

February 25, 1971

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

S. 1000

it ought to sue for peace. In fact, if the South Vietnamese reverse continue, Hanoi may well end up believing they are much closer to a military victory than they themselves had thought. In any case, nothing about this operation would seem to serve the cause of a negotiated settlement and final peace.

Mainly we should now be on a very different course. We should not be expanding the war, but trying to find ways to deescalate it. We should not be taking actions in Indochina which seem to assure our further and deeper entanglement. We should, instead, be deciding on a date on which to end our involvement. We should not be seeking a military solution in southern Laos; we should be seeking a political solution in Paris to end the war in Vietnam.

#### ADOPTION OF RULES BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, at its organizational meeting on February 18, 1971, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare readopted its existing rules governing the committee's procedures.

I send a copy of the committee's rules to the desk and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record as required by section 133B of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended.

The committee will meet again shortly to consider amendments to these rules and any amendments then adopted will also be submitted for publication in the Record.

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

#### RULES AND PROCEDURES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

**Rule 1.** Unless the Senate is meeting at the time, or it is otherwise ordered, and notice given, the Committee shall meet regularly at 10:30 a.m. on the second and fourth Thursday of each month. The Chairman may, upon proper notice, call such additional meetings as he may deem necessary.

**Rule 2.** The Chairman of the Committee (subcommittee), or if the Chairman is not present, the ranking Majority member present shall preside at all meetings.

**Rule 3.** All hearings conducted by the Committee (subcommittee) shall be open to the public except:

1. Executive sessions for the consideration of bills or resolutions, or

2. For voting, or

3. Where the Committee (subcommittee) by majority vote of those present orders an Executive session.

**Rule 4.** For the purpose of conducting an Executive session, a majority of the Committee (subcommittee) actually present shall constitute a quorum. No measure or recommendation shall be reported from the Committee (subcommittee) unless a quorum of the Committee (subcommittee) is actually present at the time such action is taken. Votes by proxy shall be permitted.

**Rule 5.** For the purpose of conducting public hearings (including the taking of sworn testimony) a quorum shall be determined as follows:

(a) For the full Committee—five members actually present.

(b) For seven-member subcommittee—three members actually present.

(c) For five-member subcommittee—two members actually present.

**Rule 6.** There shall be kept a complete record of all Committee (subcommittee) action. Such records shall contain the vote cast by each member of the Committee (subcommittee) on any question which a "yea and nay" vote is demanded.

The Clerk of the Committee, or his assistant, shall act as recording secretary of all proceedings before the Committee (subcommittee).

**Rule 7.** The Committee (subcommittee) shall so far as practicable, require all witnesses heard before it, to file written statements of their prepared testimony at least seventy-two hours before a hearing and to limit their oral presentation to brief summaries of their arguments. The presiding officer at any hearing is authorized to limit the time of each witness appearing before the Committee (subcommittee).

The Committee (subcommittee) shall, as far as practicable, utilize testimony previously taken on bills and measures similar to those before it for consideration.

**Rule 8.** Should a subcommittee fail to report back to the full Committee on any measure within a reasonable time, the Chairman may withdraw the measure from such subcommittee and report that fact to the full Committee for further disposition.

**Rule 9.** No subcommittee may schedule a meeting or hearing at a time designated for a hearing or meeting of the full Committee.

**Rule 10.** It shall be the duty of the Chairman to report or cause to be reported to the Senate, any measure or recommendation approved by the Committee and to take or cause to be taken, necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

**Rule 11.** No person other than members of the Committee (subcommittee) and members of the staff of the Committee, shall be permitted to attend the Executive sessions of the Committee (subcommittee), except by special dispensation of the Committee (subcommittee), or the Chairman thereof.

**Rule 12.** The Chairman of the Committee (subcommittee) shall be empowered to adjourn any meeting of the Committee (subcommittee) if a quorum is not present within fifteen minutes of the time scheduled for such meeting.

**Rule 13.** Whenever a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part thereof shall be before the Committee (subcommittee) for final consideration, the Clerk shall place before each member of the Committee (subcommittee) a print of the statute or the part or section thereof to be amended or repealed showing by stricken-through type, the part or parts to be omitted, and in italics, the matter proposed to be added.

**Rule 14. Investigation Procedures**

a. An investigating committee (subcommittee) may be authorized only by the action of a majority of the committee.

b. No investigating committee (subcommittee) is authorized to hold a hearing to hear subpoenaed witnesses or take sworn testimony unless a majority of the Members of the committee or subcommittee are present: Provided, however, that the committee may authorize the presence of a Majority and a Minority Member to constitute a quorum.

c. An investigating committee (subcommittee) may not delegate its authority to issue subpoenas except by a vote of the committee (subcommittee).

d. No hearing shall be initiated unless the investigating committee (subcommittee) has specifically authorized such hearing.

e. No hearing of an investigating committee (subcommittee) shall be scheduled outside of the District of Columbia except by the majority vote of the committee (subcommittee).

f. No confidential testimony taken or confidential material presented in an executive

hearing of an investigating committee (subcommittee) or any report of the proceedings of such an executive hearing shall be made public, either in whole or in part or by way of summary, unless authorized by a majority of the Members of the committee (subcommittee).

g. Any witness summoned to a public or executive hearing may be accompanied by counsel of his own choosing who shall be permitted while the witness is testifying to advise him of his legal rights.

**Rule 15.** Subject to statutory requirements imposed on the Committee with respect to procedure, the rules of the Committee may be changed, modified, amended or suspended at any time, provided, however, that not less than a majority of the entire membership so determine at a regular meeting with due notice, or at a meeting specifically called for that purpose.

#### PRESS REACTION TO SENATOR CASE'S RADIO FREE EUROPE INITIATIVE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, recently my close colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey (Gen. Case), took an important initiative in bringing before the Senate and the Nation certain issues concerning the funding and operation of Radio Free Europe. Senator Case's initiative has attracted considerable attention in the press. I am unanimous in my consent that a selection of press articles on this subject be printed in the Record.

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

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, July 29, 1971]

RADIO FREE EUROPE CASES SENATOR AS SENATOR, CIA, CASE SAYS; ASKS CONGRESS

(By Linda J. Keener)

WASHINGTON.—Sen. Clifford P. Case (R-N.J.), charging that millions of dollars in Central Intelligence Agency funds is used to operate Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, is urging Congress to control the funding of the two stations.

Case said he plans to introduce legislation tomorrow calling for the two propaganda stations to be operated "under the authorization and appropriation process of Congress."

"During the last 20 years," Case said in a statement yesterday, "several hundred million dollars in U.S. Government funds have been expended from secret CIA budgets to pay almost totally for the costs of these two radio stations broadcasting to Eastern Europe.

"In the last fiscal year alone, over \$60 million was provided by the CIA as a direct government subsidy, yet at no time was Congress asked or permitted to carry out its traditional constitutional role of approving the expenditure."

MOST COSTS LINKED TO CIA

Case said that although Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty both claim to be non-governmental organizations sponsored by private contributions, high sources indicate that direct CIA subsidies pay nearly all their costs.

According to Internal Revenue Service returns, he said, the combined operating cost of the two stations for fiscal 1969 was almost \$34 million—21.1 million for Radio Free Europe and \$12.8 million for Radio Liberty.

Although Radio Free Europe conducts a fund-raising campaign each year, Case said, he has been informed that only about \$12 to \$20 million in free advertising space is donated, less than \$100,000 is contributed by

S 2034

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 25, 1971

the public and gifts from corporations and foundations are small.

The rest, or more than \$30 million each year, Case said, comes from the CIA.

Asked about Case's charges, a CIA spokesman said:

"The Central Intelligence Agency never responds to statements."

Other Washington sources report that despite assistance by the two stations that they are private organizations U.S. officials assigned to the American consulate general in Munich, Germany, maintain extremely close contact with them.

At least one of these officials, according to the sources, maintains a full-time liaison role to the two stations with a mission of assuring that their program content does not differ from U.S. policy.

To keep the stations informed, the sources said, the liaison man passes on a steady stream of classified and unclassified U.S. Government documents reporting on events in Eastern Europe.

In addition, the sources said, U.S. Government security officers regularly inspect the headquarters of the two stations to make sure the facilities for keeping the classified material are secure.

The sources added that the Government's official connection with the stations is further highlighted by a State Department program which regularly brings American embassy officials throughout Eastern Europe to Munich for extensive briefing sessions.

Case's allegations bring to mind the 1967 disclosure that the CIA was funding the National Student Association.

At that time, a presidential commission, headed by John Gardner, then secretary of Health, Education and Welfare; CIA Director Richard Helms, and Nicholas Katzenbach, then under secretary of state, recommended that "no federal agency shall provide direct financial assistance or support, direct or indirect, to any of the nation's educational or voluntary organizations."

#### SECURITY INSPECTION

President Lyndon B. Johnson ordered the security inspection implemented by all federal agencies.

Case said the bill he will introduce tomorrow would amend the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to authorize funds to the two radio stations in Europe.

The bill, he said, provides that no other federal funds could be made available to either Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty, except under the provisions of this Act.

From the Newark Sunday News,  
Jan. 24, 1971

#### Case Plans CIA to Bank Europe (By John P. Fenner)

WASHINGTON.—Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are supported almost entirely by Central Intelligence Agency funds and the bill brought under direct congressional control, Sen. Clifford P. Case, R-N.J., said today.

Case will introduce legislation this week, Case said, to let both broadcast agencies under the current annual appropriation process.

Over the last 23 years, he said, several hundred million dollars have been spent from secret CIA funds to pay almost the total cost of the stations, which broadcast to Western Europe.

The last fiscal year alone, over \$30 million was expended by CIA as a direct government subsidy, yet at no time was Congress asked permission to carry out its traditional constitutional role of approving the expenditure, Case charged.

The sources on reputed CIA spending for the stations—which claim to be non-governmental agencies supported by private contributions—have been published before, but never officially acknowledged, Case said his

own inquiry satisfies him that the charges are true.

Between \$12 million and \$20 million in free advertising space is donated annually to raise private contributions for the stations, Case said, but the return from the public is "apparently less than \$100,000."

Case's proposal would amend the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act to authorize funds for both stations in the coming fiscal year and provide that no other federal money could be diverted to either station.

A spokesman for Case said the New Jersey Republican hopes the legislation, if successful, will begin to lift the curtain on various federal secret spending, much of which, he feels, is no longer warranted.

Emergency funding of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty from secret accounts might be understandable in an emergency or for a year or two, Case said. But the justification has lessened as international tensions have eased, he said.

[From the Trenton Sunday Times,  
Jan. 24, 1971]

#### CASE WOULD HALT CIA RADIO FUNDING.

WASHINGTON.—If you thought that Radio Free Europe depended on private contributions solicited through its extensive television ad campaigns, you may be surprised to know that it is funded largely by the federal government's Central Intelligence Agency (CIA).

So said Sen. Clifford P. Case (R-N.J.), in announcing plans to introduce Monday legislation that would for the first time put federal funding of RFE and Radio Liberty under the control of Congress.

The New Jersey senator said that the two radio stations, which claim to be non-governmental organizations sponsored by private contributions, receive about \$30 million per year from secret CIA budgets over which Congress has no control.

#### FREE SPACE DONATED

CIA funding allegedly accounts for nearly all of the \$34 million operating costs of the two stations, with the remainder coming from corporate contributions and citizen donations.

Under the auspices of the Advertising Council, Case said, about \$12-20 million in free ad space is donated to RFE and RL by television and radio stations, newspapers and magazines, and billboard companies.

The reported \$100,000 in citizen donations that result from this campaign, however, are a negligible portion of the RFE and RL budgets, Case said.

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty were begun in 1950 and 1951, respectively. RFE broadcasts to Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria and Rumania, while RL broadcasts to the Soviet Union.

RFE and RL programming and editorial policies often parallel those of the Voice of America, the U.S. federally funded official international radio station.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star,  
Jan. 24, 1971]

#### CASE TO LIFT COVER ON CIA RADIO AID (By George Sherman)

Sen. Clifford P. Case, R-N.J., will present legislation tomorrow to end what he claims are secret multimillion dollar subsidies given by the Central Intelligence Agency to private American radio stations broadcasting to Communist Europe.

According to a statement issued yesterday, Case charges that last fiscal year alone the CIA gave "over \$30 million" to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty "as direct government subsidy." Both supposedly are non-governmental anti-Communist stations. Both are based in Munich, Germany.

"During the last 20 years several hundred

million dollars in United States Government funds have been expended from secret CIA budgets to pay almost totally for the costs of these two radio stations broadcasting to Eastern Europe," Case charged.

#### SUBSTITUTE FUNDING SOUGHT

Case, a member of both the Senate Foreign Relations and Appropriations committees, said he will present legislation to bring the two stations under the authorization and appropriation process of Congress. He will call tentatively for a \$30 million authorization, he said, under the amended U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948.

Rep. Ogden R. Reid, R-N.Y., will introduce similar legislation in the House, Case said.

In developing his case, Case said that income tax returns showed that the combined operating costs of the two stations in fiscal 1969 were nearly \$34 million (\$21,109,935 for Radio Free Europe and \$12,887,401 for Radio Liberty).

Of that amount, he charged, \$30 million came from the CIA. Less than \$100,000 came from the public, through a free advertising campaign by the Advertising Council of the media in this country, and a "small part" more came from private corporations and foundations, Case said.

#### EASING OF TENSION NOTED

Case charged that any possible justification for this "covert funding" has lessened over the years with the easing of international tensions.

The New Jersey Republican said he would ask that administration officials be called to testify before Congress on the needs of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

He noted that in 1967, after disclosures that the CIA was providing funds for the National Student Association, President Johnson accepted a recommendation that "no federal agency shall provide covert financial assistance or support, direct or indirect, to any of the nation's educational or voluntary organizations."

That recommendation, which added that "no programs currently would justify any exception to this policy," was made by John Gardner, then secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Richard Helms, director of CIA, and Nicholas Katzenbach, then under secretary of State.

"The extraordinary circumstances that might have been thought to justify circumvention of constitutional processes" in an "emergency situation" years ago, said Case, "no longer exist."

#### EVIDENCE CITED

Sources close to Case say evidence exists to prove that the two stations are really adjuncts of the U.S. government. They say that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty receive classified documents from the American consulate general in Munich for use in their broadcasts.

Furthermore, the sources say, Radio Free Europe sends messages to Washington—presumably to the CIA—using the secret coding system of the consulate general.

Observers here said Case merely is bringing out into the open a situation known in official circles for years.

[From the Baltimore News-American,  
Jan. 24, 1971]

#### SENATOR CASE ASKS OVERSEAS RADIO CIA FUND CUTOFF

(By John P. Wallach)

WASHINGTON.—Sen. Clifford P. Case, R-N.J., announced Saturday he would introduce legislation Monday to stop the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) from continuing to bankroll Radio Free Europe (RFE) and Radio Liberty (RL).

Case charged that the outlay from "secret" CIA funds has already cost the U.S. taxpayer "several hundred million dollars." The Re-

February 20, 1971

Republican senator called on the two organizations to quit the pretense of acting as private organizations claiming to rely solely on voluntary contributions.

As a replacement for covert government funding, Case proposed that Congress appropriate the \$50 million that is now needed to meet the station's average annual budget. Both RFE and RL beam, in several languages, news to the nations of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

Both organizations are heavily staffed by refugees from behind the Iron Curtain, but are distinct from the Voice of America, which is an official arm of the U.S. government and receives all its funding from Congress.

Case's allegation that the CIA continues to finance the two stations amounts to a direct attack against CIA Director Richard Helms, who was one of three members of a presidential investigatory body formed after the disclosure in 1967 of CIA funding of the National Student Association.

The commission, which also included John Gardner, the secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) and Nicholas Katzenbach, then secretary of state, recommended "no federal assistance or support, direct or indirect, to any of the nation's educational or voluntary organizations."

On March 29, 1967, President Johnson accepted the commission's recommendations and ordered that they be implemented by all federal agencies.

Case announced that he would call leading administration officials to testify on his bill, charging that "during the last twenty years, several hundred million dollars in United States government funds have been expended from secret CIA budgets to pay almost totally for the cost of these two radio stations.

"In the last fiscal year alone, over \$30 million was provided by CIA as a direct government subsidy; yet at no time was Congress asked or permitted to carry out its traditional constitutional role of approving the expenditure," Case said.

Congressional sources disclosed additional evidence of the links between the stations and the U.S. government—ties that Case believes violate at least the spirit of the organization's charters which enable them to maintain tax privileges and other benefits as private, non-governmental operations.

The evidence cited was:

At least one foreign service officer assigned to the American consulate general in Munich is permanently assigned to helping RFE and RL staffers in Munich prepare broadcasts. The U.S. official's chief task is to assure that the program content does not differ from U.S. foreign policy.

In order to keep RFE and RL personnel informed on current U.S. policy, the broadcasters are given access to classified and unclassified U.S. government, including CIA, documents reporting on events in Eastern Europe.

U.S. government security personnel regularly inspect RFE and RL's headquarters in Munich to make sure facilities for keeping classified material are secure.

The State Department runs a special program which regularly brings American embassy officials from Eastern Europe to Munich to brief RFE and RL staffers. The station's executives also have the use of U.S. diplomatic pouches to communicate with their offices in Washington and New York.

The Voice of America maintains separate studios in Munich but its staffers freely exchange research, background information and other documents with RFE and RL personnel.

Case also charged that Radio Free Europe benefits from millions of dollars of free advertising under the auspices of the Advertising Council, but realizes only a fraction of this is private contributions.

"I have been advised that between \$12 million and \$20 million in free media space is donated annually to this campaign while the return from the public is apparently less than \$100,000," Case said.

"Additionally," the New Jersey senator said, "both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty attempt to raise money from corporations and foundations, but contributions from these sources reportedly pay only a small part of their total budgets."

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Jan. 24, 1971]

#### RADIO FREE EUROPE "FINANCED BY CIA"

WASHINGTON.—Sen. Clifford P. Case said yesterday secret Central Intelligence Agency subsidies have financed most operating costs of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty which beam broadcasts to Eastern Europe.

He called for an end to covert government financing and said he will introduce legislation tomorrow to bring the two stations under the congressional authorization and appropriation process.

Case, a member of both the Senate Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees, said tax returns of the two stations show combined operating costs of nearly \$54 million for fiscal 1969.

#### DIRECT SUBSIDIES

Although both claim to be nongovernmental organizations sponsored by private contributions, Case (R-N.J.) said, "the bulk of Radio Free Europe's and Radio Liberty's budgets, or more than \$30 million annually, comes from direct CIA subsidies."

His legislation calls for an initial authorization of \$30 million for the two stations, but Case said the figure could be revised as further information becomes available.

He noted that, after disclosure in 1967 of CIA funding of the National Student Association, former President Johnson directed that no covert financial assistance should be provided by federal agencies to education or voluntary organizations.

#### EVIDENCE OF LINKS

Congressional source disclosed additional evidence of the links between the stations and the U.S. government—ties that Case believes violate at least the spirit of the organization's charters which enable them to maintain tax privileges and other benefits as private, nongovernmental operations.

The evidence cited was that:

At least one Foreign Service Officer assigned to the American Consulate General in Munich is permanently assigned to helping RFE and RL staffers in Munich prepare broadcasts. His chief task is to assure that the program content does not differ from U.S. foreign policy.

In order to keep RFE and RL personnel informed on current U.S. policy, the broadcasters are given access to classified and unclassified U.S. government (including CIA) documents reporting on events in East Europe. In addition, U.S. government security personnel regularly inspect RFE and RL's headquarters in Munich to make sure facilities for keeping classified material are secure.

The State Department runs a special program which regularly brings American Embassy officials from Eastern Europe to Munich to brief RFE and RL staffers. The station's executives also have the use of U.S. diplomatic pouches to communicate with their offices in Washington and New York.

The Voice of America maintains separate studios in Munich, but its staffers freely exchange research, background information and other documents with RFE and RL personnel.

#### CIA FUNDS

Case said from \$12 million to \$20 million in free media space is donated annually to the campaign to raise funds for the two sta-

tions, but that "the return from the public is apparently less than \$100,000" while contributions from corporations and foundations likewise account for only a small portion of their budgets.

The 1969 tax returns for the two stations show that Radio Free Europe received \$22 million in contributions, gifts and grants, while Radio Liberty received \$10 million, Case said.

Breakdowns of the sources are not required, but aides said Case had learned virtually all of the contributions were in fact from CIA funds.

#### THE NEEDS OF THE PEOPLE

Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. President, as the new chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I want to set forth for Senators and for the people my views regarding the role which the committee should undertake to fulfill during the coming years.

One hundred and two years ago, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was established. Through the years, it has been known by different names, but regardless of its name, it is the committee's mandate which will always be of first and foremost importance.

I am proud to say that our task today is the American people, their needs, their hopes, and their aspirations. The committee size changed and jurisdiction over the legislative areas of education, labor, public health, and, frankly, "the public welfare generally" has become a heavy but welcome responsibility, and I know that no committee member regards it lightly. I am honored to be their chairman.

It is my intention as chairman to assure that this committee shall respond in the fullest possible measure to the needs, hopes, and aspirations of the American people in the 1970's.

To do this, the committee must play a vital and major role in evaluating our national needs and our strategies for meeting those needs. It is uniquely constituted to perform that role. It can do so through the enactment of forward-looking legislation. It can also fulfill that function through a major legislative review effort to guarantee that the promise of programs already enacted by Congress is realized by effective performance from those charged with their execution.

The constituency of this committee is as broad as the Nation itself. It includes America's 80 million working men and women as well as its 20 million senior citizens. It comprises every American in need of health care and every American who wants a decent education for his child. It includes America's 25 million poverty stricken and its 5.4 million unemployed. Included, too, are the millions of Americans who have suffered disadvantages as members of minority groups.

#### AMERICA'S YOUTH

Although the subcommittees of our committee have been organized so as to represent and act upon the needs and concerns of the various elements of our constituency, we have learned during the past 2 or 3 years that one major portion of our society has not been adequately represented in the councils of government: Our country's youth. I

Radio file

Both papers commend the holding of these hearings, and I've earlier expressed my gratitude for your allowing me here. But that same editorial and I respectfully raise this further question. I quote again,

"The House Ways and Means Committee, while 'thoroughly convinced' that something must be done to give financial aid to the cities, still insists that 'there has to be an alternative' to revenue sharing. Why, pray tell, does there have to be an alternative? Why not revenue-sharing?"

To finish on the same theme with which I began, I've asked you to look at this matter not as members of Congress only, but as citizens, businessmen, families.

I urge you to avoid polarizing your position, and rejecting this concept today because you've rejected it yesterday, last month or last year. I urge you to meet your responsibility in the present time, by giving this plan to the nation for its future.

True, it is not a panacea, not perfect. Solving imperfections that may develop, however, will be the happy problem of coming ranks of lawmakers; more importantly of future ranks of the peoples of this nation. But, they can't improve, what they don't have.

As a businessman, representing free private enterprise, I strongly feel our future domestic economy depends in great measure, on the action of this committee and this Congress.

Therefore, I urge you, to bring this legislation to the Congress for a vote—It's your responsibility.

#### KUZNETSOV HAILS RADIO LIBERTY

#### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1971

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, at the present time there are some in this country who are questioning the important work being done in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union by Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

For millions of men and women these voices from the West provide the only alternative to the distorted government-controlled news issued by official Communist state radio stations.

The Communists themselves admit that the influence of these Western stations has caused them to provide more factual information to their citizens. The Soviet newspaper, *Komsomolskaya Pravda* for May 29, 1971, said this of the conclusions which Soviet propagandists should draw from the work of Radio Liberty:

The reports which we publish must deal more frankly with the unfavourable features and developments in our society. It is always better for us to analyse them ourselves than to wait for commentaries by various "voices" [i.e. foreign radio stations] which reach our public in one way or the other . . . Our reports on events in the West should be less superficial. Talk of the "bared teeth of savage imperialism" fail to impress many people in these days.

The Soviet writer, Anatoli Kuznetsov, fled from Russia to England in order to achieve the freedom of expression which was denied to him in his native land.

In a letter to the London Daily Telegraph for June 7, 1971, he criticizes those in America who would alter or eliminate the important services rendered by Radio

Free Europe and Radio Liberty. He notes that—

If it were not for the broadcasts by Radio Liberty, Soviet propaganda would continue unhindered in its work of deceiving the population with rosy pictures of life in the Soviet police-state and denunciations of "imperialism" in the West.

Of American critics, he points out that—

American Senators permit themselves to make very far-reaching declarations without having very much information at their disposal.

Mr. Kuznetsov's letter is one which I share with my colleagues, and I include it in the RECORD at this point:

#### RUSSIA AND RADIO LIBERTY

SIR: I understand that the work of the two American-supported radio stations, Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, which are based in Munich and broadcast to the countries of the Communist world is shortly to come under discussion in the United States and that certain changes are proposed in their status.

The first person to raise the question of the sources from which these stations are financed was Senator Clifford Case, but now Senator William Fulbright has raised his voice against their very existence.

The statements made by these two Senators were greeted with delight by the official Soviet propaganda machine, which could scarcely have dreamt of receiving support from such high quarters. A logical consequence of this was a "trial balloon" in the form of an official protest by the Polish Government to the West Germans about the continued presence of Radio Free Europe on German territory.

I could say a great deal about how essential a part of life and how great a source of hope for Soviet citizens is Radio Liberty, whose broadcasts I listened to regularly until I left the Soviet Union in the middle of 1969.

But my views on this subject may very well be considered biased. Let me therefore quote from a Soviet newspaper, *Komsomolskaya Pravda* for May 29, 1971. Discussing the conclusions which Soviet propagandists should draw, from the work of Radio Liberty, the paper said:

The reports which we publish must deal more frankly with the unfavourable features and developments in our society. It is always better for us to analyse them ourselves than to wait for commentaries by various "voices" [i.e. foreign radio stations] which reach our public in one way or the other, directly or by roundabout means. Our reports on events in the West should be less superficial. Talk of the "bared teeth of savage imperialism" fail to impress many people in these days. We must go more deeply into things for our young people.

This unexpected comment by a Soviet newspaper contains everything—an admission that Radio Liberty provides true factual information, confirmation that it reaches a wide circle of listeners and, moreover, the statement that the Soviet Press compares very unfavourably with Radio Liberty.

The above quotation makes it quite clear that Soviet propaganda does not provide information of an "unfavourable" nature and that it limits its account of life in the West to talk of the "bared teeth of imperialism."

On top of all that we cannot avoid the conclusion from what the Soviet newspaper says that, if it were not for the broadcasts by Radio Liberty (the station most violently attacked in the article), Soviet propaganda would continue unhindered in its work of deceiving the population with rosy pictures of life in the Soviet police-state and denunciations of "imperialism" in the West.

Were it not for Radio Liberty it would never have occurred to them to revise, however little, their Stalinist ideas.

It is at first sight a strange situation: American Senators cast doubt on the value of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, while the Soviet Press has no doubt at all about their effectiveness.

But it is really not so strange, because the Soviet propagandists know precisely what those radio stations transmit and how their broadcasts are received, while American Senators permit themselves to make very far-reaching declarations without having very much information at their disposal about the subject under discussion.

A. ANATOLI (KUZNETSOV).

#### BIG BUS BILL

#### HON. FRED SCHWENGL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGL. Mr. Speaker, the tactics used by the bus and truck lobbies to secure passage of legislation allowing wider and heavier vehicles is well known to many of us. However, the story written by Mr. George Anthan in the Des Moines Register for May 30 is one of the best articles that has been written documenting these tactics.

The amazing fact brought out by the article is the brazen admission by officials of the American Trucking Association—ATA—that they do in fact, utilize "whipsaw tactics" to play one State against another. It seems to me that this admission is all the more reason why we need to be especially firm on the size and weight legislation here at the Federal level.

Questions were raised by the truckers in the past as to whether opponents of the Federal size and weight legislation lacked faith in the judgment of the various State legislatures. In view of the ATA tactics and strategy revealed in the Register article, it seems to me that some skepticism in this regard is certainly justified. The article follows:

TRUCK LOBBY FOCUSES ON IOWA'S LAW—ASKS APPROVAL OF 65-FOOT UNITS  
(By George Anthan)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Truckers are making a major effort this year to clear a coast-to-coast route through the upper Midwest for 65-foot-long twin trailer-truck combinations (double-bottoms), officials of the American Trucking Association (ATA) have confirmed.

Iowa, astride one of the country's most important east-west Interstate highways, is a focal point of this effort. Trucking officials said most states east and west of Iowa allow the longer double-bottom trucks.

Also, state trucking organizations, backed by the ATA, are seeking approval for 65-foot double-bottom trucks in Wisconsin and Minnesota, and in several southern states.

Officials of the trucking industry said the longer twin-trailer trucks are vital to the economy of the industry. They say rising costs due to inflation have made more efficient trucks necessary, and that the 65-foot double-bottom vehicles not only contain much more space for freight, but are more economical in that a trailer can be loaded for a certain destination and dropped off there. The tractor and the other trailer then can continue on to another destination.

the communists refused to accept or abide by the ceasefire, we would, of course, reserve the right to defend ourselves against attack. But at the same time, the President would announce that the U.S. would repeat the ceasefire initiative in two weeks time. If that, too, failed, it would be repeated a third and fourth time—until the communists were convinced the U.S. was serious about ending the war.

The combination of a U.S. initiative and the declared intention to repeat that initiative would, I believe, make the difference between ceasefire proposals which have been mere gestures and the real thing.

If one accepts the premise, as I do—because I believe it inescapable after all these years—that there is no ideal or certain solution to the war, that whatever we do may not be adequate or lasting or completely satisfactory, then the wisdom of trying for a ceasefire becomes compelling, for these, among other, reasons:

- (1) we would know whether it would work, or could work, in a relatively short time—a matter of weeks;
- (2) if it did work, we would have an improved chance to win objectives in Southeast Asia we all want;
- (3) if it didn't work, all our other options would still be open and, more importantly, we would be considerably more unified as a result of the experience of making an open, demonstrably genuine, and wholehearted effort to end the war.

**NOTHING TO LOSE, MUCH TO GAIN**

In other words, we have little or nothing to lose and potentially a great deal to gain by trying this ceasefire idea or something like it.

**WILLIAM D. HASSETT TESTIFIES ON REVENUE SHARING**

**HON. JACK F. KEMP**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, public hearings on President Nixon's general revenue-sharing proposal will be concluded next week. Then the matter will be considered by the Ways and Means Committee in executive session.

From all indications this committee will reject the proposal. But such action would not necessarily mean the proposal's demise for the Senate appears to be unswayed by the unsympathetic Ways and Means Committee.

Moreover, the testimony by private citizens before Ways and Means has had its impact on the other body. Bill Hassett, an Amherst, N.Y. real estate company president is one of those whose voice will be heard throughout the Congress.

Bill is a member of the New York State Committee for Revenue Sharing and a director of the Buffalo area Chamber of Commerce and did a brilliant job in support of general revenue sharing before the Ways and Means Committee this morning.

I am proud to call attention to his testimony and include his comments at this point in the Record:

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM D. HASSETT, JR., FOR NATIONAL CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR REVENUE SHARING IN WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 17, 1971.

May I express my thanks to Chairman Mills and this Committee, for the opportunity of talking with you today.

First, I should like to tell you who I am, describe the area where I come from and what viewpoint I represent, so that you may evaluate my remarks about Revenue Sharing with more meaning.

I own and operate a Real Estate and Building Business in Buffalo, New York. We employ approximately 200 people. In addition to my basic business activities, I attempt to serve our area by Board of Director or Trustee Membership in the Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce, the Marine Midland Bank—Western, the area's largest; Canisius College, the area's largest independent institution of higher education; the United Fund, and many other charitable or civic institutions. I try to be both a businessman, and a responsible citizen.

Our area, Buffalo and Erie County, lies at the Western end of New York State. Unfortunately, many people identify New York State only with New York City, 450 miles to the East. Few realize that Buffalo and Erie County has a population of over 1,100,000 persons, and is larger than 15 of the States in this nation. It is a major metropolitan area.

As to viewpoint, my thoughts are borne out of the practical experience of any hard working businessman. I started my company, have achieved some success, and grapple with the problems of furthering it—trying to make it grow.

I tend to look ahead, and view problems as an inevitable part of life. It's the solving of problems, that creates opportunities—and will set a future way of life for my children, your children and all of our grandchildren.

Now I have spent this rather lengthy time in orientation, to try to establish a common perspective; so that I might ask you of the committee to share a viewpoint with me—to freshly, and simply, view today's discussion of problems and proposed solutions, from a young but seasoned—an optimistic but practical point of view.

I am neither a theoretician nor an economist. But as a businessman who works daily with industry, retailers, office users, housing developments and governments, I am keenly aware of the difficulties all of these areas of endeavor encounter in doing business, and providing needed services in our metropolitan area. As a businessman, I am convinced, that the revenue sharing proposals which you are considering would be of great benefit to my community and others, larger and smaller, throughout the country. Let me attempt to illustrate this in specific terms by using Buffalo/Erie County as an example of the problem, and then showing the effect of Revenue Sharing.

The City of Buffalo has come to a point where it cannot raise more general revenue from its existing taxable base. It has run full up against its constitutional limit. New York State, which last year returned to our area \$204,000,000 of the tax dollars it collected in the Buffalo Metro area, cannot supply more State Aid. We cannot look to the State for the kind of increases in State Aid we need. The State itself, has needs that must go unmet due to fiscal pressures.

The city's present budget will not allow it to maintain present municipal services without more revenue. Layoffs and cutbacks are being explored and planned. In many essential phases of city services, including Police, Fire, Educational, Sanitation and other areas. Only this year's sale of its reversionary rights to the Greater Buffalo Airport, coupled with a sales tax increase, that pushed this tax in the city to a total of \$.07 on the dollar, has permitted the city to maintain these services to-date.

And just maintaining them at present levels, has not been enough to stem the outflow of people from the city, and industry from the city and the area, with resulting unemployment. Major plant closings in our area totalled 22 in the four years 1966 to 1969, but another 21 in the last 16 months. This alarming rate has more than doubled. Unemploy-

ment has soared from 3.5% in early 1968 to over 6.5% through the first five months of 1971.

Industry will not remain or expand in an area where not only the quality, but worse, even the continuance of essential services is in question. Industry will not remain or expand in an area when paying the limit of taxation, still does not insure the providing of services. People do not wish to remain, or build for their family's future, in an area of declining services and opportunities, coupled with increasing costs.

And what of the towns and villages in the rest of the county? They mirror the city. For example, property taxes in Amherst, an immediate suburb, have gone up over 40% in the last three years.

The health and progress of the suburbs is directly related to the city which they surround. Buffalo's problems are interwoven with the county as a whole. And the county, city, the towns and the villages, the state, all need more general revenue, which they cannot adequately derive from presently fully taxed sources.

I have used my home to illustrate. Unfortunately, this set of circumstances is not unique to Erie County and Buffalo. It is a national problem, requiring national response, program and action.

I've set out the Buffalo area's problem.

What would the administration's plan do for the Buffalo/Erie area? Under the proposed \$5 Billion Dollar funding available nationally for the first full year, the City of Buffalo would receive back \$4.8 Million of tax dollars collected in Buffalo by the Federal Government. The rest of Erie County would receive an additional \$7.5 Million.

For the city, this could be converted into salaries for 85 policemen, plus 50 firemen and two new fire stations, plus 170 teachers, plus operational funds for 40 needed playgrounds, plus new day care facilities and services for 700 children of lower income families whose parents need and want to work—and with these benefits established, we still would not have used more than one-half of Buffalo's allotment of general Revenue Sharing funds. The balance could be used for other needed programs that cannot now be funded. We would gain these programs and people with our equitable share of funds collected in our area, but now distributed elsewhere, despite our crying need for more help at home. Similar examples can be shown for the county, towns, villages and state. I've confined this illustration only to the city.

This would be the effect in our community and so many others in this nation. Communities that today cannot maintain let alone improve services; communities that are losing their taxpayers—and whose only present alternative is to tax still further, in an attempt to retain them—that's an unworkable alternative!

To use the popular governmental phrase—that's counterproductive!

But general Revenue Sharing is a workable solution—an equitable one—and a simple one. Others more technically knowledgeable than I have testified to this fact before your committee, in two Presidential Study Commissions, and many other forums showing strong bipartisan support. I have not dealt in the mechanics; therefore, but in the effective desirability from a businessman's point of view.

We have two major newspapers in our area, each independently and locally owned. I think that's something of a rarity these days. It's a further rare instance, when they solidly agree on a major issue.

Well, they both strongly endorse the passage of a Revenue Sharing Program.

The Courier Express in its lead editorial on June 11th said, "We can only hope that—members of the Mills Committee will strive mightily to report this bill out".

The Buffalo Evening News in its lead editorial on June 3rd also strongly endorsed the concept of Revenue Sharing.

Martin	Fryor, Ark.	Stanton.
Mathias, Calif.	Quillen	J. William
Mathis, Ga.	Rangel	Steele
Mazzoli	Rees	Steiger, Wis.
Meeds	Reid, Ill.	Stratton
Metcalfe	Reuss	Stubblefield
Mikva	Rhodes	Stuckey
Mink	Roe	Sullivan
Minshall	Rousselot	Teague, Tex.
Mitchell	Roy	Ullman
Morse	Roybal	Wampler
Murphy, Ill.	Runnels	Ware
Murphy, N.Y.	Ruppe	Watts
Myers	Sandman	Whalley
Nix	Scherle	Wiggins
Passman	Shriver	Winn
Patman	Skubitz	Wolf
Pepper	Slack	Wright
Pickle	Smith, Iowa	Wylder
Pirnie	Snyder	Wyman
Podell	Spence	Yatron
Price, Tex.		Young, Fla.

Mr. Cabell with Mr. Myers.  
 Mr. Mazzoli with Mr. Wampler.  
 Mr. Meeds with Mr. McClure.  
 Mr. Donohue with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. Dulski with Mr. Halpern.  
 Mr. Fascell with Mr. Wyman.

Messrs. ANDREWS of Alabama, JACOBS, BIESTER, McCOLLISTER, KEATING, and ARENDS changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**"DON'T HOLD YOUR BREATH"**

(Mr. ROUSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROUSH, Mr. Speaker, last week the President and the Secretary of the Interior journeyed to the New York harbor area, there to proclaim the intention of establishing a Gateway National Recreation Area. I am delighted at the addition of such a proposed parkland, for I have long advocated additional recreational areas throughout the Nation, especially in highly populated areas.

In remarks for the press the President noted at that same time that this was "one of the most significant steps that the Federal Government has taken, in cooperation with the State governments, on recreation perhaps in this century." For, he said, this step "moves in the direction that all people who have evaluated our parks and recreation areas believe we should move; and that is, to move to bring parks to the people."

Thus the President once again reaffirmed his promise of a legacy of parks. In his earlier Environment Message to Congress in February he noted "merely acquiring land for open space and recreation is not enough" and had urged that "We must bring parks to where the people are so that everyone has access to nearby recreational areas."

All of this sounds good and I thoroughly agree. However, I must admit to some incredulity. Just this spring I conducted lengthy correspondence with the National Park Service over the fact that the budget for 1972 does not provide 1 penny for the development of another park that is now 5 years old, that has been described by the Interior Department as "ideally suited to fulfillment of the recreational and open space needs of the people of this region," and that would serve another 10 million people.

I refer, of course, to the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore which I was proud to author some 5 years ago. The House Interior Committee at that time described and recommended this great national lakeshore thus:

Located at the Southern end of Lake Michigan—less than 50 miles from the Chicago-Gary Industrial complex—the proposed Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore fits the national need like a glove. . . . Nowhere in the Great Lakes is there a greater need for shoreline recreation areas.

That seems to me a resounding endorsement. Yet, like an empty house that

great potential park area awaits recreational facilities, parking lots, roads, trails to become fully useful.

So while I rejoice in the creation of new parks and fully recognize the need for recreation areas in the East, I must ask the question as to where this money will come from? The National Park Service has an 11-point development program criteria for programing projects and planning funds. Where will this project fit? And if we can afford another recreation area, why not develop some of the many parks that are awaiting funds? Do not the people of Indiana, Michigan, and Illinois who would use the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore deserve equal treatment?

Or perhaps this project will suffer the same fate as the Indiana Dunes? The Congress proposes but the administration disposes and refuses funds for projects that do not suit political needs.

Last week I discussed the President's massive cancer research program. Obviously my purpose was not to object to cancer research, but to point out once again, as here in the case of parks, the sharp contrast between what the administration does with what it says. The President proposes a vast attack on cancer while he is holding in reserve \$34.5 million in funds for the Regional Medical programs, aimed at attacking not only cancer but the other killer diseases of heart attack and kidney disease.

I fear the park situation may be a repeat situation. I hope the people of New Jersey and New York do not plan on visiting that recreation area anytime in the near future.

**WHY JUST CIA RADIO FUNDS?**

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FASCELL, Mr. Speaker, I rise to applaud the Nixon administration for coming to the Congress this morning to seek congressional approval of legislation which would vest the operation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty in a nonprofit corporation chartered by the Federal Government.

At the same time, however, I would like to suggest that the day for piecemeal adjustment is over—and that much more fundamental surgery is required if the Congress is to play its proper role in assuring that the U.S. Government does not speak with a forked tongue to the world beyond our borders.

I have great respect for the work which Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have performed over the years in carrying the message of truth and freedom to millions of people in Eastern Europe and Asia. To many of those peoples, those two radio stations were the only source of factual information about developments in their own countries and in the world at large.

I am not adverse, therefore, to this kind of dialog. As a matter of fact, in this age of public diplomacy, I believe that it is imperative for the United States to maintain and enlarge commu-

So the resolution was agreed to.  
 The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Helstoski with Mr. McCloskey.  
 Mr. Stratton with Mr. Latta.  
 Mr. Wright with Mr. McKinney.  
 Mr. Clark with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.  
 Mr. Corman with Mr. Ruppe.  
 Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Bingham.  
 Mr. Mikva with Mr. Conyers.  
 Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Mitchell.  
 Mr. Rees with Mr. Rangel.  
 Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Nix.  
 Mr. Harrington with Mr. Diggs.  
 Mr. Clay with Mr. Badillo.  
 Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Findley.  
 Mrs. Abzug with Mr. Gray.  
 Mrs. Hicks of Massachusetts with Mr. Fish.  
 Mr. Flowers with Mr. Winn.  
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Steele.  
 Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Sandman.  
 Mr. Hagan with Mr. Rousselot.  
 Mr. Gibbons with Mr. William J. Stanton.  
 Mr. Runnels with Mr. Ware.  
 Mr. Roy with Mr. Snyder.  
 Mr. Roe with Mr. Mailliard.  
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.  
 Mr. Ullman with Mr. Long of Louisiana.  
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Baring.  
 Mr. Culver with Mr. Reuss.  
 Mr. Yatron with Mr. Roybal.  
 Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Mann.  
 Mr. Mathis of Georgia with Mr. Abourezk.  
 Mr. Chappell with Mr. Davis of Georgia.  
 Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mrs. Mink.  
 Mr. Patman with Mr. Metcalfe.  
 Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Ichord.  
 Mr. Dent with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.  
 Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mrs. Dwyer.  
 Mr. Passman with Mr. Young of Florida.  
 Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Mathias of California.  
 Mr. Podell with Mr. Kemp.  
 Mr. Carey with Mr. Morse.  
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Pirnie.  
 Mr. Karth with Mr. Betts.  
 Mr. Ashley with Mr. Kuykendall.  
 Mr. Blaggi with Mr. Whalley.  
 Mr. Slack with Mr. Burke of Florida.  
 Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. McKeivitt.  
 Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Spence.  
 Mr. Wolf with Mr. Grover.  
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Minshall.  
 Mr. Howard with Mr. Skubitz.  
 Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Wiggins.  
 Mr. Cotter with Mr. Crane.  
 Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Coughlin.  
 Mr. Giamlo with Mr. Quillen.  
 Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Price of Texas.  
 Mr. Hamilton with Mr. Frey.  
 Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Wylder.  
 Mr. Pickle with Mr. Shiver.  
 Mr. Watts with Mr. Scherle.  
 Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Buchanan.  
 Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Martin.  
 Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Rhodes.  
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Camp.  
 Mr. Brasco with Mr. Hastings.

May 24, 1971

nication with the coinhabitants of our planet.

The question is, how do we do it—and with how many governmental or government-supported voices should we attempt to project our message to the world?

At present, that message is frequently garbled by a cacophony of strange and conflicting sounds—with each separate outlet pushing its own version of the American dream and its own interpretation of the American prescription for the world's ills.

There is Voice of America, with its sonorous tones proclaiming to be the essence of orthodoxy—though sometimes belatedly—on matters of Government policy.

Then there are Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty—now to be admitted to the official family entitled to open Federal support—which bring to this new role a tradition of unorthodoxy in the pursuit of their own specialized ends.

Then there is RIAS—Radio in the American Sector—which tries to scale the Berlin Wall and give the residents of both Germanies, as well as those few Americans within earshot, a liberal dose of American jazz and rock interspersed with news keyed to the particular pre-occupations of its listeners.

In addition, there is the American megawatt transmitter in Munich, with the long wave frequency potential of becoming one of the foremost communicators of Europe, whose sporadic, lovely function appears to be the jamming of Soviet messages to its own people and its neighbors.

The Armed Forces network in Europe is also a part of the American voice which reaches millions of foreign nationals—as are our military broadcasting activities in the Far East.

All of these activities are supported by the American taxpayer, operate with the sanction of the U.S. Government and whether rightly or wrongly, are deemed to carry our Nation's message to the world.

Unfortunately, each one of them is pretty much its own boss—and neither the Congress nor the American people have any clear idea of how they carry out their public mandate or whether they contribute to the advancement of our national objectives.

As I said at the outset, I am not opposed to the setting up of a Government-subsidized corporation to manage our overseas broadcasting activities. It seems to me, however, that a corporation in this field, whether modeled on Comsat or some other model, would be turning its back on reality if it were to concern itself solely and exclusively with Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

As nearly a decade of studies conducted by the International Organizations and Movements Subcommittee which I chaired during the 1960's showed, we need a drastic, fundamental reorganization of all U.S. Government-supported broadcasting activities, abroad. And the time is long passed when we could patch up things by resorting not even to half measures but to quarter measures.

There are two more points I would like to make:

First, it seems to me that by attempting to perpetuate existing arrangements, we are skating on very thin ice. The cold war thaw has robbed some of our overseas broadcasting operations of their political viability. I do not know, for example, how long the West Germans will indulge us to run our several, disparate operations on their soil—but I have a feeling that it will not be very long.

Second, I am not convinced that the American taxpayer should continue to shoulder the full burden of these rather expensive undertakings. There is, it seems to me, a pretty good possibility that under more realistic and practical arrangements, including joint ventures, some of these broadcasting facilities could become self-sustaining or even return part of the investment to the U.S. Government. I have not seen this possibility mentioned in the administration's proposals.

Mr. Speaker, we live in an age whose very character is shaped by electronic communications. We ought to recognize that fact in our external operations. And we ought to employ the instruments of communication available to us in sensible and imaginative ways so as to advance our national goals and the cause of peace.

I am delighted that after years of persistent prodding by my subcommittee, the executive branch has finally turned its attention to these matters. And I commend the President for coming to the Congress with his proposals. But I doubt that either the Congress or I as one of its Members will be interested in any partial solution which would place new burdens on the American public without attempting to go to the heart of the problem which confronts us—and try to remedy it.

#### WILLY BRANDT'S MISTAKES IN EASTERN POLICIES

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is now clear that the West German coalition government is becoming increasingly uneasy about its Ostpolitik. The original euphoria about the "new opening to the East" has disintegrated gradually in the usual slowdown of Communist bargaining practices, deliberate delays, additional conditions and in particular because of the issue of Berlin. The optimistic expectations of the first months of Willy Brandt's new West German approach and forecasts of a sudden breakthrough in the East-West relations have proven to be completely unrealistic and unfounded.

There are many great political figures of yesteryear who ended in the bitter and disappointed political dead ends. Willy Brandt may also be heading for a dead end by trying his own instant method for a rapprochement with the Soviet Union and its satellites. Many politicians thought, as Brandt does, that being

known as Socialists or peasant party leaders they had a special means to enter the Moscow door without falling into the trap maintained by the Reds.

I well recall how good intentions were crushed in the very first East European detente effort of Polish Prime Minister Mikolajczyk in 1945 and 1946. Mikolajczyk provided the air of legitimacy to the Communist takeover in Poland by joining the first postwar Communist-controlled government in Warsaw. But his attempt to work with the Communists did not last very long and he escaped to West Germany via West Berlin. He was fortunate that the Berlin wall was not yet in existence at that time. Today Mikolajczyk would probably be shot like many Germans have been during similar attempts.

In the years in which he worked in the free world for the restoration of freedom in Poland and other lands behind the Iron Curtain, Mr. Mikolajczk spent many years in Washington as head of the Peasant Union and on numerous occasions told me of the treachery, hypocrisy, and brutality of the Communists which he witnessed first hand while working in post-war Poland.

But apparently lessons of history have not impressed Willy Brandt and his government very much. He plunged into his new version of detente just as naively or even more so than all his predecessors starting with Mikolajczyk.

The problem is that Brandt takes himself very seriously but the Soviets do not. They consider his type of government only a transition government toward their goal of a permanent Soviet style "socialist society" in which the Communist Party, no matter how small and insignificant, plays the dominant role. Toward this end they have already activated a small Communist party of Germany under Kurt Bachmann. This party is waiting its turn, once Willy Brandt will be in real political bind, to edge itself into a key political position in no way commensurate with the number of its members or the support it can generate at the voting booth.

In the meantime, Brandt has completely concerned himself on the Berlin issue. There is no German in his right mind who would support the one-sided Soviet and Polish treaties signed by Brandt without a "satisfactory" settlement of the Berlin problem. Chancellor Brandt some months ago was forced by circumstances to accept the linkage of the Berlin issue with ratification of the Warsaw and Moscow treaties. He expected that the Soviet Union would be demonstratively cooperative concerning Berlin after the 24th CPSU Congress of March-April 1971. But the Congress produced nothing to alleviate the tension, nothing really new in the search for detente.

Now the Soviets are pressing Brandt into ratification of the treaties without an agreement on Berlin. And what is worse, there are some disturbing signs that Willy Brandt is softening toward another compromise.

Fortunately, Brandt cannot bargain the Berlin issue alone because this is an

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I say that the Senator from Michigan could not be more wrong than in the interpretation in the statement which he has made.

We recognize the fact that the President is trying to withdraw, that he has made considerable progress in that respect, and we anticipate without question that, in keeping with his word, by the first of May there will be left in Vietnam a total of 284,000 American personnel, compared to the almost 550,000 who were there when he took office.

It is too bad that, in our scheme of things, when one party or the other takes a stand on a particular issue such as this, the cry of politics is raised. May I assure the distinguished acting minority leader that nothing was further from the thoughts of the Senator from Montana, the majority leader, or the members of the policy committee or, in my judgment, the members of the conference.

There is a distinct difference of opinion but what we were trying to do was to be constructive. What we want to do is to help the President. We know that his burdens are heavy. We know that he has the ultimate responsibility, but, by the same token, we know that as individual Senators we have a responsibility, and as a party and as a Senate we have responsibilities as well.

There was no thought, I repeat, of politics in taking this action, but I am not surprised that the cry has been raised. That appears to be inevitable no matter what is attempted. The cry of politics, if it does not meet with the approval of the other side, is raised immediately.

I think I can say without fear of contradiction that I have been one of the least partisan Senators and one of the least partisan majority leaders that this body has ever seen. Moreover, I would point out that in the final resolving clause, the majority resolution states:

That in pursuit of these objectives—

That means all of them—

the committee urges full support wherever possible by both Senate Democrats and Republicans of the initiatives of the President, the Senate Committees and Members, and the House, which may be pertinent to these ends.

So I want the record clear. I want it clearly understood that we are concerned, that we understand the concern of the President and our colleagues across the aisle, and that as far as the charge of politics is concerned, there is absolutely—absolutely—no foundation for such an allegation or charge whatsoever. The record should be clear.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement made by the distinguished majority leader. He is the fairest and most nonpartisan majority leader that the Senate has ever had, so far as the junior Senator from Michigan knows, and I commend him upon the statement he has just made. Perhaps it will be helpful as the American people and the press seek to interpret the action taken at the Democratic caucus yesterday, and the motives behind it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

#### APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, in accordance with Public Law 90-264, appoints the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON) to the National Visitor Facilities Advisory Commission.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, in accordance with Public Law 84-372, appoints the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) to the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, in accordance with Public Law 83-420, appoints the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) to the Board of Directors of Gallaudet College.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, in accordance with Public Law 79-555, appoints the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) to the U.S. National Commission for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, in accordance with Public Law 84-944, appoints the Senator from Georgia (Mr. GAMBRELL) to the Senate Office Building Commission.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, in accordance with Public Law 86-380, appoints the following Senators to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: (Mr. ERVIN, Mr. MUSKIE, and Mr. MUNDT.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, in accordance with Public Law 90-259, appoints the following Senators to be advisory members to the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control: Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. BOGGS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under a previous order, the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES) is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### HIDDEN CIA FINANCING

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, every day we seem to discover more examples of the misuse of Government funds.

Senator CASE has now performed a valuable public service by drawing attention to secret financing of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty by the Central Intelligence Agency.

Since such covert funding weakens the effectiveness of these organizations, I agree that no further financing should come from the CIA.

These points have been well expressed in an editorial from the Des Moines Register of February 3. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### HIDDEN CIA FINANCING

Senator Clifford P. Case (Rep., N.J.) says that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty got from the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) more than \$30 million of the \$34 million they spent in 1969. In 20 years, Case says, the U.S. government has given these broad-

casters "several hundred million dollars" without congressional approval or knowledge.

Case isn't necessarily for cutting off government support, but he does want it brought into the open where it can be debated on its merits. It is time.

Radio Liberty broadcasts to the Soviet Union in a number of Soviet languages. Radio Free Europe broadcasts to the other East European Communist states, in their languages. Both use anti-Communist exiles from the target countries for staff, and broadcast news, culture and political points of view.

Both were founded by American citizens, and Americans have been prominent in their top management and fund-raising. The two broadcasting systems pose as being privately supported, but their spending is way out of proportion to their private fund-raising.

It has been widely suspected for years that they depended heavily on CIA money and that perhaps they were CIA operations from the ground up. But it wasn't polite to say so.

Didn't Radio Liberty have Herbert Hoover, Harry Truman and Dwight Eisenhower for honorary chairmen? Radio Free Europe's American fund-raising chairmen began with Lucius D. Clay and Henry Ford II, and the drive won endorsement of successive Presidents and governors.

There was criticism of Radio Free Europe at the time of the Hungarian revolt of 1956, for fear its "freedom" talk lured Hungarians into fighting and dying. Other exile radios did call for armed revolt (perhaps also with CIA money), but Radio Free Europe was too big and too established for that.

In 1967 the CIA was caught subsidizing the private National Student Association so it could go to international meetings and stand up to Communist-subsidized student organizations. A new group of student leaders denounced the arrangement, and the government announced that thereafter it would not provide secret funds, directly or indirectly, to "educational or private volunteer organizations."

Asked Senator Case in 1971: Doesn't that rule apply to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty?

The government did not directly deny or confirm Case's figures on their funds or answer directly his question. But it did say that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty "are not educational or private voluntary organizations" and that it intends to continue financing them—if it is financing them.

What it is.

Dean Rusk when he was secretary of state used to call covert operations "dirty tricks" and once facetiously described the CIA as "Department of Dirty Tricks." But he emphasized that only a small part of its work consisted of covert operations (as distinguished from fact-finding) and that not all these operations were "dirty."

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are not "dirty." While their fund-raising has been mostly covert, their activities have been broadcast for anyone to hear.

The argument for having them in addition to official Voice of America broadcasts was that, being private, they could be harder-hitting. Using exiles as writers and broadcasters, they could say "We Russians," "We Poles," "We Ukrainians" instead of "We the United States." This had some real value.

But the phony financing has gone on long enough. It never really fooled the Communist governments, and we doubt if it fooled many American congressmen. As Case says, it ought to be public knowledge.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order entered yesterday, the distinguished Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG) is recognized for 15 minutes.



tee the situation of the Democratic Majority in the Senate in the light of the Republican occupancy of the Presidency.

"In present circumstances, as we examined them in the Policy Committee, a new approach by the Party in the Senate was indicated. We found, for example, that Democratic Senators were asking from time to time for a statement of the position of the Leadership on national issues before the Senate. Heretofore, Democratic Presidents had largely supplied that yardstick.

"It was agreed that an effort should be made to delineate Democratic positions in the Senate on certain issues of significance in which there existed a substantial degree of unity among members of the Party.

"We are—all of us—aware of the difficulties which are inherent in trying to find common ground amidst our diversities. Yet, we believe the effort must be made. The Policy Committee is the political arm of the Democratic Conference of the Senate and it has a basis in law for the performance of the function. In addition, as presently constituted—that is, combined with the Legislative Review Committee—the Committee is accurately representative of the principal philosophical inclinations and the geographic derivations of the party in the Senate.

"Lest there be any doubt, I want to make it very plain that the Committee will not intrude, in any way, upon the functions of any of the Legislative Committees. On the contrary, it will continue to follow its customary practice with regard to the regular scheduling of legislation for floor action. . . .

"May I stress here the point that the Legislative Committees will, as always, delineate the legislation for floor consideration. What we are suggesting is in the nature of a political supplement to that responsibility.

"In a similar fashion, the Committee has not the slightest intention of presuming to replace a Senator's individual judgment with a Party judgment. We may offer a Committee view, but members will continue to vote on the issues on the basis of their conscience and wisdom. Indeed, even when a position has been delineated by the Policy Committee, its individual members will still vote as they see fit when the issue reaches the Senate floor.

"In conclusion, I would point out that in addition to the unanimous endorsement of this new approach by the members of the Policy Committee, the chairmen of the Legislative Committees, with whom I met on May 7, also agreed, without objection, to this proposed course.

"Senator Holland moved that the Conference approve this use of the Policy Committee as a formulator of Party policy. The motion was approved unanimously by standing vote. In announcing the vote, Senator Mansfield again stressed that a Policy Committee position, although stated as a Party position, was not binding on individual Members."

The Democratic Policy Committee proceeded to identify 15 major issues during the 91st Congress which it thought deserved substantial Democratic support. These ranged from the National Commitments Resolution in May of 1969, to the proposal of June 24, 1969, that sought—successfully—to link the temporary surtax extension to tax reform and tax relief. They included a Resolution calling for a substantial reduction of U.S. troops in Europe adopted in July of 1969; a suggestion to increase social security benefits by 15% together with a \$100 minimum benefit payment; a proposed mutual freeze with proper verification on the deployment of new offensive and defensive strategic nuclear weapons in April of 1970; a series of actions on the economy, one advocating the use of jawboning and standby wage and price authority, another in June, 1970, seeking Presidential use of the authority over credit and interest controls as provided by

Congress, and another submitting a full economic report in September of 1970. These are some of the issues with which the Policy Committee identified itself in the last Congress.

Its actions took various shapes, all of which were approved under the terms endorsed by this caucus in 1969 and affirmed again at the beginning of this Congress. It was understood that the Policy Committee would seek out only issues that would command a two-thirds majority of the Committee itself. Because of the broad philosophical and geographical makeup of the Committee, it was thought that two-thirds would provide sufficient backing among the Senate Democrats to identify any such issue in terms of a Senate Majority position.

It should be stressed that actions of the Policy Committee are recommendations only. No member of the Caucus is bound by a Policy Committee judgment. How each individual decision of the Policy Committee is conveyed is a matter for the Leadership and the Policy Committee to determine on an issue-by-issue basis. In the past, Caucuses have been convened and advised of a decision; floor announcements have been made and press conferences have been held—all for the purpose of communicating the actions of the Policy Committee to Democratic members, the Senate and the public.

On yesterday, the Policy Committee again acted and instructed me, as Chairman, to notify the press immediately of the action. The Committee also requested that the Caucus be convened for the purpose of submitting the matter directly to all Senate Democrats. What the action concerns is a general Majority policy resolution which recommends certain issues as fundamental to any agenda of the 92nd Congress. It was in this context that the Democratic Policy Committee unanimously approved the resolution submitted here today. It is a general Democratic Policy Committee statement on major issues. What reaction, if any, the Caucus decides to register is, of course, up to the Caucus. The Policy Committee, after all, is fully responsible to the Caucus.

It should be said, however, that if there are constructive initiatives to be offered on the major issues confronting the country, then it seems to me incumbent upon us as the Senate Majority to identify those issues wherever and whenever possible by policy statements. We believe it is helpful to state what are considered to be some of the most significant national issues and the general approach most of us as Democrats are inclined to take with regard to these issues. In my judgment, we owe it to the President and we owe it to the country to do so. As the party in control of the Senate in the legislative branch we have a responsibility to the nation, along with a Republican Administration.

It was in that context that the Policy Committee acted on yesterday. The members spoke, may I say, in a highly unified voice after a thoughtful debate and discussion. They spoke, in my judgment, in a most constructive and responsible voice. While they spoke as Democrats, they eschewed any suggestion of partisanship for the sake of partisanship. That is how it has been; that is how it will continue to be insofar as I am concerned.

The resolution which the Policy Committee adopted on yesterday is a resolution of Senate purpose for the 92nd Congress. It represents an attempt to focus our joint efforts during the next two years.

As a follow-up to this resolution, the Committee would hope to set forth specifics in additional resolutions of the Policy Committee from time to time as these issues emerge in the Senate. In this case, as in all cases, the actions of the Policy Committee are for the guidance of Members only. In no case will the jurisdiction of any standing

committee be infringed, impaired or encroached upon in any fashion. Indeed, on yesterday, when the Majority Whip proposed a discussion of an increase in social security benefits as a subject for consideration by the Policy Committee—a matter for which all Members have great sympathy—he was designated by the Committee to discuss the matter with the Chairman of the Finance Committee (Senator Long). That is the way the Committee has always operated. I reiterate, there will be no infringement on the legislative responsibilities of any standing committee.

It is in this framework that this matter is brought before you. It is hoped that members of the Caucus will understand the thrust of the resolution which has just been presented, weigh its significance and give us any reactions which they may have.

Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. President, in response to the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, I feel I must say for the record that while, of course, the Democrats have a right to adopt such a reservation, I believe it is very unfortunate that, in party caucus, they have seen fit to draw such a party line. As the press has interpreted it—and with some justification—the resolution appears to be an attempt by Senate Democrats to make political capital out of a war that President Nixon inherited, and from which he has been striving diligently and successfully to disengage us.

If this is politics—and it is difficult to reach any other conclusion when the Democrats meet in caucus and take such action—I would suggest that it is bad politics.

The American people understand that there are differences of viewpoint in the Senate concerning the war, whether we should have gotten into the war, and also about the conduct of the war. Those differences exist on both sides of the political aisle, and they are well known.

But, Mr. President, when the Nation's security is at stake, the American people expect that partisanship will stop at the water's edge. That was a principle enunciated and practiced by a distinguished predecessor of mine from the State of Michigan; I must say that I wish it were followed more today than it seems to be.

So, as a spokesman for Senators on my side of the aisle, I must say that the action taken yesterday was unfortunate. While the expression of such a point of view by Senators is understandable, I regret that it was the product of a party caucus—though I recognize the right of the other party to draw a party line in that way.

I point particularly to the fact that the resolution as adopted referred to withdrawal by a time certain. The Senate debated essentially that question during the last session, and a majority in the Senate believed that it would not be in the national interest, as I recall, for Congress to fix a definite time table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. President, may I be recognized? I feel I should be given the opportunity to answer the allegations made by the distinguished acting minority leader.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Montana is recognized for 3 minutes.

S 1324

to the County Board of Supervisors. All Lawrence asked was that the county resist attempts to build any more highways through what is to be known as Ellanor Campbell, Hayes Lawrence Park in honor of his late wife, and that the dilapidated one-lane bridge over Big Rocky Run be replaced with a two-lane bridge faced with stone from the pre-Revolutionary quarry on the property.

Lawrence added that it would be nice if the County Park Authority would allow the Rocky Run Garden Club, of which Mrs. Lawrence was a founder, to continue meeting in the old wheat mill as it has for 40 years or so. But he does not insist upon it.

There are those who use their philanthropy to buy a kind of immortality: to keep their names engraved in stone somewhere or to make sure some young fellow doesn't spend the fortune in a way of which its amasser would not have approved or to preserve some land the former owner loved.

Not Lawrence. He confesses affection for the trees that cover most of Middlegate Farm, but he doesn't demand their preservation. He'd like the mill, one of the largest and oldest in the county, to be restored (the Lawrences have used it as a guesthouse) but doesn't require it.

"The place will be theirs," he said. "I expect they'll take care of it. Ellanor and the children and I have had a great deal of pleasure from it and I hope the people of the county will."

Lawrence will talk about the land, which was camped on and fought over by both sides during the Civil War Battles of Bull Run (First and Second Manassas), but discourages questions about himself and his philanthropy.

"My wife loved the trees, couldn't stand to have one cut and didn't like to see them fall. She picked the land when we bought it in 1935 (the bulk of it for about \$16,000). It was in her name. In her will (Mrs. Lawrence died in June, 1969) she said it was to be donated to a beneficiary of my choice.

"Through the years the Scouts and other groups had come to study nature there, so I thought we should leave it to the people who live in Fairfax and their friends."

Actually, Middlegate Farm is Lawrence's second major gift to Fairfax residents. The first, and some would say the most important one, was the county executive form of government, which was adopted by the voters in 1950 after a masterful campaign designed and executed principally by Lawrence.

In that fight he took on and beat every powerful political group: the entrenched Byrd Organization under the so-called Courthouse Crowd headed by the late Circuit Judge Paul E. Brown, and the coalition that had developed the reform movement, which included the League of Women Voters, the Federation of Citizens Association and the Good Government League. He also beat down the chairman of the county's governmental study commission, of which Lawrence was vice chairman.

The Byrd Organization was trying to hold on to the existing county board form, under which power was concentrated in the hands of Judge Brown, able and articulate and arch-conservative.

The coalition, including Lawrence's chairman, was pressing for the county manager form, under which all members of the ruling board would have been elected at large.

Lawrence cried a pox on both their houses in this pre-election letter to The Washington Post:

"The political power today in Fairfax County . . . is vested primarily in a few officials who are elected by county-wide voting. They are the ones who are today fighting change in Fairfax County's government.

"Their brothers under the skin—the politicians who are lurking behind the pressure groups to take over under the county manager system—will be more firmly entrenched in

power than these few elected officials have been.

"Each voter would be voting for six supervisors under the county manager plan. It is conceivable that the voters in one district will know enough about the personal capacity of any of the 10 or more candidates for the board from the other districts—or will the voters have to depend upon the political machine or a coalition of pressure groups to hand them a slate on which to vote 'ja'?"

That kind of rhetoric apparently blew all his opponents down, good guys and bad guys together, because the voters gave their "ja" to Lawrence's plan by 5,210 to 3,502.

Lawrence then headed a team that put the county executive form into effect over a two-year period. The new government wasn't perfect by any means—several supervisors have gone to prison for zoning bribery conspiracy—but the more efficient and flexible county executive system at least survived the population boom that started in the 1950s.

Judge Brown, a Virginia gentleman of the old school, was not one to let political differences interfere with friendships. He continued to invite Lawrence as a speaker before the Off the Record Club, a group of Fairfax squires who met to discuss political issues privately and informally.

The squires no longer meet. Most are dead or retired. But David Lawrence marches on, cranking out five newspaper columns a week as he has for 55 years, plus the back page spot in the magazine. Whether he's at his vacation home in Sarasota, Fla., the farm or his suite at the Sheraton-Carlton Hotel, he always has his news ticker and a direct telephone line to his office at U.S. News.

His lifetime routine remains unbroken, although a friend said "it's just a routine now, with Ellanor gone. She was the center around whom he revolved."

Lawrence said it himself during the Medal of Freedom award ceremony at the White House on April 22:

"I have a sentimental interest in the White House. I started writing about White House activities when I graduated from Princeton in 1910 when Mr. Taft was President . . . It so happened in the early years I was sitting in the White House lobby when a beautiful girl went through to call on a member of the secretarial staff. Two and a half years later she became my wife. We were married for almost 51 years. The Lord sent me one of the most wonderful companions in the world and he took her away last year. I know if she could have been here she would have appreciated this hour very much, and I do, too.

"Thank you, Mr. President."

The President: "I am sure she is here right now."

Now, he doesn't want to talk about her with strangers. He shrugged off questions about the award scrolls and plaques, covering two walls of his office, which he has accumulated over the years. Never mind the Presidential Medal of Freedom presented to him "and seven other old guys."

Lawrence is a very private man.

And a busy one. He steps carefully now, not so big and vigorous as once, but he steps right along, aided and abetted by Obadiah William Person, his chauffeur of 27 years, who maneuvers the huge black Cadillac limousine through Washington traffic with a skill and abandon that would make any nut in a Volkswagen envious. The Cady does not have low-number license plates. It wouldn't occur to Lawrence to ask for them, although the President says Lawrence is the journalist he has known longest and best.

Out to the farm, roaring down Rt. 66 to the Centreville exit. Whipping past his lands and his pond and the Civil War earthworks. First stop, the wash house, turnout on the ticker. Paper jams. Damn machine won't work. Never mind.

Lawrence seems to be in a hurry, although he assures his interviewer he's not. The

old man touches everything he passes in the cottage, everything he passes in the mill. He hasn't really lived at the farm since Mrs. Lawrence died.

## RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) has raised for scrutiny by Congress and the public the question of covert funding by the Central Intelligence Agency of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. He has proposed legislation to authorize public funding of these stations. His statements have been well covered by the press, and considerable information of potential value to Senators is contained in this group of articles, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Jan. 24, 1971]

CASE WOULD BAR CIA AID FOR RADIO FREE EUROPE

(By Benjamin Welles)

WASHINGTON, January 23.—Senator Clifford P. Case, Republican of New Jersey, charged today that the Central Intelligence Agency had spent several hundred million dollars over the last 20 years to keep Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty functioning.

Mr. Case, a member of the Appropriations and Foreign Relations Committees, said that he would introduce legislation Monday to bring Government spending on the two stations under the authorization and appropriations process of Congress. Representative Ogden R. Reid, Republican of Westchester, said today that he would introduce similar legislation in the House.

Radio Free Europe, founded in 1950, and Radio Liberty, formed a year later, both have powerful transmitters in Munich, West Germany, staffed by several thousand American technicians and refugees from Eastern Europe.

Radio Liberty broadcasts only into the Soviet Union, Radio Free Europe to other Eastern European countries except Yugoslavia.

Both organizations have offices in New York and purport to be privately endowed with funds coming exclusively from foundations, corporations and the public. Both, however, are extremely reticent about the details of their financing.

Senator Case noted in a statement that both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty "claim to be nongovernmental organizations sponsored by private contributions." However, he went on, "available sources indicate direct C.I.A. subsidies pay nearly all their costs."

The Senator said that the Central Intelligence Agency provided the stations with \$30-million in the last fiscal year without formal Congressional approval.

### DISCLOSURES RESTRICTED

Under the Central Intelligence Agency's operating rules, its activities—such as covert funding—are approved by the National Security Council. However, disclosure to Congress is limited to a handful of senior legislators on watchdog committees of each house.

The Central Intelligence Agency and Radio Free Europe both declined to comment today on Senator Case's statement. Efforts to elicit comment from Radio Liberty were unavailing.

Covert C.I.A. funding of the two stations has, however, been an open secret for years, although the C.I.A., in accordance with

February 11, 1971

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 1323

A change in the law will be necessary before the small farmer can be helped. The set-aside eligibility requirement was delayed one year by an administrative order from the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

With this thinking we fully agree, as will all those interested in the plight of our farmers under this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire Hackethorn article, "Plow Up That Grass, Gain 'Flexibility,'" be printed in the Record.

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

**PLOW UP THAT GRASS, GAIN "FLEXIBILITY"**  
(By Jack Hackethorne)

The Administration's new farm bill has small farmers in a pickle. Recently announced changes in eligibility set-aside provisions have quieted some of the rumbles from larger farmers, but even they had been unhappy about plowing up grass to comply with a set-aside provision requiring acres to be rotated.

A change in the law will be necessary before the small farmer can be helped. The set-aside eligibility requirement was delayed one year by an administrative order from the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

In Nodaway County, for example, 691 farms have a feed grain base of 25 acres or less. Many are maintaining their homes on these farms. Many of these small farms are owned by retired farmers drawing a small government payment and, in some cases, Social Security.

Many of these farms have been seeded for pasture and hay. If price support payments are collected, the new law requires a minimum of 45 percent of feed grain base be planted or the base will be reduced each year, eliminated after three years. To protect this base will require this grass land be broken out. Not only will this add to soil erosion and pollution problems but some farmers will be forced off the farm.

Emery Shell has an 88-acre farm south of Pickering. He is 73 years old and has lived on this place since 1949. Shell has a 20-acre feed grain base, seeded to grass since 1961. "Now, to qualify, I must plow up some of the good grass and plant corn," he says. "It ought to raise good corn. It has had a rest, but I would be better off the way it was under the old program."

Carl E. Halzer lives on 78 acres south of Maryville. At 79, "I am not able to farm any more. All my ground is in grass and is terraced. I have been trying to get it all in grass. It is good farming and there is no erosion, and will be better land when I leave than what I moved on 40 years ago. I have no need for corn, and at my age I hate to plow up any grass."

Elbert Risser, Route 1, Sheridan, has 200 acres, "would just as soon have the entire farm seeded down in grass and feed a few cows. Now I will have to plow up 21 acres of fescue that would make an awful lot of winter pasture just to save feed grain base."

A controversial section of the program dealing with set-aside acres was temporarily delayed a year after a loud rumble from the midwest feed grain farmers.

Under the old farm program (Act of 1965) farmers were urged to take land out of feed grain production and to divert acres to soil conserving crops such as grass. If farmers harvest a crop from these diverted acres they lose government payment and price supports.

Under the Administration's new program farmers were asked to set aside acres (probably 20 percent of the feed grain base but the figure is yet to be announced) and take them out of production. If they set aside these acres along with conserving acres they would

be free to grow all the corn and other feed grains they want on remaining acres. The catch is that the set-aside acres must have been used to grow crops in one of the past three years. This virtually rules out land diverted from production from year-to-year under the previous program. The effect would be to force farmers to rotate acres set aside each year. This would have disrupted cropping plans and increased costs by making it necessary to plow up land already seeded to grass and established grass seedings on land intended for feed grain crops.

H. H. Woolridge, in Cooper County, thinks the provision is "silly" and the delay should be made permanent. "I have been using 2 pounds of Atrazine per acre to keep the weeds and grass out of my corn for about 12 years. Grass will not grow on this ground. It does not make sense to plow up good grass and plant corn and then expect to establish a good cover of grass on those fields that have been in corn."

D. T. Weekley, who farms near Blackwater, said, "They are asking us to destroy what we have already done and to start over again."

#### NOTHING TO FEAR FROM FBI

Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. President, last year the Congress passed the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970 which imposed great new responsibilities on the FBI. These included new areas of combating organized crime and in investigating bombings at institutions receiving Federal assistance. Shortly after this act was passed, the Congress also approved a supplemental appropriation for the FBI to enable that agency to employ an additional 1,000 special agents to handle the new duties.

A great amount of misinformation was circulated about this increase of FBI manpower and the added responsibilities with respect to bombings. It was alleged the FBI was going to swamp college campuses around the country with its agents and take over the policing of student activities. Nothing could have been further from the truth.

Recently I came across an editorial in the Panama City, Fla., News Herald which speaks clearly to the charges that the FBI was going to be used to curtail freedom of speech on campuses. I think it is important to make this editorial comment a matter of record for the Congress and ask unanimous consent to include it in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### NOTHING TO FEAR FROM FBI

Since its inception the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been and continues to be just what the title implies, an investigative arm of law enforcement. It is not a federal police force. Neither is it judge and jury for alleged criminal actions.

Alarmists, however, are crying again that the FBI plans to "saturate" college campuses with officers to curtail liberty and freedom of speech.

The whispering campaign against the FBI stems from President Nixon's provision for appointment of 1,000 additional agents in the fight against organized crime.

The Organized Crime Control Act of 1970 signed into law Oct. 1 specifically gives the FBI the responsibility for investigating bombings or bombing attempts on federal property or any institution receiving federal financial assistance.

The notion that such action presents a threat to the country is ridiculous.

As FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover observed, the FBI would be "more than pleased if it were never necessary to investigate a single bombing under the new act."

There's really nothing sinister and menacing about investigation acts of bombing and terrorism. They've almost doubled in number over 1969, and persons who worry about "repressive" law enforcement might better expand their energy in working to prevent these crimes.

#### GIFTS OF DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. President, the February 11 edition of the Washington Post includes an article on Mr. David Lawrence, by Hank Burchard, a Washington Post staff writer.

The article describes Mr. Lawrence's philanthropies, which have been generous and of great benefit to the people of northern Virginia.

Mr. Lawrence is one of the Nation's most distinguished journalists. His was the first newspaper column to be syndicated by wire.

He became president and editor of U.S. News in 1933 and since 1959 has been chairman of the board and editor of U.S. News & World Report.

More than 300 newspapers carry Mr. Lawrence's daily column.

At the age of 82, Mr. Lawrence continues to write his column and maintain his interest in world affairs. His long career is one of singular achievement.

David Lawrence is a great newspaperman, a great American, and a wonderful friend.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Washington Post article "Gifts of David Lawrence" be included at this point in the Record.

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

#### GIFTS OF DAVID LAWRENCE

(By Hank Burchard)

David Lawrence came into this world with very little and wants to go out of it the same way, not that he's in any hurry.

Lawrence, 82, dean of American syndicated newspaper columnists (he invented the form in 1916), founder of his own news service and a flourishing weekly newsmagazine, friend and/or chastiser of Presidents from Taft to Nixon, respected spokesman for what might be called the Old Right, should be a wealthy man.

He isn't. He has given most of it away. Lawrence sold the news service, called the Bureau of National Affairs, to its employees in 1946 and did the same with his magazine, U.S. News & World Report, in 1962, at what associates called bargain prices.

The last of his major possessions, the magnificent Middlegate Farm near Centerville in Fairfax County, he gave to the people of the county in December, final title to pass when he does.

The farm is 639.8 acres, two-tenths of an acre less than one square mile. It was given without strings, lock, stock and barrel, including houses (3), furnishings, mementos and all—every thing except the new teletype printer in the wash house, which is the property of the Associated Press.

The rolling, wooded acres are assessed at \$5 million, but the land is actually priceless, there being no other such piece of private property in the county.

He gave it the way he always does these things, the way he gave land for three Centerville churches, diffidently and at a distance. He gave the farm by sending a note

standing policy, and the two stations themselves have consistently refused to discuss either their operations or their funding.

Citing returns filed with the Internal Revenue Service in the 1969 fiscal year, Mr. Case said that the stations' combined operating costs that year totaled \$33,997,336. Of this, he said, Radio Free Europe spent \$21,109,935 and Radio Liberty \$12,887,401.

#### FUNDS SOUGHT BY ADVERTISEMENT

"The bulk of Radio Free Europe's and Radio Liberty's budgets, or more than \$30-million annually, comes from direct C.I.A. subsidies," Mr. Case charged. "Congress has never participated in authorization of funds to R.F.E. or R.L., although hundreds of millions of dollars in Government funds have been spent during the last 20 years."

Mr. Case pointed out that Radio Free Europe conducted a yearly campaign for public contributions under the auspices of the Advertising Council. Between \$12-million and \$20-million in free media space is donated annually to this campaign, he said, but the return from the public is "apparently less than \$100,000."

Furthermore, he said, both stations attempted to raise money from corporations and foundations but contributions from these sources reportedly pay only a small part of the stations' total budgets.

Senator Case said that his proposed legislation would seek to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to authorize funds for both stations in the fiscal year beginning next July 1. His proposal would call for an initial sum of \$30-million, but he said that the sum would be subject to change.

#### BAR ON OTHER FUNDS

At the same time, Mr. Case said, his proposal would provide that "no other" United States Government funds could be made available to either station except under the provisions of the act. He also said that he would ask that Administration officials concerned with overseas information policies be called to testify in order to determine the amount needed for the station's operations.

"I can understand why covert funds might have been used for a year or two in an emergency situation when extreme secrecy was necessary and when no other Government funds were available," Mr. Case said.

But, he went on, the justification for covert funding has lessened over the years as international tension has eased, as the secrecy surrounding the stations has "melted away," and as more open means of funding could be developed.

"In other words," he said, "the extraordinary circumstances that might have been thought to justify circumvention of constitutional processes and Congressional approval no longer exist."

#### JOHNSON CREATED XXX

Mr. Case pointed out that in 1967, after there had been public disclosure that the C.I.A. had been secretly funding the National Student Association, President Johnson created a committee that was headed by Nicholas de B. Katzenbach, the Under Secretary of State, and that included Richard Helms, head of the C.I.A., and John W. Gardner, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

He further noted that on March 29, 1967, Mr. Johnson publicly accepted the committee's recommendation that "no Federal agency shall provide covert financial assistance or support, direct or indirect, to any of the nation's educational or voluntary organizations" and that "no programs currently would justify any exceptions to this policy."

People familiar with the operations of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty noted that both had been started at the peak of the Cold War and had just "gone rolling on" ever since. The Katzenbach committee,

some sources said, had cut off covert funding from virtually all other recipients.

"They solved all the tough ones," one source said, "but they were under such pressure from Johnson to get their report out and get the heat from Congress and the public cut off that they didn't solve the funding of the stations. They turned it over to another committee."

The second committee, whose members these sources declined to identify, worked over a year and then turned in secret recommendations to Mr. Johnson. However, Mr. Johnson pigeonholed the recommendations and finally left the problem for the incoming Nixon Administration to solve, the sources said.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Jan. 24, 1971]

#### PUBLIC FINANCING OF OUTLETS ASKED; RADIO FREE EUROPE NOW IN CIA SPHERE, CASE WARNS

(By Peter J. Kumpa)

WASHINGTON, January 23.—Senator Clifford P. Case (R., N.J.) announced today that he will introduce legislation Monday to provide for open congressional financing of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

Mr. Case explained that, if approved, the legislation would remove the stations from the need for secret funds from the Central Intelligence Agency. He said that in the last fiscal year, the CIA provided a direct subsidy of \$30 million to the stations which broadcast to the Soviet Union and five Eastern European Communist countries.

Although both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty claim to be non-governmental organizations sponsored by private contributions, the senator said that "available sources" indicate the CIA pays almost all their costs.

#### PRODUCES TAX RETURNS

He produced figures from returns filed with the Internal Revenue Service showing that the combined operating costs for the stations in fiscal 1969 was almost \$34 million (\$21,109,935 for Radio Free Europe and \$12,887,401 for Radio Liberty).

Though a national advertising campaign under the auspices of the Advertising Council uses somewhere between \$12 and \$20 million in free media space to solicit contributions for the stations, Mr. Case said, returns from the public amount to less than \$100,000.

The stations raise the rest of their budgets from corporate and foundation contributions, he said.

"Congress has never participated in authorization or appropriations of funds to Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty, although hundreds of millions of dollars in government funds have been spent during the last 20 years," Senator Case said.

"I can understand why covert funds might have been used for a year or two in an emergency situation when extreme secrecy was necessary and when no other government funds were available" he went on.

#### LESSENING OF TENSION

But now, the senator asserted, with the lessening of international tension and with the melting of secrecy, some means of open financing of the stations should have been provided.

"In other words, the extraordinary circumstances that might have been thought to justify circumvention of constitutional processes and congressional approval no longer exist," Senator Case said.

The senator was not critical of the work of the stations, both of which have their main offices and studios in Munich, Germany. His legislation, in fact, would authorize \$30 million for continuation of their work. He simply wants Congress to supervise the spending of taxpayers' money.

Radio Free Europe, started in 1950, broad-

casts to Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Romania. Radio Liberty, opened a year later, concentrates only on the Soviet Union. In 1956, Radio Free Europe was criticized for raising false hopes of help for the Hungarian rebels. Since then, the stations have been less controversial.

Informed congressional sources have no doubts about the close tie-up between the the stations and the government.

A full-time liaison officer from the consulate in Munich is assigned to go over program content to make it conform to U.S. government policy, they point out. Because classified as well as unclassified government information is provided, security personnel check out the stations, the same sources report.

Further, they say U.S. embassy officials from Eastern Europe get briefings at Radio Free Europe. The station, in turn, uses the coded communications of the Munich consulate to keep in touch with Washington, the sources report.

Though their studios are in Germany, the transmitters for the stations are in Spain, Portugal and Taiwan, all countries with special arrangements with the United States, the sources report.

#### THE 1967 PANEL'S FINDINGS

In 1967, after disclosures of CIA financing of the National Student Association, a presidential committee made up of John Gardner, then Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Richard Helms, CIA director, and Nicholas de B. Katzenbach, then under secretary of State, recommended that no federal agency should provide covert funds for any of the nation's "educational or voluntary organizations."

President Johnson accepted the committee's recommendations. On March 29, 1967, he ordered all federal agencies to implement them.

Senator Case's bill, similar to one shortly to be introduced in the House by Representative Ogden R. Reid (R., N.Y.), would provide funds for the stations out of the Informational and Educational Exchange Act. It would forbid funding by any other government channel.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 25, 1971]

#### CIA AGAIN CHARGED WITH POLICY MEDDLING (By Robert P. Hey)

WASHINGTON.—Once again, charges of Central Intelligence Agency influence on U.S. foreign policy are reverberating through Congress.

Sen. Clifford P. Case charges that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty actually are financed—clandestinely—by the CIA, to the tune of more than \$30 million annually.

The New Jersey Republican alleges "several hundred million dollars in United States Government funds" have been given these stations over the past 20 years without congressional approval or even knowledge.

In New York, Bernard Yarow, senior vice-president of Radio Free Europe, says his organization's reaction to the charges is: "No comment."

#### SUPPORT SUPPOSEDLY PRIVATE

Both stations beam information to Communist-controlled nations in Eastern Europe. They have stoutly maintained for years that they were financed through private contributions.

Senator Case, the New Jersey Republican, thinks it is high time all this was brought out into the open. He has introduced legislation to have the finances of both stations provided, openly, through the same authorization-and-appropriation process through which Congress controls the budgets of most governmental agencies.

These changes strengthen one present trend—the increasing insistence of Con-

February 11, 1971

gress—particularly the Senate—on exerting influence upon the direction of United States foreign policy.

But all this also seems like a page out of the recent past. In 1967 it was disclosed that the CIA was funding what had been presumed to be an organization of students without government links, the National Student Association. The uproar at that time was thunderous over clandestine government penetration of student organizations, with all the implications of potential infringement on academic freedom.

#### EARLIER REPORT QUOTED

Senator Case now quotes, with considerable irony, a recommendation made by a presidential committee which investigated that CIA funding.

It recommended that "no federal agency shall provide covert financial assistance or support, direct or indirect, to any of the nation's educational or voluntary organizations," and that "no programs currently would justify any exception to this policy."

Sources close to Senator Case say he is not trying to close down Radio Free Europe, but merely to bring into the open the government's relationship to it.

The view here is that the CIA for 20 years has remained the financier of Radio Free Europe, in the Case charge, due to bureaucratic inertia. "It's the whole question of how does the government change," in the words of one source. No one here suggests there is any Machiavellian plot behind the CIA financing, at least, not at present.

The Case bill is expected to be referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, chaired by Sen. J. Fulbright (D) of Arkansas, where it is assured a sympathetic hearing. Senator Case is a member of that committee.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Jan. 24, 1971]

#### PROPOSES CIA CUT OFF RADIO STATION FUNDS (By Richard Dudman)

WASHINGTON, January 23.—Senator Clifford P. Case (Rep.), New Jersey, proposed Saturday that the United States drop the pretense that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are private enterprises and begin financing them openly.

Although the two propaganda stations have been widely known to be operations of the Central Intelligence Agency, Case became possibly the first public official to blurt out the truth publicly.

Radio Free Europe, beamed to Eastern Europe, and Radio Liberty, beamed to the Soviet Union, operate in Munich, West Germany, ostensibly on private contributions.

But Case said these contributions apparently come to less than \$100,000 a year, with modest additional amounts from foundations and corporations, whereas the stations' operating expenses for fiscal 1969 were almost \$34,000,000.

He showed copies of returns they filed with the Internal Revenue Service reporting that operating costs were \$21,109,935 for Radio Free Europe and \$12,887,401 for Radio Liberty.

#### FREE ADVERTISING

Case said he had been advised that between \$12,000,000 and \$20,000,000 in free media space was donated annually to the fund raising campaign under auspices of the Advertising Council.

"In the last 20 years several hundred million dollars in United States Government funds have been expended from secret CIA budgets to pay almost totally for the costs of these two radio stations broadcasting to Eastern Europe," Case said. "In the last fiscal year alone, over \$30,000,000 was provided by CIA as a direct government subsidy; yet at no time was Congress asked or permitted to carry out its traditional constitutional role of approving the expenditure."

The Senator said he would introduce a bill Monday amending the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to authorize funds for the two stations in fiscal 1972. The bill also would provide that no other U.S. Government funds may go to either radio station except under provisions of the act.

#### POST ENDORSES HUMPHREY-REUSS REVENUE-SHARING BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. President, Monday's Washington Post contained a lead editorial which addressed itself to the various revenue-sharing proposals now before the Congress.

I am gratified the editorial singled out the bill that Congressman HENRY REUSS and I introduced for laudatory mention.

Senator HUMPHREY and "Congressman REUSS have put in a bill which would phase the funds progressively over a longer period of time, meanwhile encouraging the adoption or reform of income taxes by the States and a whole array of measures designed to bring State and local financial and governmental practices at least into the century which will shortly end."

Mr. President, that is indeed the thrust of the Humphrey-Reuss bill—to provide increasing Federal grants to States and local governments to ease their fiscal crunch and as an inducement to reform and streamline their governmental structures and processes.

Local government must be more responsive to the needs of their people. The Humphrey-Reuss bill will authorize the funds to help provide these services and to help State and local governments render themselves able to allocate these funds more efficiently and economically. Such reform will make both present revenues and expected Federal revenue sharing go just that much further.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Post editorial for February 8, 1971, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### MR. NIXON'S MESSAGE ON REVENUE SHARING

There were not many surprises in the message on revenue sharing the President sent to Congress on Thursday. Mr. Nixon addressed himself primarily to the "general" (or real) revenue sharing of \$5 billion with the states in the program's first year of operation, as distinct from the so-called "special revenue sharing" (more properly, consolidated grants) that has yet to be spelled out and which is meant to provide the states with \$11 billion for broadly defined purposes.

The general revenue sharing measure Mr. Nixon outlined would automatically dispense an amount equal to 1.3 per cent of the nation's taxable personal income to state and local governments for use as they see fit. It is to include financial incentives for the states to maintain their own tax efforts and to work out their own sharing arrangements with local governments—"pass through" formulas, as they are known, that are particularly suited to the state's individual requirements and acceptable to a majority of its governing bodies (such as cities, townships, counties) representing a majority of its population. There is also to be provision for a federal audit which—given the ban on racially discriminatory use of the funds—could prove quite interesting in those cases where the funds might go into the general

treasury of a state or local government: it is not inconceivable that with such a mixture of moneys, the federal government would acquire more leverage than it now has in eliminating discrimination from state-supported programs.

This, to be sure, remains in the realm of speculation as does so much else related to the meaning and ultimate effect of Mr. Nixon's proposal. However, "if" questions in this matter are especially interesting—indeed, it could be argued that whatever the fate of this particular measure, Mr. Nixon has done the nation a considerable service by initiating what could be a highly productive debate on problems that should have been faced long ago. We are not referring here to the rhetoric of "revolution" or to Mr. Nixon's own antic borrowing ("Power to the People") or to the elided logic that underlies talk of "giving back" to the states functions and responsibilities the federal government acquired only because the states refused to assume them in the first place. Rather, we have in mind the valuable and overdue focusing of attention on the urgency of devising an equitable and effective redistribution of the nation's tax revenue.

The argument over the precise amount of money—\$5 billion—to be shared in the first full year of the general program is a case in point. That sum has been faulted both as too little and too much. But the dispute is not one of those conventional split-the-difference affairs in which the object is merely to reach agreement on the size of an outlay the federal government can afford. Each argument tends to rest, instead, on a particular theory of the merit and purpose of revenue sharing. \$5 billion is far too small a sum if you take at face value the Nixon administration's stated aims. In fact the White House, ritually and repeatedly blaming the nation's social unrest on the gap between promise (or overpromise) and performance, has nonetheless started down a similar road itself in making large, power-to-the-people claims for the dispensation of an amount which is actually less than that by which state and local budgets increase annually. At most these funds can be expected to mitigate a rise in local taxes, not to take the place of such a rise. And the prospective administration measure carries an insufficiency of funds, incentives, and sanctions to ensure that the shared revenue will not merely be of help in perpetuating a variety of relationships between citizen and government and among divisions of government that sorely require change on grounds that range from moral to managerial.

It is for this last reason that others—chiefly legislators and political theorists who are not known for their scrupulousness with the public purse—are claiming that the \$5 billion first year sum is too large. It is too large, they contend, to be dispensed to such uncertain effect when the means are at hand for a pass at revenue sharing that would at once reach the people and the state and local governments in severest need. This alternative would be for the federal government to assume all or almost all the costs of our national welfare programs—meaning that share which state and local governments are now obliged to pay. Meantime—the argument runs—while the state and local governments and their taxpayers would gain relief in the release of state and local welfare expenditures for other purposes, a more modest sum could be allocated to a phased general revenue sharing plan that would be, in Congressman Henry Reuss's terms, a "catalyst" not a "crutch."

This school of thought, to which we are ourselves inclined at this point, holds that the automatic allocation of federally collected revenue to the states represents a step that will not easily be reversed and one with critically important long-term implications and effects. From which it follows that it should not be taken loosely or lightly or in

February 11, 1971

to the County Board of Supervisors. All Lawrence asked was that the county resist attempts to build any more highways through what is to be known as Ellanor Campbell, Hayes Lawrence Park in honor of his late wife, and that the dilapidated one-lane bridge over Big Rocky Run be replaced with a two-lane bridge faced with stone from the pre-Revolutionary quarry on the property.

Lawrence added that it would be nice if the County Park Authority would allow the Rocky Run Garden Club, of which Mrs. Lawrence was a founder, to continue meeting in the old wheat mill as it has for 40 years or so. But he does not insist upon it.

There are those who use their philanthropy to buy a kind of immortality: to keep their names engraved in stone somewhere or to make sure some young fellow doesn't spend the fortune in a way of which its amasser would not have approved or to preserve some land the former owner loved.

Not Lawrence. He confesses affection for the trees that cover most of Middlegate Farm, but he doesn't demand their preservation. He'd like the mill, one of the largest and oldest in the county, to be restored (the Lawrences have used it as a guesthouse) but doesn't require it.

"The place will be theirs," he said. "I expect they'll take care of it. Ellanor and the children and I have had a great deal of pleasure from it and I hope the people of the county will."

Lawrence will talk about the land, which was camped on and fought over by both sides during the Civil War Battles of Bull Run (First and Second Manassas), but discourages questions about himself and his philanthropy.

"My wife loved the trees, couldn't stand to have one cut and didn't like to see them fall. She picked the land when we bought it in 1935 (the bulk of it for about \$16,000). It was in her name. In her will (Mrs. Lawrence died in June, 1969) she said it was to be donated to a beneficiary of my choice.

"Through the years the Scouts and other groups had come to study nature there, so I thought we should leave it to the people who live in Fairfax and their friends."

Actually, Middlegate Farm is Lawrence's second major gift to Fairfax residents. The first, and some would say the most important one, was the county executive form of government, which was adopted by the voters in 1950 after a masterful campaign designed and executed principally by Lawrence.

In that fight he took on and beat every powerful political group: the entrenched Byrd Organization under the so-called Court-house Crowd headed by the late Circuit Judge Paul E. Brown, and the coalition that had developed the reform movement, which included the League of Women Voters, the Federation of Citizens Association and the Good Government League. He also beat down the chairman of the county's governmental study commission, of which Lawrence was vice chairman.

The Byrd Organization was trying to hold on to the existing county board form, under which power was concentrated in the hands of Judge Brown, able and articulate and arch-conservative.

The coalition, including Lawrence's chairman, was pressing for the county manager form, under which all members of the ruling board would have been elected at large.

Lawrence cried a pox on both their houses in this pre-election letter to The Washington Post:

"The political power today in Fairfax County . . . is vested primarily in a few officials who are elected by county-wide voting. They are the ones who are today fighting change in Fairfax County's government.

"Their brothers under the skin—the politicians who are lurking behind the pressure groups to take over under the county manager system—will be more firmly entrenched in

power than these few elected officials have been. . .

"Each voter would be voting for six supervisors under the county manager plan. It is conceivable that the voters in one district will know enough about the personal capacity of any of the 10 or more candidates for the board from the other districts—or will the voters have to depend upon the political machine or a coalition of pressure groups to hand them a slate on which to vote 'ja'?"

That kind of rhetoric apparently blew all his opponents down, good guys and bad buys together, because the voters gave their "ja" to Lawrence's plan by 5,210 to 3,502.

Lawrence then headed a team that put the county executive form into effect over a two-year period. The new government wasn't perfect by any means—several supervisors have gone to prison for zoning bribery conspiracy—but the more efficient and flexible county executive system at least survived the population boom that started in the 1950s.

Judge Brown, a Virginia gentleman of the old school, was not one to let political differences interfere with friendships. He continued to invite Lawrence as a speaker before the Off the Record Club, a group of Fairfax squires who met to discuss political issues privately and informally.

The squires no longer meet. Most are dead or retired. But David Lawrence marches on, cranking out five newspaper columns a week as he has for 55 years, plus the back page spot in the magazine. Whether he's at his vacation home in Sarasota, Fla. the farm or his suite at the Sheraton-Carlton Hotel, he always has his news ticker and a direct telephone line to his office at U.S. News.

His lifetime routine remains unbroken, although a friend said "it's just a routine now, with Ellanor gone. She was the center around whom he revolved."

Lawrence said it himself during the Medal of Freedom award ceremony at the White House on April 22:

"I have a sentimental interest in the White House. I started writing about White House activities when I graduated from Princeton in 1910 when Mr. Taft was President. . . . It so happened in the early years I was sitting in the White House lobby when a beautiful girl went through to call on a member of the secretarial staff. Two and a half years later she became my wife. We were married for almost 51 years. The Lord sent me one of the most wonderful companions in the world and he took her away last year. I know if she could have been here she would have appreciated this hour very much, and I do, too.

"Thank you, Mr. President."

The President: "I am sure she is here right now."

Now, he doesn't want to talk about her with strangers. He shrugged off questions about the award scrolls and plaques, covering two walls of his office, which he has accumulated over the years. Never mind the Presidential Medal of Freedom presented to him "and seven other old guys."

Lawrence is a very private man.

And a busy one. He steps carefully now, not so big and vigorous as once, but he steps right along, aided and abetted by Obadiah William Person, his chauffeur of 27 years, who maneuvers the huge black Cadillac limousine through Washington traffic with a skill and abandon that would make any nut in a Volkswagen envious. The Cady does not have low-number license plates. It wouldn't occur to Lawrence to ask for them, although the President says Lawrence is the journalist he has known longest and best.

Out to the farm, roaring down Rt. 66 to the Centreville exit. Whipping past his lands and his pond and the Civil War earthworks. First stop, the wash house, to turn on the ticker. Paper jams. Damn machine won't work. Never mind.

Lawrence seems to be in a hurry, although he assures his interviewer he's not. The

old man touches everything he passes in the cottage, everything he passes in the mill. He hasn't really lived at the farm since Mrs. Lawrence died.

## RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) has raised for scrutiny by Congress and the public the question of covert funding by the Central Intelligence Agency of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. He has proposed legislation to authorize public funding of these stations. His statements have been well covered by the press, and considerable information of potential value to Senators is contained in this group of articles, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Jan. 24, 1971]  
CASE WOULD BAR CIA AID FOR RADIO FREE EUROPE

(By Benjamin Welles)

WASHINGTON, January 23.—Senator Clifford P. Case, Republican of New Jersey, charged today that the Central Intelligence Agency had spent several hundred million dollars over the last 20 years to keep Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty functioning.

Mr. Case, a member of the Appropriations and Foreign Relations Committees, said that he would introduce legislation Monday to bring Government spending on the two stations under the authorization and appropriations process of Congress. Representative Ogden R. Reid, Republican of Westchester, said today that he would introduce similar legislation in the House.

Radio Free Europe, founded in 1950, and Radio Liberty, formed a year later, both have powerful transmitters in Munich, West Germany, staffed by several thousand American technicians and refugees from Eastern Europe.

Radio Liberty broadcasts only into the Soviet Union, Radio Free Europe to other Eastern European countries except Yugoslavia.

Both organizations have offices in New York and purport to be privately endowed with funds coming exclusively from foundations, corporations and the public. Both, however, are extremely reticent about the details of their financing.

Senator Case noted in a statement that both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty "claim to be nongovernmental organizations sponsored by private contributions." However, he went on, "available sources indicate direct C.I.A. subsidies pay nearly all their costs."

The Senator said that the Central Intelligence Agency provided the stations with \$30-million in the last fiscal year without formal Congressional approval.

### DISCLOSURES RESTRICTED

Under the Central Intelligence Agency's operating rules, its activities—such as covert funding—are approved by the National Security Council. However, disclosure to Congress is limited to a handful of senior legislators on watchdog committees of each house.

The Central Intelligence Agency and Radio Free Europe both declined to comment today on Senator Case's statement. Efforts to elicit comment from Radio Liberty were unavailing.

Covert C.I.A. funding of the two stations has, however, been an open secret for years, although the C.I.A., in accordance with

February 11, 1971

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 1323

A change in the law will be necessary before the small farmer can be helped. The set-aside eligibility requirement was delayed one year by an administrative order from the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

With this thinking we fully agree, as will all those interested in the plight of our farmers under this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire Hackethorne article, "Plow Up That Grass, Gain 'Flexibility,'" be printed in the RECORD.

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

Plow Up That Grass, Gain "Flexibility"  
(By Jack Hackethorne)

The Administration's new farm bill has small farmers in a pickle. Recently announced changes in eligibility set-aside provisions have quieted some of the rumbles from larger farmers, but even they had been unhappy about plowing up grass to comply with a set-aside provision requiring acres to be rotated.

A change in the law will be necessary before the small farmer can be helped. The set-aside eligibility requirement was delayed one year by an administrative order from the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

In Nodaway County, for example, 691 farms have a feed grain base of 25 acres or less. Many are maintaining their homes on these farms. Many of these small farms are owned by retired farmers drawing a small government payment and, in some cases, Social Security.

Many of these farms have been seeded for pasture and hay. If price support payments are collected, the new law requires a minimum of 45 percent of feed grain base be planted or the base will be reduced each year, eliminated after three years. To protect this base will require this grass land be broken out. Not only will this add to soil erosion and pollution problems but some farmers will be forced off the farm.

Emery Shell has an 88-acre farm south of Pickering. He is 73 years old and has lived on this place since 1949. Shell has a 20-acre feed grain base, seeded to grass since 1961. "Now, to qualify, I must plow up some of the good grass and plant corn," he says. "It ought to raise good corn. It has had a rest, but I would be better off the way it was under the old program."

Carl E. Helzer lives on 78 acres south of Maryville. At 79, "I am not able to farm any more. All my ground is in grass and is terraced. I have been trying to get it all in grass. It is good farming and there is no erosion, and will be better land when I leave than what I moved on 40 years ago, I have no need for corn, and at my age I hate to plow up any grass."

Elbert Risser, Route 1, Sheridan, has 200 acres, "would just as soon have the entire farm seeded down in grass and feed a few cows. Now I will have to plow up 21 acres of fescue that would make an awful lot of winter pasture just to save feed grain base."

A controversial section of the program dealing with set-aside acres was temporarily delayed a year after a loud rumble from the midwest feed grain farmers.

Under the old farm program (Act of 1965) farmers were urged to take land out of feed grain production and to divert acres to soil conserving crops such as grass. If farmers harvest a crop from these diverted acres they lose government payment and price supports.

Under the Administration's new program farmers were asked to set aside acres (probably 20 percent of the feed grain base but the figure is yet to be announced) and take them out of production. If they set aside these acres along with conserving acres they would

be free to grow all the corn and other feed grains they want on remaining acres. The catch is that the set-aside acres must have been used to grow crops in one of the past three years. This virtually rules out land diverted from production from year-to-year under the previous program. The effect would be to force farmers to rotate acres set aside each year. This would have disrupted cropping plans and increased costs by making it necessary to plow up land already seeded to grass and established grass seedlings on land intended for feed grain crops.

H. H. Woolridge, in Cooper County, thinks the provision is "silly" and the delay should be made permanent. "I have been using 2 pounds of Atrazine per acre to keep the weeds and grass out of my corn for about 12 years. Grass will not grow on this ground. It does not make sense to plow up good grass and plant corn and then expect to establish a good cover of grass on those fields that have been in corn."

D. T. Weekley, who farms near Blackwater, said, "They are asking us to destroy what we have already done and to start over again."

## NOTHING TO FEAR FROM FBI

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, last year the Congress passed the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970 which imposed great new responsibilities on the FBI. These included new areas of combating organized crime and in investigating bombings at institutions receiving Federal assistance. Shortly after this act was passed, the Congress also approved a supplemental appropriation for the FBI to enable that agency to employ an additional 1,000 special agents to handle the new duties.

A great amount of misinformation was circulated about this increase of FBI manpower and the added responsibilities with respect to bombings. It was alleged the FBI was going to swamp college campuses around the country with its agents and take over the policing of student activities. Nothing could have been further from the truth.

Recently I came across an editorial in the Panama City, Fla., News Herald which speaks clearly to the charges that the FBI was going to be used to curtail freedom of speech on campuses. I think it is important to make this editorial comment a matter of record for the Congress and ask unanimous consent to include it in the RECORD.

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

## NOTHING TO FEAR FROM FBI

Since its inception the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been and continues to be just what the title implies, an investigative arm of law enforcement. It is not a federal police force. Neither is it judge and jury for alleged criminal actions.

Alarmists, however, are crying again that the FBI plans to "saturate" college campuses with officers to curtail liberty and freedom of speech.

The whispering campaign against the FBI stems from President Nixon's provision for appointment of 1,000 additional agents in the fight against organized crime.

The Organized Crime Control Act of 1970 signed into law Oct. 1 specifically gives the FBI the responsibility for investigating bombings or bombing attempts on federal property or any institution receiving federal financial assistance.

The notion that such action presents a threat to the country is ridiculous.

As FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover observed, the FBI would be "more than pleased if it were never necessary to investigate a single bombing under the new act."

There's really nothing sinister and menacing about investigation acts of bombing and terrorism. They've almost doubled in number over 1969, and persons who worry about "repressive" law enforcement might better expand their energy in working to prevent these crimes.

## GIFTS OF DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the February 11 edition of the Washington Post includes an article on Mr. David Lawrence, by Hank Burchard, a Washington Post staff writer.

The article describes Mr. Lawrence's philanthropies, which have been generous and of great benefit to the people of northern Virginia.

Mr. Lawrence is one of the Nation's most distinguished journalists. His was the first newspaper column to be syndicated by wire.

He became president and editor of U.S. News in 1933 and since 1959 has been chairman of the board and editor of U.S. News & World Report.

More than 300 newspapers carry Mr. Lawrence's daily column.

At the age of 82, Mr. Lawrence continues to write his column and maintain his interest in world affairs. His long career is one of singular achievement.

David Lawrence is a great newspaperman, a great American, and a wonderful friend.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Washington Post article "Gifts of David Lawrence" be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

GIFTS OF DAVID LAWRENCE  
(By Hank Burchard)

David Lawrence came into this world with very little and wants to go out of it the same way, not that he's in any hurry.

Lawrence, 82, dean of American syndicated newspaper columnists (he invented the form in 1916), founder of his own news service and a flourishing weekly newsmagazine, friend and/or chastiser of Presidents from Taft to Nixon, respected spokesman for what might be called the Old Right, should be a wealthy man.

He isn't. He has given most of it away. Lawrence sold the news service, called the Bureau of National Affairs, to its employees in 1946 and did the same with his magazine, U.S. News & World Report, in 1962, at what associates called bargain prices.

The last of his major possessions, the magnificent Middlegate Farm near Centerville in Fairfax County, he gave to the people of the county in December, final title to pass when he does.

The farm is 639.8 acres, two-tenths of an acre less than one square mile. It was given without strings, lock, stock and barrel, including houses (3), furnishings, mementos and all—every thing except the news teletype printer in the wash house, which is the property of the Associated Press.

The rolling, wooded acres are assessed at \$5 million, but the land is actually priceless, there being no other such piece of private property in the county.

He gave it the way he always does these things, the way he gave land for three Centerville churches, diffidently and at a distance. He gave the farm by sending a note

standing policy, and the two stations themselves have consistently refused to discuss either their operations or their funding.

Citing returns filed with the Internal Revenue Service in the 1969 fiscal year, Mr. Case said that the stations' combined operating costs that year totaled \$33,997,336. Of this, he said, Radio Free Europe spent \$21,109,935 and Radio Liberty \$12,887,401.

#### FUNDS SOUGHT BY ADVERTISEMENT

"The bulk of Radio Free Europe's and Radio Liberty's budgets, or more than \$30-million annually, comes from direct C.I.A. subsidies," Mr. Case charged. "Congress has never participated in authorization of funds to R.F.E. or R.L., although hundreds of millions of dollars in Government funds have been spent during the last 20 years."

Mr. Case pointed out that Radio Free Europe conducted a yearly campaign for public contributions under the auspices of the Advertising Council. Between \$12-million and \$20-million in free media space is donated annually to this campaign, he said, but the return from the public is "apparently less than \$100,000."

Furthermore, he said, both stations attempted to raise money from corporations and foundations but contributions from these sources reportedly pay only a small part of the stations' total budgets.

Senator Case said that his proposed legislation would seek to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to authorize funds for both stations in the fiscal year beginning next July 1. His proposal would call for an initial sum of \$30-million, but he said that the sum would be subject to change.

#### BAR ON OTHER FUNDS

At the same time, Mr. Case said, his proposal would provide that "no other" United States Government funds could be made available to either station except under the provisions of the act. He also said that he would ask that Administration officials concerned with overseas information policies be called to testify in order to determine the amount needed for the station's operations.

"I can understand why covert funds might have been used for a year or two in an emergency situation when extreme secrecy was necessary and when no other Government funds were available," Mr. Case said.

But, he went on, the justification for covert funding has lessened over the years as international tension has eased, as the secrecy surrounding the stations has "melted away," and as more open means of funding could be developed.

"In other words," he said, "the extraordinary circumstances that might have been thought to justify circumvention of constitutional processes and Congressional approval no longer exist."

#### JOHNSON CREATED XXX

Mr. Case pointed out that in 1967, after there had been public disclosure that the C.I.A. had been secretly funding the National Student Association, President Johnson created a committee that was headed by Nicholas de B. Katzenbach, the Under Secretary of State, and that included Richard Helms, head of the C.I.A., and John W. Gardner, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

He further noted that on March 29, 1967, Mr. Johnson publicly accepted the committee's recommendation that "no Federal agency shall provide covert financial assistance or support, direct or indirect, to any of the nation's educational or voluntary organizations" and that "no programs currently would justify any exceptions to this policy."

People familiar with the operations of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty noted that both had been started at the peak of the Cold War and had just "gone rolling on" ever since. The Katzenbach committee,

some sources said, had cut off covert funding from virtually all other recipients.

"They solved all the tough ones," one source said, "but they were under such pressure from Johnson to get their report out and get the heat from Congress and the public cut off that they didn't solve the funding of the stations. They turned it over to another committee."

The second committee, whose members these sources declined to identify, worked over a year and then turned in secret recommendations to Mr. Johnson. However, Mr. Johnson pigeonholed the recommendations and finally left the problem for the incoming Nixon Administration to solve, the sources said.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Jan. 24, 1971]

#### PUBLIC FINANCING OF OUTLETS ASKED; RADIO FREE EUROPE NOW IN CIA SPHERE, CASE WARNS

(By Peter J. Kumpa)

WASHINGTON, January 23.—Senator Clifford P. Case (R., N.J.) announced today that he will introduce legislation Monday to provide for open congressional financing of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

Mr. Case explained that, if approved, the legislation would remove the stations from the need for secret funds from the Central Intelligence Agency. He said that in the last fiscal year, the CIA provided a direct subsidy of \$30 million to the stations which broadcast to the Soviet Union and five Eastern European Communist countries.

Although both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty claim to be non-governmental organizations sponsored by private contributors, the senator said that "available sources" indicate the CIA pays almost all their costs.

#### PRODUCES TAX RETURNS

He produced figures from returns filed with the Internal Revenue Service showing that the combined operating costs for the stations in fiscal 1969 was almost \$34 million (\$21,109,935 for Radio Free Europe and \$12,887,401 for Radio Liberty).

Though a national advertising campaign under the auspices of the Advertising Council uses somewhere between \$12 and \$20 million in free media space to solicit contributions for the stations, Mr. Case said, returns from the public amount to less than \$100,000.

The stations raise the rest of their budgets from corporate and foundation contributions, he said.

"Congress has never participated in authorization or appropriations of funds to Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty, although hundreds of millions of dollars in government funds have been spent during the last 20 years," Senator Case said.

"I can understand why covert funds might have been used for a year or two in an emergency situation when extreme secrecy was necessary and when no other government funds were available" he went on.

#### LESSENING OF TENSION

But now, the senator asserted, with the lessening of international tension and with the melting of secrecy, some means of open financing of the stations should have been provided.

"In other words, the extraordinary circumstances that might have been thought to justify circumvention of constitutional processes and congressional approval no longer exist," Senator Case said.

The senator was not critical of the work of the stations, both of which have their main offices and studios in Munich, Germany. His legislation, in fact, would authorize \$30 million for continuation of their work. He simply wants Congress to supervise the spending of taxpayers' money.

Radio Free Europe, started in 1950, broad-

casts to Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Romania. Radio Liberty, opened a year later, concentrates only on the Soviet Union. In 1956, Radio Free Europe was criticized for raising false hopes of help for the Hungarian rebels. Since then, the stations have been less controversial.

Informed congressional sources have no doubts about the close tie-up between the stations and the government.

A full-time liaison officer from the consulate in Munich is assigned to go over program content to make it conform to U.S. government policy, they point out. Because classified as well as unclassified government information is provided, security personnel check out the stations, the same sources report.

Further, they say U.S. embassy officials from Eastern Europe get briefings at Radio Free Europe. The station, in turn, uses the coded communications of the Munich consulate to keep in touch with Washington, the sources report.

Though their studios are in Germany, the transmitters for the stations are in Spain, Portugal and Taiwan, all countries with special arrangements with the United States, the sources report.

#### THE 1967 PANEL'S FINDINGS

In 1967, after disclosures of CIA financing of the National Student Association, a presidential committee made up of John Gardner, then Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Richard Helms, CIA director, and Nicholas de B. Katzenbach, then under secretary of State, recommended that no federal agency should provide covert funds for any of the nation's "educational or voluntary organizations."

President Johnson accepted the committee's recommendations. On March 29, 1967, he ordered all federal agencies to implement them.

Senator Case's bill, similar to one shortly to be introduced in the House by Representative Ogden R. Reid (R., N.Y.), would provide funds for the stations out of the Informational and Educational Exchange Act. It would forbid funding by any other government channel.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 25, 1971]

#### CIA AGAIN CHARGED WITH POLICY MEDDLING (By Robert P. Hey)

WASHINGTON.—Once again, charges of Central Intelligence Agency influence on U.S. foreign policy are reverberating through Congress.

Sen. Clifford P. Case charges that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty actually are financed—clandestinely—by the CIA, to the tune of more than \$30 million annually.

The New Jersey Republican alleges "several hundred million dollars in United States Government funds" have been given these stations over the past 20 years without congressional approval or even knowledge.

In New York, Bernard Yarow, senior vice-president of Radio Free Europe, says his organization's reaction to the charges is: "No comment."

#### SUPPORT SUPPOSEDLY PRIVATE

Both stations beam information to Communist-controlled nations in Eastern Europe. They have stoutly maintained for years that they were financed through private contributions.

Senator Case, the New Jersey Republican, thinks it is high time all this was brought out into the open. He has introduced legislation to have the finances of both stations provided, openly, through the same authorization-and-appropriation process through which Congress controls the budgets of most governmental agencies.

These changes strengthen one present trend—the increasing insistence of Con-



gress—particularly the Senate—on exerting influence upon the direction of United States foreign policy.

But all this also seems like a page out of the recent past. In 1967 it was disclosed that the CIA was funding what had been presumed to be an organization of students without government links, the National Student Association. The uproar at that time was thunderous over clandestine government penetration of student organizations, with all the implications of potential infringement on academic freedom.

#### EARLIER REPORT QUOTED

Senator Case now quotes, with considerable irony, a recommendation made by a presidential committee which investigated that CIA funding.

It recommended that "no federal agency shall provide covert financial assistance or support, direct or indirect, to any of the nation's educational or voluntary organizations," and that "no programs currently would justify any exception to this policy."

Sources close to Senator Case say he is not trying to close down Radio Free Europe, but merely to bring into the open the government's relationship to it.

The view here is that the CIA for 20 years has remained the financier of Radio Free Europe, in the Case charge, due to bureaucratic inertia. "It's the whole question of how does the government change," in the words of one source. No one here suggests there is any Machiavellian plot behind the CIA financing, at least, not at present.

The Case bill is expected to be referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, chaired by Sen. J. Fulbright (D) of Arkansas, where it is assured a sympathetic hearing. Senator Case is a member of that committee.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch,  
Jan. 24, 1971]

#### PROPOSES CIA CUT OFF RADIO STATION FUNDS (By Richard Dudman)

WASHINGTON, January 23.—Senator Clifford P. Case (Rep.), New Jersey, proposed Saturday that the United States drop the pretense that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are private enterprises and begin financing them openly.

Although the two propaganda stations have been widely known to be operations of the Central Intelligence Agency, Case became possibly the first public official to blurt out the truth publicly.

Radio Free Europe, beamed to Eastern Europe, and Radio Liberty, beamed to the Soviet Union, operate in Munich, West Germany, ostensibly on private contributions.

But Case said these contributions apparently come to less than \$100,000 a year, with modest additional amounts from foundations and corporations, whereas the stations' operating expenses for fiscal 1969 were almost \$34,000,000.

He showed copies of returns they filed with the Internal Revenue Service reporting that operating costs were \$21,109,935 for Radio Free Europe and \$12,887,401 for Radio Liberty.

#### FREE ADVERTISING

Case said he had been advised that between \$12,000,000 and \$20,000,000 in free media space was donated annually to the fund raising campaign under auspices of the Advertising Council.

"In the last 20 years several hundred million dollars in United States Government funds have been expended from secret CIA budgets to pay almost totally for the costs of these two radio stations broadcasting to Eastern Europe," Case said. "In the last fiscal year alone, over \$30,000,000 was provided by CIA as a direct government subsidy; yet at no time was Congress asked or permitted to carry out its traditional constitutional role of approving the expenditure."

The Senator said he would introduce a bill Monday amending the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to authorize funds for the two stations in fiscal 1972. The bill also would provide that no other U.S. Government funds may go to either radio station except under provisions of the act.

#### POST ENDORSES HUMPHREY- REUSS REVENUE-SHARING BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. President, Monday's Washington Post contained a lead editorial which addressed itself to the various revenue-sharing proposals now before the Congress.

I am gratified the editorial singled out the bill that Congressman HENRY REUSS and I introduced for laudatory mention.

Senator HUMPHREY and "Congressman REUSS have put in a bill which would phase the funds progressively over a longer period of time, meanwhile encouraging the adoption or reform of income taxes by the States and a whole array of measures designed to bring State and local financial and governmental practices at least into the century which will shortly end."

Mr. President, that is indeed the thrust of the Humphrey-Reuss bill—to provide increasing Federal grants to States and local governments to ease their fiscal crunch and as an inducement to reform and streamline their governmental structures and processes.

Local government must be more responsive to the needs of their people. The Humphrey-Reuss bill will authorize the funds to help provide these services and to help State and local governments render themselves able to allocate these funds more efficiently and economically. Such reform will make both present revenues and expected Federal revenue sharing go just that much further.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Post editorial for February 8, 1971, be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### MR. NIXON'S MESSAGE ON REVENUE SHARING

There were not many surprises in the message on revenue sharing the President sent to Congress on Thursday. Mr. Nixon addressed himself primarily to the "general" (or real) revenue sharing of \$5 billion with the states in the program's first year of operation, as distinct from the so-called "special revenue sharing" (more properly, consolidated grants) that has yet to be spelled out and which is meant to provide the states with \$11 billion for broadly defined purposes.

The general revenue sharing measure Mr. Nixon outlined would automatically dispense an amount equal to 1.3 per cent of the nation's taxable personal income to state and local governments for use as they see fit. It is to include financial incentives for the states to maintain their own tax efforts and to work out their own sharing arrangements with local governments—"pass through" formulas, as they are known, that are particularly suited to the state's individual requirements and acceptable to a majority of its governing bodies (such as cities, townships, counties) representing a majority of its population. There is also to be provision for a federal audit which—given the ban on racially discriminatory use of the funds—could prove quite interesting in those cases where the funds might go into the general

treasury of a state or local government: it is not inconceivable that with such a mixture of moneys, the federal government would acquire more leverage than it now has in eliminating discrimination from state-supported programs.

This, to be sure, remains in the realm of speculation as does so much else related to the meaning and ultimate effect of Mr. Nixon's proposal. However, "iffy" questions in this matter are especially interesting—indeed, it could be argued that whatever the fate of this particular measure, Mr. Nixon has done the nation a considerable service by initiating what could be a highly productive debate on problems that should have been faced long ago. We are not referring here to the rhetoric of "revolution" or to Mr. Nixon's own antic borrowing ("Power to the People") or to the elided logic that underlies talk of "giving back" to the states functions and responsibilities the federal government acquired only because the states refused to assume them in the first place. Rather, we have in mind the valuable and overdue focusing of attention on the urgency of devising an equitable and effective redistribution of the nation's tax revenue.

The argument over the precise amount of money—\$5 billion—to be shared in the first full year of the general program is a case in point. That sum has been faulted both as too little and too much. But the dispute is not one of those conventional split-the-difference affairs in which the object is merely to reach agreement on the size of an outlay the federal government can afford. Each argument tends to rest, instead, on a particular theory of the merit and purpose of revenue sharing. \$5 billion is far too small a sum if you take at face value the Nixon administration's stated aims. In fact the White House, ritually and repeatedly blaming the nation's social unrest on the gap between promise (or overpromise) and performance, has nonetheless started down a similar road itself in making large, power-to-the-people claims for the dispensation of an amount which is actually less than that by which state and local budgets increase annually. At most these funds can be expected to mitigate a rise in local taxes, not to take the place of such a rise. And the prospective administration measure carries an insufficiency of funds, incentives, and sanctions to ensure that the shared revenue will not merely be of help in perpetuating a variety of relationships between citizen and government and among divisions of government that sorely require change on grounds that range from moral to managerial.

It is for this last reason that others—chiefly legislators and political theorists who are not known for their scrupulousness with the public purse—are claiming that the \$5 billion first year sum is too large. It is too large, they contend, to be dispensed to such uncertain effect when the means are at hand for a pass at revenue sharing that would at once reach the people and the state and local governments in severest need. This alternative would be for the federal government to assume all or almost all the costs of our national welfare programs—meaning that share which state and local governments are now obliged to pay. Meantime—the argument runs—while the state and local governments and their taxpayers would gain relief in the release of state and local welfare expenditures for other purposes, a more modest sum could be allocated to a phased general revenue sharing plan that would be, in Congressman Henry Reuss's terms, a "catalyst" not a "crutch."

This school of thought, to which we are ourselves inclined at this point, holds that the automatic allocation of federally collected revenue to the states represents a step that will not easily be reversed and one with critically important long-term implications and effects. From which it follows that it should not be taken loosely or lightly or in

ington to end its covert financing by the C.I.A. and to finance and operate it on a new open basis. The situation has got to be taken into hand quickly, for as matters stand, funds will run out for RFE—and for Radio Liberty, which broadcasts to the Soviet Union—quite soon. The two stations are much too valuable to be lost in a summer haze.

East European governments resentful of RFE's broad appeal to their populations have long stewed and fulminated about it—along with pulling such dirty tricks as putting poison in the salt shakers of its Munich headquarters. They could do little more, until Willy Brandt opened his policy of reconciliation with the East. Then, sensing an opportunity for leverage, they said that his *Ostpolitik* and RFE are incompatible. In fact, they are not, but Germany was embarrassed. Once Mr. Nixon made clear his position that Americans troops and American radios in Germany are part of a package, however, Bonn diplomatically told the protesting East Europeans to cool down.

Some East European governments bored in harder when Senator Clifford Case stated publicly what almost everybody had known for years—that the C.I.A. finances RFE (and Radio Liberty). Poland, for instance, called upon the United States last month to put RFE off the air.

Senator Case's point was to get RFE out in the open and so he offered a bill to finance it by direct appropriations, through the State Department. The administration, correctly contending that much of RFE's audience appeal lies in its appearance of independence from the American government, countered with a bill to set up a publicly funded "private" corporation to run both RFE and RL (West Germany, for its own reasons, favors the latter approach.) In the meanwhile, there arose on Capitol Hill legitimate questions about the cost of the stations, their research functions, their relationship to other American propaganda and cultural programs, and their coordination with political efforts for detente. The administration did not allow enough time for Congress to cope adequately with these questions and, as a result, the stations are now hanging by the thread of a continuing resolution which provides funds only until August.

We do not have dogmatic views on the kind of organizational home the stations ought to have or on the size of their budgets or the scope of their non-broadcasting activities. We would like to make the emphatic point, however, that RFE and RL do an extremely important job and, in our judgment, do it well.

RFE still carries an image of irresponsibility dating from its indeed-irresponsible words of encouragement to Hungarian rebels in 1956. Together, RFE and RL have the reputation of being the voices of bitter emigres and primitive anti-Communists. The two stations, however, have considerably changed and they can no longer be fairly accused of the sins of their past. What they do now is to communicate directly with the people of East Europe who want to listen to them in order to learn what they cannot learn from their own captive press and radio. The stations do not incite to revolution or preach anti-Communism; they say what is going on in East Europe. It would be an unpardonable breach of faith with the stations' millions of listeners to deny them their choice of radio fare.

Detente, if it means anything, means widening the West's contacts with the East, not helping the East to seal off its people from the West. It means the exchange of people, goods, words and ideas. This is the essential business of RFE and RL. The Congress, in its rightminded determination to shake the station free of the CIA, should not lose sight of the reason for letting them continue it.

## BIERNE SPRAGINS HONORED AS PUBLIC CITIZEN

### HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Huntsville, Ala., Times honored Mr. Bierne Spragins, one of Alabama's most outstanding residents. I have known Mr. Spragins for more than 25 years, and I have never known a more dedicated public citizen.

The editorial remarks in the Huntsville Times cite the high points of his illustrious career of service to his community and its constant improvement. Beyond this record he is congenial and friendly. He is most gallant and chivalrous in all his departments. I am grateful that he has allowed me to be his friend through the years.

At this point I wish to include the comments of the editorial as a part of my remarks:

#### BIERNE SPRAGINS WAS THERE

Things have changed these past 50 years for Huntsville and its Rotary Club; but then some things are pretty much the same. For instance, when Rotary met this week, just as in 1920, Bierne Spragins was there.

The local club, for no special reason but for lots of good ones, therefore, paid tribute to its longtime member and former president (1932-33) for a life-time of effort in behalf of this community's development. We lend our applause.

Mr. Spragins is known generally as a banker. And that he is, having begun at the First National in 1919, soon after returning from World War I service in France. After an interlude operating the family's ice-and-coal company, he returned to First National Bank in 1933 as executive vice president and in 1935 succeeded his father, the late R. E. Spragins, who had served in that capacity since 1909.

But Mr. Spragins has served this community, to which his family came in 1820, in more ways than financial. For he has harbored a steadfast enthusiasm for its economic and cultural development. He was, for example, among the 18 men who organized the Huntsville Industrial Expansion Committee in 1944, and he served as its second president. He also served as president of the Chamber of Commerce in 1946.

In the words of one of his friends, "Bierne probably has had a hand in recruiting every new industry that has come to Huntsville in the past 25 years—except maybe the other banks."

Over the years, Mr. Spragins has garnered his share of accolades for his services. He received the C of C Distinguished Citizens Award in 1964, and in recognition of 21 years of service as chairman of two Army advisory committees, Huntsville's and the Third Army's, he received the Department of the Army's highest civilian award, the Outstanding Civilian Service Medal.

The recognition of his fellow Rotarians added sheen to the illustrious record.

Well, things may have been pretty much the same at Rotary, 1920 and 1971. Bierne Spragins was there.

But things surely are not the same in Huntsville, and in no small measure because Bierne Spragins was here.

## BOOKBURNERS AND CULTURAL CENSORS AT WORK

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in nearby Montgomery County of Maryland the bookburners are back censoring and suppressing free speech in education.

The latest cultural work to be purged is "Little Black Sambo," printed in 1899 and enjoyed for generations by our youth with no qualms of conscience or psychological backlash.

The retort of the censor that the decision was not to be construed as book-burning clearly shows a guilt feeling and psychotic defensive reaction.

If all books in the library that might be offensive to someone were destroyed, there would be few books remaining in the library. Yet no reason was given to purge the book which degraded police officers as "pigs" nor was any book ridiculing whites suggested for suppression.

It appears that Montgomery County has a biased and prejudiced director of educational media and technology on its hands.

In the meantime, another federally funded organization, the Smithsonian Institution, has scoured the country to locate backwoods people, representative of American folklore to come to Washington at taxpayers' expense and give a demonstration of living culture in America.

Included in the conglomeration is said to be a black Ohio Colonial blues band comparable to a New Orleans blues band. Certainly by our Maryland standards of censorship, this could be regarded as "ridicule of black people"—specially if someone white told them so.

The material follows:

[From the Sunday Star, June 27, 1971]

SAMBO "DISMISSED" BY COUNTY SCHOOLS

(By Thomas Love)

"Little Black Sambo," the story of a boy with new clothes who outsmarts several tigers who want to eat him, has been ordered removed from Montgomery County schools.

Following a complaint by a mother of two elementary school children, a system official has ordered all copies of the book removed from school libraries, along with film strips and records telling the story.

"This decision is not to be construed as 'book burning,' but rather as book selection," Nancy C. Walker, director of the department of educational media and technology, said in a memo to all principals and librarians.

In May, Barbara Smith, of 11212 Skuykill Road, Rockville, whose two children attend Rockinghorse Elementary School, complained to the school administration that the book is a "ridicule of black people."

The black mother asked that the books be withdrawn from school libraries. After a month-long investigation, a committee of principals, librarians, teachers and a central office staff member recommended that her requests be granted.

"'Little Black Sambo' is derogatory. It's not good literature for children."

She said the book implies that "black people are preoccupied with 'fine' clothes, in-

ing Sea in about 1,000 years, at which time it would be harmless. The "very unlikely" alternative would be for the radioactive water to reach the Bering Sea in two or three years at about 1,200 times safe levels and continue to be discharged for 130 years, he says.

"In this unlikely event, the mixing with ocean waters in longshore currents would introduce an effective dilution factor," Mr. Gard says confidently.

But Jerold Lowenstein, a radiation expert at the University of California Medical Center in San Francisco, scoffs at the "magic of dilution" and says low levels of radioactivity can accumulate and be reconcentrated in the food cycle. Sen. Gravel adds, "In these days when the nation is deeply concerned about mercury poisoning and the market for seafood products has fallen off sharply, even the suspicion that radioactive water is leaking to the surface could devastate the market for all fishery species of the North Pacific."

Conservationists are especially enraged because the Aleutian Islands, including Amchitka, are a national wildlife refuge. But when he established the refuge in 1913, President Taft provided that Amchitka could be used for military purposes. Says the Audubon Society's Mr. Bell, "I think it is perfectly clear that cooling stations and the like were the kind of military purposes that President Taft considered commensurate with wildlife refuge status. It is obvious that he could not have conceivably imagined that this might include testing five-megaton nuclear weapons."

**"NO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT"**

Cannikin, the AEC claims, will cause "no significant environmental impact" on Amchitka. The island is home to the endangered sea otter, which the AEC has been helping transplant to other habitats in an effort to expand its ranks. Perhaps as many as 20 sea otters "could suffer measurable physiological effects" from the test, the AEC says, but the overall impact will be "negligible." The AEC adds that "a few fish of commercially important species may be killed by the shock."

As far as the Aleuts are concerned, the Aleutians should belong to them under a complex Alaskan native land claims settlement now pending before Congress. Ilodor Philemonof, president of the Aleut League, which is threatening a lawsuit, says the Aleuts "were and are entitled to the protection of provisions of the Constitution. Property should not be taken without due process." The proposed explosion, he alleges, is another example of the white man subjecting Aleuts to "mistreatment and misfortune."

But the overriding issue in the controversy may be whether the test is actually necessary. Officially, the AEC hasn't disclosed the precise purpose of the \$160 million project except that "the test is considered of vital importance to national security." In testimony to a Senate committee in April, an AEC official admitted Cannikin will be to test the warhead for the Spartan antiballistic missile.

If that's the case, some scientists allege, then Cannikin is pointless. Jeremy J. Stone, director of the 2,000-member Federation of American Scientists, claims Cannikin was conceived by the AEC in 1966 under President Johnson to test the Spartan missile, an anti-Chinese missile defense system. However, Mr. Stone contends, the Nixon administration in early 1969 revised the ABM program to have the defense of Minuteman ICBM's against a Soviet threat as its primary purpose, with the defense of cities from a China attack as a supplemental program. "There now is ample reason to believe that a majority of the U.S. Senate will not support an anti-Chinese ABM," he says, adding that the Spartan missile isn't necessary in the ICBM defense system.

"Basically," Mr. Stone argues, "Cannikin is a bureaucratic oversight—an experiment that has been waiting to be canceled."

The final green light for Cannikin must be flashed by President Nixon. The Anchorage Daily Times, quotes "reliable sources" in Washington as saying the administration may cancel Cannikin because of its "potential political risk" in the wake of the recent agreement with the Soviet Union at the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks to negotiate limits on defensive ABM systems. (One AEC official grumbles that the Russians earlier this year set off a six-megaton test on an Arctic Island and "you didn't hear too much about that.")

Like its smaller Amchitka predecessor in 1969, Cannikin is generating much international ill will, especially in Canada and Japan, two fishing nations. Patrick Moore, a Canadian conservationist, points out that Japan, Canada and even the Soviet Union (which is 800 miles from Amchitka) are closer to the blast sites than is the contiguous U.S., and thus "exposed to a more serious threat." His suggestion: If the U.S. wants "to indulge" itself in the test, explode it in the geographic center of the U.S. in central Kansas.

**THEY MOUTHED MORALITY**

**HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to direct the attention of the House to today's news commentary section of the New York Times, where Charles Frankel has presented a very informative and clarifying analysis of Walter Rostow's view of "moralism" in policymaking for Vietnam:

**THEY MOUTHED MORALITY**

(By Charles Frankel)

Walt Rostow has stated the moral case for the war in Vietnam in these pages. No one who knows Mr. Rostow doubts his sincerity or depth of moral commitment. But the issue is not what it has been said to be—that those who made the decisions about the war were indifferent to moral considerations. The issue is the impersonal one as to the actual nature of these considerations, and the kind of logic that should be used in thinking about them.

It is odd for Mr. Rostow to call on George Kennan's animadversions against "moralism" to support the position he takes. His position is a study in moralism. Reading him, I have the same feeling again that I had when I discussed the war with some of its defenders in the Johnson Administration. It was the feeling of running into a blank wall, and turning around and running into another.

The first was a wall of fact to which I wasn't privy. ("If only you knew the facts that we know about Vietnam, you wouldn't hold the position you do." Well, now I know some of those facts, and they are quite unlovely.) But the other wall was and is the Great Wall of Moral Absolutes, a wall of principles to which one clings against the facts, against experience, against feeling.

Mr. Rostow begins, in effect, by telling us to keep our guard up against moral doubts. He sets up an impossible ideal—absolute pacifism—and confesses to a feeling of sadness that we can't attain it. But we can't; life is hard. "All national policy—like the human condition itself—is morally flawed."

The operative moral question about the war in Vietnam is not whether war in general is "ugly and sinful." It is about this war,

its necessity, its purposes, whether these purposes could be accomplished, whether they were worth accomplishing given the cost in human suffering.

And what about this war? Mr. Rostow says that it meets one condition for being moral because the "national interests" we have pursued in Vietnam are parallel to those of the South Vietnamese, who, in 1961 and 1965, wanted to fight for an independent destiny. The South Vietnamese? Which one? Which government? What about the South Vietnamese who are with the Vietcong?

Again, Mr. Rostow says that a war, if it is to be moral, must be conducted "so as to minimize damage to civilian lives." The argument, when offered in defense of the Vietnam war, is ghoulish. What is the relation of this abstract principle to mass transfers of populations, free-fire zones, the ghastly weapons we have used? Does the fact that all national policy is "morally flawed" relieve us from the responsibility of looking at facts?

The rest of Mr. Rostow's statement is similar. He says that our basic "power interests" in the world are morally legitimate because they are wholly "negative": We simply wish "to prevent the dominance of Europe and Asia by a single potentially hostile power." But what of the specific ways in which we have pursued this "negative" goal?

We cannot draw the lessons from Vietnam that some of its critics wish us to. The war is not a product of "the system." It is the product of the Cold War mentality, of the inordinate influence of the Pentagon and its satellites, and of policies that were adopted only by circumventing the system of consultation with the electorate and its representatives. But the way we got into the war, the way we have argued about it, tells us something about our national life.

It tells us that the habit is widespread of asserting airy moral principles without looking at their content and consequences. Highly intelligent men, products of the best education we have to offer, think that they have done their duty by morals when they mouth abstractions whose living meaning is left unexamined, and cling to lofty goals without ever asking whether the legitimacy of these goals is affected by what is done in their pursuit.

**RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY**

**HON. ROBERT H. STEELE**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 24, I joined Mr. REID of New York in sponsoring of H.R. 9330, a bill to provide for the creation of an American Council for Private International Communications, Inc., as a funding and management mechanism for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. Last Saturday, the Washington Post published an editorial regarding RFE and RL. I bring to the attention of my colleagues this very informative piece:

**THE ESSENTIAL BUSINESS OF RADIO FREE EUROPE**

Radio Free Europe, which undertakes to tell East Europeans the news about themselves that their own controlled media withhold, is under harsh political attack for that reason from governments of some of the East European countries it broadcasts to. It may face an even greater peril, however, from the confusion of efforts underway in Wash-

themselves substantial, should not be allowed to overshadow those of the cities. For, after all, governments exist to meet the needs of people, and people do not lose their legitimate claim upon government by congregating—wisely or unwisely—in metropolitan areas.

There is no easy solution to the complex and interrelated problems which plague governments at all levels. But anything which drives wedges between different constituencies within any given state, as is bound to happen if Uncle Sam bypasses the states in dealing with the cities, will simply make matters worse.

### AMERICA'S HOUSING POLICIES

Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. President, the Supreme Court's recent decision in *James against Valtierra*, upholding the constitutionality of California's mandatory public housing referendum law, has caused considerable controversy across the Nation. No one knows what effect the decision will have on America's housing policies. Many commentators have asserted that it should be read very narrowly, while others claim that the Court has closed off the suburbs to low- and moderate-income families.

Herbert M. Franklin, executive associate of the National Urban Coalition, has written a thoughtful review of the *James* case entitled "Power to the people who got there first" which deserves the attention of every person concerned with lowering the economic barriers now surrounding our suburbs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Franklin's article published in the May/June issue of *City* magazine be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### POWER TO THE PEOPLE WHO GOT THERE FIRST

The recent declaration by a five-man majority of the Supreme Court that local referenda on decent housing for the poor "demonstrate devotion to democracy, not bias, discrimination, or prejudice" should awaken school book memories of our national past.

Our most momentous, and calamitous, friction between democratic theory and the fate of the helpless took place in 1854. In that year Stephen Douglas destroyed the Missouri Compromise by promoting "squatter sovereignty" through the odious Kansas-Nebraska Act that permitted slavery to be voted up or down in those two territories. Historians suggest that Douglas probably sincerely believed that slavery would be voted down. But it took a Civil War and virtually a new Constitution to resolve the questions symbolized by that event. We apparently have some more resolving to do under the complicated circumstances of modern life.

Lincoln's rebuttal to Douglas was essentially that the sacred right of self-government of the few cannot be permitted to override the concerns of an entire nation. It was not the vote in the territories that concerned Lincoln but its impact on the needs of the whole society, as those needs were themselves expressed through less parochial but still democratic means. His argument is still fresh and instructive.

It took long enough, but the Supreme Court's solicitude for racial minorities when they are directly and officially disadvantaged has now been established. But the current slim majority has chosen to ignore what every presidential commission in recent years has documented: the inextricable link be-

tween the problems of race and poverty in this society. In so doing, the Court has chosen not to see in the Constitution the guiding principles of economic justice that must undergird a concern for racial justice in urban America. Both require for their solution national policies that are now frustrated by a latter-day squatter sovereignty.

If the conflicts today are less strident than in Lincoln's time, they are just as pervasive. The widening racial and economic disparities in metropolitan areas, now confirmed by the census, will require new national policies that balance the just claims of the needy against the legitimate purposes of local self-government.

For example, a third of our families cannot attain decent housing without a subsidy. The federal government will be subsidizing the construction of 500,000 dwelling units next year. That figure must grow to 750,000 in a few years if our national 10-year housing goals are to be met. During the last decade the federal involvement was a minuscule 60,000 units annually. But we have inherited a dual system of transmitting these increasingly large subsidies to the ultimate beneficiaries. If you are a moderate- or middle-income family you get the benefit of the federal interest assistance subsidies through the Federal Housing Administration and private intermediaries who finance and develop housing. If you are poor you get your subsidy (if you get any at all) only on the initiative of local public officials and, thanks to the Court, perhaps the sufferance of the local electorate. As a result, housing subsidies for low-income families are simply unavailable in vast sections of the nation, including some major cities, while FHA mortgage insurance and subsidies flow to the nonpoor with the market. The only FHA subsidy for low-income people, the rent supplement program, by federal law requires local official approval (even though the project is on the tax rolls). So a perverse symmetry is maintained—a legislated, and now Court-sanctioned, bias against the poor—which is magnified if the enormous automatic income tax benefits to middle- and high-income homeowners are considered.

Short of federal occupation of the field, replacing this dualism by a single-variable housing subsidy for the entire range of eligible income groups, even the moderate-income programs may come under the cloud of the Court's decision. Many local controversies have affected moderate-income rather than low-income proposals. With the federal role in housing increasing the President has stood astride the suburban boundary to oppose "forced integration" and to defend the economic integrity of enclaves of "\$20,000 to \$24,000" homes probably occupied by families with incomes not significantly higher than those eligible for federal moderate-income subsidies.

Who is protecting whom from what? This is an illustration of how essentially racial tensions can deny opportunities for whites as well as blacks. The President is, in effect, telling the white postal worker or teacher seeking a subsidized dwelling in the suburbs: We're going to treat your needs as though you were black. Even moderate-income housing in the suburbs in popular terms means "black" housing and "economic" integration means "racial" integration. Last year, in fact, the President sent Congress a report in which he asserted that both economic and racial discrimination limits sites for federal low- and moderate-income housing programs.

In this context the distinction between economic and racial integration is a arid legalism. Since the federal programs are supposed to open up housing opportunities on an integrated basis, everyone knows that subsidized units potentially can be occupied by blacks. The majority's observation that the challenged mandatory referendum is "neutral" because it applies to all low-in-

come projects and not only to "projects which will be occupied by a racial minority" is an archaic throwback to the now outlawed public housing policy in segregating the races.

Almost one hundred years ago Justice Field said, "When we take our seats on the bench we are not struck with blindness and forbidden to know as judges what we see as men."

For those who can see, the trend is disturbing. The federal housing programs are premised on the interest of private entrepreneurs to work in tandem with government assistance. What is happening lately should give them pause. Projects that increase racial concentrations in the inner city have been challenged successfully under the civil rights laws. Sites in suburbia or "better" areas will meet with various local exclusionary tactics. The vise is beginning to close on the availability of sites, and the risks of delay or total frustration have mounted. As for Secretary Romney's ambition to attract the most highly capitalized concerns into these programs, one can assume these are also the people with the most cautious lawyers.

Lawyers can, of course, find many reasons to limit the scope of the opinion. California's unique history of putting many public questions before the electorate may make similar attempts to single out the poor for electoral consideration in other states more suspect. Situations where racial prejudice is obviously a motivating factor clearly remain subject to successful legal challenge, and these encompass not only referenda but discriminatory zoning, subdivision, and building regulations. But the result will embolden the latter-day squatters who would like to keep anybody out of their privileged sanctuaries.

Indeed, the majority's evisceration of the equal protection clause seems to invite referenda on welfare and other programs for the poor that may "lead to large expenditures of local governmental funds for increased public services and . . . lower tax revenues." Why poor people living in squalid slums (many of them tax-delinquent properties) place a greater burden on public services than poor people in decent housing is not explained. What is implied is that you can vote on whether to let them in at all.

There may be some, even on the Supreme Court, who believe as did Stephen Douglas, that the common sense of the most parochial electorate will recognize poverty as one of the more costly conditions we confront. But with the President describing welfare beneficiaries as shiftless work-shirkers, a compassionate electorate may be too much to expect.

There is other potential mischief in this decision. People are expensive, particularly people with school-age children, and this is so whether they are rich or poor. If you can get the industry and let the new people live in the neighboring town your property taxes will be lower. (If they are poor people, or black people, all the more reason to keep them out.)

If a referendum can purify fencing out the poor (since these, in the Court's terms, are only one of the "diverse and shifting groups that make up the American people"), why not use it as a refuge against urban growth generally? Can the townships of large-lot homes and excessive building size requirements keep out apartments by putting this to a vote of existing residents on the grounds that apartment dwellers will increase the costs of public services? Or how about voting to keep out all but one-bedroom apartments? Indeed, in a recent study of one well-to-do suburb, it appears that because of low assessments on expensive homes, the presence of a good industrial tax base and high per capita school expenditures, a three-bedroom, single-family home valued at less than \$100,000 produced a net deficit to the local fisc.

Can that community vote to keep out the \$25,000 homes that concern the President? Or must we call on the due process clause to protect the developers' property rights to rationalize the relationships of civilized human values to urban land?

Power to the people is fine. But power to the people who got there first means the continued balkanization of our metropolitan areas.

#### AMBASSADOR ROBERT ELLSWORTH

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, public service is a privilege, but it imposes heavy burdens on the talent, the courage, the strength, and the dedication of the men and women who devote their lives to politics and Government. The glamor and the trappings of office have enough glitter so that the hard work is sometimes overlooked until we reach some milestone and look back over the road we have traveled.

Bob Ellsworth has come home from Europe and will make his home in Maryland. He is very welcome and I look forward to a renewed opportunity to learn from him some of the lessons gained from his experience as U.S. Ambassador to NATO.

Ambassador Ellsworth entered the Congress in the election of 1960 and took his seat as a representative from Kansas on the same day that I also took my seat in the House. He immediately earned a leadership role among the Republican freshmen and he retained that role by his industry and ability.

When he left the House and undertook the general practice of law he soon became associated with a successful New York lawyer, Richard M. Nixon. Their professional relationship was such that when Mr. Nixon moved his office to Washington, Bob Ellsworth came along as Assistant to the President of the United States.

He was later entrusted with the delicate and highly sensitive responsibility of representing the President and the people of the United States in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. During his tenure in Brussels, I had occasion to visit Europe and can testify to the high regard in which Bob Ellsworth was held.

And now we are glad to welcome him back, to thank him for all his good work and to wish him many years of contentment and happiness and success.

#### RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, funding for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty is fast approaching the critical point. In fact, as the matter stands, funds for both operations will be running out quite soon.

An editorial published in the Washington Post of June 26 raises very pertinent issues concerning the importance of approving appropriations as soon as possible to enable the two stations to continue their valuable broadcasts.

While Congress is currently hassling over the issue of where financing for both operations should come, we should keep in mind the vital importance of these stations continuing their operations.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### THE ESSENTIAL BUSINESS OF RADIO FREE EUROPE

Radio Free Europe, which undertakes to tell East Europeans the news about themselves that their own controlled media withhold, is under harsh political attack for that reason from governments of some of the East European countries it broadcasts to. It may face an even greater peril, however, from the confusion of efforts underway in Washington to end its cover financing by the C.I.A. and to finance and operate it on a new open basis. The situation has got to be taken into hand quickly, for as matters stand, funds will run out for RFE—and for Radio Liberty, which broadcasts to the Soviet Union—quite soon. The two stations are much too valuable to be lost in a summer haze.

East European governments resentful of RFE's broad appeal to their populations have long stewed and fulminated about it—along with pulling such dirty tricks as putting poison in the salt shakers of its Munich headquarters. They could do little more, until Willy Brandt opened his policy of reconciliation with the East. Then, sensing an opportunity for leverage, they said that his Ostpolitik and RFE are incompatible. In fact, they are not, but Germany was embarrassed. Once Mr. Nixon made clear his position that American troops and American radios in Germany are part of a package, however, Bonn diplomatically told the protesting East Europeans to cool down.

Some East European governments bored in harder when Senator Clifford Case stated publicly what almost everybody had known for years—that the C.I.A. finances RFE (and Radio Liberty). Poland, for instance, called upon the United States last month to put RFE off the air.

Senator Case's point was to get RFE out in the open and so he offered a bill to finance it by direct appropriations, through the State Department. The administration, correctly contending that much of RFE's audience appeal lies in its appearance of independence from the American government, countered with a bill to set up a publicly funded "private" corporation to run both RFE and RL (West Germany, for its own reasons, favors the latter approach.) In the meanwhile, there arose on Capitol Hill legitimate questions about the cost of the stations, their research functions, their relationship to other American propaganda and cultural programs, and their coordination with political efforts for detente. The administration did not allow enough time for Congress to cope adequately with these questions and, as a result, the stations are now hanging by the thread of a continuing resolution which provides funds only until August.

We do not have dogmatic views on the kind of organizational home the stations ought to have or on the size of their budgets or the scope of their non-broadcasting activities. We would like to make the emphatic point, however, that RFE and RL do an extremely important job and, in our judgment, do it well.

RFE still carries an image of irresponsibility dating from its indeed-irresponsible words of encouragement to Hungarian rebels in 1956. Together, RFE and RL have the reputation of being the voices of bitter emigres and primitive anti-Communists. The two stations, however, have considerably changed and they can no longer be fairly accused of the sins of their past. What they do now is to communicate directly with the people of East Europe who want to listen to them in order to learn what they cannot learn from their own captive press and radio. The stations do not incline to revolution or preach anti-Communism; they say what is going on in East Europe. It would be an unpardonable breach of faith with the stations' millions of

listeners to deny them their choice of radio fare.

Detente, if it means anything, means widening the West's contacts with the East, not helping the East to seal off its people from the West. It means the exchange of people, goods, words and ideas. This is the essential business of RFE and RL. The Congress, in its right-minded determination to shake the stations free of the CIA, should not lose sight of the reason for letting them continue it.

#### THE PENTAGON DOCUMENTS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, we are reading and hearing much today about the stolen Pentagon documents which allegedly reveal that former President Johnson was planning to escalate the Vietnam war even before the 1964 Presidential elections during which he campaigned as the peace candidate.

Many issues have been raised during this controversy, and I am sure that further study and research will uncover other issues.

Few conclusions stand out clearly at this point, but one fact does stand out—a great portion of the American people feel that they have been deceived and lied to.

An editorial entitled "A Monstrous Lie," published in the News of June 27 calls attention to this debate. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### A MONSTROUS LIE

Enough of the so-called Pentagon Papers have been published, amid a flurry of federal court injunctions against publication by individual newspapers, to get a glimmer of an idea of what they are and are not.

It is clear that the entire set of documents, even when all are released or made public by other means, will tell only a small part of the Vietnam war story and the decision-making processes involved in American participation in the Indochina conflict. Some indications are beginning to emerge to show that the papers may have been handpicked carefully to create an entirely erroneous concept of how America got bogged down in Southeast Asia.

The further implication is that the Pentagon study ordered by former Defense Secretary McNamara may have been designed to serve the selfish interests of the so-called Kennedy clan and Pentagon Whiz Kids who got America deeply involved in Vietnam in the 1960's then tried to get themselves off the hook.

It is very easy to handpick from among hundreds of differing "contingency plans" devised to cope with every conceivable kind of development and come up with an entirely distorted picture of the planning process and to shift the onus of responsibility from one group to another, almost at will. There are strong indications that this may have been done in the Pentagon study, at least in some instances.

Therefore, the American public would be well advised against accepting as "full gospel" the contents of the voluminous study report as it is revealed, piecemeal or otherwise.

It is possible however, to spot obvious instances in which the American public was lied to for reasons of selfish partisan politics.

One is the matter of the decision to bomb North Vietnam. The Pentagon papers show that a fairly firm consensus to bomb the north had developed in the Johnson administration before the 1964 presidential elec-

### ASSISTANCE TO RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 18) to amend the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to provide assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "department", strike out "\$30,000,000" and insert "\$35,000,000"; so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 is amended by inserting after section 702 the following new section:

#### "AUTHORIZATION FOR GRANTS TO RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

"Sec. 703. There are authorized to be appropriated to the department \$35,000,000 for fiscal year 1972 to provide grants, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate, to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. Except for funds appropriated under this section, no funds appropriated after the date of enactment of this section for any fiscal year, under this or any other provision of law, may be made available to or for the use of Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 92-319), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

#### WHAT THE BILL DOES

As reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, Senate bill 18 amends the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to authorize for fiscal year 1972 a \$35 million appropriation to the Department of State for grants to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. The Secretary of State is given the authority to determine the terms and conditions of the grants. The bill prohibits any other appropriated funds from being used to finance these radio operations.

#### BACKGROUND

Senator Case introduced S. 18 on January 25, 1971. In his introductory remarks, he stated the bill's principal objective was " \* \* \* to bring Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty under the authorization and appropriation process of the Congress."

By way of background, Senator Case pointed out.

During the last 20 years, several hundred million dollars in U.S. Government funds have been expended from secret CIA budgets to pay almost totally for the costs of these two radio stations' broadcasting to Eastern Europe. In the last fiscal year alone, over \$30 million was provided by CIA as a direct Government subsidy; yet at no time was Congress asked or permitted to carry out its traditional constitutional role of approving the expenditure.

The full text of Senator Case's statement is contained in the appendix to this report.

Radio Free Europe (RFE) was established in 1950 and Radio Liberty (RL) in 1951. The former operates under the auspices of the Free Europe Committee, Inc., and the latter under the auspices of the American Commit-

tee for Freedom for the Peoples of the U.S.S.R., Inc. RFE broadcasts to five Soviet Bloc countries: Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and Rumania. RL's broadcasts are limited to the Soviet Union.

The Department of State describes the two Radios as "private broadcasters" which "report and comment extensively on internal developments in their target areas and do so in an objective fashion."

The cost of doing this, according to the State Department, is "approximately" \$36.2 million annually. Of this amount, the Department says, less than \$2 million comes from private contributions, almost entirely U.S. corporations. (See appendix.)

The gap between private contributions and actual budget expenditures—some \$34 million in this instance—has been filled by funds from the Central Intelligence Agency, although Executive Branch officials refuse publicly to acknowledge the Agency's participation or role in maintaining and operating the two Radios. Following this policy, the Department declined to supply additional financial data for this report on Government funding of RFE and RL.

From the current budget of \$36.2 million, the two Radios employ a staff of 2,614 with RFE employing 1,652 and RL, 962. (See appendix for further breakdown.)

Both Radios maintain separate broadcast headquarters and research facilities in Munich, Germany. In addition, Radio Free Europe has offices, studios, or other facilities in the following cities: New York, Athens, Berlin, Bonn, Brussels, Geneva, London, Paris, Rome, Stockholm, Vienna and Lisbon. In a similar fashion, Radio Liberty is located in New York, Barcelona, Lamberthelm, London, Madrid, Paris, Playa del Pals and Taipei.

RFE's and RL's combined budget of \$36.2 million may be compared to the Voice of America's budget of \$41 million for its worldwide operations during FY 1971. For further comparison, an estimated \$37 million was spent in FY 1971 on official educational and cultural exchange programs. By way of comparison with domestic programs, the FY 1972 budget request for educational T.V. and radio was \$31 million.

On July 1, 1971, Congress approved H.J. Res. 742 providing continuing appropriations for Federal agencies and programs through August 6, 1971. As a result of action taken by the Senate Appropriations Committee, which was approved by the Congress as a whole, the authority to fund Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty was shifted and restricted to the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948.

In its report (No. 92-240) on H.J. Res. 742 the Senate Appropriations Committee stated,

"The Committee recommends the inclusion of a provision to provide interim funding for the support of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty pending the enactment of legislation to provide for open funding of these organizations."

#### COMMITTEE ACTION

On February 1, 1971, the Committee forwarded copies of S. 18 to the Department of State and requested "coordinated Executive Branch comments \* \* \* at an early date." On March 12, the Committee wrote again to the Department stating tentative hearings on the bill had been scheduled for April 28. The State Department responded on April 22 requesting a delay in the hearings until the "latter part of May."

In an effort to accommodate the Department, the Committee agreed to change the hearing date from April 28 to May 24. A public hearing was held at that time and the Committee heard from three witnesses: the Honorable Congressman Ogden R. Reid, who introduced a similar bill in the House of Representatives; the Honorable Martin J. Hillenbrand, Assistant Secretary of State for

European Affairs; and Mr. Paul C. Bartlett, former President of Radio New York World-wide, Inc.

In place of commenting on S. 18, Assistant Secretary Hillenbrand presented the Administration's views on a substitute bill, S. 1936. Senator Case introduced this bill on the day of the hearing. (See appendix.)

This alternative would establish an American Council for Private International Communications, Inc. Although publicly funded, the Council would be a "non-governmental, private, non-profit corporation" with headquarters in the District of Columbia. While the primary purpose of the corporation would be to channel Government funds to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, the Administration's bill would also make eligible for financing any "private American organizations with established programs of broadcasting to other countries, or other . . . selected activities in the international mass media field \* \* \*"

S. 1936 contained an open-ended authorization and provided that sums appropriated shall remain available until expended. In addition to this funding flexibility, the bill did not specify an agency or department to which the funds would be appropriated.

The Committee first considered both of these proposals in Executive Session on June 8, at which time it decided that, before making any definitive, long-term decisions on future funding of the Radios, the Committee should have available some in-depth, background studies on them. Following this decision, the Chairman of the Committee wrote to the Library of Congress and the General Accounting Office requesting separate studies from each of them on the two Radios. Senator Fulbright's letters are included in the appendix to this report.

The Committee considered these bills again in Executive Session on July 21, at which time it rejected, by voice vote, a slightly modified version of S. 1936 (see appendix) and then adopted S. 18 with an amendment increasing the authorization level from \$30 to \$35 million for fiscal year 1972.

#### COMMITTEE COMMENTS

The Committee on Foreign Relations views Senate bill 18 as stop-gap legislation—designed primarily to bring into the open the Government's role in financing both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

The Committee deplores the fact that this financing—covering some 20 years—has been kept secret from the American people and their elected representatives. It is indeed regrettable that the Executive Branch of Government under five administrations deceived the taxpayers with respect to the expenditure of these public funds. Indeed, as one of the witnesses who testified during the Committee's hearing of May 24 reminded the Members, we " \* \* \* had been led to believe that Radio Free Europe was financed by dimes from school children and voluntary gifts from concerned citizens anxious to keep truth alive behind the Iron Curtain."

The connivance of both public and private officials to lead the American public to believe this fantasy is to be regretted. Not only did the government officials and others involved in these radio stations mislead the American public but they also deceived those who listened to the Radios and relied on them as the products of private enterprise. How ironical and tragic it is that such practices have been used in the name of getting "the truth through to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain!" And, even at this late date, Executive Branch officials refuse to discuss this matter openly or to disclose to the American public how many of its tax dollars have been used in this highly questionable activity.

Senate bill 18 is intended to terminate this deception; it is intended to let the people know what they are paying for and how much.



# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 117

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, AUGUST 2, 1971

No. 123

## Senate

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

### PRAYER

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

O Thou Shepherd of our souls, who has watched over our going out and our coming in and hast brought us to this place and the tasks of a new week, may we shut out the busy world until we find Thee anew within, until our thoughts are reverent, our work is hallowed, and faith reconsecrates all common things as sacraments of love. Pour in upon our consciousness the sense of Thy nearness not only when we pray but moment by moment while we work.

Teach us the meaning of true greatness—that it is not in getting but in giving, not in being served but in serving, that it is in giving self to find a new self, that it is in walking in the way of the Man of Nazareth.

Lead us beside the still waters and through the green pastures of divine truth. May Thy rod and staff comfort and strengthen us. When evening comes may we lie down in safety and rest in the peace of those whose work is well done and whose souls are at peace with Thee. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, July 31, 1971, be dispensed with.

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

### WAIVER OF THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

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

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees

may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

### THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of, first, Calendar Nos. 312, 313, and 317; and then Calendar Nos. 322 through 327.

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

### PEACE CORPS AUTHORIZATIONS, 1972

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2260) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, together with minority views, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment, at the beginning of line 7, strike out "\$82,200,000" and insert "\$77,200,000"; so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2502 (b)), which authorizes appropriations to carry out the purposes of that Act, is amended by striking out "1971" and "\$98,800,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "1972" and "\$77,200,000", respectively.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 92-318), explaining the purposes of the measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 2260, as proposed to be amended, is to authorize an appropriation of not to exceed \$77,200,000 for the fiscal year 1972 operations of the Peace Corps. This compares with a fiscal year 1971 authorization of \$98,800,000 and appropriation of \$90 million of which \$4,900,000 was estimated to be unobligated as of June 30, 1971. No other amendments to the Peace Corps Act are proposed.

#### BACKGROUND

On April 13, the Peace Corps submitted an authorization request for \$72,300,000, which

was introduced by Senator Fulbright (by request) on May 5 (S. 1711). Subsequently, on June 9, the revised request for \$82,200,000 was submitted because "the recruiting program has been most successful" and a higher training input was anticipated. This proposal likewise was introduced (by request) as S. 2260.

On June 30, 1971, by Executive Order 11603, the Peace Corps was transferred to Action, an agency created by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1971, which in the absence of congressional disapproval became effective on July 1, 1971. At the same time, Joseph H. Blatchford, Director of the Peace Corps, was designated acting Director of Action and his nomination to be Director of Action was submitted to the Senate. While all the details of the reorganization are not completely agreed upon, the committee was told that the Deputy Director of the Peace Corps will also be the Deputy Director of Action in charge of international operations. The Peace Corps name and organization overseas will be kept according to assurances given to the committee. Certain offices and functions of the Peace Corps headquarters in Washington, on the other hand, have been combined with those of domestic voluntary programs—such as those of the General Counsel, public, minority, and congressional affairs, recruiting, training, placement, finance and accounting.

Appropriations made pursuant to the Peace Corps Act, which are subject to an annual authorization, are allocated to the Director of Action but available only for the purposes of the Peace Corps Act. The Committee on Foreign Relations expects strict accountability for these funds, especially in the administrative overhead categories.

#### COMMITTEE ACTION

Hearings on S. 2260 were announced on July 12 and took place on July 16. Mr. Joseph H. Blatchford, Director of the Peace Corps, accompanied by senior officials from the Peace Corps, was the principal Government witness on behalf of the bill. Thomas J. Scanlon, a former Peace Corps volunteer, testified not in opposition to S. 2260, but in opposition to the merger of the Peace Corps with Action. The hearings have been printed for the information of the Senate and the general public. On July 21, by voice vote, the committee ordered S. 2260 reported favorably to the Senate, with the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which S. 2260, a bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act, was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

S 12755

This assumes, of course, that both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty perform useful broadcast services and, although the Committee is divided in its thinking on this point, a majority of the Members believe that the Radios should be given the benefit of the doubt—a serious doubt indeed in view of the public's repeated reluctance to provide through private contributions the amount of financial support the Radios say they need. But, in adopting S. 18, the Committee indicated its unwillingness to give the Radios the benefit of the doubt beyond the current fiscal year or to give them the kind of organizational and financial flexibility contained in S. 1936, the Administration-approved bill.

The background studies on Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty being prepared by the Library of Congress and the General Accounting Office will be available to the Committee some time this Fall. Hopefully, these studies will provide the kind of analysis that will permit the Committee to make a more informed judgment as to whether or not these radio stations are in the public interest.

*Estimated program costs*

The following information in provided pursuant to section 252 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended: For the current fiscal year, the executive branch estimates the Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty programs will cost \$36.2 million. Over the next 5 fiscal years, the executive branch estimates the total cost of these programs to be \$200-\$210 million.

For the reasons which are obvious in this report, the committee is unable to evaluate these estimates. In the final analysis, of course, the Congress could fund these programs in accordance with the executive branch estimates or it could, at any point, terminate them.

**PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA**

The bill (H.R. 2894) to incorporate the Paralyzed Veterans of America was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 92-323), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

**PURPOSE OF THE BILL**

The purpose of H.R. 2894 is to grant a Federal charter of incorporation to the Paralyzed Veterans of America.

**HISTORY**

The bill passed the House on April 27, 1971, and was referred to the District Committee on April 29, 1971. Hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Business, Commerce, and Judiciary on June 11, 1971, receiving favorable testimony from representatives of the District of Columbia Government and the Paralyzed Veterans of America. No testimony was received in opposition to the bill and the Committee has not received any objection to the proposal.

**BACKGROUND**

Founded in Chicago in February of 1947, the Paralyzed Veterans of America is an organization consisting of some 5,500 active members from every State in the Union, who comprise 21 chapters located in various parts of the United States. The organization is nonpolitical and nonsectarian, with the sole qualification for membership being that the individual be a service veteran and that he have a spinal cord injury or disease. There

are presently 12,000 to 15,000 veterans suffering from this type of disability, including those from Vietnam. Hence, the membership of the Paralyzed Veterans of America includes 40 to 50 percent of its total potential. Its national headquarters is located at 3636 16th Street NW., in Washington, D.C.

Prior to World War II, few persons afflicted with paraplegia lived beyond 6 months. The advent of the so-called miracle drugs, however, accompanied by newly discovered medical techniques, gave the paraplegic limited health and increased his lifespan. Thus, medical science had devised the means to prepare him physically for the outside world, but more was needed. For the paraplegic was a new kind of human being. Few realized the appalling extent of his inquiry or the many problems he must conquer to again become a part of the mainstream of our society. Many customs, laws, and usages were at variance to the paraplegic's way of life. Ways had to be found to modify, to liberalize, and to acclimate this new way of living so that these men could become a useful part of our society.

In 1946, the 2,500 living paraplegics and quadriplegics were grouped in Veterans' Administration hospitals located in Boston, Mass., New York, N.Y., Chicago, Ill., Richmond, Va., Memphis, Tenn., and Van Nuys, Calif. They were quick to recognize the new problems their presence created in the physical, social, and industrial worlds. For this reason, these groups formed local organizations to face these problems as best they could.

This was the situation which led to the meeting of representatives of these local groups the following year, and the founding of the Paralyzed Veterans of America.

**WORK OF THE ORGANIZATION**

The principal aim of the Paralyzed Veterans of America is to promote research in the area of paraplegia and its rehabilitative problems. During the 21 years of its life, this organization has accomplished an outstanding record of service in this area, both to its members and to civilian paraplegics. A few examples are the following:

1. Created the National Paraplegia Foundation, a separate and independent organization to promote medical research in the several fields connected with injuries and diseases of the spinal cord.
2. Contributed over \$200,000 from its meager resources to that organization for spinal cord research, and for the development, printing, and distribution of several publications designed to inform, assist, and educate all those persons afflicted with similar disabilities.
3. Provided the funds necessary to conduct a joint study, under the administration of the National Paraplegia Foundation and the then Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, on the service needs of paraplegics and quadriplegics.
4. Established in 1961 a national service program for its members, and has served them at an annual cost averaging \$30,000. This year, the organization's budget for the service program amounts to \$28,000.

In addition, the Paralyzed Veterans of America has cooperated with the President's Committee in its program of employment of the handicapped. It has conducted its own intensive program, in cooperation with the National Commission on Architectural Barriers, in the elimination on architectural barriers to the handicapped. They are an active member of the United States Council of the World Veterans Federation, the mission of which is to assist the veterans of other nations and to promote international peace and security through support of the United Nations Charter. Also, they have cooperated with many other Federal and private agencies on problems of the handicapped.

As a means of raising funds, as well as providing a needed recreational outlet for its

members, the Paralyzed Veterans of America promotes wheelchair basketball teams. The team in Boston, known as the New England Clippers, is now in its 20th year of continuous play, and three of its members are paraplegic veterans of World War II.

In short, this organization has been unstinting in its efforts to assist in and promote programs on both the national and the international level, in an earnest desire to serve these most seriously disabled veterans who have fought to preserve our national heritage.

**NEED FOR LEGISLATION**

The Federal charter which H.R. 2894 will grant to the Paralyzed Veterans of America will accredit that organization with the Veterans' Administration and enable their national service officers to represent their members before that agency. The organization will also acquire the respect and stature which accrue only to organizations with congressional recognition.

**THE PINE MOUNTAIN WILDERNESS, PRESCOTT AND TONTO NATIONAL FORESTS IN ARIZONA**

The bill (S. 959) to designate the Pine Mountain Wilderness, Prescott and Tonto National Forests, in the State of Arizona was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, in accordance with subsection 3(b) of the Wilderness Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 891), the area classified as the Pine Mountain Primitive Area, with the proposed additions thereto and deletions therefrom, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Proposed Pine Mountain Wilderness," dated April 1, 1966, which is on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, is hereby designated as the Pine Mountain Wilderness within and as a part of the Prescott and Tonto National Forests, comprising an area of approximately nineteen thousand five hundred acres.

Sec. 2. As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and a legal description of the Pine Mountain Wilderness with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and such description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however,* That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made.

Sec. 3. The Pine Mountain Wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act.

Sec. 4. The previous classification of the Pine Mountain Primitive Area is hereby abolished.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 92-329), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

**PURPOSE**

This bill would establish the Pine Mountain Wilderness in Arizona embracing an area of 19,569 acres. The proposal is one sub-



mitted to the Congress pursuant to the provisions of the Wilderness Act.

#### LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The Pine Mountain Primitive Area would have been designated a wilderness area by S. 710 of the 91st Congress, which was approved by the committee and the Senate, but the area was left out when the House passed S. 3014, an omnibus wilderness bill.

#### DESCRIPTION

The proposed Pine Mountain Wilderness would encompass 13,569 acres, including most of the Pine Mountain Primitive Area and some contiguous national forest lands. There is no mining production and no known deposits which could be mined profitably. Located near the center of Arizona, the area is generally rugged and mountainous, and ranged by elk, antelope, desert bighorn sheep and mountain lion, with fishing for black bass and rainbow trout. During hearings on S. 710, the Forest Service was asked to provide additional data regarding water yield improvement opportunities within the proposed wilderness as it might affect the Maricopa Water Conservation District. This was subsequently provided, indicating that the proposed wilderness would include only 2.6 percent of the district's watershed, that conversion for water yield would contribute only 185 acre-feet per year, and that conversion outside the wilderness would be more favorable.

#### RECOMMENDATION

The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs unanimously reports S. 969 and urges early enactment.

#### SYCAMORE CANYON WILDERNESS, COCONINO, KAIBAB, AND PRESCOTT NATIONAL FORESTS IN ARIZONA

The bill (S. 960) to designate the Sycamore Canyon Wilderness, Coconino, Kaibab, and Prescott National Forests, State of Arizona was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, in accordance with subsection 3(b) of the Wilderness Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 891), the area classified as the Sycamore Canyon Primitive Area, with the proposed additions thereto and deletions therefrom, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Proposed Sycamore Canyon Wilderness," dated April 15, 1966, which is on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, is hereby designated as the Sycamore Canyon Wilderness within and as a part of the Coconino, Kaibab, and Prescott National Forests, comprising an area of approximately forty-six thousand five hundred acres.

Sec. 2. As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and a legal description of the Sycamore Canyon Wilderness with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and such description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however,* That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made.

Sec. 3. The Sycamore Canyon Wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act.

Sec. 4. The previous classification of the Sycamore Canyon Primitive Area is hereby abolished.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 92-330), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

#### PURPOSE

This bill would designate 46,500 acres as the Sycamore Canyon Wilderness under provisions of the Wilderness Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 890).

#### LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The Sycamore Canyon Primitive Area would have been designated a wilderness area by S. 710 of the 91st Congress, which was approved by the Committee and the Senate, but the area was left out when the House passed S. 3014, an omnibus wilderness bill.

#### DESCRIPTION

This is a deep and colorful canyon on the south edge of the Colorado Plateau. It is located 20 miles southwest of Flagstaff. Elevations range from 7,000 feet on the highest part of the canyon rim to 3,600 feet on Sycamore Creek, 2 miles north of the Verde River. Geologic forces that carved the canyon left massive formations of red and white sedimentary rock. The canyon winds for 20 miles along Sycamore Creek and spreads as much as 7 miles from rim to rim.

The proposed wilderness includes 45,492 acres of the existing Syracuse Canyon Primitive Area and 1,000 acres in the three adjacent areas not now in the Primitive Area. Also within the proposed boundary is a 16-acre portion of a privately owned tract. The Forest Service hopes to acquire this by exchange or purchase.

#### RECOMMENDATION

The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs unanimously reports S. 960 and recommends early enactment.

#### CONVEYING CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY OF THE UNITED STATES TO UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA, STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

The bill (S. 74) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the University of North Dakota, State of North Dakota, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the University of North Dakota, State of North Dakota, that tract of land situated on the campus of the University of North Dakota at Grand Forks, North Dakota, which is a portion of a tract of land which was heretofore deeded to the United States by the University Memorial Corporation. The tract being hereby conveyed is more particularly described as follows:

That part of the south half of the southwest quarter of section 4 township 151 range 50 bounded as follows: Commencing at a point on the north boundary line of the Great Northern Railway right-of-way which is 913 feet east of the west line of said southwest quarter, thence east along said north boundary line a distance of 150 feet; thence north and parallel to the west line of said southwest quarter a distance of 376.10 feet thence east a distance of 107 feet; thence north and parallel to the west line of said

southwest quarter a distance of 350 feet; thence west a distance of 257 feet to a point 913 feet east of the west line of said southwest quarter and 726.10 feet north of the point of beginning; thence south to the true point of beginning.

The north boundary of the above described tract lies along a line which commences at the northeast corner of lot 20 in block 2 of the University Park Addition, Grand Forks City, according to the plat on file in the Office of the Register of Deeds, Grand Forks County, North Dakota, and recorded in book 87 of deeds, page 12, and which continues west along the south line of the alley in said block 2, extending to a point described above as the northwest corner of the tract.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 92-328), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

#### PURPOSE

This bill would transfer a strip of land from the U.S. Bureau of Mines to the University of North Dakota for the construction of a winter sports arena.

#### DESCRIPTION

A square of land amounting to 11.7 acres was deeded to the Federal Government in 1940 by the university at no cost for use by the Bureau of Mines as a buffer zone to protect existing coal research facilities against overexpansion in that vicinity. The land in question is 3.6 acres which is now greatly needed for expansion of the university's education and recreation program. It is no longer needed by the Federal Government.

#### COST

No Federal expenditure will result from the enactment of this bill.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee unanimously reports S. 74 and recommends early enactment.

#### AUTHORIZATION OF DISPOSITION AND DISTRIBUTION OF JUDGMENTS FOR CLAIMS OF CONFEDERATED SALISH AND KOOTENAI TRIBES OF THE FLATHEAD RESERVATION, MONT.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 602) to provide for the disposition of judgments, when appropriated, recovered by the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont., in paragraphs 7 and 10, docket No. 50233, U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 2, after line 8, insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 3. Sums payable under this Act to enrollees or their heirs or legatees who are less than eighteen years of age or who are under a legal disability shall be paid in accordance with such procedures, including the establishment of trusts, as the Secretary of the Interior determines appropriate to protect the best interests of such persons.

So as to make the bill read:

#### S. 602

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the funds appropriated to the credit of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the

November 19, 1971

Mr. Gray with Mr. Hillis.  
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Ashbrook.  
 Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. McCloskey.  
 Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.  
 Mr. Ullman with Mr. Eshleman.  
 Mr. Passman with Mr. McCollister.  
 Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Cleveland.  
 Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.  
 Mr. Evans of Tennessee with Mr. Mathias of California.  
 Mrs. Crasso with Mr. Crane.  
 Mr. Hagan with Mr. Veysey.  
 Mr. Wright with Mr. Grover.  
 Mr. Patman with Mr. Latta.  
 Mr. Chappell with Mr. Peysner.  
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Conyers.  
 Mr. Leggett with Mr. Diggs.  
 Mr. Waldie with Mr. Stokes.  
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Rousselot.  
 Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Mitchell.  
 Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. J. William Stanton.  
 Mr. Corman with Mr. Davis of Georgia.  
 Mr. Alexander with Mr. Ruth.  
 Mr. Baring with Mr. Sebelius.  
 Mr. Podell with Mr. Dellums.  
 Mr. Cotter with Mr. Shoup.  
 Mr. Abourezk with Mr. Badillo.  
 Mr. Culver with Mr. Steele.  
 Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Ware.  
 Mrs. Abzug with Mr. Clay.  
 Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Koch.  
 Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Hathaway.  
 Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Harrington.  
 Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Fisher.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, I was not present when the vote was just taken on House Resolution 699, and I wish to announce that if I had been present I would have voted "yea."

#### PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO RADIO FREE EUROPE AND TO RADIO LIBERTY

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 18) to amend the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to provide assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN).

The motion was agreed to.

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 18, with Mr. BRINKLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLIARD) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN).

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MORGAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, S. 18 authorizes funds to finance the operation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty for 2 years. It also provides for a commission to make a study of what these programs are trying to do and the best way to do what should be done in the future.

I am afraid that there is a good deal of misunderstanding about Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

They exist primarily to serve the listening audience in the satellite countries of Eastern Europe and listeners in the Soviet Union with uncensored programs of local interest.

Both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty operate primarily from Munich. Radio Free Europe directs its programs to the Eastern European countries. Radio Liberty directs its programs to the Soviet Union. Both concentrate on news and comment on developments within the individual countries concerned.

They are staffed by people who have left these countries, who speak the language and who know the interests and reactions of the people in the various countries.

These operations are fundamentally different from the Voice of America. The Voice of America is concerned with U.S. foreign policy and with events and issues of worldwide interest.

Originally, these stations were concerned primarily with cold war issues. In recent years, they have focused on news and comments of interest to their listeners, much of which would be broadcast by their own stations if they were not subject to censorship.

Although Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have been in existence for more than 20 years, this is the first opportunity the House has had to pass judgment on them. The reason is that heretofore they have been funded by the Central Intelligence Agency. That source of funds has been ended. It is, therefore, necessary to authorize and to appropriate funds for their continued operation in the usual manner.

Both stations were incorporated in the United States in the years immediately following World War II when the cold war was getting underway. Radio Free Europe broadcasts to five Soviet bloc countries—Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania. The broadcasts to each of these averages 15 hours a day in their native language. Radio Liberty broadcasts are directed to the people in the Soviet Union. Those broadcasts, which are around the clock, are made in Russian and 17 other major languages that are spoken in that country. Although the administrative headquarters of both organizations is in the United States, their base of operations is principally in Germany. The German Government licenses the stations as foreign non-profit corporations.

The objectives of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are much the same.

Members are well aware that the Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc countries practice heavy, even oppressive, censorship within their borders. It is only through the broadcasts of these two organizations that it is possible for the citizens of those countries to know what is going on in their own countries. Each organization maintains a highly specialized staff that analyzes news and information that comes from behind the Iron Curtain, whether in writing or in broadcasts. The quality of the staff work is recognized by western scholars, journalists, and government officials. In addition to news and information, the broadcasts are interspersed with music and other cultural material, sports, and other features.

Clearly, the unique contributions of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty arise from the fact that they provide material that would be available to their listeners if their own governments did not engage in censorship.

The Congress is faced with the issue whether Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty serve our national interests and, if so, what is the best way to fund them.

The Senate provided stopgap financing for 1 year while it awaited the results of two reports—one by the General Accounting Office and one by the Library of Congress—to make a final determination. The administration recommended the creation of the American Council for International Communications, which would be a Government-financed but operationally independent agency.

The committee considered both the interim and the permanent approach. After hearings and executive consideration, we decided that there were too many unknowns to warrant endorsing a permanent organization. We believed that large policy issues should be considered as well as plans for operation.

The committee, therefore, amended the Senate bill to provide for a far-ranging study by a body that would include Members of Congress as well as outside experts. Such a study would be carried out by a commission that would report by November 1972, and go out of business not later than June 1973. Pending the completion of that study, we also authorized funding for 2 fiscal years. In short, ours is also a stopgap measure that makes no final judgment on the future of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have chosen the only responsible course in this matter. I urge the House to pass this bill.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs could explain what is the difference between these two radios included in this legislation and Radio Free Asia and why is that organization which appears to be on a par with these two not included in the legislation?

Mr. MORGAN. There is, as you know, a broadcasting station on Taiwan that broadcasts to Siberia and the parts of Russia that are in Asia. They do not

tested and found competent by his precursor as an FAA-designated check pilot, Mr. James Saterfield. It turns out that Mr. Saterfield was also a Chicago & Southern employee.

The system under which the Federal Aviation Administration delegates its authority in this manner is called the approved inspection program. It is so widespread and patently so inadequate that we must be concerned with the possibility that other crashes will occur at any time under its loose controls.

In the hearings before the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. George Moore, associate administrator for operations of the FAA, estimated that at least 70 percent of their work in the certification was delegated. This figure was later reestimated by Mr. Moore to "go high as 90 percent."

This system of "delegated authority" is clearly inadequate in assuring public safety. Both in the inspection of airline manufacturing and operation, the FAA had abdicated its responsibility. We do not allow the National Association of Manufacturers to determine violations of the Fair Trade Practices Act, the drug manufacturers to approve the safety of their products. Why should airline companies be in almost total control over questions of safety of their operations? Truly, the FAA has hired the rabbit to guard the lettuce patch, the fox to guard the chicken coop.

Our regulatory agencies are supposed to exist for a reason. The FAA is supposed to assure the safety of commercial airlines operations. Under its current practices, it sloughs off its responsibility, it compromises public trust.

In commercial aviation, consumer protection is the protection of a passenger's life and limb. Those who rely on commercial aviation—the passengers especially, the business community, the general public, and the government—have the right to expect that when they board such planes, the Federal Government attests to the fact that maximum safety reviews of pilot and aircraft have been analyzed.

It is up to the FAA to provide this assurance—to tell the public they have done everything possible to insure the safety of the aircraft in which they ride. That is not being done today. And it is up to the Congress to require the FAA to carry out responsibly the safety task assigned to it.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—ayes 290, nays 3, not voting 137, as follows:

[Roll No. 408]

YEAS—290

- Adams
- Anderson, Calif.
- Andrews, Ala.
- Andrews, N. Dak.
- Annunzio
- Archer
- Arends
- Ashley
- Aspin
- Aspinall
- Bigich
- Belcher
- Bennett
- Bertrand
- Botts
- Bevill
- Biaggi
- Bucster
- Bingham
- Blanton
- Borgs
- Bolling
- How
- Brademas
- Bray
- Brinkley
- Broomfield
- Brotzman
- Brown, Mich.
- Brown, Ohio
- Broyhill, Va.
- Buchanan
- Burke, Fla.
- Burke, Mass.
- Burleson, Tex.
- Burlison, Mo.
- Burton
- Byrnes, Wis.
- Byron
- Cabell
- Caffery
- Carney
- Carter
- Casey, Tex.
- Chamberlain
- Clawson, Del.
- Collins, Ill.
- Collins, Tex.
- Colmer
- Conable
- Conte
- Coughlin
- Daniel, Va.
- Daniels, N.J.
- Danielson
- Davis, Wis.
- Dellenback
- Denholm
- Dennis
- Dent
- Derwinski
- Dickinson
- Donohue
- Dow
- Downing
- Drinan
- Duski
- Duncan
- du Pont
- Dwyer
- Edwards, Calif.
- Eilberg
- Erlenborn
- Evans, Colo.
- Fascell
- Findley
- Flowers
- Foley
- Ford
- William D.
- Forsythe
- Fountain
- Fraser
- Frelinghuysen
- Frenzel
- Frey
- Gallagher
- Garmatz
- Gaydos
- Gettys
- Gialmo
- Gibbons
- Gonzalez
- Goodling
- Green, Ore.
- Green, Pa.
- Griffin
- Gubser
- Gude
- Haley
- Hamilton
- Hammer-
- schmidt
- Hanley
- Hanna
- Hansen, Idaho
- Hansen, Wash.
- Harsha
- Harvey
- Hastings
- Hawkins
- Hays
- Hechler, W. Va.
- Heinz
- Helstoski
- Henderson
- Hicks, Mass.
- Hicks, Wash.
- Hogan
- Hollifield
- Hosmer
- Howard
- Hull
- Hungate
- Hunt
- Hutchinson
- Ichord
- Jacobs
- Jarman
- Johnson, Calif.
- Johnson, Pa.
- Jones, Ala.
- Jones, N.C.
- Jones, Tenn.
- Karte
- Kastenmeter
- Kazen
- Keating
- Kee
- Koth
- Kyl
- Kyros
- Landstrobe
- Landrum
- Lennon
- Lent
- Lloyd
- Long, La.
- Long, Md.
- Lujan
- McClary
- McCormack
- McCulloch
- McDonald, Mich.
- McEwen
- McKay
- McKevitt
- McKinney
- McMillan
- Madden
- Mahon
- Mailliard
- Martin
- Matsunaga
- Mayne
- Mazzoli
- Meeds
- Meicher
- Metcalfe
- Michel
- Mikva
- Miller, Calif.
- Miller, Ohio
- Mills, Md.
- Minsh
- Mink
- Minshall
- Monagan
- Montgomery
- Moorhead
- Morgan
- Morse
- Mosher
- Moss
- Murphy, Ill.
- Murphy, N.Y.
- Myers
- Natcher
- Nedzi
- Nix
- Obey
- O'Hara
- O'Konark
- O'Neill
- Patten
- Perkins
- Pickle
- Pike
- Pirnie
- Poage
- Poff
- Powell
- Preyer, N.C.
- Price, Ill.
- Price, Tex.
- Quinn
- Quillen
- Rallsback
- Randall
- Rangel
- Rarick
- Rees
- Reid, N.Y.
- Reuss
- Rhodes
- Riegle
- Robinson, Va.
- Rodino
- Roe
- Rogers
- Roncallo
- Rooney, N.Y.
- Rooney, Pa.
- Rosenthal
- Rouah
- Roy
- Roybal
- Ruppe
- Ryan
- Sarbanes
- Satterfield
- Saylor
- Scherle
- Scheuer
- Schneebeli
- Schwengel
- Scott
- Seiberling
- Shipley
- Shriver
- Sisk
- Skubitz
- Smith, Calif.
- Smith, Iowa
- Smith, N.Y.
- Spence
- Springer
- Stanton
- James V.
- Steed
- Steiger, Wis.
- Stephens
- Stratton
- Stubblefield
- Stuckey
- Sullivan
- Symington
- Talcott
- Taylor
- Teague, Tex.
- Thompson, Ga.
- Thompson, N.J.
- Thomson, Wis.
- Thone
- Tiernan
- Udall
- Van Deerlin
- Vander Jagt
- Vanik
- Vigorito
- Waggoner
- Wampler
- Whalen
- White
- Whitehurst
- Whitten
- Widnall
- Wiggins
- Williams
- Wolf
- Wyatt
- Wylder
- Wylie
- Wyman
- Yates
- Yatron
- Young, Fla.
- Young, Tex.
- Zablocki
- Zion
- Zwach

Gross	Hall	Schmitz
NOT VOTING—137		
Abbutt	Dorn	Mathis, Ga.
Abernethy	Dowdy	Mills, Ark.
Abourezk	Eckhardt	Mitchell
Abzug	Edmondson	Mizell
Addabbo	Edwards, Ala.	Mollohan
Alexander	Edwards, La.	Nelsen
Anderson, Ill.	Esch	Nichols
Anderson, Tenn.	Eshleman	Pasanan
Ashbrook	Evins, Tenn.	Patman
Badillo	Fish	Pelly
Baker	Fisher	Pepper
Baring	Flood	Pettis
Barrett	Flynt	Peysor
Bell	Ford, Gerald R.	Podell
Blackburn	Fulton, Tenn.	Pryor, Ark.
Blackburn	Fuqua	Purecell
Boland	Gallagher	Roberts
Brasco	Goldwater	Robison, N.Y.
Brooks	Grasso	Rostenkowski
Broyhill, N.C.	Gray	Rousslet
Byrne, Pa.	Griffiths	Ruinels
Camp	Grover	Ruth
Carey, N.Y.	Ivan	St Germain
Cederberg	Halpern	Sanfman
Celler	Harrington	Sebelius
Chappell	Hathaway	Shoup
Chisholm	Hébert	Sikes
Clancy	Heckler, Mass.	Slack
Clark	Hillis	Snyder
Clausen	Horton	Staggers
Don H.	Jonas	Stanton
Clay	Kemp	J. William
Cleveland	King	Steele
Collier	Kluczynski	Steiger, Ariz.
Conyers	Koch	Stokes
Corman	Kuykendall	Teague, Calif.
Cotter	Latta	Ullman
Crane	Leggett	Veysey
Culver	Link	Waldie
Davis, Ga.	McCloskey	Ware
Davis, S.C.	McClure	Whaley
de la Garza	McCullister	Wilson, Bob
Delaney	McDade	Wilson,
Dellums	McFall	Charles H.
Devine	Macdonald,	Winn
Diggs	Mass.	Wright
Dingell	Mann	
	Mathias, Calif.	

So the resolution was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.  
 Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.  
 Mr. Boland with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Sandman.  
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Devine.  
 Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Goldwater.  
 Mr. Dingell with Mr. Esch.  
 Mr. Flood with Mr. McDade.  
 Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Mizell.  
 Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Bell.  
 Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Cederberg.  
 Mr. Runnels with Mr. Collier.  
 Mr. Roberts with Mr. Whalley.  
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Blackburn.  
 Mr. Link with Mr. Nelsen.  
 Mr. McFall with Mr. Teague of California.  
 Mr. Mathis of Georgia with Mr. Pelly.  
 Mr. Nichols with Mr. Winn.  
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Snyder.  
 Mr. Purcell with Mr. McClure.  
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Don H. Clausen.  
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Bob Wilson.  
 Mr. Sikes with Mr. King.  
 Mr. Slack with Mr. Kuykendall.  
 Mr. Staggers with Mr. Baker.  
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Horton.  
 Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Robinson of Virginia.  
 Mr. Brasco with Mr. Halpern.  
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Fish.  
 Mr. Dorn with Mr. Jonas.  
 Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Camp.  
 Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Clancy.  
 Mr. Mann with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.  
 Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Pettis.  
 Mr. St Germain with Mr. Kemp.

broadcast to China, but the transmitter is on Taiwan.

Mr. STRATTON. Is not there an organization which calls itself Radio Free Asia and does that have the same sponsors?

Mr. MORGAN. That does not have the same sponsorship. I do not believe it is financed with Government funds. It may receive private contributions.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CABELL. I thank the gentleman in the well for yielding.

I would like to say that several years ago I had the pleasure of serving as State chairman for Radio Free Europe in my State, and to have spent 2 weeks in Germany going over it carefully and trying very diligently to pick it to pieces. I have never found a better instrumentality for putting the American philosophy across to those people behind the Iron Curtain than Radio Free Europe was able to do.

I would like also to call the attention of this body to the fact that Radio Free Europe and its activities are not to be confused with the Voice of America program. Voice of America has a tinge that Radio Free Europe does not have because it has been separated from a strictly governmental agency.

I wish to commend the work that this committee has done and the chairman for bringing this legislation to light. I sincerely hope that this one instrumentality for bringing truth behind the Iron Curtain will be kept up. To prove the effectiveness of the program, if the Russians did not know that we are making inroads on their philosophy, they would not spend the millions of dollars they are spending in trying to jam the programs of Radio Free Europe.

Mr. MORGAN. I thank the gentleman from Texas. I share his views and I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Can you tell the Committee who is in charge of programing? Who determines the program content?

Mr. MORGAN. They have a large staff of specialists. As I said, the headquarters is in New York, but most of the staff is located in Munich, Germany. The overall supervision is in the hands of people in New York who are not government officials but who understand broadcast operation. Radio Free Europe is headed by William P. Dunkirk. On the board of directors are distinguished individuals including Gen. Lucius Clay. But the real programing is done by the professional staff in Munich, Germany. They run what is largely a news broadcasting operation.

[Mr. CABELL addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

(Mr. MAILLIARD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of S. 18. This bill, as amended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, would create a temporary commission for conducting a one-time study of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. The legislation would also provide financing for their operations on an interim basis.

It is my opinion, Mr. Chairman, that a study and evaluation of the international radio broadcasting activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty is very timely.

These radios have been operating since shortly after World War II. Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty act as "domestic" radios providing news and information that is not supplied by the Communist government controlled news organs. The emphasis of these radios is upon encouraging liberalization and peaceful reform. On the whole, I believe they have done a good job.

However, after so many years of operation, I think it is appropriate that a commission conduct an independent and comprehensive study. The commission, consisting of nine members, representing the legislative branch, the executive branch, and non-Government experts, would go out of business after the completion of its study, no later than July 1, 1973.

Radio Free Europe broadcasts to five Soviet bloc countries—Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania. Radio Liberty broadcasts to the Soviet Union in Russian and 17 other major languages spoken in that country. The focus in both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty is upon objective and accurate news reporting and balanced commentaries. They seek to encourage indigenous forces of peaceful reform as they provide news that listeners would receive from stations in their own countries if censorship did not exist.

Finally, I would like to emphasize the difference between these stations and the Voice of America, since their roles and functions are sometimes confused. Voice of America broadcasts on a worldwide basis as the radio arm of the U.S. Information Agency. Its purpose is to report and interpret U.S. life and policy. By contrast Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty emphasize news, information, and entertainment, with a highly localized content and appeal. Their function and purpose are entirely different from the Voice of America. They use different frequencies and different transmitters from the Voice of America.

Mr. Chairman, while Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have done a good job, I believe the time has come to review their operations as we consider their future. In the meantime we should provide interim financing as provided for in the bill before us. I urge your support of S. 18 as amended by our committee.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

(Mr. HOGAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in

support of S. 18, providing assistance to Radio Free Europe and to Radio Liberty.

The principal purpose of this Senate bill is to create a temporary mechanism for conducting a one-time study and evaluation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, and to provide for interim financing of those operations while the study is in progress. To this end, enactment of this legislation will establish a nine-member Commission on International Radio Broadcasting, composed of representatives of the legislative and executive branches of the U.S. Government and of the public.

Both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty were conceived in the years immediately following World War II and have been funded, until this past fiscal year, by the Central Intelligence Agency. The legislation before us is nothing more than a stopgap measure until the Commission reports its findings in 1973 as to whether these radio stations should continue in the future to be financed by the U.S. Government and, if so, how they should be financed.

Mr. Chairman, in the 3 years that I have represented the people of Maryland's Fifth Congressional District in this body, I have joined each year during the third week in July—Captive Nations Week—with numerous of my colleagues in commemorating the observance of this week.

Despite the worldwide publicity given to the U.S. Captive Nations Week resolution when it first passed the 86th Congress in July 1959, and the annual reports on it since, it still remains a mystery why so few in the free world comprehend the captive nations concept. Similarly, there are few people today who could give an intelligent answer when asked what Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty are.

To enumerate the captive nations accurately and historically one must begin in 1920 with the subjugation of Byelorussia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, and several others in the Soviet Union. The second wave of Communist aggression reduced Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania to captivity in the early 1940's. The third wave in the late 1940's enslaved a whole new group of nations, including Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Albania, and many others.

It was during this third wave, in the late 1940's and early 1950's, that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty came into being. The current emphasis of RFE is to give encouragement to the indigenous forces of peaceful reform and to provide a mechanism for increasing within authoritarian governments the public accountability of public officials for their public acts. Radio Liberty broadcasts, on the other hand, offer positive alternatives to the Soviet system, couched in friendly terms, and for the most part, by indirection. In recent months Radio Liberty has devoted an increasing amount of its programs to the plight of Soviet Jews.

Mr. Chairman, during the 13th annual commemoration of Captive Nations Week this past July, I wrote to each Member of this body requesting my colleagues to join me in sponsoring a res-

olution to safeguard the Hungarian Holy Crown of St. Stephen. In my letter to my colleagues, I said:

In the past years, many of us have joined together during this week and, on the floor of the House, lamented the plight of those many foreign nations who still live under Communist domination and oppression. Unfortunately, too often each year, our words are forgotten as quickly as they are spoken. Rarely is it possible to take some kind of constructive action which will live on after the well-meaning words have long since died away.

Thirty-nine of my colleagues have joined me in sponsoring a resolution (H. Con. Res. 385), expressing the sense of Congress that the Holy Crown of St. Stephen—Hungary's national treasure and symbol of constitutional government—should remain in the safekeeping of the United States until such time as Hungary once again functions as a constitutional government established through the free choice of the Hungarian people.

Similarly, Mr. Chairman, this legislation before us today again gives the Members of this body another opportunity to act, rather than merely to speak. The hopes of these peoples, and the hopes of their brothers and sisters in this country, are dependent upon the continuance of such activities as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. I urge my colleagues to approve this legislation with dispatch.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, there is one point that I think is extremely important, which should be considered by the committee, and which is referred to in the report, and that is the importance of maintaining the morale of the many devoted people who are working for these agencies.

I myself feel that it would be helpful for us to emphasize the fact that many, if not most of us, believe strongly in the objectives and workings of these agencies and that this report and this action is not in any way meant to prejudice that there will be a termination of these activities.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I would agree with the gentleman.

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation to provide assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty for a period of 2 fiscal years and to authorize the formation of a commission to study the problem of the continuation and support of these two related activities.

The revelation of past governmental support of these broadcasting facilities has raised this problem and obviously it must be settled. I believe that much helpful work is done by these two organizations in news reporting, in commentary upon international happenings and in explanation of the workings of our society. It is interesting to note that the Germans are about to construct a station that will be more expensive by far than

the facilities which we are discussing and the Chinese also have plans for a very substantial facility.

The main justification for the continuance of this function is the gradual education of people behind the Iron Curtain in the ways of democracy and the provision for them of a balanced appraisal of the happenings in this country and throughout the world.

I know from experience the avidity with which people in the socialist countries look for dispassionate news sources and we provide them with a notable service in bringing unadulterated news and commentary to them. In addition, in this way we furnish the basis for the eventual return of representative government to these countries while giving proportion to the distorted picture of the United States which they might otherwise derive from the information agencies available to them. This bill will also provide a commission to make a very necessary long-range study of this whole problem and with directions that a response be made to the Congress in time to determine what the future policy of our Government will be in this regard. I support this bill and hope that it will be adopted.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I arise to say I feel very strongly that both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty make sense. I would guess that any evaluation of their functions would come to that same conclusion. This is not arguing against the advisability of setting up a commission. I certainly would have no reason to suggest that a commission is not necessary.

I think it is important that we continue these activities. This legislation, for that reason, is important, because it does provide authority for the financing for a 2-year period of both these Radios.

I would like also to point out, because there is sometimes confusion, the different roles played by Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and the Voice of America. The Voice of America, as its name implies, basically is interested in and concentrates on reporting on the American scene and the American way of life. In contrast, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are in effect national voices of the geographical areas to which they send their broadcasts. They analyze and they organize news from certain countries, and report to them in the same way that an independent radio station would if their governments had such programs.

We need to keep the distinction between the two types in mind, and we need also to recognize that both have their place.

Our committee discussed the possibility of the Voice of America taking over the activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. Although we should not prejudice, or predict, what the commission may decide, I hope that a merger will not be recommended by the commission, as the responsibilities are quite different.

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

(Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY AS SEEN BY DIPLOMATS AND SCHOLARS

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in looking at the radios, their aims, their methods and their impact, we should consider not only the views of the administration but also the views of independent observers who are able to make meaningful judgments about their work. We need to hear the words of disinterested and expert scholars and journalists throughout Western Europe and the United States. We need to examine the thinking of former Ambassadors who were stationed in the countries concerned and the statements of people who have recently come from these countries and who were dependent for their knowledge on what they heard over those radios.

In the committee hearings, testimony was given by the Honorable U. Alexis Johnson, Under Secretary of State, based on his experience as Ambassador to Czechoslovakia. The record also includes impressive, firsthand testimony by three recent emigres from Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet Union, and from two of our former Ambassadors to the Soviet Union and Poland, respectively, Foy Kohler and John Gronowski. The record also includes statements by Prof. Zbigniew Brzezinski, director of the Research Institute on Communist Affairs at Columbia University and by a spokesman for the Polish-American Congress.

All of those witnesses strongly supported the continuation of the work of the radios. They were reflective of the serious concern in the academic and political worlds that this valuable service might be coming to an end. However, these statements were by no means the only ones being made publicly. For example, Dr. Hugh Seton-Watson, the distinguished professor of Russian history at London University and one of the most knowledgeable scholars on Eastern European affairs in the Western World, wrote to the London Daily Telegraph, in part, as follows:

For the great majority of the people in the censor-ridden Communist world, broadcasting is the only means the West has of conducting a dialogue with them. . . . I know from long personal experience that both the Europeans and the Americans responsible for running Radio Free Europe are extremely well informed, balanced in their judgments and in no sense fanatical crusaders. On the contrary, they are people who have been working for years to bring about true understanding.

One might question whether these Western opinions were valid if they were not echoed even more strongly from the East. A recent epigme, Mr. Henryk Bi-recki, wrote a letter to the Washington Star a short time ago in which he outlined his own background as a Communist official in charge of the Department

of Cultural Exchanges in the Polish Foreign Office and then made an eloquent plea for continuing the radios. He talked about the deep concern in the Polish Communist Party about the influence of Radio Free Europe and how the decision was made to use all available diplomatic and secret channels to bring about its closure. He then said:

The day when this goal will have been achieved will be a dark one for all these members of the Communist establishment who, like myself, have never lost hope that the system may become more humane and tolerant, less cruel and aggressive. They will lose a powerful ally.

These radios have been called the voice of the silent opposition in Eastern Europe. Their news broadcasts and commentaries are read and discussed daily both by the peoples and by their Communist leaders. There is good reason to believe that even the central committees of the Eastern European Communist Parties start their days by reading broadcast summaries. As Birecki said:

Communist leaders who have become prisoners of their own monopoly of information need this radio for their own private enlightenment, but at the same time fear its impact on others.

After listening to all of the evidence about these radios, the Foreign Affairs Committee voted to report out the bill we have before us. It provides for the establishment of a commission which will examine thoroughly the operations of the radios but will do so within the overall context of international radio broadcasting. Before making its recommendations, the commission can look thoroughly into what the radios do and not just what others say they do. It can look into how the information is gathered, how reliable it is, and what kind of impact it makes. If it chooses, it can examine broadcasting done by others in the area and broadcasting done by the Soviet bloc. All this will take some time and the November 30, 1972, deadline for the commission's report is designed to allow for careful study. To set a shorter period would mean that we would have to consider permanent legislation almost as soon as action on the present bill is completed. I hope that the House will accept this bill and that the funds will be provided to carry on with this important work.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong support for S. 18.

The Commission it would establish is essential to proper congressional consideration of the future of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. The money it would authorize—\$36 million for fiscal year 1972 and \$38.5 million for fiscal year 1973—would continue the operations of these radios during this interim period.

The hearings of the Committee on Foreign Affairs have provided firm evi-

dence of the success of these radios during the years in which they have operated.

The need for their services was well stated by former Ambassador to Poland, John A. Gronouski, when he testified before our committee. Mr. Gronouski said:

It is not enough for the people of Eastern Europe to get undistorted news of events in other parts of the world, however important this in itself may be. It is even more important that they have access to information about events in their own country other than that which those in control wish to make known.

For if the international community is to make progress toward the East-West detente about which we all dream, this will come about through pressure exerted on their own governments by an informed citizenry.

This is the role, Mr. Chairman, that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are helping to fulfill in their 24-hour-a-day broadcasts to the oppressed people of the Soviet bloc.

I would remind my colleagues of the House that much as we wish it, the battle for the minds of men is not yet over. So long as censorship prevails in the Soviet bloc, their citizens will seek to know the truth.

If we tire of the competition and write off the minds of millions in the Soviet bloc, we reduce their ability to influence their governments toward the liberalization of policies. To achieve a generation of peace, we must continue to compete for the minds of men.

Mr. Chairman, I would direct the attention of the House to the Commission which this legislation would establish. The Commission—composed of representatives of the legislative and executive branches of Government, and of the public—will perform an extremely important function as it review and evaluates the activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

The legislation we are considering today is a sensible and reasonable solution to the problem of funding Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. I urge its approval.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (Mr. MORAN) indicated at the outset, the legislation before the House embodies a compromise and provides interim financing for the broadcasting operations of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

I had suggested that compromise when it became apparent, after several days of active consideration of the matter at hand, that neither the Senate proposal—which called for a 1-year authorization of appropriations through the Department of State—nor the executive branch request—which envisioned the setting up of a permanent corporation to fund these activities—would carry in the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The alternative which is embodied in the amended bill, S. 18, attempts to steer a middle course:

It recognizes that these broadcasting activities, financed for years through the

CIA, have been, and may well continue to be, an important adjunct of the overseas operations of the U.S. Government;

It acknowledged that most of us here know all too little about them, or about their relevance to our country's current foreign policy undertaking; and

It provides for a way in which these broadcasting activities can be reassessed by an impartial panel in which the executive branch, the Congress and the public will participate. This task of reassessment is essential.

During the past two decades, without most of the Members of the Congress being informed about it, several hundred million dollars of the taxpayers' money has been spent on these operations.

This represents very substantial, and enduring, commitment of public funds and governmental support.

We cannot, in all logic and fairness, either terminate or perpetuate this commitment without knowing what it is all about.

The solution which I have proposed envisions the setting up of a tripartite Presidential commission which can do a thorough job of evaluating these operations and informing the Congress, and the public, about their relevance to today's and tomorrow's foreign policy of the United States.

This job will take at least a year. When it is completed, the commission will go out of existence and the Congress, supplied for the first time with relevant information, can decide what should be done about these activities.

In the meantime, the legislation before us will also provide interim financing for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty—financing through an independent commission, rather than through the Department of State.

#### OPPOSING ARGUMENTS

Mr. Chairman, the amended bill, S. 18, came to the floor of the House with bipartisan support. It was reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs by a vote of 23 to 1. And it is, we have been told, fully acceptable to the administration.

Nevertheless, some objections have been raised to it, first, on the grounds that Presidential commissions often have a way of perpetuating themselves without rendering effective service; and, second, on the grounds that interim financing through the State Department would be preferable to an independent agency route.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has considered both arguments and rejected them for the following reasons:

First, the bill before us provides clearly that the commission which will study the operations of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty will go out of existence by July 1, 1973. There is no way in which the commission can perpetuate itself under this legislation. This is a one-shot affair designed to accomplish a specific job. Once that job is done, the commission will be finished and will cease to exist.

Second, as to performance, the commission is being given a very definite, clear-cut assignment. It is required by legislation to report on that assignment

to the President and the Congress. And to assure that the commission does not fall down on the job, part of the membership will be drawn from the Congress.

Finally, regarding the financing of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty operations, our committee has considered the possibility of using the State Department route and has rejected it for very good reasons. Neither of these two radio operations is a part of the State Department. Neither of them has been officially connected with the normal foreign policy apparatus of the U.S. Government. For some 20 years, these radio broadcasting activities have been financed by the CIA and conducted under the cloak of "private" sponsorship. This is no time to shove them on the Department of State. The administration does not want that; the State Department does not want it; and the Committee on Foreign Affairs has recommended against it.

I hope and urge that the House approve the recommendations of the committee.

#### UNITED STATES SPEAKS WITH MANY VOICES

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this occasion to comment on a separate, but related, subject: The need for a thorough reappraisal of all overseas broadcasting activities of the U.S. Government.

For a number of years, while serving as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, I was deeply involved in a study of the impact on foreign audiences of the many far-flung and uncoordinated overseas broadcasting activities of the U.S. Government.

In Europe alone, for example, there are some 155 U.S.-financed radio transmitters which operate on short-wave, medium-wave and long-wave frequencies, broadcasting American messages to tens of millions of Europeans and Asians.

There is the Voice of America, the official information arm of the U.S. Government.

There are Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, whose primary targets are Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

There is RIAS—Radio in the American Sector in Berlin—which entertains American troops as well as millions of West and East Germans with American jazz, news, and other programs.

Then there is a special megawatt transmitter in Munich which is used occasionally to jam Soviet broadcasts to Eastern Europe.

And, finally, there is the Armed Forces Network which numbers many millions of Europeans among its audience.

All of these activities are supported by the American taxpayers, operate with the sanction of the U.S. Government, and, whether rightly or wrongly, are deemed to carry out Nation's message to the world.

The problem is that each of these operations is fairly autonomous and neither the Congress nor the American people have any clear idea of how much they cost, how they carry out their respective mandates, or whether they con-

tribute to the advancement of our national objectives abroad.

Three years ago, in a report entitled "The Future of U.S. Public Diplomacy," our subcommittee recommended that the U.S. Government undertake a thorough reexamination of these and many other overseas information activities financed with Federal funds. The need for such a reappraisal is still urgent.

#### CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would again urge the House to approve S. 18 as reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

This action not only will contribute to a solution of an immediate problem and help the Congress obtain the necessary information to make an intelligent determination regarding the future of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, but may also provide us with valuable experience and insights regarding how other problems in this area could be approached.

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. WAGGONNER, at the request of Mr. FASCELL, was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I submit that if we are going to find a solution to the question of how to preserve the good work of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, we must be very clear about what it is we are preserving.

It has sometimes been fashionable to dismiss these unique communications activities as reactionary left-overs from the cold war. It may have been fashionable, but it has little to do with the facts.

The Los Angeles Times columnist Robert S. Elegant pointed this out last March, in a column which was reprinted in a number of leading papers. The attacks on Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty by Communist governments are at least logical from the Communist point of view, Mr. Elegant said, because:

Authoritarian governments are understandably distressed by outsiders challenging their monopoly of information.

But in the West, Mr. Elegant said:

Attacks are leveled by the wrong people for the wrong reasons . . . True liberals should . . . support the stations' aims: free information and East-West relaxation . . . The fundamental point is simple. Neither tensions within Communist society nor tension between East and West would miraculously disappear if both stations went off the air tomorrow . . . Despite their human imperfections, both seek to reduce internal and international tension by the best means known to man—the freer flow of information.

This point deserves repeating. The distinguished Swiss newspaper Neue Buercher Zeitung made its own thorough investigation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty this spring and commented on June 30:

The reason and justification for these stations are to be found in the fact that the Communist states know no freedom of opinion—that they hinder a free exchange of information . . . In our modern age of global communications and mass media, the

leaders in Moscow and the East European countries try to work against this communication, keeping the Curtain closed at least to that extent, maintaining a "camp of controlled information."

And the Swiss paper concluded:

It is their sealing-off that is unnatural and contradictory to the tendency of our age toward immediate, global and varied information—not the existence of the two stations, which fulfill important functions as gates to a world-wide process of communication, and thus actually serve that coexistence about which so much is said . . .

If we doubt this, we have only to turn to the Communists' themselves. When Czechoslovakia was occupied by Soviet and allied arms in 1968, and told to restore the censorship it had dropped during the Prague spring, party leader Dubcek and his Central Committee were forced to issue a resolution stating, and I quote:

The press, radio and television are primarily an instrument for the implementation of the policy of the Party and state . . . They are responsible for the mass-information media working in an exclusively socialist spirit.

Now you and I may say that in the long run censorship cannot work. And indeed it does not, but only because organizations such as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty believe that truth is not a tool of political control but an absolute value, and act on that belief.

Even wiser heads in Eastern Europe realize the same things. One notable example is Wladyslaw Bienkowski—an old party man, a distinguished sociologist, a former Polish Minister of Education and friend of former Polish Party Leader Gomulka. Here is what he wrote about his own party's efforts at censorship, in a book published late in 1969—a book which, incidentally, had to be published outside of Poland. I quote:

Today, when techniques of communication have done away with distances . . . the hierarchical method of selecting and censoring information has become a glaring anachronism. . . . If the authorities of a country employ the tactics of evading problems and hiding facts from their own people, there will always be others to do the job for them—who will inform the people, in the language of the country, and tell them why their own government kept these particular facts from them.

And Bienkowski goes on:

It is astounding and alarming how far the influence of this foreign propaganda—represented chiefly by Free Europe—has extended not only over the society, but over our authorities.

Today's Communist leaders would also do well to read their own Karl Marx. Here is what the founder of the movement wrote for a German paper, 139 years ago:

A censored press remains a bad thing, even when it publishes good products . . . A free press remains a good thing, even when it believes in bad products . . . The character of a censored press is the characterless disorder of unfreedom, a 'civilized' atrocity, a perfumed monster.

Now, all of us can agree on the virtues of a free press and a free flow of information everywhere. But there are still two questions to which we should have clear answers:

November 19, 1971

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

First: If we carefully abstain from activities which the Communist leaderships of East Europe and the Soviet Union find objectionable, will they see the light? Will they abandon their ideological campaigns and efforts to arm their own people against us psychologically?

And second: Are these two radios actually worthy instruments to keep the channels of information open?

As to the first point, let me turn to official evidence from East Europe. In an April 1970 article, the then chairman of the Hungarian Parliament, Gyula Kallai, explained peaceful coexistence this way:

The policy of peaceful coexistence is cooperation as well as struggle at the same time. The method to be applied is cooperation and competition in the economic and scientific fields, and struggle in the political, diplomatic and ideological spheres.

This spring the official weekly of the Czechoslovak Party, *Tribuna*, predicted that through the decade ahead:

There will hardly be any reduction of tension in the ideological field . . . It is a long-term trend which will grow even sharper in the '70's.

As to whether Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are worthy instruments of freedom of information, allow me to quote a few impartial witnesses—neither East European nor American:

I have mentioned the Swiss daily *Neue Zuercher Zeitung* in another connection. In its June 30 study of the two stations, this paper also said, and I quote:

A critical look at the broadcasts shows that RL and RFE work with the same methods and sources as other Western radio stations, and are just as open and accessible as the latter, so that one cannot speak of secret or "agitating" stations . . . the news programs are put together from material from Western agencies and from the official pronouncements of the Communist countries. These news programs are varied and objective.

This June, Poland's Foreign Minister protested to the Bonn Government about RFE's broadcasts, which he called a "hostile activity." The Polish press chimed in to accuse Radio Free Europe of "false information" and "subversive activity." In response, the major West German daily *Sueddeutsche Zeitung*—a supporter of the Brandt administration—took an unusual step: It printed translations of a full day's news programs of Radio Free Europe's Polish service, spread across much of two pages, and invited its readers to judge for themselves whether Radio Free Europe was objective.

The Dutch National Radio Service also made a careful study and broadcast a documentary lasting almost an hour. The broadcast ended with this comment:

Radio Free Europe is not out of date . . . We would be doing an injustice to the people in East Europe if the station were to be closed down . . . Radio Free Europe is looked upon by the peoples of the East bloc countries in the same way we Dutchmen looked upon the BBC and *Radio Oranje* (the Dutch wartime freedom station) during World War II.

In regard to broadcasting to the Soviet Union, we have an eloquent statement from Anatoli Fedoseyev, the Russian scientist recently defected from the Soviet Union to England.

In talking about the shortsighted policies of the Soviet Government in the economic field, he said that the Soviet Union could, under other policies, make rapid advances and doing so would automatically put an end to the present tensions in Europe. He then asks:

What can the outside world do to speed change . . . ? The answer is simple: Increase the flow of information. There is no need for anyone to try to teach the Soviet people what to think. But there is an enormous and insatiable demand for information, for facts, about the outside world, about other Communist countries, and especially about the Soviet Union itself. The citizens of the Soviet Union are often the last people to hear news of events inside their own countries.

Mr. Chairman, all of us want a relaxation of tension and a growth of understanding and trust between this country and the Communist world. But we cannot afford to forget that such policies are real and durable only when they are backed by the will of informed peoples on both sides of the world. Let me close with the words of a very perceptive editorial which appeared in the *Washington Post*, June 25. Said the *Post*:

Detente, if it means anything, means widening the West's contacts with the East, not helping the East seal off its people from the West. It means the exchange of people, goods, words and ideas. This is the essential business of RFE and RL. The Congress, in its rightminded determination to shake the stations free of the CIA, should not lose sight of the reason for letting them continue it.

(Mr. SIKES, at the request of Mr. FASCELL, was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, in the discussion of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, I would like to look at the other side of the coin for a moment.

I am speaking of the international political effort of the Communist world—particularly as it displays itself through radio broadcasting.

Of course, you run into a contradiction immediately here. The Communist view of the doctrine of peaceful coexistence—whatever it means—does not include ideological coexistence—that is, a free exchange of ideas and information.

Thus if Western stations broadcast the truth as they see it, into areas under Communist control, that, in the eyes of Moscow and Warsaw and Prague is a violation of the spirit of peaceful coexistence. But if Communist governments are doing the broadcasting—and Radio Moscow is the world's leading international broadcaster—it seems to be something else again. Like all of us—but without any occasional saving grace of humility the Communists believe they have a patent on truth.

Soviet Party leader Leonid Brezhnev drew this distinction very plainly in his "State of the Union" message to the Soviet Party Congress this spring, when he said:

We are living in conditions of unceasing ideological warfare.

The Soviet leader evidently believes he has a patent on truth, and he proposes to use it. He went on to say:

Let the voice of truth about the Soviet Union be heard on all continents of the earth.

It is also interesting that Poland—after abstaining for many years—has recently resumed intensive "jamming" of RFE broadcasts. The Polish regime might be expected to argue—as its propagandists already argue—that RFE is a barrier to relaxing tensions in Europe because it interferes in internal affairs—Communist style.

However, we have heard nothing about any restriction of Soviet-bloc international broadcasts. And some of them are truly remarkable.

For example, in its broadcasts to Japan Radio Moscow has criticized local election candidates for—in its words—"flooding the voters' ears with sweet-sounding promises." To Indonesia, Radio Moscow quoted a publication of the outlawed Indonesian Communist Party and called on the Indonesian people for a confrontation with what it called the "new-order regime and its reactionary schemes."

A Soviet-operated station calling itself "Peace and Progress" radio has consistently criticized the Indian Government as well as non-Communist opposition parties in that country for the last 3 years. Other bloc broadcasts call for their listeners to overthrow the government of Turkey, Greece, Iran, and Brazil.

Soviet propaganda to West Germany goes still further. There is a powerful German-speaking radio—"Soldiers' Station 935"—which tries to create the impression that it is speaking from inside West Germany—but actually comes from East Germany; it addresses itself directly to the West German armed forces, and advises them on how to resist cooperation with NATO.

In other words:

At a time when the Soviet Union and its allies are campaigning to shut down Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, their own propaganda stations are going full blast.

The fact is that the Soviet Union today is broadcasting in some 79 languages for 332 hours daily—an increase of 14 percent in the last 4 years. In 1970, radio stations of the Communist states aired just under 1,000-hours a day in 99 languages. A recent British study of Communist broadcasting concluded that—and I quote:

Radio propaganda remains the most important means at the disposal of Communist countries in their attempts to gain credibility and to influence international developments in favor of Communist aims.

Therefore—even if RFE and Radio Liberty were to use the kind of tactics many Soviet broadcasts do—the Soviet and East European effort to call "foul" against Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty would ring a bit hollow.

Mr. Chairman, the comment has been made in this country that Radio Free Europe is an anachronism, that it is out of place in an age of detente—an age, hopefully, of negotiation.

The answer to that charge is that in the attempt to bring about more normal relations between East and West, it is very important indeed to provide to East



Europeans a full range of news and opinions about their own affairs as well as external matters. It is essential that East Europeans know the full truth about the real requirements for peace. Judging by careful interviews of East European travelers done by public opinion research institutes, Free Europe is heard regularly by 31 million people, over half the population over 14 in its audience area. In effect, it is they who have answered those who contend the radios have no function in the present era. Thirty-one million people do not listen to an anachronism. They do listen to Radio Free Europe in areas where it is very important that our side be heard. I consider it essential that this program continue.

Mr. MADDEN, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAILLIARD, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN, Mr. Chairman, I commend the Committee on Foreign Affairs for reporting this legislation to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to provide assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty (S. 18).

These two information programs have been in operation since shortly after the close of World War II. At that time the threat of Soviet aggression still existed throughout countries of Western Europe.

To my mind the cheapest and probably the most effective offense and defense that the free world has against Communist aggression is to acquaint the people of the world both behind and outside the Communist Iron Curtain with the real facts and truths about Communist tyranny and enslavement. Numerous reports come from behind the Iron Curtain by the people who listen to the broadcast of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty to many of the secret operations of Communist tyranny from the standpoint of concealed enslavement of its people and the punishment rendered to its citizens who do not conform.

Through this information millions behind the Iron Curtain receive first-hand information of important news from the outside world and knowledge that our Nation and other free nations have not given up hope, and that the United States is continuing its programs and sacrifices to aid them in their fight for eventual freedom. Entertainment and informative programs are broadcast into their homes conveying aspects of American life and culture which is of great value to the families who are receiving the service of these broadcasts. For the billions of dollars that the American taxpayers have paid to curb the Communist tyranny from expansion, I think the educational and informative programs originating from Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are the most effective and produce great results in our program to curb Communist expansion throughout the free world.

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAILLIARD, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIRNIE, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I, too, wish to express my appreciation of the mission of Radio Free Europe and the way in which it conveys inspiration and encouragement to its millions of listeners behind the Iron Curtain. It does express in very vivid and very appropriate manner the ideals and the true spirit of America, and does keep alive the spirit of freedom in the hearts of those who have reason to feel oppressed because of the environment in which they are forced to live. I have supported this program since its inception and am proud of its achievements.

(Mr. PIRNIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAILLIARD, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I see by the report that Radio Free Europe had an additional \$1.5 million in operating funds, which came from private sources, and Radio Liberty has almost no private contributions. Can the gentleman explain what is the source of the \$1.5 million, and why people would be interested in contributing to one and not to the other?

Mr. MAILLIARD, I cannot give a positive answer to that, but I have heard on the radio and various other places appeals for private contributions for Radio Free Europe. I do not recall ever having heard one for Radio Liberty. They are separate. I would suppose it would depend on the effort they might make to get private contributions.

Mr. MORGAN, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAILLIARD, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN, Of course, Radio Free Europe has always had an organized fund-raising campaign. There have been frequent announcements on television and the radio. Radio Liberty has no organized campaign, and receives only a few small contributions from individuals who have a serious interest in the program. They make no public solicitation whatsoever. Their donations and contributions have been very small, I would say not more than \$5,000 or \$10,000 a year.

Mr. MAILLIARD, I should think that is the case.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I support S. 18.

Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. Chairman, I note that the committee report indicates in recent months Radio Liberty has devoted an increasing amount of its program to the plight of the Soviet Jews, and indicates that cultural programs have been featured along with Jewish holidays. I notice also that the Radio Liberty broadcasts in 17 languages. A number of us have tried to get some of its programming done with full programs in Yiddish. Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe have resisted those suggestions. In my judgment, this is an important symbolic gesture on our part that these programs be made in Yiddish. I am wondering if

the committee took this up and can give us any assurance that this kind of programming may be forthcoming.

Mr. MAILLIARD, I do not recall this particular question coming up during the hearings, but I did not attend them all. I will be glad to yield to the chairman of the committee for a response.

Mr. MORGAN, I agree with the gentleman who asked the question, that it is proper that some broadcasts should be in Yiddish. I want to assure him that the commission that will be formed to make a study under this bill will definitely have a responsibility to determine whether some of the broadcasts should be in Yiddish and Hebrew.

Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. Chairman, then I have the assurance of the committee chairman and the ranking Republican member that they will bend all their efforts to see to it we do get some broadcasts in Yiddish?

Mr. MORGAN, The bill provides that there will be two Members of the House on this commission. I am sure that whoever the the House Members on the commission are, they will recognize the importance of the issue which the gentleman has raised.

Mr. MAILLIARD, I am quite certain that this is one of the subjects that the commission should make some recommendations on.

Mr. FRENZEL, I thank both of the gentlemen, and I endorse this program wholeheartedly.

Mr. MORGAN, Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this resolution simply because Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have been two of the most effective links that the free world has had with the people behind the Iron Curtain.

I had occasion to review many of the broadcasts of Radio Free Europe and some of the other work they are doing. I believe that Radio Free Europe has provided the heartbeat of hope and it continues to provide that heartbeat of hope for 180 million people behind the Iron Curtain living in the captive nations of Europe who, by listening to the Radio Free Europe program and broadcasts, are constantly reminded that we, as the free people of the United States, have not forgotten them and that we share in their great hope for the liberation and liberalization of these people with their ultimately rejoining the free nations of the world.

I think the adoption of this resolution will be a great morale booster for the many wonderful people who work for Radio Free Europe, people who have been making an enormous contribution. They are all people who have been carrying on this relentless struggle behind the Iron Curtain.

I must say that they have been showing a great deal of professionalism which they have developed over the years and that this has brought a great degree of confidence to the people listening to the broadcasts. Those who listen to Radio Free Europe and its broadcasts behind the Iron Curtain have certainly

been given a great deal of hope from those broadcasts.

I have been behind the Iron Curtain to some of those countries and talked to those people and discussed with them the value and the importance of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. In both instances they tell us that frequently this is the only link they have with the free world. Radio Free Europe is the only method by which these people can continue to understand what is happening to the rest of the world.

I certainly hope that the Commission goes over the program and sees to it that we have a continuation of the Radio Free Europe broadcasts after the 2-year period and that they give serious consideration to restoring Radio Free Cuba along with Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

We had a very effective Radio Free Cuba operating into Cuba for a number of years and then it was shut down during the hysteria that swept this country a few years ago.

It seems to me that it is important for us to continue to get behind the Iron Curtain of Cuba and bring to the Cuban people the truth about America and what is happening on this continent.

So, I am most pleased and wish to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) and his committee on both sides of the aisle for not succumbing to the hysteria that swept our country a few years ago when there were strong voices trying to sweep aside Radio Free Europe for people behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Foreign Affairs Committee has shown excellent judgment in bringing this bill before the House and affording us an opportunity to vote on this measure in order to show the people in RFE the great confidence that we have in what they are doing.

So, Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the adoption of this measure.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID).

(Mr. REID of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the chairman and ranking minority member for the action they are taking today on bills that were initially introduced by Senator CASE and myself, the purpose of which was to facilitate and insure ultimate direct funding for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and to separate the funding from the CIA, thereby to increase, we believe, the credibility of the stations.

Mr. Chairman, I very much hope that the 2-year funding that is called for in the House version of the bill will prevail in any conference with the Senate. I think the assurance of continuity of these two stations is very important from several standpoints, not the least of which involves the personnel of the stations. Equally important, there are certain diplomatic implications beyond the study.

This study will take 1 year, and I hope that it may conclude not only that there is merit to continuing these stations, but also that they will be placed in broad-

based American Council that would be analogous, perhaps, to the British Council which has so effectively carried forth endeavors that facilitate open communications.

I believe, therefore, that this bill should be supported. I think it only fair to say that when I was recently in Poland it was very clear that Radio Free Europe had played a very key, sensitive, and thoughtful role in reporting on the events brought on by the student riots in 1968 and, subsequently, in 1970.

These stations must become independent of the U.S. Government. Otherwise their credibility will be open to increasing question. And furthermore, we are dealing here with a sophisticated operation that must function within parameters of sensitivity, judgment, and the dictates of the truth.

What is called for is fidelity—straight news reporting, because we get from this a sensitivity to the kind of straight news that these countries do not have because of censorship, but which can be of very real benefit to the furtherance of open communications leading to higher living standards, more freedom and personal liberties in these countries.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 18, as amended by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, because I believe the continuance of U.S. assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty to be essential to the struggle for human rights around the world.

This legislation proposes a study, to be conducted by a Commission on International Radio Broadcasting, to determine what role the United States should play in the support of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty in the future.

The House version also provides interim funds, totaling \$36 million for fiscal 1972 and \$38.52 million for fiscal 1973, to enable these two vital networks to continue broadcasting daily news and features behind the Iron Curtain where many people are denied even the day-to-day reports of events occurring in their own countries.

Through such factual broadcasts they fill the void of information so necessary to world understanding—a void created by Government control of news media.

During hearings on these two stations, the Foreign Affairs Committee heard testimony on the widespread influence and effect of both networks, first by former Soviet residents who believe strongly that the broadcasts of Radio Liberty can reach sufficient listeners to ultimately help bring about changes and give rise within the Soviet Union to greater freedoms. We heard similar opinions expressed by other former Iron Curtain residents about Radio Free Europe.

As one witness so poignantly described it:

Thought control was what enabled Stalin to invade Finland, Poland and the Western Ukraine, what enabled Hitler to occupy much of Europe. It is now being practiced at dangerous levels throughout the Soviet bloc.

While millions of Americans daily listen to and read the news and a divergency of opinion from independent

media, they often take this uncensored dissemination of news for granted.

We in the United States have the opportunity to insure, through Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, that those behind the Iron Curtain will continue to receive at least a little of the truth for which they so hunger.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, these networks can help to bridge the gap of understanding between East and West and the truth itself can provide a foundation for peace with freedom in our time.

Support for S. 18 will guarantee the continuation of this vital service to millions of people who are daily denied the truth and thereby the weapon for freedom.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 18 as amended. The Foreign Affairs Committee of the House has acted wisely in calling for an extensive evaluation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty while, in the interim, authorizing funds for their continued operation.

The measure reported out of the House Committee would establish a tripartite commission made up of representatives of the Congress, the executive branch, and the public. The commission is to re-evaluate the activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and submit the results of its study to Congress by November 30, 1972. The bill authorizes appropriations to the commission chairman of \$36 million for fiscal year 1972 and \$38.5 million for fiscal year 1973 to enable Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty to continue operations pending congressional evaluation of its report.

This approach is a realistic one. In the first place, it accomplishes the immediate goal of removing all secrecy and hidden funding of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. At the same time, the bill withholds final judgment on whether and how to fund these broadcast operations. I am gratified that both the measure passed by the Senate and the bill under consideration by the House recognize the importance of continuing RFE and RL broadcasts pending further congressional evaluation.

The debate over the future of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty has perhaps received as much attention in the foreign press as in our own country. At this point, I would like to share with my colleagues several commentaries about RFE and RL that have appeared in the West European press:

The London Daily Telegraph on June 9 of this year stated:

There is now talk of revising the status of these stations, and signs of a "liberal" offensive on their freedom. It is odd that the self-appointed defenders of civil liberty in the West should have so little concern for the same liberties in the East. Would it really make the world any safer or the Soviet leaders any nicer if our last thin line of communication with the people of the Communist world were cut?

In August 1968, the Manchester Guardian observed:

When the West bemoans that it can do nothing to help, it forgets that it can supply

information, and that is what eastern Europe needs to keep its hopes alive . . . It is not only in Czechoslovakia that honest news is needed. All the other satellite countries keep their people in ignorance of the facts. . . In fighting the sort of tyranny we now see in eastern Europe, a good transmitter is worth at least one nuclear submarine.

The Paris *Nouvel Observateur* commented in January of 1970:

No other station in the world, American or other, exercises such influence direct or indirect on the public opinion of five countries. . . its five radios are certainly more dangerous today than they were yesterday for the East European regimes.

The *Muenchner Merkur*, a West German paper, stated in June of this year:

Careful analyses by the Federal Press Office already showed weeks ago that the American (RFE) take great pains, with extreme journalistic care and objectivity, in the formulation of their broadcasts. Precisely this—the non-tendentious representations of daily events in the West and East—is probably the true stumbling block for Warsaw.

The Hamburg liberal paper, *Die Zeit*, commented on July 2, 1971:

Factual accuracy and objectivity are the first order of news analysis (at RFE), which depends on the superlatively reliable and careful work of an 80-man-strong Research and Analysis Department . . . The "agitation station" in Munich help to close gaps which continue to arise thanks to the anachronistic information policy of the Communist regimes.

Mr. Chairman, the above comments demonstrate the tremendous importance other Free World countries place on the role of RFE and RL. A more extensive analysis of these radio stations appeared in the Zurich daily *Neue Zurich Zeitung* entitled "Free News for Unfree Countries." This article further illustrates the strong support of RFE and RL by the press in Western Europe and I commend it to my colleagues attention during the current debate:

[Translation from *Neue Zurich Zeitung*, June 20, 1971]

#### FREE NEWS FOR UNFREE COUNTRIES

With a screeching crescendo, Communist propaganda is increasing its campaign against Radio Free Europe (RFE) and Radio Liberty (RL), and presents them as major hindrances to a relaxation of tensions in Europe. Both stations were set up at the beginning of the 1950's by the Americans in Munich for the purpose of broadcasting information behind the Iron Curtain and to giving the peoples of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union their own voice. According to the late President Kennedy, they were created to give the people on the other side of the Iron Curtain a sign that they have not been forgotten, and to guarantee "that the peoples of all countries receive the truth and through it are able [to make] intelligent judgments."

#### OPEN WORLD ON THE AIRWAYS

The two stations, whose programming centers are located in Munich, are independent of each other, have their own desks and broadcasting installations, and have different tasks. Radio Liberty broadcasts to the Soviet Union—from Lampertheim, Spain, and Taiwan, with a capacity of 1,840,000 watts—in Russian and 17 other languages of the Soviet peoples. Radio Free Europe has five transmitters in Holzkirchen, nine transmitters in Biblis, and eighteen transmitters in Portugal (including four each with 100 and 250 kilowatts) with a total strength of 2245

kilowatts, broadcasting daily 20 hours to Czechoslovakia, 19 hours to Poland and Hungary, 12 hours to Rumania, and 8 hours to Bulgaria. The reason and justification for these stations are to be found in the fact that the Communist states know no freedom of opinion, that they hinder a free exchange of information, and that the ruling Party maintains its opinion monopoly with every available means. In our modern age of global communication and mass media, the leaders in Moscow and the East European countries try to work against this communication, keeping the Curtain closed at least to that extent, maintaining a "camp" of controlled information. It is their sealing off that is unnatural and contradictory to the tendency of our age toward immediate, global, and varied information—not the existence of the two stations, which fulfill important functions as gates to a worldwide process of communication and thus actually serve that coexistence about which so much is said, not hindering it, as they are accused of doing.

#### SOVIET COUNTERMOVES

Since Khrushchev's successors, out of their fear of "convergence" and growing intellectual opposition, introduced a re-ideologization in the spirit of the Brezhnev Doctrine, and in April 1968 called for "ideological class struggle," they have been conducting an intensified battle against the influence of foreign radio broadcasts in the area they rule. The programs directed at the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, not only by Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty but by the BBC, Voice of America, and *Deutsche Welle* as well, are fought against as "indirect imperialist subversion." Jamming stations, which had been closed down during the period of Khrushchev's coexistence policy, went back into action (with the exception of Hungary and Rumania); and in the Soviet Union, the punishment for listening to foreign stations was increased. As these countermeasures apparently bore little fruit, the Soviet leaders are trying by propagandistic and diplomatic means to silence the stations themselves. This is the goal of the campaign directed against RFE and RL, which, as American organizations operating from the territory of the Federal Republic, are apparently the most vulnerable.

RL's supporter is the Radio Liberty Committee in New York, whose honorary president is Harry Truman and which is directed by former Deputy Secretary of State Howland Sargeant. RFE belongs to Free Europe, Inc., led by prominent personalities of America and advised by a Western European committee under Dirk Stikker. It had already been known for a long time that these stations were not being operated solely with contributions from American organizations and private persons; the recent revelation by Senator Case of the financing by the CIA was thus no surprise. However, President Nixon's initiative to put the financing of the stations on a new basis and thus insure their further activity is combined by Congress with its own drive for greater control over the government's foreign policy, and has found an opponent in Senator Fulbright.

Communist propaganda is, of course, trying to take advantage of these domestic American discussions. The information broadcast by RL and RFE is presented to their own subjects as "imperialist agitation" from the "CIA's witches' kitchen," and, appealing to latent anti-Semitic sentiments, is denounced as "Zionist propaganda." The 20th Olympic Games in Munich in 1972 are being used as the lever with which to demand a closing down of the stations whose activity, according to the Soviet version, would be contrary to the "Olympic spirit." The magazine *Sport v SSR* even threatened in April that one could not expect Communist sportsmen to appear in a place like Munich where

anti-Communist and "revanchist" organizations were active. However, Avery Brundage indicated in a television interview on May 9 that an exchange of letters with the presidents of the radio stations had given him assurance that they understand the ideals of the Olympic Games and will comply with them, and he said he believed "that there should be no difficulty from this side."

#### PRESSURE ON BONN AND MUNICH

The campaign against the Munich stations is, however, not only concentrated on the Olympics, but is broadly connected with Brezhnev's Western policy. Moscow and Warsaw are obviously trying to infer from the treaties with Bonn the demand for suspension of the freedom stations; they see in them a danger for "European security." The Polish Government recently even undertook diplomatic steps in Washington and Bonn to achieve the closing down of RFE. The Bonn Government, which is responsible for granting the license to broadcast and has just renewed it for another year, has reacted to such pressure soberly and calmly until now. For legal, organizational, and technical reasons it would in any case be impossible to close RL and RFE overnight. Observing the Communist campaign directed against the Munich stations, one can see the GDR as the driving force, as well as the close cooperation among the orthodox forces in the Eastern Bloc. The fact that the radio and press in East Germany, the Ukraine, and White Russia are the strongest agitators against the two stations' presence in the Federal Republic gives rise to the suspicion that these attacks could have something to do with the criticism of Moscow's understanding with Bonn which has cropped up in those areas.

#### NUMEROUS LISTENERS

Communist propaganda's constant attacks on RL and RFE are an indirect proof of their effectiveness among the population of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Even Party leaders admit that the programs from RL and RFE are widely spread in their countries and that they serve as a source [of information] for the rulers themselves. In the Soviet Union, there are about 27 million radio sets with short-wave reception, which means that every fifth adult Soviet citizen can receive foreign broadcasts. It is estimated that in times of crisis over two-thirds of the Soviet citizens listened to foreign stations. Radio Free Europe has, through continuing empirical surveys and constant interviewing of tourists from Eastern Europe, been able to produce a more exact picture of its listening audience and their reactions and attitudes, confirmed and supplemented by official surveys in Eastern Europe. It has been ascertained that nearly 39 million, or one-half, of the residents over 14 years of age in the target countries listen to RFE; in Poland alone, 12 million (59%); in Rumania, 6.5 million (57%); in Czechoslovakia, 5.5 million (50%); in Hungary, four million (55%) and in Bulgaria, 2.5 million (44%). The most recent surveys clearly indicate how, during and after the Polish unrest in December, the number of listeners rose abruptly—RFE's listening audience in Poland to 83%, in Rumania to 66%, and in Hungary to 78%.

#### WIDE SELECTION

A critical look at the broadcasts shows that RL and RFE work with the same methods and sources as other Western radio stations and are just as open and accessible as the latter, so that one cannot speak of secret or "agitating" stations. However, they do place greater emphasis on spoken information; 16% of the broadcasting time at RL and RFE is reserved for news. The news programs are put together from material from Western agencies and from the official proclamations of the Communist countries.

These news programs are varied and objective—which even the Communist side cannot completely deny, as they recently have had to wage their battle against the “deideologization” of Western radio propaganda. For instance, Moscow accuses Radio Liberty, which it tries to portray as a disturbance to European “relaxation of tension,” of having a [too] stressed interest in questions of European unity and security.

The two stations have one special and important function: the communication of Western press voices to those countries in which the population is not allowed to buy foreign newspapers. Radio Liberty broadcasts several times daily in 18 languages—a five-minute press review, and transmits in addition texts or excerpts from important editorials and reportage in well-known newspapers. Radio Free Europe broadcasts press reviews daily to Bulgaria, Poland, and Rumania (10 minutes apiece), Czechoslovakia (15 minutes), and Hungary (25 minutes). Not only American newspapers are cited in them, but the Western European press as well has a lot to say, including *l'Unita* and *Humanite*.

Let us look at an example: On May 25, RFE included in its press review for Rumania and in information programs in the Rumanian language the following material: commentaries from AFP, Daily Telegraph, and UPI on Podgorny's trip to Cairo (6 minutes); Federal Chancellor Brandt's interview in *Spiegel* on Ostpolitik and a Berlin agreement (5 minutes); the statement by Czech exile politicians in the *Neue Zuercher Zeitung* on the Prague Party Congress (5 minutes); Paul Wohl in the *Christian Science Monitor* on the ideals and experience of the Soviet population (10 minutes); Ernst Fischer's essay “The Revolution is Different” in excerpts (7 minutes); and Topping's report in the *New York Times* on Chou en-lai's statements on the Soviet-China conflict (8 minutes). This transmission of Western press voices gives the listeners in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union a view of the world which they wish for and something against which to measure their own Party press. Communist journalists have demanded, in the face of RL's and RFE's effectiveness, that greater openness and broader coverage be permitted in their own press and in the mass media.

#### EASTERN COPYING

The Communist side even uses as much as it can the freedom of opinion in the West to spread its own propaganda and to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. For example, *Radio Prague* operates in Spanish and Italian among the *Gastarbeiter* in the Federal Republic [of Germany] and Switzerland. The form of organization and manner of working of the two Munich stations has been copied by the Soviet Union and, in addition to the official *Radio Moscow*, an allegedly independent *Radio Peace and Progress* has been created, which is supposedly run by the trade unions, journalists' union, and the *Novosti* agency, and which obviously is connected with the Soviet KGB (Secret Service). This radio, by the way, also uses transmitting installations outside of the Soviet Union—for example, for its German language broadcasts it uses a relay transmitter in the area of Leipzig. *Radio Peace and Progress* by far outdoes *Radio Moscow* as concerns sharpness; in Chinese it is the mouthpiece of anti-Maoist propaganda. When the Indian Government protested against attacks by *Radio Peace and Progress*, the Soviet Government declared (with a shrug) that it has no influence on this “independent station”.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That there is established a commission to be known as the Commission on International Radio Broadcasting (hereinafter referred to as the “Commission”) composed of nine members as follows:

(1) Two Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(2) Two Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate.

(3) Two members appointed by the President from among officers and employees of the executive branch of the Government.

(4) Three members appointed by the President from private life, including experts in mass communication in the broadcasting field.

(5) The President shall designate one of the members appointed from private life to serve as Chairman of the Commission. Any vacancy in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to review and evaluate international radio broadcasting and related activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

(b) The Commission shall submit its report to the President for transmission to the Congress not later than November 30, 1972, setting forth the results of its findings and conclusions, together with such recommendations as it may deem appropriate, including, but not limited to, recommendations with respect to future management, operations, and support of such activities; establishment of a corporate or other entity to administer support for, or to conduct, such activities; and protection of the rights and equities of past and present employees of Radio Europe and Radio Liberty.

(c) The Commission shall cease to exist on July 1, 1973.

SEC. 3. (a) In addition to his function as head of the Commission, the Chairman of the Commission shall provide grants to support the broadcasting activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and submit to the President for transmission to the Congress not later than November 30, as appropriate, of each grant made and a statement describing the utilization of each such grant.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Chairman for carrying out the purposes of this section, \$36,000,000 for the fiscal year 1972 and \$38,520,000 for the fiscal year 1973. Except for funds appropriated pursuant to this section, no funds appropriated after the date of first appropriation pursuant to this Act may be made available to or for the use of Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty.

SEC. 4. (a) Members of the Commission who are Members of Congress or officers or employees of the executive branch shall serve without compensation for their services as members of the Commission. Members of the Commission who are not Members of Congress or officers or employees of the executive branch shall receive per diem at the daily rate prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule by section 5316 of title 5 of the United States Code when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission. All members of the Commission, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, shall be allowed

travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703(b) of title 5 of the United States Code.

(b) The Chairman of the Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary. Such personnel may be appointed without regard to provisions of title 5, United States Code, covering appointments in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates. Any Federal employee subject to civil service laws and regulations who may be appointed by the Chairman shall retain civil service status without interruption or loss of status or privilege. In no event shall any individual appointed under this subsection receive as compensation an amount in excess of the maximum rate for GS-18 on the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) In addition, the Chairman of the Commission is authorized to obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed the maximum rates for GS-18 on the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) Upon request of the Chairman of the Commission, the head of any Federal agency is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to the Commission to assist it in carrying out its duties under this section.

(e) The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis such administrative support services as the Commission may request.

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such sums as may be necessary for its administrative expenses.

Mr. MORGAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, this bill was printed August 3 and I am confident that everyone is familiar with its contents. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the committee rises.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BRINKLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 18) to amend the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to provide assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, pursuant to House Resolution 699, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 271, nays 12, answered "present" 1, not voting 146, as follows:

[Roll No. 410]

YEAS—271

Abourezk	Eckhardt	Lujan
Adams	Ellberg	McClary
Anderson, Calif.	Erlenborn	McCormack
Andrews, Ala.	Fascell	McCulloch
Andrews, N. Dak.	Findley	McEwen
Annunzio	Fish	McKay
Archer	Flowers	McKevitt
Arends	Foley	McKinney
Ashley	Ford	McMillan
Aspin	William D. Ford	Macdonald, Mass.
Aspinall	Forsythe	Madden
Begich	Fountain	Mahon
Belcher	Frelinghuysen	Maillard
Bennett	Frenzel	Martin
Bergland	Frey	Matsunaga
Betts	Gallifanakis	Mayne
Bevill	Gallagher	Mazzoli
Biaggi	Garmatz	Meeds
Blester	Gaydos	Melcher
Bingham	Gettys	Metcalfe
Blanton	Glalmo	Mikva
Bolling	Gibbons	Miller, Calif.
Brademas	Goodale	Miller, Ohio
Bray	Goodling	Mills, Md.
Brinkley	Green, Oreg.	Minish
Broomfield	Green, Pa.	Mink
Brotzman	Griffin	Minshall
Brown, Mich.	Gross	Monagan
Brown, Ohio	Gubser	Montgomery
Broyhill, Va.	Gude	Moorhead
Buchanan	Haley	Morgan
Burke, Mass.	Hall	Mosher
Burleson, Tex.	Hamilton	Murphy, Ill.
Burlison, Mo.	Hammer	Murphy, N.Y.
Burton	Hammerschmidt	Myers
Byrnes, Wis.	Hanley	Natcher
Byron	Hanna	Nedzi
Cabell	Hansen, Idaho	Nix
Caffery	Harsha	O'By
Carney	Harvey	O'Hara
Carter	Hathaway	O'Konski
Casey, Tex.	Hechler, W. Va.	O'Neill
Cederberg	Heinz	O'Connell
Chamberlain	Helstoski	Patten
Clawson, Del.	Henderson	Perkins
Collins, Ill.	Hicks, Mass.	Pickle
Collins, Tex.	Hicks, Wash.	Pike
Colmer	Hogan	Pirnie
Conable	Hollifield	Poage
Conte	Hosmer	Poff
Coughlin	Howard	Powell
Daniel, Va.	Hull	Preyer, N.C.
Daniels, N.J.	Hungate	Price, Ill.
Danielson	Hunt	Price, Tex.
Davis, S.C.	Hutchinson	Pucinski
Davis, Wis.	Ichord	Quie
Dellenback	Jacobs	Quillen
Dennis	Jarman	Railsback
Dent	Johnson, Calif.	Randall
Derwinski	Johnson, Pa.	Rangel
Dickinson	Jones, Ala.	Rees
Donohue	Karh	Reid, N.Y.
Dow	Kagen	Reuss
Downing	Kee	Rhodes
Drinan	Keith	Riegle
Dulski	Kemp	Robinson, Va.
Duncan	Kyl	Rodino
du Pont	Kyros	Roe
Dwyer	Lloyd	Rogers
	Long, La.	Roncallo
	Long, Md.	Rooney, N.Y.

Rooney, Pa.  
Rosenthal  
Roush  
Roy  
Roybal  
Ruppe  
Ryan  
Sarbanes  
Satterfield  
Saylor  
Scherie  
Scheuer  
Schneebeli  
Schwengel  
Scott  
Shipley  
Shriver  
Sisk  
Skubitz  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, N.Y.  
Spence

Springer  
Stanton  
James V. Steed  
Steiger, Wis.  
Stephens  
Stratton  
Stubblefield  
Suckey  
Sullivan  
Swinerton  
Talcott  
Taylor  
Teague, Tex.  
Terry  
Thompson, Ga.  
Thompson, Wis.  
Thone  
Tiernan  
Udall  
Van Deerlin  
Vander Jagt

Vanik  
Vigorito  
Wargonner  
Wampler  
Whalen  
White  
Whitehurst  
Widnall  
Wiggins  
Williams  
Wright  
Wyatt  
Wydler  
Wylie  
Yates  
Yatron  
Young, Fla.  
Zablocki  
Zion  
Zwach

Mr. Young of Texas with Mr. Grover.  
Mr. Patman with Mr. Latta.  
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Peyster.  
Mr. Clark with Mr. Conyers.  
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Diggs.  
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Stokes.  
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Rousselot.  
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Mitchell.  
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. J. William Stanton.  
Mr. Corman with Mr. Davis of Georgia.  
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Ruth.  
Mr. Baring with Mr. Sebelius.  
Mr. Podell with Mr. Dellums.  
Mr. Cotter with Mr. Shoup.  
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Badillo.  
Mr. Culver with Mr. Steele.  
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Ware.  
Mrs. Abzug with Mr. Clay.  
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Koch.  
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.  
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Harrington.  
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Fisher.  
Mr. Evans of Colorado with McDade.  
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Lent.  
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Keating.  
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Smith of California.  
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.  
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.  
Mr. Boland with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.  
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Sandman.  
Mr. Celler with Mr. Devine.  
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Goldwater.  
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Eech.  
Mr. Flood with Mr. McDade.  
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Mizell.  
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Bell.  
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Hastings.  
Mr. Runnels with Mr. Collier.  
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Whalley.  
Mr. Kluczyński with Mr. Blackburn.  
Mr. Link with Mr. Nelsen.  
Mr. McFall with Mr. Teague of California.  
Mr. Mathis of Georgia with Mr. Pelly.  
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Winn.  
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Snyder.  
Mr. Purcell with Mr. McClure.  
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Don H. Clausen.  
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Bob Wilson.  
Mr. Sikes with Mr. King.  
Mr. Slack with Mr. Kuykendall.  
Mr. Stagers with Mr. Baker.  
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Horton.  
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Robinson of New York.  
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Halpern.  
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Bow.  
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Jones.  
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Camp.  
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Clancy.  
Mr. Mann with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.  
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Pettis.  
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Michel.  
Mr. Gray with Mr. Hillis.

NAYS—12

Burke, Fla.  
Denholm  
Edwards, Calif.  
Hays

Kastenmeier  
Landgrebe  
Moss  
Rarick

Schmitz  
Whitten  
Wolf  
Wyman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Seiberling

NOT VOTING—146

Abbutt  
Abernethy  
Abzug  
Addabbo  
Alexander  
Anderson, Ill.  
Anderson, Tenn.  
Ashbrook  
Badillo  
Baker  
Baring  
Barrett  
Bell  
Blackburn  
Blatnik  
Boggs  
Boland  
Bow  
Brasco  
Brooks  
Broyhill, N.C.  
Byrne, Pa.  
Camp  
Carey, N.Y.  
Celler  
Chappell  
Chisholm  
Clancy  
Clark  
Clausen, Don H.  
Clay  
Cleveland  
Collier  
Conyers  
Corman  
Cotter  
Crane  
Culver  
Davis, Ga.  
de la Garza  
Delaney  
Dellums  
Diggs  
Dingell  
Dorn  
Dowdy  
Edmondson  
Edwards, Ala.

Edwards, La.  
Esch  
Eshleman  
Evans, Colo.  
Evin, Tenn.  
Fisher  
Flood  
Flynt  
Ford, Gerald R.  
Fraser  
Fulton, Tenn.  
Fuqua  
Goldwater  
Grasso  
Gray  
Griffiths  
Grover  
Hagan  
Halpern  
Hansen, Wash.  
Harrington  
Hastings  
Hawkins  
Hébert  
Heckler, Mass.  
Hillis  
Horton  
Jonas  
Jones, N.C.  
Jones, Tenn.  
Keating  
King  
Kluczyński  
Koch  
Kuykendall  
Landrum  
Latta  
Leggett  
Lennon  
Lent  
Link  
McCloskey  
McCleary  
McCollister  
McDade  
McDonald, Mich.  
McFall  
Mann  
Mathias, Calif.  
Mathis, Ga.

Michel  
Mills, Ark.  
Mitchell  
Mizell  
Mollohan  
Morse  
Nelsen  
Nichols  
Passman  
Patman  
Pelly  
Pepper  
Pettis  
Peyster  
Podell  
Pryor, Ark.  
Purcell  
Roberts  
Robison, N.Y.  
Rostenkowski  
Rousselot  
Runnels  
Ruth  
St Germain  
Sandman  
Sebelius  
Shoup  
Sikes  
Slack  
Smith, Calif.  
Snyder  
Stagers  
Stanton, J. William  
Steele  
Steiger, Ariz.  
Stokes  
Teague, Calif.  
Thompson, N.J.  
Ullman  
Veysey  
Waldie  
Ware  
Whalley  
Wilson, Bob  
Wilson, Charles H.  
Winn  
Young, Tex.

So the bill was passed.  
The Clerk announced the following pairs:  
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Ashbrook.  
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. McCloskey.  
Mr. Abbutt with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.  
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Eshleman.  
Mr. Passman with Mr. McCollister.  
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Cleveland.  
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.  
Mr. Evin of Tennessee with Mr. Mathias of California.  
Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Crane.  
Mr. Hogan with Mr. Veysey.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the creation of a commission to evaluate international radio broadcasting and related activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, to authorize appropriations to the Chairman of the Commission, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to

extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

~~RURAL DEVELOPMENT—WHAT WE NEED IS THE RELEASE OF FUNDS WE HAVE ALREADY APPROPRIATED~~

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Washington Post carried the following big headlines: "Both Parties Push Aid Program for Rural Areas." The story followed, pointing out what a number of my colleagues plan to do toward passing legislation to meet rural needs. Prominent among those mentioned is our good friend and colleague, Senator ROBERT DOLE, Republican Leader in the Senate, and under that—with a question mark—appeared the words, "the White House Bill".

Mr. Speaker, what we need is action, not more talk. What we need is the release of present funds, not more legislation. What we need is to get President Nixon and his Director of the Budget, Mr. George P. Shultz, to turn loose the money we in the Congress provided for rural area programs in the appropriations bill which I authored as Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee handling the subject, Public Law 92-73. These funds are available now, but the President and Director of the Budget refuse to release them.

These frozen funds total \$58 million for rural water and waste disposal grants, \$75 million for the Farmers Home Administration to make production loans, \$216 million for rural electrification loans, and \$5.9 million for rural telephone loans, funds for rural housing for domestic farm labor, for mutual and self-help housing, flood prevention, resource conservation and development, land conservation and development.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has done its part; however the Bureau of the Budget, with the approval of the White House, has cut back the agricultural conservation program, now REAP, by \$55.5 million for next year despite a congressional directive to continue it at its former level. This means that the President and Mr. Shultz are turning their backs on 1 million Americans all over the United States who have each year put up an equal amount of their own money, in addition to their labor, to really do something about pollution.

Such veto reduces soil technicians for the Soil Conservation Service and greatly retards watershed programs as well as regular soil conservation activities.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat: What we need is action, not any more talk. What we need is the release of present funds, not more legislation.

~~RED CHINA AT THE U.N. COULD JEOPARDIZE SETTLEMENT OF ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT~~

(Mr. BIAGGI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I want to alert my colleagues to a very serious situation that could arise in light of Red China's recent inflammatory remarks at the United Nations and the earlier expulsion of Nationalist China.

Let me first point out that when Nationalist China was thrown out, a dangerous precedent was set. It was the first time a member of the U.N. was expelled. Now, if they can make a claim that Taiwan is not a "legitimate" government, the same can be said of other governments.

Moreover, Red China has decided to cast itself as the self-styled champion of "third world" rights. The lesser developed nations of the world are ready to listen to the rhetoric of Mao and his cronies, and, what is more important, vote with them. As such this alliance can pose a formidable threat to peace efforts in the U.N.

Here is where the serious problem lies. Red China, in its maiden speech at the U.N. leveled a strong attack on Israel, claiming that it had committed aggression against the Palestinians and that it was not the legitimate government of the area. Will one of Red China's first acts in the U.N. be to order the expulsion of Israel and the seating of the Palestinian guerrillas?

The Middle East situation is the most explosive issue before the United Nations Security Council. The other four permanent members of that body have entered into negotiations in an effort to reach a settlement. Now with Red China on that Council, what chance will there be for a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict?

I am sure we will see a Red Chinese effort to thwart every action or initiative taken by the Security Council toward a settlement of the Middle East war. To permit a U.N. negotiated settlement would mean a "victory" for the Soviet Union in Red China's eyes. To see a continued confrontation would mean a greater opportunity for Red China to establish itself in the Middle East. Clearly the United Nations will become more impotent than ever.

I am sure we have not seen an end to the folly of the United Nations action against Taiwan. As one local newspaper recently put it, we have begun the era of "China in the Bullshop."

~~PRINCETON LYNCH MOB~~

(Mr. ICHORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, on October 28, 1971, I described on the floor of this House the makeup of a group calling itself the Committee for Public Justice that has been created to harass and

~~criticize the Federal Bureau of Investigation.~~

At that time I remarked that at least one member of the Committee for Public Justice, Lillian Hellman, had been identified in sworn testimony before Congress as a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A. In addition, an individual commissioned to prepare a paper for the Committee for Public Justice, Frank Donner, was identified in sworn testimony as a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and like Miss Hellman, when given an opportunity to explain his past activities, exercised his right to invoke the fifth amendment.

On November 3, 1971, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat carried editorial comment on this so-called Committee for Public Justice entitled "Princeton Lynch Mob."

I think the editorial pretty well sums up the Committee for Public Justice as a "manufacturer of garbage" and a "kangaroo court."

I would like to insert this editorial in the RECORD.

~~PRINCETON LYNCH MOB~~

If the Ku Klux Klan announced that it was holding a conference at Princeton University to castigate the Federal Bureau of Investigation, it is highly unlikely that it would be given much credibility or news coverage.

Why then did certain liberal newspapers give a great amount of coverage to a conference at Princeton University held by a far leftist group that everyone knew was called for the single purpose of making a violent attack on the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its director J. Edgar Hoover?

Because certain leftist critics have no real case against Mr. Hoover or the FBI, they have to manufacture the garbage they put out.

Certainly the conference at Princeton (calling it a conference gives this kangaroo court too much stature) has to rank as one of the most vicious in memory. Under the sponsorship of the Committee for Public Justice, they proceeded to make a whole series of undocumented, unsubstantiated charges against the FBI and its director.

How could anyone give such an assemblage the slightest bit of credibility?

Just consider who some of the leading "critics" at the hate-the-FBI session were:

There was Ramsey Clark, who has been conducting a vendetta against Hoover and the FBI for years. In our book Clark was one of the worst Attorney Generals in the nation's history.

He was a weak sister from the word go. Hoover expressed it, perfectly when he said several years ago that Clark was "like a jellyfish . . . a softie" when he was Attorney General.

There was Frank Donner, who in 1955 took the 5th Amendment when he was asked by the House Un-American Activities Committee about his connections with the Communist party. Donner made news in 1961 again when he attacked the Un-American Activities Committee in a book that was so biased most St. Louis bookstores refused to handle it.

There was Lillian Hellman, who was identified in sworn testimony before Congress in 1951 as having been a member of the Hollywood chapter of the Communist party, according to Rep. Richard H. Ichord, chairman of the House Internal Security Committee.

Ichord, who denounced the Committee for Public Justice for its hatchet job on the

INTERIM PHASE OF THE CAMPAIGN  
AGAINST MARIJUANA, 1971

Results obtained to date, in the States of Sinaloa, Durango, Chihuahua, Michoacán and Guerrero.

MARIJUANA

Fields destroyed: 1,384.  
Area: (square meters) 5,704,368.  
Plants destroyed: 106,776,433.

POPPY

Fields destroyed: 826.  
Area: (square meters) 2,195,871.  
Plants destroyed: 37,992,916.

Despite these impressive statistics, the Mexican Government could be doing a much better job if it had more personnel and equipment. There are only 250 Federal officers in the entire nation. Moreover, only 6.2 percent of the Mexican budget covers the army, navy general administration, and law enforcement. As a result the Federal agents are not well paid—\$120 to \$150 a month—and there is a severe lack of equipment, especially helicopters and airplanes which are the principal tools in the drug enforcement activities.

Hopefully, the U.S. Government can continue to work closely with the Mexican Government and provide badly needed assistance, such as equipment and training, so that the results can be even more meaningful.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION TO SOON ANNOUNCE LOCATION OF FIRST LIQUID METAL FAST BREEDER REACTOR

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McCORMACK) is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, during the next few months the Atomic Energy Commission will announce the site of the first liquid metal fast breeder reactor—LMFBR. This nuclear reactor and its associated research facilities will demonstrate the design and engineering feasibility of the next generation of nuclear power reactors.

The LMFBR will be paid for by the Federal Government—through funds that have already been substantially appropriated—by the manufacturers of the reactor, and by a large group of electric utilities.

My comments today are intended to make you aware of the fact that the people of the Hanford area in eastern Washington, where I live, are almost unanimous in support of locating the LMFBR in the Hanford site. In this respect, my congressional district seems to be unique in the entire Nation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington is making

FBI said Miss Hellman was a founder of that committee.

There also were three former FBI agents, several former assistant attorney generals, a professor and other known critics of the FBI who made various allegations about FBI surveillance and other operations—none of which had enough support to warrant a further inquiry.

Members of Congress, of course, should ignore the hot air from this verbal lynching of Mr. Hoover and the FBI.

The FBI may not be perfect but it continues to do a most outstanding investigative and enforcement job for the Department of Justice.

This kind of public smear attack on the FBI inevitably boomerangs. Those who engage in such stacked, public name-calling sessions make themselves look silly.

If these are the main accusers of the FBI, then the FBI and Mr. Hoover must be doing very well indeed.

Never has a barrage missed its mark so completely. The big artillery shell intended for the FBI plooped out of the Committee for Public Justice's howitzer and landed on top of the assembled leftist "eggheads." Hopefully this will be the last we will hear from this committee that apparently knows so little about public justice.

FREEZE OF FUNDS FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES

(Mr. MYERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago the gentleman from Mississippi cited that some of the funds allocated for agricultural purposes and to help rural America are being held by OMB.

I have an extremely high regard for the gentleman from Mississippi, and I believe our voting records indicate we philosophically agree on most every point, but I believe the gentleman from Mississippi did miss one point, and that is this: This Congress and this House of Representatives consistently have appropriated over the budget, and they have in every instance this year appropriated more money with one exception, and that is the Defense appropriation.

Now, my friends, how in the world is the President of the United States going to spend more money than we have coming in without going out to borrow more money? We have placed a limitation on how much he can borrow. We have only so much money coming in from revenues. When we spend over that someone has to stop spending. The buck stops with the President and the OMB.

I am sure the President agrees with many of us about the desirability of some of the great programs. I certainly agree with the idea suggested by the gentleman from Mississippi that these rural programs are necessary. But the President is doing the only thing he can do, when we are forcing him to spend more than we have and that is to freeze those funds.

FREEZE OF FEDERAL FUNDS

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I just got

in on the tail end of that conversation awhile ago about freezing funds, and I want to say that we can be pennywise and pound foolish.

We froze a lot of funds the other day when this House passed without a record vote the biggest giveaway program Congress has ever participated in and that was not needed. I am referring to the tax program which passed the House about 3 weeks ago. And the President supported that program, and I believe it is going to be disastrous for this country when one considers the fact that this year we will have a deficit of about \$33 billion.

I want to say we could also be pennywise and pound foolish if we hold up money for construction of medical schools and things like that.

So there are two sides to this coin. Certainly there are some useless programs in this country that should be done away with, but it is not all a one-sided story. If the President wants to veto programs let him do so but I object to the withholding of funds to perhaps be released in time for an election.

MEXICAN DRUG ENFORCEMENT EFFORT

(Mr. FREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I recently spent several days in Mexico conferring with officials and seeing for myself what the Mexicans have done to stop the cultivation and trafficking in illegal drugs. I found, to my surprise, that the Mexicans are really trying to do something about the growing of poppies and the drug problem in general.

The following statistics indicate what the Mexican Government has been able to accomplish in the past 2 years in Operation Cooperation:

TOTALS OF OPERATION COOPERATION, OCTOBER 1969 TO OCTOBER 6, 1971

POPPY

Number of fields destroyed: 11,245.  
Area in square meters: 28,534,200.  
Number of plants destroyed: 313,549,402.  
Seeds confiscated: 316 Kgs. 260 Grs.  
Raw opium: 87 Kgs.  
Heroin: 54 Kgs. 159 Grs. 6 Mgs.  
Cocaine: 163 Kgs. 532 Grs.  
Morphine: 11 Kgs.

MARIJUANA

Number of fields destroyed: 3,133.  
Area in square meters: 18,006,809.  
Dry Marijuana incinerated: 39 Tons 603 Kgs.  
Confiscated Marijuana in stock: 76 Tons 434 Kgs. 550 Grs.  
Seed confiscated: 348 Kgs. 690 Grs.

TOXIC PILLS

Barbiturates and amphetamines: 31,009-240.  
L.S.D.: 584.  
"Peyote": 3 Kgs.

VEHICLES CONFISCATED

Planes: 5.  
Boats: 3.  
Automobiles: 44.

DETENTIONS

Prior investigations: 1,832.  
Persons accused: 5,204.  
Foreigners: 914.

E 12462

the same language as the young and imaginative and liberal-thinking element inside East Europe.

Czechoslovak Party leader Gustav Husak, on the day he took over from Dubcek in April, 1969, complained that the journalist and writers and intellectuals who had tried to create "socialism with a human face" in 1968 were still thinking and saying the same things a year later . . . and that Radio Free Europe was talking their language. Husak said:

If one reads the monitoring of Radio Free Europe, one finds the same things—the same way of speaking—and frequently the same terminology as one does in the writings of some of our publicists.

And a year earlier, the Polish Party Central Committee's chief of "Educational Affairs"—that is, ideological indoctrination—complained that the March 1968 demonstrations of students and writers in Poland had provided ammunition for Western broadcasters. He said:

Free Europe could proclaim to all and sundry that it had not invented an "anti-regime affair," but had merely provided a platform for the writers of Poland.

In short, what Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are doing is to drag facts and ideas out into the light of day, where young East Europeans can examine them and make up their own minds. And I need hardly add: the way they make up their minds will affect the future of our young people as well as themselves.

We can even hope that this ventilating of facts and ideas will persuade the Communist governments themselves to give their youth a chance to think. Let me quote again from the Soviet youth journal, Komsomolskaya Pravda, on May 29 of this year. It said that Soviet publicists could draw serious lessons from the work of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, and added:

The press reports which we publish should deal more openly with the unfavorable aspects and developments of our society. It is better for us to analyze these aspects ourselves than to wait for the commentaries of Western radio stations . . . We fail to impress many people these days by talking about the "bared teeth of savage imperialism." We must analyze things more thoroughly for our young people.

When official radio in the Communist bloc acts seriously on this recommendation, it will start to draw listeners away from Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. Until their competition follow their route, however, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have an important role to play.

WILL THE U.N. EXPEL THE UNITED STATES?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1971

Mr. RARICK, Mr. Speaker, the approval of this Congress to permit the President to authorize purchase of chrome ore from Rhodesia so long as this country is dependent on Communist

sources as the sole supplier was signed into law yesterday at noon. Such action by this Congress to approve of non-Communist sources for strategic materials vital to our national security and defense drew immediate retaliation from the United Nations. By a vote of 106 to 2 the United Nations sought by the use of world propaganda to intimidate the President of the United States to violate the laws as well as the security of the people of his own Nation.

The interesting follow up to the U.N. called for prohibition of trade with Rhodesia was U.S. approval of \$528 million in export licenses for sophisticated U.S. equipment to be shipped to a truck factory in the Soviet Union.

The expulsion of the Nationalist Chinese may prove to be to their benefit. In fact, many informed Americans feel that expulsion of the United States by the United Nations "peace bloc" would benefit the United States. And they would expel the United States if it were not that we were bankrolling the organization and furnishing the real estate as well as supplying the barn which houses the conspirators.

I include the following related news clippings:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Nov. 17, 1971]  
 U.N. VOTES 106 TO 2 TO BAN CHROME DEAL  
 (By William Fulton)

NEW YORK.—Members of the United Nations General Assembly, including Red China, today ordered the United States to continue its ban on the importation of chromium ore from Rhodesia.

The vote was 106 in favor, 2 against with 13 abstentions.

The resolution attempted to force a reversal of congressional action permitting President Nixon to purchase the ore from Rhodesian sources as long as this country is dependent on the Soviet Union as the sole supplier.

The U.N. Security Council in 1968 embargoed the ore along with other Rhodesian products in an effort to bring the Salisbury white minority government to its knees.

HAS CONGRESS' OK

Both houses of Congress have approved the new legislation, which is awaiting the President's signature. The United States did not participate in today's voting on the grounds the matter was still in the constitutional process.

"We do not participate, announced Astronaut Alan B. Shepard Jr., a U.S. delegate, when his country's name was called.

Portugal and South Africa cast today's negative votes. Abstentions were registered by Belgium, Brazil, Britain, Canada, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Italy, Luxemburg, Malawi, and the Netherlands.

Today's attempt by the assembly to apply pressure upon a sovereign state in the midst of law-making procedure was unprecedented.

CONCERN TOLD

The U.N. resolution expressed the assembly's "grave concern at the recent legislative moves in the Congress of the United States of America which, if carried thru and confirmed, would permit the importation of chrome into the United States from southern Rhodesia and thus would constitute a serious violation of the above-mentioned Security Council resolution imposing sanctions against the illegal regime in southern Rhodesia."

A key operating clause called upon the Government of the United States to take the "necessary measures" to prevent Rhodesian

imports. It reminded Washington of Article 25 of the U.N. Charter stating that member countries would carry out Security Council decisions.

The resolution requested the government of the U.S. report to the assembly on the action taken.

Twenty-four countries most of them African, drew up the resolution. The Soviet Union hopped on the bandwagon.

TERMED ILLEGAL

Soviet Delegate Ivan G. Neklessa charged that the "illegal Ian Smith regime" in Rhodesia was being supported by the United States, Britain and other North Atlantic Treaty Allies.

Ambassador Huang Hua, delegate for the Communist People's Republic of China, said that his vote for the current resolution did not imply it had supported previous resolutions on this subject. This was interpreted to mean that past action had not been severe enough.

Rako Naco of Communist Albania said his delegation would have preferred a stronger resolution even to the point of condemning "United States imperialists."

Hassan Kaid Abdulleh of Somalia charged the American Congress has defied the U.N. by its vote.

RESUME ARMS DEBATE

The assembly resumed its debate on a Soviet proposal for a world disarmament conference, postponed until the arrival of the Red Chinese delegation. Representatives of Poland, Bulgaria and Hungary, Soviet satellites, were among the speakers.

Western delegates regard the matter as a grandstand play for Afro-Asian delegates demanding a greater voice in U.N. disarmament talks. The Westerners feel a global conference would be too unwieldy for effective negotiations.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Nov. 18, 1971]

NEW CHROME LAW PUTS ADMINISTRATION ON SPOT

The White House is being studiously indecisive about the new law allowing U.S. imports of Rhodesian chrome in direct violation of U.N. sanctions against the rebel white regime in Africa.

The law was contained as an amendment by Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr., I-Va., in the \$21.3 billion military procurement legislation signed yesterday by President Nixon.

Byrd argued that resuming chrome imports from Rhodesia allows the U.S. to break its current dependence on the Soviet Union for this strategic material, which is used mainly in the manufacture of steel.

But White House press secretary Ronald L. Ziegler and State Department officials noted yesterday that the amendment does not become effective until Jan. 1. Ziegler said the United States would make no comment or take any action to "jeopardize" the current negotiations between Britain and Rhodesia to end the rebellion.

PROTESTED IN U.N.

The chrome amendment has caused a storm of protest in the United Nations. On Tuesday the General Assembly voted 106-2 to condemn the United States for breaking the Rhodesian embargo. Yesterday angry black African delegates threatened to take the matter to the U.N. Security Council.

But the more immediate problem for the Nixon administration is the impact of the law on relations with Britain. British Foreign Secretary Sir Alec Douglas Home is now in the Rhodesian capital of Salisbury negotiating a compromise with the all-white regime, and the British have suggested this symbolic American break of the sanctions undermines a "tough" British position.

American officials admit that the new law, requiring the President to admit Rhodesian chrome into the U.S. so long as that ore is



ford public schools in Connecticut, and later graduated from Wesleyan University in Middletown. From 1951 to 1953 he served as a U.S. Marine Corps officer and had a tour of duty in Korea.

In 1956, he was graduated from Georgetown Law School, Washington, D.C., and was admitted to practice law in the state and federal courts of Indiana and Connecticut. In 1957 and 1958 he practiced law in Muncie, Indiana, and then returned to Milford where he became a partner in the law firm of Cramer and Anderson, serving until he resigned to take up his state duties.

Commissioner Altermatt is a member of the American Bar Association, the Indiana Bar Association, the Connecticut Bar Association, Danbury Bar Association, and Litchfield County Bar Association. He is also the former town attorney of New Milford and Bridgewater, and former chairman of the United Fund and Milford Hospital Fund Drive. He is also a long-time member of the New Milford Board of Education.

As a member of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, he serves as Chairman of Zone 1, which includes eight Eastern states and the Virgin Islands. He is also a member of the NAIC Committee on Financial Condition, Examination and Reporting. In addition, he serves on the group's Valuation of Securities Subcommittee, and the Subcommittee to Consider Elimination of Reinsurance Offset in Model Rehabilitation and Liquidation Act, where he is vice chairman.

Commissioner Altermatt, 41, is married to the former Ann Taylor. They have five children.

**PRESIDENT NIXON SHOULD TAKE ACTION ON CHEESE IMPORTS**

**HON. GRAHAM PURCELL**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1971

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon should delay no longer in taking action on the Tariff Commission's recommendations on quota-type cheese costing 47 cents a pound or more.

The Commission, at the President's request, held hearings earlier this year and submitted their recommendations to him on July 28. At that time they recommended that the 47-cent-price break be eliminated and that those cheese types costing over that amount be placed in the same quota with their less costly counterparts.

Though more than 3 months has passed, the President has done nothing.

Unfortunately cheese costing more than 47 cents a pound, still outside of quota, is coming into this country at a far greater rate than last year. For the first 9 months of 1971 these were running 10 to 15 percent above the same period last year.

I believe that much of this increase is due to the fact that importers are trying to get as much shipped in as they can before quotas are imposed by Presidential action. Thus any delay on the President's part in taking action is only playing into their hands, to the detriment of the domestic dairy industry.

For these reasons it is imperative that the President take early action.

TELL IT LIKE IT IS

**HON. ROBERT H. STEELE**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1971

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, in politics as in advertising, these days, the emphasis is on youth. Our advertising experts tell us that the youth market is of prime importance—that young people set the styles, and will be tomorrow's major customers. As for politics, there are few among us who do not expect the new young voters to be a decisive force in the next elections.

It is one of the great strengths of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and they have won a solid and increasing place in the minds of young Soviet citizens and young East Europeans. The letters they receive confirm this more and more. And RFE's audience surveys show that the steady growth in listenership which this station enjoys is coming primarily from the 16-to-25 age group.

Here are the figures—based on public-opinion polls conducted by leading West European opinion-testing institutes among East European visitors to the West.

In Czechoslovakia, the percentage of persons 16 to 25 who listen to RFE jumped from 40 percent to 65 percent between 1965 and 1969.

In Hungary it jumped from 53 percent to 67 percent, and in Poland from 35 percent to 56 percent.

In the first two countries, RFE now attracts larger proportions of youth than of any other age groups.

In Poland the young listenership has almost drawn even with the others.

RFE's music programs have had an effect in attracting the young. But as a Hungarian boy recently wrote to Radio Free Europe:

We don't turn off the station while it broadcasts news . . . often we listen to you on the streets; the policeman stands by and pretends not to hear it. Three boys in our group are sons of Party officials, and the same is true about their fathers.

As that letter suggests, music may have initially brought a lot of young listeners to Radio Free Europe, but the radio's youth-oriented programs have held this new audience and made it a permanent one. First there is Radio Free Europe's straightforward, no-nonsense news about internal affairs of East Europe and the outside world. But also there are lively talk programs for youth, conducted by East Europeans—many of them young and only recently arrived in the West—who have learned from their own experience what it is like to be cut off from the world and even from the truth about one's own country. These programs deal with ideals, discussions and dissent among Western students, fun and fashion, films, books, religion, and history. They include free-speaking roundtable conferences and interviews, which are widely popular.

A Rumanian student writing to the Neue Literatur—a cultural publication

in his own land—in February of this year, explained the need for such programs. He wrote:

Here we are not used to discussions. Our heads are stuffed with the ideas and theories of other people. We do not ask for freedom to act, but why are we denied the freedom to think?

East European governments worry about their young people listening to youth-oriented programs from the West. They know that it creates a pro-Western cult, which has an underlying political significance. Nevertheless, the East European radios have been forced to copy such broadcasts and air them at the very same time Radio Free Europe does its own. Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria all do this.

Hungarian officials who try to guard the ideological purity of young people have gone even further. Back in 1965, when Radio Free Europe introduced a late-afternoon program of music and talk called Teenager Party, the national youth organization's monthly journal admitted that the "overwhelming majority of the young people are definitely enthusiastic" about that program.

There have even been direct admissions of Radio Free Europe's impact. The Soviet official youth publication Komsomolskaya Pravda said last May that Western nonpolitical programs directed toward youth are "seemingly innocent"—but, it warned, the 16-year-olds who today are only interested in these programs will become accustomed to listening to Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe and will begin to listen to other programs of these stations.

In May of last year, there was a particularly frank appraisal of Radio Free Europe in the Czechoslovak Communist Party's theoretical journal, Nova Mysl, based on a study of listenership by the Czechoslovak radio itself. The writer said this study revealed that Radio Free Europe was the most popular of foreign radio stations among Czechoslovak listeners of all ages, and especially popular with youth. The author went on, and I quote:

Analysis of the sociological structure of the respondents shows that the number of listeners was substantially higher among young people and among people of higher education, who are clearly interested in gathering information from the largest number of sources. . .

The telling point here, I think, is the admission that Radio Free Europe's listenership is highest among the young and the well educated, who want "information from the largest number of sources." The standard propaganda line against Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty used to be that they were "cold war instruments," staffed by aging refugees who had lost touch with their countries, capable only of anti-Communist polemics or extravagant claims for the capitalist system. But that line has changed—at least among responsible critics in East Europe. They recognize that these stations concentrate on events and trends within the East European societies themselves, and that they know what they are talking about. Especially they recognize that these stations speak

met time after time with this question: can you type? Some of our strongest allies today, my friends, are middle-income fathers of bright, remarkable young women.

It does seem strange that considering we are almost at the 200th Anniversary of our Nation's founding, that Black men were given the vote over 100 years ago, and White and Black women won the vote more than 50 years ago, we should—at this late date—still have to be talking about winning equality for women.

Some might think it more lady-like if we just bat our eyes, be demure and settle for the tokenism which has been our lot for fifty years within our country and within our parties. But that is not what thinking women do.

One of the great myths of all time is that being a political activist somehow defeminizes us.

I've worked hard all my life. So have millions of other working women. And let me assure you the moonlight doesn't seem any dimmer, the candlelight doesn't flicker any less, the bubbles in the bubble bath don't burst any sooner, when your take-home pay is the same as your male counterpart. You can be sensuous and still think and vote and run for office.

Yes, women are indeed an admirable sex. Through the centuries, we've been wept upon, stepped upon, and slept upon—and we still find something in men to love.

I've worked for woman-power in politics since I started covering Eleanor Roosevelt's Press Conferences 27 years ago, and I do not plan to abdicate my movement because of a little noise. The words "Right On" do not come trippingly off my tongue. But sometimes I'm learning and I'm enjoying it. If the caucus sometimes comes on a little strong, let's remember—these are strong times. But I assure you that this is no burlesque.

If the Democrats and Republicans mean what they say—and we do what we can do—the next National Conventions will not be peopled by the shopworn henchmen and fatcats of outmoded party structures. They will represent a broader base of every group in this country.

I believe the political party that is truly committed to inner reform by action—one whose delegates are truly from the people—and I spell it the Sam Rayburn way—"peepul"—will do more to restore the faith of this country in itself than any other single action.

It's in your hands. And let me say to you—for I have worked in the National Media a long time, on both sides of the pad and pencil—let me recall what a public relations man once said to Moses when Moses was leading the children of Israel out of the wilderness of Egypt. (Perhaps you don't know the history of public relations goes back that far . . . but it does.)

As they approached the Red Sea, the public relations man said, "Moses, what are you going to do when you get to the Red Sea?"

"That's easy," Moses replied, "I will simply raise my hands and the waters will part."

The PR man looked aghast. "Wow! You do that and I'll get you two paragraphs in the Old Testament."

So, my friends, if you write people into the political conventions in Miami and San Diego, I believe I can get you two paragraphs when the historians write what women did in the 1970's to make this a more humane, compassionate country.

I have a lot of faith in the women of this country. They have a way of knowing whether you are for them or against them. They can spot a phoney. Perhaps, because we are so deeply involved in the continuity of life, we are more fundamental in our sense of values, more committed to bring this unfinished democracy to fruition where we can all enjoy the pursuit of happiness.

We know that, as a Nation, we simply cannot enjoy the questionable luxury of treating any citizen as less than a total person.

This last year I've traveled over 100,000 miles in this country. In fact, I think I've traveled more than Spiro Agnew and Edmund Muskie combined—and had more to say than Martha Mitchell, if that is humanly possible.

And I find a sad sort of loneliness in this land, an emptiness of spirit, an eroding fear that perhaps permeates a zipcode, area-code, punch card society . . . A fear that there will be no human being to answer a cry in the night. But there is also a plaintive yearning to be someone who answers the cry in the night.

That is why it is so right at this particular moment in our Nation's history that we not be timidly transfixed as spectators. That we rally to women's participation for human liberation.

I'm glad we are a caucus of many viewpoints. How awful if we were stereotyped, crystallized into a single track mind with no room for growth or change!

And let's remember—not to shortchange each other—women are human. We don't have to approve of each other 100 percent on all issues. Seventy percent will do. How many friends do you endorse 100 percent? If all the varied assortment of people in the American Revolution had waited to like each other, we'd still be at Bunker Hill.

Each of us has something to bring to the Women's Political Caucus. Surely women in this new, exciting political movement have reached the point of civilization where we can have many voices, because we are of one heart. The movement is big enough for all of us. The question is: Are we big enough for the movement. I think we are. I think we must be. For there is work to be done. And together, we can reach out to this Nation and answer its cry in the night.

## COMPREHENSIVE CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, November 15, the joint Senate-House conference committee completed its work on S. 2007, the Economic Opportunity Act extension which includes the new comprehensive child development bill. Yet, in a continuation of the most peculiar and objectionable procedures which have marked the handling of this measure from the beginning, no printed report on the conference committee's conclusions has yet appeared, and I am now informed that none is expected until after the Thanksgiving recess.

Not only my own constituents, but concerned parents and citizens from all over the country have been writing to me—and no doubt many of my colleagues have received similar letters—asking for copies of this measure. Except for pages of very fine print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 30, the day we passed the bill, we have nothing to send them, since it was passed on that day as an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act extension, without a printed committee report being available. Those who ask us for a copy of such an important bill,

and have to be told that there is none, naturally wonder why. So do I.

Passage of this measure by the Senate and House in September took place with comparatively little advance warning and debate, and very little publicity before or after the fact. But as more and more people have learned of what we did then, a tide of public anger is rising with which sooner or later we shall have to deal. A good time to begin would be when this conference committee report comes to us for approval. It should be sent back to committee with instructions to remove the "child development" portion so that this could be handled in the normal way, on its own merits or demerits, as a separate bill.

The Comprehensive Child Development Act would provide extensive care—mental, physical, social, and psychological—for all American children below school age. It is far more than the simple custodial day care which many supporters of this legislation who have not studied it carefully still think is its primary or sole purpose.

For anyone—especially government—to try to supplant a child's parents in deciding what their child needs is to mount an assault on the family, the foundation of any stable society. There is no better way to raise children than in the close-knit, mutually loving, deeply personal interrelationship of a family. Both human experience and religious faith testify to this truth.

Interference with the family unit is fundamentally contrary to our Judaeo-Christian heritage. This legislation promises to provide just such interference with, and perhaps eventual elimination of, the responsibility of parents for the upbringing of their children. Thinking men, and religious men, are becoming more and more concerned about this "child development" legislation. Examples could be cited from each of the three major divisions of American religious belief—Protestant, Catholic and Jewish—from Dr. Jerzy Hauptmann, editor of the Lutheran Scholar, to Will Herberg, noted Jewish sociologist and student of comparative religions, to last week's editorial in the Catholic Standard, the diocesan newspaper of Washington, D.C. I would like to insert into the Record at this point for the benefit of my colleagues this brief, but most thought-provoking editorial.

The editorial follows:

[From the Catholic Standard, Washington, D.C., Nov. 11, 1971]

### RECONSIDERATION NEEDED

House and Senate conferees on Capitol Hill are working toward a reconciliation of what they consider relatively minor differences between two versions of the same bill (HR 10351 and S 2007), to be known as the Comprehensive Child Development Act. The Act, if passed, will be an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The provisions of the Child Development Act are aimed at giving supportive care to children under the age of six. The Senate has added a highly questionable National Child Advocacy section to the proposed legislation. All of this represents what many think is the opening thrust by government into an area historically reserved to the family. Although the Act purports to guarantee voluntary participation, the step between

tive side, the bill did provide for overt fundings through the Department of State, an improvement over the previous methods of funding by the Central Intelligence Agency. In the course of hearings on this subject in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I became particularly concerned with the lack of effort or intentions on the part of the executive branch to undertake a serious evaluation of the radio's consistency with U.S. foreign policy goals. Most of the testimony we heard simply applauded the past work of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty without getting to the more fundamental question of what relationship the ongoing operation might or ought to have with the U.S. Government. In this time of rapid change and realignments in international politics, this question must be addressed with serious deliberation.

S. 18, as amended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, at the initiative of our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL), provides for both an evaluative study and interim financing for the two radio activities while the study is in progress. The membership of the proposed commission would be balanced, with representatives from the executive branch, both Houses of Congress, and the private sector. Those who share my concern that these activities and the executive branch should not be given carte blanche without regard to the foreign policy implications in a fast changing world, should be encouraged that S. 18, as amended, withholds final judgment on whether—and how—to fund these two activities. At the end of the study period of approximately 1 year, we should be in a much better position to determine the proper role of the U.S. Government regarding Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

### NEW FORCE IN TEXAS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, in a ringing, stinging speech to the Texas Women's Political Caucus Saturday in Texas, Liz Carpenter laid it on the line with a rallying cry of not just "register and vote" but "file and run."

It is a tight speech and sums up well a vibrant force growing in this country that will be recognized sooner or later—and if the Caucus has its way, it will be clearly sooner. They will be striving for more women delegates to the presidential conventions and more women candidates at all levels.

Mrs. Carpenter points out striving for full equality in politics and elsewhere does not necessitate any loss of femininity.

As she puts it:

The moonlight doesn't seem any dimmer, the candlelight doesn't flicker any less, the bubbles in the bubble bath don't burst any sooner, when your take-home pay is the same as your male counterpart.

She makes a plea for what she calls "peepful"—for dignity and femininity

without being stifled under a cloud of protectionism. And she does so in no uncertain terms, praising the House for its passage of the women's rights amendment. Her words sting and bite and make one flinch occasionally—but they get an important point or two across.

The text of that speech follows:

#### THINKING WOMEN—THE NEW POLITICS IN TEXAS

We gather here today as the political parties begin organizing for the 1972 election. We gather here because we are determined that women have an equal voice in the party structures. We gather here because we are determined *this time* to run that gainout from Texas Precinct to National Convention to see that the two major political parties—(and others which emerge)—live up to their glowing words about party reform.

Larry O'Brien, Robert Dole, Gore Vidal—any others—here we come!

But it is no secret that this year while we talk of party politics and party issues, more and more Americans (and particularly young Americans) are being turned off by any party. They are saying, "A plague on both your houses." There are many who have lost faith in both major political parties because they do not believe these parties speak for the mass of American people or that they will live up to their proposed reforms.

Suddenly last summer a new political movement was born which will help them—the National Women's Political Caucus, composed of women from many political parties, old-line organizations, newly formed groups, and many women who are not a member of anything except the human race—almost.

All of us are moving the women's liberation movement into women's participation for human liberation, for better day care programs, better ecological laws, better education, abortion reform, equal opportunities for people of all color and all sex.

Today in Texas this movement takes hold at the grassroots. You will leave here after our workshops committed and equipped with the know-how to organize your towns and counties and be a vital force in placing women in positions of decision-making at every level which affects our lives:

—That means in Government, where our rallying cry in 1972 will not only be "register and vote", but "file and run". Yes, run for office—Delegate, Tax Assessor, the Legislature, Congress. And if you decide you aren't qualified, then support the qualified candidate who lets you know how she or he stands on the human issues. Ask yourself, does he listen to you, a woman voter, a woman with a family or a business or a job, as much as he listens to others? Does he give you equal time?

—That means in the corporation where we will no longer be the unwitting consumers of unimaginative male-run conglomerates that neither represent their major employees or their major consumers on their boards. Lyndon Johnson gave us Title 7 in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Let's use it. Let's sue.

It means in Labor Unions where we are perfectly willing to trade that phoney mantle of protectionism for some equal pay and equal rights. It is high time that George Meany and the AFL-CIO stop dragging their feet and stalling the Senate on the Equal Rights Amendment. I don't know what has bothered George Meany all these years. Can it be that he is a male chauvinist plumber? Well, most of the labor forces are now wise to it. Well, Congress is getting wise to this. The House passed the Equal Rights Amendment this Fall with only 23 voting against it.

Now it's the Senate's turn. Before we go home today, I hope we will wire the leadership of the Senate and Senators Tower and Bentsen—that we want quick, prompt, overwhelming passage of a right that is long overdue.

So let every party chairman know, let every Governor and every candidate for Governor know now—that today in Texas, women are issuing a declaration of independence. We are tired of making the coffee, licking the stamps, and writing the checks.

We are tired of selling the tickets and being locked out of the ball park.

We mean to be in on the decisions.

So—if we seem a little pushy. If we seem a little noisy—it is because, Roy Orr and George Willford, we shout so you will hear us.

And we are going to be busy and organized and on hand May 6 in every precinct meeting in this state—not just to vote, my friends, but to run for delegate.

The 200th anniversary of our nation is almost here. We will no longer take second place to anyone. We care about this country; we care about this state; we care about our home towns—and we are no longer going to take second place to anyone.

We intend to "rip off" a piece of the political action for ourselves in 1972.

And let me tell you, from years of experience, this is where we will separate the men from the boys.

Those who count women in, can count on women.

Those who count women out, can't count on us at all. We are going to leave you behind at the ballot box nursing your boyhood insecurities.

This is not a battle cry for revenge. It is a rallying cry for simple justice. Any male candidate worth electing knows this. And any political candidate today with any pulse-feeling capabilities at all knows there is a new momentum, there is new action, something has happened to women. As Sarah Hughes put it, "We're tired of studying our status. We have graduated."

"The voice of the people may be soprano," Governor Preston Smith told the Status of Women Commission last year.

And he's right. But the voice of power is bass—and it has been getting "base" and "baser."

We are no longer going to be stuck with the ridiculous statistics. More than half of the voting power of this country—53 percent—is women. But only 12 women are in Congress. None on the Cabinet. None on the Supreme Court.

At the last national conventions, only 13 percent of the delegates to the Democratic convention were women. Only 17 percent of the delegates to the Republican convention were women.

And what about Texas?

Texas sent 120 delegates to the Democratic National Convention. Thirteen were women. Thanks for nothing gentlemen.

The Republicans did a little better and this hurts me as a palm-singing Democrat. They sent 56 delegates to the convention; 15 were women.

The Texas Senate and House have 181 members. Only two are women and anyone who watches it knows. Barbara Jordan and Frances Parnthold are lonely. Let's send them some company.

Every intelligent person, man or woman, in this country knows there are millions of working women being exploited.

You know it when a woman professor makes \$7,000 and a man in the same job makes \$9,000. You know it when a woman scientist earns \$10,000 a year and her male counterpart takes home \$13,000.

You know it when a restaurant owner hires waitresses until 8 P.M. just when the good tips start. He smugly argues it's not safe to keep the girls on the job after dark. But he doesn't bat an eye when he has charwomen coming in at 2 A.M. to clean the place up.

Every parent of a college-educated daughter knows it when they pay more than \$10,000 to educate her in the professions and she is



monies. He said present federal legislation under the Occupational Safety Act may provide dollars for his needs, but added that other funds are available, too.

The Federal Highway Safety Act recently provided money through the state for a vehicle rescue course administered by the State Fire School, directed by Louis J. Amabili of Hockessin. The school offers courses in fire fighting and was subsidized by Washington for an emergency care course for ambulance drivers which is among the first in the country, and a model for other states.

Favinger says there are four independent municipalities in Delaware that govern their own fire departments. But Wilmington, Newark, Dover, and Milford all work with his office and are included in state statistics. Favinger feels that Newark soon may have to pay at least some of their fire fighters—but many company representatives feel that it should be "all or none" due to the human tendency for volunteers to resent paid associates.

But on the whole, Delaware's volunteers are probably here to stay. In a recent survey by mail, more than a third of the 60 volunteer companies returned questionnaires that overwhelmingly rejected the possibility of paid members—at least in the near future.

The companies, composed of men from teen-age to over 60, listed an average age in the early 30's. Their numbers ranged from 25 to about 100, with membership mostly growing but, at least remaining stable. Most of the companies were formed in the 1920's.

When asked if they see their roles as volunteers lessening or growing, all but 4 said they are growing. Two of the dissenters cited the lack of interest among service (something contradicted by others) and the negative effect caused by state regulations young people today in the fire—specifically the new licensing law for ambulance attendants.

When asked about a central dispatcher's importance, nearly all companies felt that response time and service to the public would be best served with a radio network. One Kent County company listed the lack of a central dispatcher as its major concern.

Among the gripes listed by the volunteers (questionnaires were sent to company chiefs or presidents) were difficulty in getting manpower in the daytime when needed; money; enlisting business-minded firemen; the misuse of ambulances as taxis; unenforced fire codes; inadequate water supplies; and faulty news media reports. None comment on improving volunteer firefighting in Delaware was that mandatory regular and advanced training should be given annually or semi-annually. Another company suggested that in light of dwindling response by citizens to annual fund drives, a "fire tax" may soon be necessary. One New Castle County chief noted that too much equipment is duplicated among companies, with no coordination as to type of apparatus in an area.

One downstate company responded that young people sometimes feel they are not wanted because of their color. The chief said he is now intentionally selecting people without regard to race, and notes that ingrown prejudices among white firemen are declining—and the more people in the community working together, the better the service, he suggests.

we are making affect more and more people. This is a time of unprecedented social change where mores are continually changing. What was socially unacceptable yesterday may very well be a viable part of our society tomorrow. In dealing with these changes we must never lose sight of our moral and ethical background.

It is proper then, at this time, that we make an effort to consider and evaluate our religious beliefs. We must be sure that if we are going to deal with moral changes, we must fully understand our own spiritual feelings. For this reason, Gov. William A. Egan of Alaska has proclaimed the week of November 21, 1971, Bible Week.

I am inserting a copy of the Governor's proclamation for my colleagues' inspection.

PROCLAMATION—BIBLE WEEK

Our system of law and justice has been built upon the foundation of the Ten Commandments. Respect for the sacredness, worth, and dignity of the individual, an essential element in our system, is rooted in Biblical teachings.

It is imperative for modern man, confused and perplexed by rapid technological and social changes, to understand the roots of his moral and spiritual belief-system.

Therefore, I, William A. Egan, Governor of Alaska, do hereby proclaim the week of November 21 through 28, 1971, as Bible Week and urge people of all faiths to observe the week by reading the Scriptures and setting up a plan of regular examination of the Foundation Book of Judeo-Christian heritage.

Dated this fourth day of November, 1971.

SECTION 503 OF MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 22, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the President now has signed into law the Military Procurement Authorization for 1972, which includes legislation to end the dependence of the United States upon Russia for the bulk of its chrome ore. This is section 503 of the authorization bill.

I believe that Congress, in voting on this question, analyzed the issue in terms of its significance to the security of this Nation.

Chrome is a vital U.S. defense material, essential for nuclear submarines, jet aircraft, and all stainless steel products.

Because of an executive order by President Johnson in 1967 resulting from a mandate from the United Nations, the United States has been prohibited from importing chrome from Rhodesia. Thus, having no chrome of our own, we have become dependent on Communist Russia for this vital defense material.

On September 23, the Senate of the United States decided to call a halt to such a ridiculous situation; and on November 10, the House of Representatives concurred. The House vote on the direct issue was a smashing 251 to 100.

It was not a regional vote or a party vote.

Analysing these two critical votes, we find that the proposal to remove the embargo on Rhodesian chrome received strong support from members of both political parties—and from Representatives or Senators from 46 of the 50 States.

Leading the list were California, Texas, Pennsylvania, Illinois, New York, Ohio and Michigan.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the extensions of remarks a State-by-State breakdown of the number of Members of the House of Representatives who voted in favor of retaining section 503 of the military procurement bill on November 10.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

California, 21; Texas, 19; Pennsylvania, 17; Illinois, 15; Ohio, 13; New York, 13; and Michigan, 11.

Florida, 9; Georgia, 9; North Carolina, 9; Virginia, 9; Indiana, 7; Missouri, 7; Alabama, 7; Louisiana, 6; and Tennessee, 6.

Kentucky, 5; Kansas, 5; Wisconsin, 5; South Carolina, 5; New Jersey, 4; Iowa, 4; Connecticut, 4; Minnesota, 4; and West Virginia, 3.

Oklahoma, 4; Maryland, 3; Mississippi, 3; Colorado, 3; New Mexico, 2; Nebraska, 2; Montana, 2; Arizona, 2; and Massachusetts, 2.

Idaho, 2; Oregon, 2; Arkansas, 1; South Dakota, 1; Nevada, 1; New Hampshire, 1; Washington, 1; Maine, 1; and North Dakota, 1.

PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO RADIO FREE EUROPE AND TO RADIO LIBERTY

SPEECH OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 18) to amend the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to provide assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I support the proposal to establish a commission to make recommendations as to the future status of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. I have always believed that this country should exert maximum efforts toward reducing cold war tensions with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, and also that the people of those countries—and everywhere as well—are entitled to objective and accurate reporting of the news. I would hope that the activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty would have a constructive influence in both regards. Certainly, if they serve to aggravate the tensions and their news reporting is slanted in favor of a certain point of view, they do not deserve official support from the U.S. Government.

S. 18, the bill on this subject as passed by the other body, was unsatisfactory in that it simply authorized appropriations in the budget of the State Department to fund these two activities without concerning itself with the effect of the activities on U.S. foreign policy. On the posi-

NATIONAL BIBLE WEEK

SPEECH OF

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, we are now at a point in time that the decisions