunteers elect the infantry in Vietnam as their choice. When we give a volunteer his choice, he is more likely to select some other job. Accordingly, for the near future we will continue to depend on the draft for most of our replacements.

If this Nation supports the President's chosen course in ending the Vietnam War, I believe the draft must be extended beyond its expiration date of June 30, 1971. Additionally, we must appreciate that movement toward a volunteer force will take time . . . and continuation of selective service will guarantee a transition period without jeopardizing this Nation's defenses. And finally, and most important, even though we reach a zero draft, *selective service legislation should remain in force as national insurance.*

I am well aware of arguments both for and against selective service. Furthermore, I recognize that the Administration has committed itself to reducing the draft to zero. But I am also aware of the problems that confront the Army as we move toward a zero draft.

To achieve our goal, we must double or triple our enlistments and reenlistments. I assure you that we will muster our best efforts to achieve that goal.

The Army's strength is a function of the combined capabilities of both its Active and Reserve Components—the One Army concept.

Therefore, as our Active forces decrease in size, the Reserve Components take on increased importance. Both are vital to this Nation's military capability . . . and both will be affected as we move toward a zero draft. A significant part of this country's military potential and one frequently ignored is the Individual Ready Reserve—a manpower pool of almost one million trained Reservists who could be used in national emergency to fill Reserve as well as Active units. This necessary adjunct of the Army Reserve is sustained by current selective service legislation.

We know that many in Army Reserve Components are motivated to enlist as an alternative to being inducted. In view of this, a large part of our problem is to increase the number of volunteers in the Army Reserve and National Guard at the same time we increase volunteers in the Active Army.

How we manage the transition from an Army of over a million and a half men to one very substantially smaller is crucial in our movement toward attracting more men.

If we decrease our Active forces in such a way that we are required to force out of the Army a significant number of volunteer officers and men who have already established their professional commitment and ability—some with two or more years of active combat—we will hardly be in a good position to attract new men into our ranks.

Conversely, if we confront our young sergeants and junior officers with no chance for promotion for many years, we face the prospect of losing many of our most capable young leaders. At the same time, we present a dismal picture of career attractiveness for those we wish to recruit. If we are to attract and, more importantly, retain young talent, reasonable opportunities for advancement must exist.

We cannot have the Army our Nation needs without good people. We need quality as well as quantity—and in the appropriate skills to meet our needs. This is our primary task—we accept it as a matter of the highest priority and utmost importance.

Success can only be achieved by a concerted effort in four areas simultaneously:

First, those of us in uniform in positions of high responsibility in the Army must attack this problem with all of the vigor, imagination, and dedication we can muster, and we must apply ourselves intensively to the task.

Second, we must eliminate unnecessary irritants and unattractive features of Army life where they exist.

But we will hold to those immutable principles of dedicated professionalism, loyalty, integrity of character and sacrifice. They are the hallmarks of a disciplined, responsible Army. All else is secondary. Young Americans thrive on challenges and high standards. We must insure that all activities have a perceivable need . . . understandably, exercises without a justifiable purpose "turn them off."

Third, we will not achieve our goal without the application of resources, and I mean money. We will need to increase pay. And we will probably find that we must put our money primarily in those jobs which are most arduous and have the least application to civilian pursuits . . . the infantry, artillery, and armor.

We will need money for housing our people—an item for which we have deferred needed expenditures throughout the Vietnam War. We will need money to maintain those houses. We will need modern barracks. We will need modern barracks. We will need money for civilian labor contracts so that our helicopter mechanics are not cutting grass and our radar technicians are not washing dishes.

Fourth, we will need the support of the American people and their leaders in business, industry, the church, education, and the news media. We cannot attract the kind of soldier we need into an organization denigrated by some, directly attacked by others, and halfheartedly supported by many. This country cannot have it both ways. If the Army is portrayed and believed as a Service to be avoided at all costs, a Service in which only those with the least qualifications need be recruited, and if we do not have the active help of community and national leaders in every field, even money will not do the job.

Success is required in these four areas if we are to achieve our goal. But the Army has sufficient control to produce what is required only in the first two. We can attack the problem immediately and energetically. And we can work toward making life in the Army more attractive for those young men we want to volunteer. But in the other two areas, we need help . . . from the Administration, the Congress, and the citizenry of our Nation.

I hereby commit the Army to the achievement of the first two objectives.

We have instructed commanders to avoid any practice that could be considered in the

category of "make work." Specifically, they have been alerted to such things as:

Reducing inspections so that more time can be devoted to training.

Increasing their sensitivity to unrealistic training schedules that do not produce tangible results for the time expended.

And insuring that Saturday morning activity is not scheduled when that same activity could be accomplished just as effectively during the week.

We have achieved tangible results:

We have identified successful recruiters and stabilized their tours.

We have improved our training by implementing individually oriented, self-paced instruction in some military skills.

We have implemented a generous student loan program for dependents.

And we have begun to improve services for our men and their families—items such as improved laundry and commissary services.

A final point, and one in which I have great personal interest, is the broad opportunities for the men and women in the Army to improve themselves. Education means a great deal to the soldier, the Army, and the Nation. What the Army is doing to provide additional educational opportunities for its people is not well known. But it is substantial. Listen to this:

In the Army school system of two colleges, 20 branch schools, and 11 specialist schools, we offer over 900 different courses of instruction on a campus that is located in 17 different states. By the end of this fiscal year, we will have had 67,000 in the classroom each day of the year and will have enrolled over 350,000 servicemen in our Army school system. These courses cover a wide spectrum of academic subjects as well as skills, trades and crafts. And most of these are readily transferable to civilian pursuits.

During FY 70, 55,000 soldiers completed high school or received equivalency certificates and over 500 received baccalaureate or advanced degrees through the Army's General Education Development Program.

These were part of the 200,000 soldiers who took advantage of Army sponsored educational opportunities—from the elementary through the university level—during the past fiscal year.

Additionally, in this period, over 38,000 who did not possess the necessary mental prerequisites entered the Army and have been given the opportunity to improve their basic education level to meet our minimum standards.

This wide participation in educational betterment is in addition to the more than 2,000 officers who are currently enrolled in the Army's advanced civil school and degree completion programs.

As we look to the future we must, and will, do more to improve opportunities for the men and women in the Army to upgrade their education and to become better citizens.

These—and other measures already adopted—are only a beginning. We will do more—we will concentrate our efforts—and we will put maximum impetus behind them.

Accordingly, I am appointing a senior general officer as Project Manager, reporting directly to me and to Secretary Resor. His mission is to raise to the maximum extent possible the number of enlistments and reenlistments in both the Active Army and Reserve Components. This officer will have authority similar to that of the Project Managers of major weapon systems currently in the Office of the Chief of Staff.

Second, we are immediately increasing the size and quality of our recruiting effort.

And third, at all levels throughout the Army, senior officers will be charged personally with the responsibility for increasing the retention of good people, both by improving the living standards of their men and families and by an intensive effort to

capitalize on the many attractive features of Army service.

Our Army is an organization of young people. Today the average age of those in the Army is less than 23 years. Over three-fourths of our enlisted strength has less than three years of service. The young men who are and will become our soldiers and junior officers have attitudes that differ from those of our older group of officers and non-commissioned officers. To ignore the social mores of this younger group is to blind ourselves to reality. Their values and attitudes need not necessarily be endorsed by Army leadership . . . yet we must recognize that they do exist. We must make Service life better understood by those who fill our ranks.

We will leave no stone unturned. We are willing to part from past practices where such practices no longer serve a productive and useful end. We are reviewing all our policies and administrative procedures . . . Nothing is considered sacrosanct except where military order and discipline . . . the soul of the Army that insures success on the battlefield . . . are jeopardized. In this, we cannot and will not yield. We will continue to hold to the principles that have traditionally guaranteed this Nation a loyal Army.

Those of you who have worn the uniform of our country look back on your service with satisfaction and pride. After the dust has settled, I am sure such will be the case with our younger generation. The important thing is that the Army not only provides an opportunity for the young people of our country to serve proudly but also provides them an opportunity to prepare themselves to be better and more effective citizens.

Today, the Army of the United States has committed itself to moving toward a volunteer force with imagination and full energy. But our success will require the assistance and support of the Administration, the Congress, and the public.

Our efforts, alone, will not be enough. All citizens must do their part. We will need assistance from many quarters. We invite your help.

GOOD NEWS FROM CLASS 4-4

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. Speaker, I insert the following article from the New York Times for 3 reasons:

First, Mr. Lelyveld's story illustrates the fact that New Yorkers—contrary to the general impression—tend to be warm and kindly people.

Second, the prominent placement of this article, complete with picture, shows that a great newspaper will feature good news as well as bad.

Third, RECORD readers should know that wonderful things are happenings in New York City all the time in spite of the city's job-like afflictions.

CLASS 4-4: A RULE IS BENT TO GIVE SHAWN A CHANCE

(By Joseph Lelyveld)

At the start of the third week of school this fall the children of Class 4-4 were told by Miss Dorothy Boroughs, their teacher, that a new student was about to join them. His name was Shaun Sheppard and, as the teacher explained it, he was really in the fifth grade but was going to remain in their class.

"They call it 'traveling,'" she said. "He'll be traveling in our class."

The aim of this unusual arrangement was to enable Miss Boroughs to continue working with Shaun, who had made good progress with her help the previous two years but still had a long way to go if he was not to be hopelessly stranded in school.

Shaun could not be formally enrolled in Miss Boroughs's fourth-grade class because he had already been left back once and that was the limit, according to school regulations. Besides, though he was thought to be more than two years behind in reading, there were other fifth graders who were much worse off.

A RULE IS BENT

What made him different was Miss Boroughs's belief that she could make a difference in his life and the willingness of her superiors to ease the rigidities of the system so she could try. But if schools had analysts to calculate risks and probabilities the way insurance companies have actuaries, then Shaun Sheppard would probably be recorded on a computer printout as the student in Class 4-4 with the lowest educational expectancy.

This would fly in the face of everything that is most obvious about Shaun himself—his lively intelligence, his feeling for stories and language, his gift for sketching and painting, and his self-sufficient emotional sturdiness, none of which could be easily missed or overlooked in a classroom.

But a computer would not have to assume equality of opportunity as the schools do when they demand that learning take place at a uniform rate. It would know, without asking why, that not many students catch up in school after falling two years behind, and that students coming from families that have been on welfare for two generations, as Shaun's has, tend to fall behind first.

ONE LIFE 'MESSSED UP'

Shaun's mother, Josephine Sheppard, knows this better than any computer. Her own life, she says, was "messed up because I never learned what I was supposed to know."

As she bitterly recalls it, she was assigned to a class for retarded children in school, though it was and is obvious that she didn't belong there. Then she dropped out altogether from Mabel Dean Bacon Vocational High School here after giving birth to Shaun at the age of 17, which was 11½ years ago.

With her own experience in mind, she says learning is what will save Shaun, "the only son I have." Three years ago she approved Shaun's being left back to repeat the third grade. She says she approves his studying with a fourth-grade class now, for it means he still has a fighting chance to move ahead with the skills he needs and not be pushed on to oblivion, which is what high school became for her.

Miss Boroughs first met Shaun when he was going through the third grade the second time. In those days he was regarded as a discipline problem and could hardly read.

But when she came into his class as a "cluster teacher" to read stories and poems, with the aim of showing that reading has a purpose, Shaun quickly won her over with the radiance and gentleness of his smiles, his eagerness to sit next to her as she read, his complete absorption in the stories, and his quickness in committing to memory verses by poets such as Robert Louis Stevenson on subjects such as rain and snow.

That year and last, Shaun's reading improved to the point that he was nearly able to handle material designed for the third grade; with the progress he has made this fall he is now almost up to the fourth grade.

But he still has a strained and erratic relation with words and numbers on paper. Having to read aloud to his teacher or his class still seems to embarrass him slightly, causing him to sit tensely, curl his hair nervously

with a finger and vibrate his knees like a jack-hammer under the table.

PERFORMANCE VARIES

Sometimes he will go to the blackboard and write "tor" as the first three letters of "taught" or subtract 678 from 1,000 and come up with the answer 789. But when he concentrates, he often works well and, on occasion, manages to express himself not just well but elegantly.

For instance, the other day Miss Boroughs was trying to get the class to tell her that she should use multiplication to solve a problem she had put on the blackboard. "Well, what should I do with these numbers? Should I cook them?" she asked, baiting the class. "What would I get if I cooked them?"

It was Shaun who called out, "A numbers soufflé."

Similarly, when Class 4-4 wrote letters to Blanche Goldberg, a student teacher who was moving to another class, it was Shaun who wrote, "Your times table work in Class 4-4 was very good and I may add superb, Miss Goldberg." Urging her to keep up the good work, he also advised, "Sock it to the facts, Miss Goldberg."

Miss Boroughs cautiously broached the idea of switching from Class 5-2 to 4-4 to Shaun when he visited her classroom early in the semester to give her a tiny bottle of dime-store perfume for her birthday. At first he said, "Maybe." A week later he said "Yes."

She then promised him that he could return to 5-2 whenever he liked and, whatever happens, that he would be promoted to the sixth grade in June.

SUNLESS APARTMENT

Shaun lives with his mother and infant sister in a small, well-scrubbed but roach-infested tenement apartment that is below street level and gets so little natural light it might almost be under water. Heroin addicts sometimes pass the apartment on their way to the basement to shoot up. Because of them, the Sheppards keep gates on all the windows and a large dog.

He has a room and television set to himself. Television, he says, is "where I learn." It also may be where he picks up words like "soufflé" and "superb."

Plaster is crumbling from the wall above his bed and his landlord only invites his mother to move out when she complains. But Shaun has handsomely decorated the wall with his own painting of Mickey Mouse.

Usually he is late when he comes swinging out of the building every morning, passing through the front door, which is missing its glass pane. From there it is a block and a half to school.

ORDER OF LAFAYETTE RESOLUTION REGARDING THE CASE OF SIMAS KUDIRKA

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, Americans are sickened, puzzled and angered by the return of a would be Soviet defector to his uncertain fate. The President has called the incident outrageous. The State Department is reported as agonizing over its role in the event. The unfolding story is one of confusion, with poor judgment the most charitable if unsatisfactory explanation offered. We have witnessed the sacrificing of a man's freedom when the question at issue was as basic as freedom itself.

New Presidential guidelines on defections should prevent a recurrence, but for now the shame, the stain is with us.

Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by the board of directors of the Order of Lafayette, Inc., and by the annual dinner held at the Plaza Hotel in New York City on December 7, 1970:

LET NO ONE GUILTY ESCAPE

(By former Congressman Hamilton Fish, Sr.)

Whereas we are today celebrating the 29th Anniversary of Pearl Harbor once known as the Day of Infamy, we are confronted with another infamous act in violation of our sacred honor as the sanctuary of Freedom.

Whereas there is an old saying that Freedom shrieked when Kosciuszko fell, and now American freedom was sabotaged when Kudirka was seized on board an American ship,

Whereas this Lithuanian radio operator who jumped from a Russian trawler onto an American Coast Guard cutter on November 23 despite his pleas for protection and sanctuary and while praying to God to be saved, was beaten by a number of Russian sailors who boarded our Coast Guard ship, tied him into a blanket and carried him off in triumph on board the Russian trawler to slavery or death,

And Whereas the tragic surrender of the Lithuanian defector shocked all freedom-loving Americans and all people everywhere who love freedom and loathe tyranny,

And Whereas all loyal Americans are deeply ashamed of our part in the martyrdom of a brave Lithuanian defector who risked his life seeking freedom from Communist slavery,

And Whereas the United States has always hitherto been recognized throughout the world as the fortress of freedom and the hope and aspiration of all those who want to be free,

And Whereas we will steadfastly uphold the torch of freedom and openly and fearlessly send the word throughout the world that such shameful appeasement will never happen again and that this Lithuanian refugee shall not have suffered imprisonment or death in vain. As the Honorable Clare Booth Luce warned "will mankind eventually stand in the light of Freedom or crawl in the darkness of slavery?"

Therefore Be It Resolved by the Board of Directors of the Order of Lafayette at a meeting held in New York on December 7, 1970 that we denounce the servile appeasement in surrendering from an American Coast Guard ship Simas Kudirka, the Lithuanian defector by force and violence into Communist slavery and martyrdom.

And Further Resolved, we urge the Administration to publicly proclaim throughout the world that all refugees from tyranny and slavery will be protected wherever the American flag flies on sea or land, within our jurisdiction.

And Further Resolved that we deplore this unnecessary sacrifice in the cause of freedom and respectfully urge and insist that any officer or government official no matter how high who was responsible for abjectly surrendering this seeker of freedom back to slavery shall be court-martialed or tried as the case may be and that no one guilty of this atrocious action shall escape proper punishment within the law and the Constitution.

And Further Resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Vice President, to the Secretary of State, to the Secretary of Transportation, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to all members of the House and Senate committees investigating this disgraceful episode affecting the honor of the United States."

STATE ANTIPOLLUTION BOARDS HAVE POLLUTERS FOR MEMBERS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, a New York Times article by Gladwin Hill on State antipollution boards documents cases in 35 States where the foxes have been set to guard the chickens. In this analogy, unfortunately, State residents have become the chickens. I recommend the following article to my colleagues:

POLLUTERS SIT ON ANTIPOLLUTION BOARDS

(By Gladwin Hill)

Most of the state boards primarily responsible for cleaning up the nation's air and water are markedly weighted with representatives of the principal sources of pollution.

This has been established in a nationwide investigation by The New York Times into the composition and operation of these boards and their role in environmental improvement.

The inquiry revealed that the membership of air and water pollution boards in 35 states is dotted with industrial, agricultural, municipal and county representatives whose own organizations or spheres of activity are in many cases in the forefront of pollution.

The roster of big corporations with employees on such boards reads like an abbreviated blue book of American industry, particularly the most pollution-troubled segments of industry.

The state boards—statutory part-time citizen panels of gubernatorial appointees and state officials—are in most states the entities that set policies and standards for pollution abatement and that then oversee enforcement. They are the agencies that the Federal Government usually has to deal with.

The possibility that board members' personal connections could prejudice objective handling of pollution problems is deplored by Federal officials. They say privately that the composition of such boards is perhaps a major reason why abatement has not progressed faster.

These officials have no objection to spokesmen for special interests serving on boards that are purely advisory. In fact, most of them welcome it. But they point out that the state pollution boards have policing powers and they think that it is wrong for members to be responsible for policing their own areas of activity.

The widespread practice of putting individuals linked directly or indirectly with polluting on state pollution boards is defended by those involved on two grounds.

One is that such individuals bring to bear needed expertise and familiarity with pollution problems. The other is that such entities as industry, agriculture and local government, because of their civic importance, rate special consideration in the councils of government.

Although there is no precise way to measure the impact of such boards on pollution problems because conditions vary so widely from state to state, there is abundant circumstantial evidence that they do not expedite pollution abatement.

One Colorado state hearing on stream pollution by a brewery was presided over by the pollution control director of the brewery. For years a board member dealing with pollution of Los Angeles harbor has been an executive of an oil company that was a major harbor polluter. The Governor of Indiana recently had to dismiss a state pollution board member because both he and his company were indicted as water polluters.

Only seven states were found in The Times inquiry to have boards without members whose business or professional ties posed possible conflicts of interest.

Eight other states—among them New York and New Jersey—get along without such boards, dealing with pollution entirely through full-time state agencies.

Conservation organizations and citizen groups in many states are campaigning against what they call "stacked" boards, and a number of states are contemplating reforms. But boards weighted with representatives from the pollution sector still dominate the national picture.

The controversial composition of most state pollution boards can be traced to their origins in state legislatures.

Many water pollution boards were created in the nineteen-fifties when water pollution first emerged as a nationwide problem and Congress passed laws giving Federal officials authority in interstate abatement. Air pollution boards were mainly formed in the last three years in response to analogous Federal legislation.

Familiar interest-group pressures in legislatures resulted in board seats in many cases being allocated by statute to such categories as industry, agriculture and municipalities.

Agriculture is a major source of pollution, from field burning and the drainage of animal wastes and farm chemicals. Counties and municipalities by the thousands have inadequate sewage facilities and noisome dumps and incinerators, and they are often as slow about remedying them as other polluters.

Some states even viewed pollution abatement as having a partisan aspect. The laws of Missouri, Utah and Ohio require that certain pollution board seats be split between Republicans and Democrats.

STATE OFFICIALS' ROLE

The presence of state officials on pollution boards does not always guarantee objectivity. Often they are from state Departments of Agriculture, Industrial Development or other agencies functionally allied with pollution sources.

Rarely, in the creation of the boards, were there any lobbyists for the general public. So it is unusual for more than one or two seats on a board to be earmarked for representatives of the public at large—if there are any at all—even though pollution is a problem distinctively affecting the entire public.

The arguments for composing boards largely of special-interest representatives are emphatically contradicted by the top Federal officials.

The Federal Water Quality Commissioner, David Dominick, said in an interview:

"Where a statutory board has responsibility as part of state government to establish standards for pollution abatement, the public is ill-served to have representatives of private vested interests passing judgment on such regulations.

"I think there's enough expertise in the public sector where no conflicts of interests would occur. The whole board should represent the public."

OPPOSES PRESENT SYSTEM

Dr. John Middleton, director of the National Air Pollution Control Administration, said:

"I think boards should represent disciplines that bear on air pollution rather than economic interests. Industry can provide any helpful information on a nonmembership basis.

"The pattern of one or two seats on a board earmarked for representatives of the public doesn't make any sense. All the members of a board should represent the public."

In many instances, industry is demonstrably subsidizing in some degree the operation of state pollution boards. Typically, they meet monthly for a day or two. Members get

only nominal compensation—\$6.30 an hour in Ohio—or sometimes only travel expenses. That means they are serving on their employers' time, and even if they forego their regular pay they are beholden to their employers for leaves of absence.

Critics of the "weighted" state boards do not contend that such boards are entirely unproductive. It is generally conceded that they have been the spearhead, however blunt, of much of the progress that has been made in pollution abatement. This applies particularly to air pollution, in which Federal regulatory steps to date have had little effect outside the field of automobiles.

The critics' contention is simply that with disinterested boards, action would have been more decisive and progress faster. This applies particularly to water pollution, an area in which Federal authorities in the last two years have been impelled repeatedly to go around state machinery and bring actions directly against polluters.

The Times investigation, conducted over the last two months, disclosed no instances of corruption. Indeed, a Federal official commented: "As far as we know these are all upright people. Many undoubtedly strive to be objective. But if you were trying a case against the X.Y.Z. Paper Clip Company, would you want an official of the company on the jury?"

No two of these state panels are exactly alike in composition. They range from five to 15 persons. A typical pattern is a nine-member board composed of several state officials, one or more representatives of industry, a representative of agriculture, representatives of municipalities and counties, and perhaps representatives of "conservation" and of "the public."

Industry is the most ubiquitous presence on such boards, with the steel industry, a big source of both air and water pollution, the most heavily represented.

The United States Steel Company, which has been cited as a polluter by Federal, state or local authorities in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Alabama and elsewhere, has executives on the air pollution boards of Alabama and Utah.

The company also had a man on Indiana's air board until a few months ago, when he was removed by Gov. Edgar Whitcomb because both he and his company had been indicted by a Federal grand jury for alleged violations of Illinois air pollution regulations.

Bethlehem Steel and National Steel have employees, respectively, on Indiana's air and water pollution boards. Bethlehem is also on the air board of Erie County, (N.Y. (Buffalo)), where it has been cited as an air polluter.

Other metal concerns also have a prominent part in pollution policymaking and enforcement among the states.

The Anaconda Company—recently sued in Montana for damages attributed to its fluoride emissions—has an executive on the air pollution board in Kentucky.

An Anaconda lawyer is on the water board in Utah. And the former head of an Anaconda subsidiary is chairman of Montana's Water Pollution Control Council.

A Reynolds Metals man is on the Alabama Water Commission. An Aluminum Company of America lawyer is an industry representative on North Carolina's Pollution Board and a staff doctor of the company is chairman of Iowa's Air Pollution Control Commission.

ROLE OF CHEMICAL MAKERS

The lead industry is well represented in Missouri pollution control. A former executive of the Eagle Pitcher Company (defendant in a recent Federal water pollution action in Kansas) is on the Missouri air board,

and a National Lead executive is on the Missouri water board.

The next most active industry in providing expertise for state pollution boards is the chemical manufacturers—also a widespread pollution source.

Monsanto has men on the Arkansas Pollution Board and on the air boards in Tennessee and Idaho. Union Carbide which has temporized for more than a decade in controlling noxious fumes from its Alloy, W. Va., metallurgical plant, has an executive on the state air pollution board in Colorado.

The DuPont company, a recurrent water polluter in its headquarters state of Delaware, has abstained from pollution board participation there—although another chemical company, Hercules Inc., is represented. But in Tennessee, a DuPont man is chairman of the air pollution control board and another DuPont man is on the state water board.

The Stauffer Chemical Company, whose fumes periodically tincture the air around Las Vegas, has a man on Nevada's Air Pollution Advisory Council, the source of panels that consider appeals from citations. The company also has an executive on Nebraska's Air Pollution Control Board.

The paper industry, another big pollution source nationally, is also well represented in pollution control agencies.

A Scott Paper Company man is on Alabama's water commission. A West Virginia Pulp and Paper Company man is on Kentucky's water board. An International Paper Company executive is on the Alabama air board.

The Brown Paper Company long criticized by conservationists for pollution, is on New Hampshire's air board. The Weyerhaeuser Company is on North Carolina's pollution board. The Bowaters Southern Paper Company is on the Tennessee air board.

On Wisconsin's pollution control board are two lawyers whose clients have included the St. Regis Paper Company and Consolidated Papers, Inc.

On the Water Pollution Control Commission in Kentucky, where acid drainage from coal mines is a big water pollution problem, is the president of the Kentucky Coal Operators Association.

These are only some of the bigger corporations from major pollution fields with representatives on the state boards. A complete list would run well over a hundred.

What are the effects of pollution influence within pollution boards?

Direct evidence that it is retarding pollution abatement is hard to find. No precise scales have yet been developed to gauge the degree of pollution in any particular state. Thus there is no way of comparing the relative progress of states with and without "weighted" boards.

There is no way of telling, moreover, how biased one board may be without prolonged observation and the effects of bias may be mingled with the effects of weak laws and regulations.

Evidence is available on all sides that from a national point of view efforts to reduce air and water pollution are making little headway under the prevailing system.

In four years, for example, air pollution has increased from an annual total of 142 million tons of contaminants to well over 200 million tons.

More than three years after the statutory deadline, as another example, only 18 states have adopted water quality standards satisfactory to the Federal Government.

What is more, Federal officials have information indicating that 32 states have extended various abatement deadlines without the approval of the Secretary of the Interior—technically a violation of Federal law.

But correlating general evidence of this kind with a particular "weighted" board in a given state will almost always be open to argument until more exact pollution measuring techniques are worked out.

What remains is circumstantial evidence. There is a wealth of it at hand and it clearly indicates the "drag effect" that such boards may have on attempts to get pollution programs moving. Here are some samples:

The Nebraska Water Pollution Control Council, notwithstanding, widespread water pollution from cattle feed lots, went 14 years without issuing a citation to such offenders until last May, when Federal officials threatened to move against an aggravated case of pollution.

In Minnesota, where one statutory requirement on the composition of the nine-member State Pollution Control Agency is that it shall contain a farmer, air pollution regulations for cattle feed lots were proposed two years ago but have not been enacted yet.

Since May, 1967, the Connecticut Water Resources Commission has issued 863 orders regarding pollution abatement. Official records indicate that compliance has been obtained in less than half of these cases.

Wisconsin's Attorney General, Robert Warren, has publicly chided the state Natural Resource Board's enforcement arm for occupying itself with "small cheese factories and small fry polluters" rather than big offenders.

Ohio—where four of the five members on the Air Pollution Control Board have ties with the pollution sector (with industry represented by Procter & Gamble, a soap company with an acknowledged pollution record)—has the smokiest city in the country, Steubenville.

Colorado's Air Pollution Control Commission recently went along with industry suggestions that preliminary enforcement of clean-air standards not be started until 1973, although disinterested citizens have contended that the standards could be met by mid-1971. Full-scale enforcement is not scheduled until 1980.

On Alabama's 14-member Water Improvement Commission, all six "industry" seats are occupied by executives of companies now involved in pollution proceedings. Alabama recently was denied a \$600,000 Federal pollution control assistance grant because its laws were adjudged so weak.

Louisiana's air and stream control commissions—composed of state officials and representatives of such groups as the Louisiana Manufacturers Association and the Louisiana Municipal Association—have never imposed a fine on anyone, and the air commission has brought only one corporate polluter into court in five years.

On Pennsylvania's 11-member Air Pollution Control Board the lone "public" member is a former vice president of a steel company. Another steel executive left the board only recently. An executive of a third steel company is on the state's water board. Scranton, Johnstown and Pittsburgh are among the top 10 on the Federal list of smoky cities.

A confidential vignette of one board's activities was provided by a recent official in a Midwestern state where pollution problems are conspicuous.

"The chief problem," he said, "was a general atmosphere of timidity [on the board] due to a hostile, lobby-ridden legislature and an apathetic Governor.

"We had money troubles constantly, so we didn't get much done. Some members would knuckle under if industry seemed to be getting to the Governor. The Governor had some ties with the power industry, which restrained us from adopting tough emission restrictions."

Virginia has been so conscious of the possible conflicts of interest that it has adopted

a law to eliminate it: Even members of the Legislature are ineligible to be on pollution boards.

The few states that have panels composed of engineers, professors, pharmacists, housewives and other disinterested citizens and that obtain expertise from outside sources give every evidence of getting along just as well as boards with members from the pollution sector.

This is also true of the states that have no citizen pollution boards. Several of these, such as New Jersey and Illinois, established professional environmental control agencies in the last year or two to supercede polluter-connected boards.

The Indiana Legislature next year will consider a proposal to supercede its present industry-oriented pollution boards with a full-time state agency like that in Illinois, which pays its five professional pollution control board members from \$30,000 to \$35,000 a year. Iowa and North Carolina are among other states considering structural revisions.

In Ohio, a "Breathers Lobby" of health, labor, church and conservation organizations has been pushing bills that would orient the state air pollution board more toward public interests by including an ecologist and an engineer among its members.

Short of statutory changes, one remedial strategy is the "end run" around slow-moving boards. Pennsylvania's Department of Justice three months ago established an "Environmental Pollution Strike Force" of six young lawyers, who have filed 17 actions against polluters and already won nine.

Finally there is the power of citizen pressure. State pollution boards generally are required by law to hold public sessions, and citizens in some states are finding that a sedulous gallery of observers may change the tenor of boards, deliberations.

At a recent stormy meeting of Alabama's water commission, an irate woman conservationist hauled off and slapped a member of the board.

COMPOSITION OF STATE POLLUTION BOARDS

	Air board	Water board	Combination air-water board
Alabama.....	*	*	
Alaska.....		**	
Arizona.....		**	
Arkansas.....		*	
California ¹	***		
Colorado.....	*	*	
Connecticut.....	*	*	
Delaware.....		*	
Florida.....		*	***
Georgia ²		*	
Hawaii.....		*	***
Idaho.....	*	*	
Illinois.....		**	
Indiana.....	*	*	
Iowa.....	*	*	
Kansas.....		*	***
Kentucky.....	*	*	
Louisiana.....	*	*	
Maine.....		*	*
Maryland.....	**	**	**
Massachusetts.....	*	*	***
Michigan.....	*	*	
Minnesota.....	*	*	*
Mississippi.....	*	*	
Missouri.....	*	*	
Montana.....	***	*	
Nebraska.....	*	*	
Nevada ³	*	*	
New Hampshire.....	*	*	
New Jersey.....	**	**	**
New Mexico.....	*	*	**
New York ⁴	**	**	**
North Carolina.....	*	*	*
North Dakota.....	*	*	
Ohio.....	*	*	
Oklahoma.....	*	*	*
Oregon.....	*	*	*
Pennsylvania.....	*	*	*
Rhode Island.....	**	**	**
South Carolina.....	*	*	*
South Dakota.....	*	*	

Footnotes at end of table.

	Air board	Water board	Combination air-water board
Tennessee.....	*	*	
Texas.....	*	*	
Utah.....	*	*	
Vermont.....	***	***	
Virginia.....	***	***	
Washington.....	**	**	**
West Virginia ⁵	*	*	*
Wisconsin.....	*	*	*
Wyoming ⁷	*	*	

* Means state pollution board contains representatives of basic pollution sources (industry, agriculture, county and city governments).

** "No Boards" means air and water pollution regulation statewide is handled by a full-time State agency.

*** Means State board is free of such representation.

¹ Pollution sources represented in regional branches of State water board.

² Air pollution handled by State board of health.

³ Water under State board of health.

⁴ State environmental board is advisory.

⁵ Interest conflicts banned by law.

⁶ Water under State division of water resources.

⁷ Water pollution control council is advisory.

Note: This table is not a classification of States as to air and water pollution conditions.

HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable James A. Farley, distinguished former Postmaster General and legendary chairman of the Democratic National Committee, rightly has been acclaimed as one of America's most illustrious political leaders. Presently chairman of the Board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., he also is recognized as a preeminent expert on the subject of American politics.

In this connection, a newspaperman friend, Mr. Paul Corcoran, recently asked him to prepare an article presenting his views and opinions on so-called political bosses who functioned during past years.

In replying to his friend, Mr. Farley prepared a most interesting and informative article, in which he vividly recalls an important aspect of American political history often overlooked in textbooks.

With the thought that we today can well benefit from studying the past, I am taking this opportunity to share Mr. Farley's article with my colleagues by inserting it at this point in the RECORD:

DEAR MR. CORCORAN: I am glad to give you my views. Yes, the so-called "Big Bosses" of the Big Cities have passed. As they pass into history, however, it seems to me that their vital, and from some standpoints, their magnificent part in American history is overlooked.

In my opinion, merely "dating back to the mass immigrations" would not explain their place in history. The old political bosses were American institutions; extra legal institutions, to be sure, but supplying a basic necessity of the growing American Republic.

The Big Bosses performed many of the functions for the new immigrant which are now performed by the huge H.E.W. government bureaus. It has been said by those who would diminish their importance that they were the "political brokers" of the newly arrived, and that they ensnared their votes in return. Actually, they did much more as

I will point out. But suppose they were political brokers? No one stopped the rich Republican financiers from doing the same thing. What is more, as their political "brokers," the Bosses got at least a show of humanity from the city governments, the first of its kind.

The Germans came first, starting around 1840 until 1848 when there was a German rush. They were better educated and more propertied than the later waves of immigrants, and they established themselves with distinction even before the Civil War. New York, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Milwaukee and Indianapolis were among their principal sites of settlement, and there was no place they went to which they didn't add their tremendous industry and great civic sense.

The Great Irish wave started with the Potato Famine of 1846. I don't want to go into this; the history of that Famine and the great plagues it brought are one of the blackest blots upon Christian history.

I hope, in your study, you will devote a few pages to an objective account of what the Irish suffered, not only at home, but in these United States, and for decades. Their labor was sometimes used when it was too dangerous to their health to send valuable slaves. This lasted for years. There was a saying that there was a dead Irishman lying under every tie of the Transcontinental Railroads. This, of course, is an exaggeration, but it is not an exaggeration to say that their pitiful wages gave them a standard of living which makes today's welfare standards look like a Roman feast.

Nor can I refrain from saying that in addition to winning their standing with their sweat and their tears, they more than earned their American citizenship with their blood. As Al Smith said, "Look at the Record." From the Revolution to the Fighting 69th, the Irish descended Americans are second to none. Nearly one half of the winners of the Congressional Medal of Honor are Irish-descended. 17 Kellys and 16 Murphys alone won the nation's highest decoration; check it.

What kept the Irish together was the Roman Catholic Church; it was their shield. What turned out to be their political sword was the Democratic Party. And what was their principal means was that they spoke the English language. They are a warm-hearted people and their suffering gave them great understanding.

So they met the boats of immigrants when they came in; you bet they did.

They met the people who couldn't speak the language and they met them as their friends. They found them jobs, they got them placed, they looked after them. These people had to earn their livings, hard livings. But they knew where to go when they were in trouble—the district club house. From morn to night, but especially after working hours, the district leaders were there, seven nights a week, listening to the poor people and their complaints.

The had little books where they listed every complaint. The next day, they would go to the various city departments themselves, to get the things straightened out: These factors were called "contracts." As a matter of course, the city officials would do the best they could to help the Bosses who had gotten them their appointments.

They had very little money for relief. In extreme cases, they would find a ton of coal for a freezing family, an undertaker who would bury as a favor, and doctors who forgot to send bills. They also created jobs—watchmen, for example—far and beyond what was needed. Today it's called relief. Then it was called municipal waste and corruption—but it served the same purpose—to save a poor family. See Lincoln Stephens on this—his autobiography really shows the

humanitarian picture behind the "corruption." This is the point I want to make to you, that the word "corrupt" is supposed to describe the Big Boss system underneath. Well, this is in part true, I suppose. But the Big Boss "corruption" was really humanitarian underneath as far as the poor working immigrant family was concerned. The Big Boss certainly made deals with the Public Utilities companies—but part of that deal was for more jobs for his working people.

The Irish were very good at looking out for poor people because as no other people they knew what unemployment, in all its horror, means. This is much more than hunger and other privations. It is a humiliation of spirit. What the Big Bosses organization offered, therefore, was understanding and affection—believe it or not—affection and sympathy for a family in trouble. There were no forms to fill out; they just helped. There was no nonsense about lack of character requiring affidavits of necessity. In short, the Big Bosses knew the people because they were of the people and this is what kept them going. What finished the Big Bosses is primarily that they did their job so well that the immigrant peoples didn't need them after the first generation. The blast furnace of the American Melting Pot is the public school. Today, just short of half of the American people are the children of these illiterate immigrants. And where are they—at the top of their professions.

Now the Welfare Departments do all of the things the Big Boss used to do, but its institutionalized. This is called public conscience now; but if we want to call them fairly, it was public conscience when the Big Boss performed the same acts, though it was called corruption then and now. But, at least, it indicates that the Big Boss was something of a Gunga Din—he got belted and flogged for doing what was as necessary then as it is now. But the new welfare institutions and general education which, incidentally, he helped establish, have put him on the shelf.

There's one thing more I want to say. The word of the Big Boss was good. It may only be because it was his stock in trade, so to speak. But whatever the reason, his word was good. Another thing: The Big Boss often "went to bat" in criminal cases, especially when there was a bad boy in a working family; but he never, never tinkered around suits between citizens and he never took money for helping a poor family in trouble.

There are a couple of more points I'd like to make. The Big Boss was on the keen lookout for talent. A poor boy, if he wanted to

work, was given a chance. That's where the Democratic Party came in. Al Smith, Senator Bob Wagner, President Harry S. Truman, President Lyndon B. Johnson, were all poor lads. So was I; and I've never stopped saying that if it was not for the Democratic Party, I would never have been its Chairman or a Cabinet officer, and these honors came to me for personal service.

I deplore the vast sums of money spent in campaigns today, because it is shutting poor boys out. The T.V. cameras will focus on a student riot, but I defy anyone to come up with any coverage of the Young Democrats or Young Republicans, giving them the same attention the old Bosses did. The high cost of campaigning is driving talent out of both parties, closing the old doors, and to the immense disadvantage of the Republic.

I strongly suggest to you that you compare the "subsidies" given in the name of public policy, the franchises given in the name of public necessity, and the tariffs exacted by the Republican Party at the time the Big City Bosses got the name of being corrupt for giving a portion of these sums to the poor. Mind you, I do not condone the corruption; but I do object to that term being applied to the Big Boss at the Bottom if it is to be condoned in the Republican Barn at the top.

One more thing: if it hadn't been for the Big Bosses, believe me, the basic legislation of F.D.R., which put the Liberals in the political business and put the Big Bosses out of it, couldn't have been passed without the Big Bosses themselves. I handled that legislation for the President and I know this as no man other than he knew better.

LOWER FARES FOR U.S. SERVICEMEN

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 7, 1970

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as many in this House know, I have, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, been a constant advocate over the years for lower fares for our air travel consumers.

In this regard, I am most pleased that one of our large progressive supplemental

carriers, World Airways, recently announced the filing of a new low tariff with the CAB that will allow U.S. servicemen to fly roundtrip from South Vietnam to California for \$350. The extension of low-cost fares for home visits to the United States for U.S. servicemen stationed in Vietnam is long overdue and an extremely worthwhile undertaking.

I want to take this occasion to congratulate World Airways on receiving this year's USO Gold Medal for safely transporting over 500,000 servicemen and women. I also commend the company's initiative in seeking the lower servicemen's fares and the press release announcing this new plan be included at the conclusion of my remarks:

LOWER FARES FOR U.S. SERVICEMEN

Edward J. Daly, Chairman of the Board and President of World Airways, Inc., announced his Company had filed a new charter tariff with the Civil Aeronautics Board which would enable military personnel to fly round trip from Vietnam to California for \$350.00. World, which operates a fleet of Boeing 707-320C Fan Jet Aircraft, is the largest charter carrier; it is based in Oakland, California and has operated scheduled air service in and to Southeast Asia for the military since 1956. Last year World flew almost 20 million miles for the Military Airlift Command and recently received the USO Gold Medal Award for having safely transported more than 500,000 servicemen and women.

World's plan will include (A) frequent flights from Vietnam to California (B) scheduled connections to all parts of the United States; and (C) financing arrangements so that all eligible military personnel will be able to take advantage of the new Vietnam policy. Mr. Daly announced that he is personally prepared to guarantee loans to servicemen who would otherwise be unable to pay for the trip or to borrow the necessary funds. These financial arrangements will be handled through the First Western Bank, Los Angeles, California, a subsidiary of World with assets in excess of one billion dollars.

This is clearly one of the most effective means of boosting morale of the serviceman, and General Creighton W. Abrams, Commander, U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam, and the Department of Defense, are to be congratulated for originating this program. Mr. Daly expresses the hope that a similar plan would be made available to military personnel serving in other overseas stations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, December 8, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
Rabbi Seymour E. Freedman, Concord Hotel Synagogue, Kiamasha Lake, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Almighty G-d: As this day begins, we lift our thoughts to praise Thee for granting us life. Implant within us now, the radiance of Thy spirit so that our deeds shall reflect the nobility of our aspirations. Help us to feel Thy divine presence, challenging us to become Thy messengers on earth bringing equity and compassion to all.

Unto the Members of this House of Representatives, who have assumed the burdens of leadership, grant inner strength, be their shield and refuge in times of difficult decision. May the knowledge that they labor to build a better America be their constant inspiration.

Grant Thy blessings, O G-d, upon this Nation. May these United States ever be an international force guiding all the world to prosperity amid peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2876. An act for the relief of the Beasley Engineering Co., Inc.;

H.R. 8573. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret M. McNellis;

H.R. 12958. An act for the relief of Central Gulf Steamship Corp.;

H.R. 15770. An act to provide for conserving surface waters; to preserve and improve habitat for migratory waterfowl and other wildlife resources; to reduce runoff, soil and wind erosion, and contribute to flood control; and for other purposes; and

H.R. 19830. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 19504. An act to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes.