

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## A SERMON ON THE FREEDOM OF MAN—PART III: WEEDS IN THE GARDEN

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, on April 2, 1969, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a sermon preached by the Reverend Charles S. Hubbard, minister of the First Methodist Church of Wilson, N.C., entitled "A Sermon on the Freedom of Man—Part I: An Introduction."

A second sermon preached by Mr. Hubbard on the same general theme which bears the title "A Sermon on the Freedom of Man—Part II: Communism" was placed in the RECORD by my distinguished colleague, Senator SAM J. ERVIN, of North Carolina, on April 14, 1969.

Mr. Hubbard's third sermon on this same theme before his own congregation is entitled "A Sermon on the Freedom of Man—Part III: Weeds in the Garden." This sermon is another extremely informative and thought-provoking discussion of the dangers within our own land to the freedoms we all hold so near and dear to our hearts. So that more Members may have an opportunity to read it, I am inserting it in the RECORD as follows:

## A SERMON ON THE FREEDOM OF MAN—PART III: WEEDS IN THE GARDEN

(By the Reverend Charles Hubbard, pastor of the First Methodist Church of Wilson, N.C.)

At our last session we discussed the dangers of Communism, that the dangers are real, that coercive pressure from the outside of this Land of Freedom are terrible pressures. Today I want to discuss growing dangers inside our land. If Freedom is the soil on which man must grow; if man cannot live in dignity or pursue happiness outside of freedom—and I contend that he cannot—then freedom itself is essential. It is not a luxury; it is not just one of the virtues; it is the essential condition whereby man must live. It is the necessary soil of his being.

But there are "weeds in the garden of Freedom"—there are weeds right here in the United States of America, the cradle of freedom; and except we do something about these weeds, they are going to choke this garden before long.

Now, what are these weeds? I certainly do not have time to list them all, but I would say that one of the most dangerous weeds I know, one that is rapidly fouling the garden of the Freedom of Man in the United States, is the weed of lack of respect for the law. If we are going to live together as a civilization, there must be basic principles of law to protect all the people; and I have never studied nor known any time in the history of the United States when there has been less respect for the concept of government by law. There is a general contempt for law from all too many people in all too many walks of life. And this condition, unless reversed, is going to undermine our culture. For, my friends, except we respect and enforce the laws made by free men, we are soon going to surrender our freedom to the law of the jungle or submit to a totalitarian state which will enforce order, but care little for justice.

I will admit that any society, however good and just, will have its law-breakers. I am not pleading here for paradise. But, to quote Horace Mann: "Let but the public mind become thoroughly corrupt, and all attempts to secure property, liberty, or life, by mere force of laws written on parchment, will be as vain as to put up printed notices in an orchard to keep off canker-worms."

What I am saying is that our essential freedom can die if we continue long to tolerate powerful organized crime syndicates that subvert the morals and ethics of our nation, manipulate a growing part of our economy and corrupt the lower levels of justice and law. And we do tolerate this social cancer. In fact, if a crook is sophisticated enough and rich enough, he is beginning to be quite welcome in the best of neighborhoods, the best of clubs and, I suspect, the "best" of churches. This weed is thriving today in our garden.

And this weed has a bigger brother which is being liberally fertilized from pulpit and college lectures all over our land. I can hear the preachers and professors now as they self-righteously declaim that there are "good" laws and "bad" laws, and you should not obey what you believe to be a "bad" law. Then they proceed to outdo the communists with word warping semantics. They tell us that personal rights are far more important than property rights; that justice must come before law and order; and that the whole "hypocritical" structure of our institutions must be torn down in order to make room for a "good" society. Their arguments are supported neither by history nor logic. They do not tell us that when property rights are put down in a once free land, all personal rights disappear soon thereafter. They do not tell us it is impossible to have justice for anyone without law and order. And they do not tell us when the institutions of a free society are ripped down, the new institutions will certainly not be those of a free people. No. But their spurious gospel has been heard and believed. Violent black militants, shouting impossible demands, have attacked the structure of freedom throughout the land. Whole cities have been disrupted, with vast areas burned and looted. Educational processes have been blocked by rioting minorities of college students. The destruction of your precious freedom is under way and gaining momentum through widespread lawlessness.

In the meantime we, and our whole structure of law, stand strangely paralyzed and bemused by the cry of "personal rights." Is there a "personal right" to commit crime without punishment? The citizen who obeys the law also has rights. He has the right to be protected from the plunder and pillage of the lawless and the right to live without fear of his safety or fear of the safety of his family. These rights are being violated every hour of every day, and many of us are getting very tired of it.

We do not need many more laws. What we do need are more fearless judges and more attorneys and more juries who are concerned with upholding the spirit of the law and the true intent of the law. The indulgence of the criminal is a broadening "yellow streak" in the character of our nation that can be fatal to us all. Lawlessness will certainly choke our freedom.

Other noxious weeds in the garden of freedom may be easily distinguished as a lessening responsibility toward work and the irreplaceable resources of our nation. A nation's true welfare depends on its power to work and to expand its resources. There can be no development without effort, and effort means work.

Yet, in spite of trade association standards, in spite of union rules, in spite of a proliferation of governmental regulations—there is much evidence today that self-interest easily undermines the excellence of the labors of men. There are too many examples I know of—of embezzlement and fraud and chiseling and featherbedding and cutting corners and quackery and shoddy goods and malpractice and kick-backs that come to my attention, for me not to fear how grave this situation must be. Is integrity in work and product dying? Are we entering the age of the "goof-off," and "gimmick"?

God forbid! I cannot believe that we can be so stupid for long. It is a simple law of nature and of God that no people can continue to use up and destroy and steal the very essence of its livelihood without bringing about its own destruction. So, isn't it about time that concerned people, like you and me, revolted against this phoneyess. Is it not time we declared we do not accept unethical practices as standard business procedures? Are we not ready to demand a recovery of the pride of craftsmanship and the obligation of business to really serve mankind. Must we not teach capital and labor alike that it is the quality of work, the genuineness of product, the dependability of character that will bring reward? We had better.

I am not here pointing an accusing finger at all business and labor. On the contrary, the solid majority of those who manage and work in the industry and business of America are ethical, honest and hard-working. I am stating, however, that if enterprise and labor loses its freedom because of a virulent and crooked minority, a great deal of our freedom will go down, too. George B. Cortel-you has said: "The greatest asset of any nation is the spirit of its people, and the greatest danger that can menace any nation is the breakdown of that spirit—the will to win and the courage to work."

Behind these evils, and responsible for most of them is the weed that is deadliest of all: a growing devaluation of the worth of man. We are in a moral crisis, and one of the problems of a moral crisis is that a lot of people do not even know we have one, or that it may be important. Thus we drift toward the law of the jungle. Thus we approach a bestial attitude toward life.

We are being told that God is absent—or dead. We are being taught that spiritual ideals and moral judgments are relative and subjective. Man is being pictured as a kind of neutral and helpless thing. And this negative, amoral, nihilistic interpretation of man inverts all our moral standards. It easily suggests that good is bad and bad is good. Why be restrained and distracted by spiritual ideals and moral standards if they do not exist? Why fear or love a dead God? Under this way of thinking life is nothing but a process of biological functioning. It can offer no satisfaction, save the pleasure of the moment. Self-gratification is the key to being.

This moral crisis is not without causes. Business is making its contribution through massive advertising campaigns that are "not quite honest." The news media often reports vital news in such a manner that the reader or viewer cannot be satisfied that he knows the truth. Even the government's statements of fact sometimes turn out to be not quite factual. All this is nourishing in the mind of the citizen a growing distrust in the very institutions that make possible a free land and a free people.

Then, when you consider the blatant corruption, the perversion, the cheap sex, the filth that is the subject matter and motivation of current movies, plays, novels and art,

you tend to wonder why there is any morality left. To defend this dirt by saying it is sensitive, it is art, it is reality—is an insult and a lie! Writers do need to be realistic. They need to picture the sordid as well as the sublime. But when people try to show that the normal cultural diet of humanity today is filth, I say they are sick. When these human buzzards portray perversion and say it is normal, when they left up self-gratification and say it is good, when they offer spiritual putrefaction and say it is clean—they are *not* just reflecting the mood of the times. They are setting the intellectual and spiritual standards of today and tomorrow.

And if you are wondering why idealistic youth is in rebellion today, you need wonder no further. They see the lie, the hypocrisy, the deliberate attempt at degradation of all that is good and uplifting and holy—and they want no part in it. I want no part in it, either. You had better not. This weed of immorality feeds on the very soul of the dignity and freedom of man.

So—I ask you—are you satisfied? Are you now prepared to give up your God-given sense of plain decency and honor? Are you ready to accept deceit and crookedness and pornography and degradation as the proper expectation for our day? Are you now willing for atheists and hoodlums and libertines to set the standards for our society? In spite of our well-founded concern for the threats of communism, we who love God and freedom need to awaken to the deadly threat right here in the bosom of our country that comes from the toleration of moral rotteness.

Of course, we who lead the spiritual life of America are the most responsible. All too often we have joined the current fad of scratching the itch and ignoring the disease of society. There's been far more preaching today on the evils of capitalism, on profits, on exploitation of labor, on social planning, than on the mind and heart of Jesus Christ. This gospel must be held high first, for it is the only workable motivation for morality, honesty, brotherhood, or anything else worth having. We will never attain a good and free society through the manipulation of selfish people. One man has said: "You can rearrange a bunch of rotten eggs any way you want to, but you are not going to make a good omelet."

Let us re-dedicate ourselves to the God who can empower us all to really be worth while. Let us all pray, witness for, and guard that which we know is Christian and right and decent and honest and good. This is the way of freedom for everybody. Any other way is chaos and ruin. God bless you.

#### SERIOUS HUNGER IN THE UNITED STATES CAN BE ECONOMICALLY ELIMINATED

**HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, serious hunger in the United States can be eliminated and the cost to do so could not be excessive. One year ago today I introduced a bill to attempt to accomplish this objective; and subsequently, the Appropriations Committee brought out in its Public Law 90-463 a provision to do just this. Under the provisions of that 1968 Appropriations Act, funds were made available to the Secretary of Agriculture to feed the seriously hungry. The bill I am introducing today makes these funds available on a permanent basis.

This principle has been approved by Congress when it passed the 1968 Agricultural Appropriations Act by a vote of 347 to 28. By making the appropriation for this program permanent, the Secretary and State and local welfare agencies involved can know that time and energy expended developing a program such as this would not be wasted as a result of cancellation of the program after 1 or 2 years. If Congress wants this program, which seems evident by the overwhelming vote this bill received, then we should make this an ongoing program and not one subject to short-term political fluctuations.

#### A RESOLUTION FOR A STUDY OF THE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY BANK PROPOSAL

**HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN**

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, how are we going to make sure that young Americans get all the education which the complexity and specialization of our modern society demands?

No one denies that the value and importance of higher education continues to become more and more of a necessity, yet each year there are still hundreds of thousands of our young people who have both the ability and the desire to continue their education, but cannot do so because they lack the finances. They lose out, but so, too, does society as a whole. The man who would have made a major breakthrough in medical research never does so, because he did not have the money to go to a good college or to medical school. How can society afford to let that happen?

Those of us who are privileged to serve in the Congress are especially aware that education is the very heart of a democracy and that the progress and well-being of our Nation is predicated upon the educational growth of our people. The education of our citizens is too important to allow financial obstacles to stand in the way. In February 1968, in a message to Congress, President Johnson, fully accepting this principle, proposed an Educational Opportunity Act:

To set a new and sweeping national goal; that in America there must be no economic or racial barrier to higher education; that every qualified young person must have all the education he wants and can absorb.

The policy of the new administration also seemed hopeful, for during his campaign for election President Nixon declared:

My Administration is committed to the proposition that no young American who is qualified to go to college will be prevented from doing so because he cannot afford it.

In the light of that statement it was particularly disappointing to see the Bureau of the Budget's recommendations for cutbacks in financial assistance to students pursuing higher education. The administration's budget for the national defense student loans recommends \$155

million; this is a substantial reduction from last year's appropriation of \$190 million, and far less than the \$270 million total in requests from the colleges. The recommendation for the health professions student loan program stands at \$15 million, down \$10 million from the funds available last year, and way below \$41 million requested by the schools involved. I hope that the Congress will restore these funds.

But even if these programs had full funding, we would only have begun to meet the problem. More must be done. In 1967, the President's panel on educational innovation proposed the establishment of an educational opportunity bank. It would enable every qualified American to attend the college of his choice regardless of his family's financial status. The bank would make loans to students accepted at postsecondary schools to cover their tuition and living costs against a pledge to repay out of future earnings. After graduation the borrowers would be charged 1 percent of their gross income over 30 years. Any student could borrow, and any student could borrow as much as he needed.

The limited loan programs existing at present can meet only part of the requests, and they do not allow undergraduates to borrow any more than \$5,000 over the period of their collegiate years. This is not enough money for a poor student to attend a private school even if it is one with moderate tuition. The educational opportunity bank would not restrict the size of the loan; without interfering with present local, State or Federal student assistance programs, the bank would give any student the opportunity to pay his own way to any college, university or professional school to which he could gain admission.

Here are the advantages which a loan bank would offer:

First. It would increase the number of postsecondary students from low-income families, and would relieve the burden of hard-pressed middle-income families who may have several children attending high-cost universities.

Second. The economically disadvantaged and middle-income students would be able to approach their choice of a college with options similar to those now reserved for the well to do.

Third. It would make the student responsible for his own education, and would stimulate, I am sure, a more serious and mature approach to his studies. Under the present family-sponsored system, we tend to prolong adolescence.

Fourth. It would remove the heavy burden of working while in college to pay educational costs thus enabling the otherwise financially strapped student to devote full time to his studies.

Fifth. It would tend to make the higher education institutions more responsive to the needs of the students themselves who would, under this program, wield the buying power.

Sixth. The plan would enable both public and private institutions to improve the quality of education by charging tuition fees closer to the full cost of education.

Seventh. It is a voluntary plan that offers help only to those who want it.

Eighth. The student would not have to worry about a loan he could not pay for some unforeseen reason because his obligation to repay is related to his future income.

Ninth. The availability of loans would not be directly affected by the state of the money market.

Tenth. Educational costs would be met without the hazards of direct Government interference.

In March of last year I introduced a resolution calling for a thorough study of the proposal by the House Education and Labor Committee and the Banking and Currency Committee. No action was taken on the resolution. Since that time the results of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education have been published. This commission has also recommended the establishment of a national student loan bank. The commission advised making loans available to undergraduate and graduate students without reference to their need; it also suggested repayment of the loan according to a percent of earnings after graduation.

I believe that the Congress should take with utmost seriousness the recommendations of these two outstanding commissions, the President's Panel on Education Innovation, and the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Accordingly, I am reintroducing a resolution directing the aforementioned committees to undertake a study of the educational opportunity bank proposal as soon as possible. I hope that they will provide us with whatever legislation is needed to implement this plan in the very near future.

Priorities should not be forgotten. The most important investment we can make in providing for the future of our Nation is to give advanced educational opportunities to as many of our people as possible.

#### SOME CHANGE IN OUR JUDICIARY'S STATUS IS NECESSARY

### HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced a bill which would require that Federal judges, District, Court of Appeals, and Supreme Court, submit themselves to approval of the people 5 years after appointment and every 5 years thereafter.

This proposal is patterned after the constitution of the State of Alaska, which makes the judiciary accountable to the people without political involvement. This is somewhat of a middle position between total nonresponsibility and partisan political standing for the bench.

Mr. Speaker, some change in our judiciary's status is necessary. The courts have become powerful arms of the Federal Government as quasi-legislative to quasi-administrative organs. It is time that the men who fill these offices answer to people.

#### PEOPLE WANT TRUTH

### HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a 2-week business trip to my State of Nevada where I met with several constituents around the State and received from them a good sounding on their feelings toward several subjects regarding national and international affairs. The strong feelings voiced by the majority, I felt, required my statements on the pressing issues facing the United States in the world today. A scheduled speech I was to deliver in Las Vegas, Nev., allowed me this outlet of communication as a Representative of the people of Nevada. This speech was delivered May 14, 1969, at the Tropicana Hotel while I was a guest of the Las Vegas Kiwanis Club and I now offer my remarks for the RECORD:

#### PEOPLE WANT TRUTH

Mr. Chairman, Kiwanis Club members and friends, it is really a pleasure and a privilege to appear before you today and it is good to be back in Las Vegas, even for a very short visit. I am going to omit lengthy preliminaries because I do not want to waste any valuable time. It is usually my custom to speak "off the cuff," but because there are a number of very vital subjects which I wish to touch upon, I am going to refer to my notes in order that none of these issues will be omitted.

Actually, I have come to have a "heart to heart" talk with you today, because I believe that you want me to "lay it on the line." As the saying goes, I intend to "tell it like it is." I believe that all that the American people want is to be told the plain, simple truth. Unfortunately, we have become the victims of widespread distortion of facts, double talk and the confusion of issues.

However, I have come to the conclusion that the so-called great silent majority is now waking up, and these good, decent people of America are not going to remain silent much longer! They are discontented and even disgusted with the status quo. They know something is wrong, and they want to do something about it. They want to get back to plain, simple truths.

Because I know that Kiwanians are devoted to high principles, as well as to the welfare of our youth, I am going to confine my remarks mainly to the things which relate to our young people—who are most assuredly America's most important product. It is through such programs as the annual "Kid's Day," sponsored by Kiwanians and the U.S. Air Force, with the air power show at Nellis Air Force Base, that our country can instill more pride, patriotism and spirit in our youth.

First of all, I want to talk about the students of today—in our public schools, and more particularly in our colleges. How do we communicate with the dissident students in order to curtail the unrest and the violence that are striking at our educational institutions? How do we cope with this rabble-rousing minority which is interrupting and disrupting the freedom of academic achievement? In turn, how do these students, who are causing the disruptions, communicate with the college administrators?

I am going to be very frank—even very blunt—in what I am going to say to you today. I think that the conditions which are facing us are so serious that there is no longer any time for "pussy-footing" or keeping silent on the issues. Therefore, I am

going right straight to the point in saying what I believe to be necessary for the security, for the advancement and for the continued preservation of our great institutions of learning. The subject calls for straightforward, plain talk, because it involves each and every one of us in this room—as well as others across the nation.

My answer is simple. There has to be a meeting of the minds between the dissident students, and the college educators and administrators. Furthermore, this should take place before the unwanted incidents occur, and not afterwards. We are all familiar with what happened at San Francisco State College, and what is continuing to happen on many other campuses.

When Mr. S. S. Hayakawa took over the reins as college president in San Francisco at the peak of student violence, he took the "get tough" approach by calling in the police—for the protection of those students and professors who chose to study and to teach. Mr. Hayakawa had no other choice than to counteract with force against the violence of the demanding students. (It is important to add that many of the trouble-making dissidents are not students, at all. Many of them are trained agitators who travel from college to college.)

I think that all of us must agree that when a minority group (or a small number of students) make their demands at gun point—or in some cases with fire bombs—in order to force a university to change its policies, it is time to "get tough." If the radicals take over, academic freedom will die, and America will wither away.

It is my true belief that the situation can be remedied without bloodshed, violence and guns. However, we will have to "get moving" right away! There are several major college campuses already doing that which I am endorsing today. That is, to have meetings in which the president, the deans and a representative number of faculty members participate, daily or several times a week, along with a representative number of students. The purpose of these meetings would be to discuss university problems, with a view to maintaining the peaceful process of getting an education.

These meetings would have to be in compliance with the current set of rules of the university, and not in any way designed to take away the powers of the university, or the college president. Chaotic and violent demonstrations will never accomplish anything for the students. Maybe the radicals will realize this when the university administration removes them from the enrollment lists and throws them off campus. This has already occurred in some colleges—but it hasn't happened often enough!

When you and I went to school—to college—there were probably things about both the policy and the curriculum which we did not like, but we did not engage in violent take-over demonstrations to show our disapproval. After all, no one is forced to attend any college. He can always leave! I believe that the general public is getting plenty "fed up" with the riotous, gun-toting rabble-rousers who do their dirty work, and then cry:—"Police brutality"—when it is necessary to establish law and order.

We have Federal aid to education because the States are overburdened with many other expenses. I wish that the Federal funds earmarked for higher education could be put in the hands of the States, instead of Washington, D.C. Many of my colleagues in Congress, as well as myself, (in view of the violence and the criminal activities which are taking place on many campuses) are not in favor of giving Federal aid to those universities which have been beset with serious demonstrations. It is my belief that all students found guilty of rioting and the destruction of buildings and classrooms should not only be scratched from the list of getting

Federal aid, but they should be dumped out of school on their so-called intellectual ears!

And while I am on the subject of these rabble-rousers, I would like to include the "SDS" characters (Students for a Democratic Society). While this group of trouble-makers have a nice-sounding, patriotic name, no one should be misled—because there is nothing patriotic or democratic about them! I have done a lot of research along these lines which reveals that they are nothing but a bunch of thoroughly brain-washed revolutionists—in most cases trained by outsiders who are not even enrolled as students. However, the Students for a Democratic Society are not the only agitators provoking unrest on our campuses, because there is another bunch of rioters known only as militants.

Now, while I have been condemning these people I have just mentioned, I assure you that they are not the only ones to blame for the disgraceful condition which pervades many of our colleges. I believe that there is also an urgent need to weed out those radical faculty members and administrators who "go along" with the rioters, and even instigate much of the trouble. On the other hand, I would condemn faculty members and administrators who will not listen to fair and just demands of the students.

Good, academic leadership is the basic key to solving the campus administration side of the problem. And putting an end to permissiveness will go a long way toward rectifying the condition. We just cannot permit this lawlessness. To permit a comparatively small handful of radicals to destroy our institutions of learning is preposterous and unbelievable! (I am happy to report that my bill to create a select committee to investigate crime and disorders in cities and on campuses was passed by the House of Representatives last month.)

Our students today are probably probing deeper into the meaning of events, and they are obviously coming to our campuses with greater knowledge than years ago. They are asking questions, and they are entitled to receive right answers. This is healthy, but it is not healthy for students or the university to be allowed to be attacked violently by a minority group bent upon disrupting the system of learning. We should not confuse anarchy with academic freedom!

This is something that every couple with children approaching college age should be concerned with right now.

As I said before, I believe that the people of this country, as a whole, are waking up to the fact that our country is in great danger. I find that the people of Nevada are particularly alert to the danger. In my travels around the State—in numerous conversations with people—and in my large volume of correspondence—there is a great dissatisfaction being expressed. People are tired of being told that black is white, and that wrong is right. They are able to recognize a falsehood when they hear it, and they are intelligent enough to want to do something about it! They are asking, "since when has America adopted the policy of the 'Big Lie'?" They are exclaiming, "we want to get back to the truth!"

I think that one glaring example of misrepresentation and misleading information lies in the area of the Vietnam situation—which subject is uppermost in the minds of most of us. I happen to have a son over there, myself, so the subject is very close to my heart.

I am going to quote from two recent news items—one which relates to a top Republican leader, and the other which is accredited to a Democratic source. Thus, the subject is removed from the realm of political or one-sided propaganda. I believe that the American people were thoroughly deceived by the last administration concerning the situation in Vietnam, and I can see no difference, thus far, under the new administration.

The first article appeared in the Nevada State Journal of May 2, 1969, and it refers to a statement made by Senator George D. Alken, the senior Senate Republican from Vermont. These are the words of Senator Alken, who is Ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:—

"Common sense should tell us that we have now accomplished our purpose as far as South Vietnam is concerned. It is my belief that the United States would do well to advise the South Vietnamese Government immediately of our intentions, and then start an orderly withdrawal of our military personnel, turning that country and that war back to its rightful owners. It may take some time to complete this operation," he added, "but it should be started without delay."

Now, I will quote from the second news item, which appeared in the May 2, 1969 issue of the Reno Evening Gazette. The Democratic source is none other than former Secretary of Defense, Clark M. Clifford, who was a strong supporter of U.S. Vietnam policy when he became the Johnson administration's Defense chief in 1968. One of President Johnson's closest associates, Clifford entered the Defense Department publicly committed to the idea that the American intervention was necessary, not only to save South Vietnam, but to prevent the takeover of other non-Communist nations in Southeast Asia. It is quite shocking, therefore, to read that he now states that he left office convinced that the Nation's military effort in the war was "hopeless." At a meeting of some of the Senate Foreign Relations committee members, on April 22, 1969, former Defense Secretary Clifford declared his disillusionment and his change of heart concerning the war in Vietnam. He told the Senators that he left office "in disagreement with many of former President Johnson's Vietnam policies, and convinced that the Domino Theory (which contends that the fall of Vietnam would lead to the takeover of other nations) was fallacious.

In view of the reversal of opinion on the part of former Defense Secretary Clifford in regard to his previous conviction that American intervention was necessary, and his present agreement with other top ranking foreign policy leaders who consider the Vietnam war as "hopeless," it appears that there is something terribly wrong about continuing a "hopeless" situation—at the cost of our servicemen's lives. (With 300 to 400 of our boys killed every week, this is an exceedingly high cost!) I say, therefore, if this is a hopeless war which we cannot possibly win, I want my boy to come home! And I am sure that you want your boys to come home, too!

I believe that the people of America—the parents and families of our fighting men—are entitled to know the truth. I also believe that the majority of the American people are exceedingly tired of going along with a no-win war. Personally, I hate war. However, I firmly believe that if we are fighting for a just and honorable cause, we should give it all we have, and get it over with! In this respect, I am a hawk! If our Nation is as powerful as we are led to believe, then our fighting men should be given the opportunity to win! It is nothing less than criminal to make them fight a "hopeless" war—with their hands tied!

The people of this country are entitled to know the truth about Vietnam. We have been kept in the dark long enough. I say that we should either win, or get out of Vietnam!

While we are considering foreign policy, I want to speak briefly on the subject of foreign aid. If there ever was a false presentation of facts, this program is it! If our foreign aid program were really doing and accomplishing that for which it was intended—feeding the hungry and helping the poverty-stricken all over the world—I would be in favor of it. In fact, I did favor the

Marshall plan at the outset. However, our present foreign aid program has grown into the most corrupt extravaganza you can imagine. It is a program which benefits crooked politicians and world bankers—and which brings aid to enemy, Communist countries. I believe in calling a spade a spade—and calling a lie a lie. Let us not call something "foreign aid" when it really amounts to treasonous aid to the enemy.

The same thing applies to trade with Communist countries—which countries in turn, use our supplies and our equipment to kill our American fighting men! I say, "stop all trade with Communist countries!"

It is sickening to me to be told to "go easy" on the subject of communism. Why is this treated in such a "hush-hush" manner by our Government? Why must we be careful not to offend the Communists? It may not be a "declared war" that our boys are fighting over in Vietnam, but they know that it is a real war, all right. They also know who is supplying the Viet Cong with ammunition and armaments.

Now, let us take a look at the United Nations organization. I don't think we have to look very deeply to see who is running that show! The Communists have dominated that organization ever since its inception—when Alger Hiss, the convicted Communist, helped to frame it. (But we pay 70% of the bills of the United Nations.)

And let's take a quick look at the peace talks now going on in Paris. If ever there could be a greater travesty, so far as accomplishment is concerned, I would like to know what it is. Days upon days of haggling over the shape of the conference table (whether round or square)—while more and more boys continue to die—make us wonder just what purpose the organization is serving. There is talk, and more talk, but nothing happens.

Coming to the national scene, isn't it about time to recognize just what is behind the attempted breakdown of juvenile morality, the pornography on our newsstands and in the mall, the so-called "sex education" in the schools, and the filthy movies that infest our theaters? Should we not recognize what is behind the widespread violence in the land, and dare to call it by its correct name—communism.

If we are looking for straight answers, we might also take up the matter of crime on the streets—and the "soft on crime" attitude of the Supreme Court. The good, decent, law-abiding citizens of this country are getting mighty disgusted with having every leniency and every protection extended to criminals, caught red-handed in the act of their guilt—and binding the hands of the Nation's police. The general American public is not stupid, and people know that the cry of "police brutality" has been a Communist slogan as long ago as the Communist-directed revolutions which took place in 1848. (Also, the slogan, "We Shall Overcome.") Generally speaking, the American people are anxious for a return to law and order. (I might add that many of us strongly oppose the Supreme Court's decisions to allow Communists in defense plants—and schools.)

We might here touch upon the Supreme Court's decision which ruled out prayer in public schools. According to a Harris poll, more than 94 per cent of the American people stand in favor of prayer in public schools. How can it be that the overwhelming majority is ignored, and a small minority—a mere handful—is allowed to represent the thinking of the great American public? Unfortunately, many people do not realize that it does not require an amendment to the Constitution to bar the Supreme Court from hearing any school-prayer cases. It is within the will of the people—and within the power of Congress—to change the Supreme Court ruling.

I believe that prayer should be restored to the American way of life. I believe, also, that the people should know the truth regarding the power of Congress to change the Supreme Court's ruling. Furthermore, I believe that every public office holder should be questioned as to how he stands on this important issue. Our country was founded on prayer, and I think that it is a horrible thing when the principal of a school has to avoid the mention of the word prayer. (This happened at a California school at a memorial service for the late President Eisenhower. The school principal announced:—"We will now have a moment of silent meditation.")

In my talk today I have given a few glaring examples of double standards, double talk and the double trouble that is abroad in our country. I know that the people of this country are seeking answers—and that they want to get back to good, old American truth! I believe that this applies, also, to the majority of our youth. They want to be told the facts, and they (of all people) are entitled to know the truth.

I intend to keep on telling the American people the truth!

## CAMPUS RIOTS AND PORNOGRAPHY

### HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, most of my colleagues will have seen a Washington newspaper article, "An Angry Scholar Speaks Out on Campus Rioting," by Dr. Dwight L. Dumond on May 4. It appeared earlier in the Detroit News. It is lengthy and I shall not ask that all of it be included in the RECORD, but I commend it to your diligent attention.

Dr. Dumond, distinguished professor emeritus of history at the University of Michigan, includes this observation in his analysis:

The militants are not progressives, not liberals. They are reactionaries of the most extreme sort. They seek to destroy, not to build, and they are achieving little except chaos and retardation. When the revolution has consumed its leaders, as always happens, and the wreckage is cleared away, we will be about where we were before the trouble started.

How soon the return to academic freedom and effective teaching will come about is a matter of conjecture, but it cannot come until order has been restored and the banners of principle and morality are again unfurled at the many disrupted and disgraced colleges and universities across our land.

Dr. Dumond continues:

They cannot speak without obscenities. They cut great holes in desks, write erotic notes on desks at which decent people have to sit after them, and burn holes in carpets and cork floors. They have revolted against everything that is decent and respectable.

Mr. Speaker, while demanding order on the campus, government and the general public should at the same time insist upon a return to decency in campus publications.

Pornography and obscenity, which came into prominence with violence and vandalism in the university sphere, should be cotargets of the crusade to

clean up the campus. Student rebellion and student immorality have been combined in the Communist-initiated and carefully devised plan to destroy both our institutions and our precepts.

Neither can any longer be tolerated.

Whether transplanted from Moscow or Peking, these evils should not have been allowed to take root in this country. In an article that appeared in the *Johnstown, Pa., Tribune-Democrat* of May 6, which I should like to include in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, Columnist Vera Glaser explains why there was reluctance to deal firmly with the revolt.

The same docile and cringing permissiveness that allowed campus rioters to get out of hand is responsible for failure to stop distribution of raw and revolting printed material. Had existing laws been utilized to prevent disorder in its early stages, as many of us advocated when the rebellion erupted in 1965, campus disruption would never have approached current levels.

Since the new administration is simultaneously striking out at violence and at salacious material mailed to juveniles, the attack should include campus smut. If justification is needed linking obscenity with insurrection, the student body of every college and university includes many boys and girls under 18 years of age.

President Nixon said on May 2:

American homes are being bombarded with the largest volume of sex-oriented mail in history. Most of it is unsolicited, unwanted and deeply offensive to those who receive it.

The same appraisal is applicable on the college campus. Parents preparing to send children to college next fall must be assured that the campus will be a place of study instead of a battleground for insurrectionists. By the same token, there must be assurance that students will no longer be exposed to scurrilous and degenerate material now appearing in many official student publications.

Mr. Speaker, here I should like to include a recent article, "The Abyss of Chaos," from the *Wall Street Journal*, as well as the Glaser column. They follow:

[From the *Wall Street Journal*, Apr. 25, 1969]

#### THE ABYSS OF CHAOS

The issue is academic freedom, not to mention a few other fundamental American rights such as freedom of speech and assembly. The question is whether the nation's colleges and universities are going to let neofascistic minorities, Negro and white, dangerously devalue the quality of higher education or indeed destroy the institutions themselves.

The question has poignancy as well as bitterness: Think of the parents now going through the spring agony of acceptance at a good school for their son or daughter; they are prepared to sacrifice to pay \$8,000, \$10,000, \$15,000 for the four years but now must wonder whether the youngster will get an education worth having or one at all. Think also of the parents who look back on their own college years as a time of hard study but of tranquility as well; the spectacle today is utterly disgusting.

It is a spectacle, needless to say, that has no place on the American scene. The essence of the American political experiment and experience is that one's own rights, one's own freedoms, depend on respect for the rights

of others. And that is so because the history of the ages hammers the message that without tolerance liberty is lost.

Yet here we have these totalitarian students, unfortunately with not a few sympathizers and fellow-activists on the faculty, forcibly preventing the majority from getting an education, doing assault to persons and property, in the case of Cornell strutting around armed to the teeth.

Why?

Most Americans have granted from the start that students do have certain legitimate grievances, that a lot is wrong with the structure and conduct of the contemporary university. Very well; grievances can be discussed, defects put right. But these student (and non-student) fascists are not interested in remedies. They are interested in destruction. Given the power they seek, they would not know what to do with it except to destroy the academic tradition, emphatically including academic freedom.

Somewhat paradoxically, it seems to us, the violence they are perpetrating stems from the sentimentality that has imbued much of the nation's political and sociological thinking for a generation or more. In this view, the child is to be "developed" but rarely disciplined (progressive education), the adult's individual responsibility is held to be minimal (society is to blame for aberrant or criminal behavior), and the people generally are to be shepherded and subsidized (the welfare state).

This is not just an instinctual development; it has been preached from many platforms, not least the very colleges and universities now in turmoil. It is not altogether surprising, therefore, that a number of young people flout authority and heap scorn on the pervasive sentimentality that lets them get away nearly with murder. They, you can be sure, are a much tougher breed.

In the special case of attitudes toward Negroes, some administrators and faculty members have expressed the sentimentality in an excess of guilt, trying to do literally anything to make up for past wrongs. Yet, as S. I. Hayakawa of San Francisco State has observed, it is one thing to accept responsibility for the consequences of slavery; it is quite another to go overboard on guilt for what our ancestors did. Guilt, unlike responsibility, can easily become a neurotic emotion.

The whole aura of sentimentality, emotionalism and romanticism helps explain the pusillanimous reaction to the violence on the part of many educators. Confronted with "non-negotiable" demands, they eagerly set up "black studies" courses, even acknowledging that the result is bound to be a double standard for Negroes and whites—what a service to the Negroes to give them an inferior education. Equally eagerly, they cave in to the demands of white militants.

It helps explain; it does not excuse. Those capitulating administrators and professors have demonstrated their abysmal inadequacy. Consider Cornell, where a majority of the faculty have reversed themselves and nullified disciplinary action against five law-breaking Negro students. What kind of way is that to run a university? In the pitiful words of one professor, "We felt we had to draw back from the abyss of chaos."

The abyss is at hand, all right, but capitulation is not how to escape it. The obvious, right, procedure is to keep the classes going, with the aid of police if necessary, and to suspend, expel or otherwise discipline the campus fascists who are making life hell, and education all but impossible, for the many more numerous serious students.

Unless the nation and its educators can overcome their emotionalism and return to common sense, not only the present but the future is full of peril. Education is not everything in life, but in our society it is a great deal.

If America lets the quality of its academic institutions be degraded or destroyed, it will become a second-rate nation, a nation of near-incompetents in the arts and sciences and all else that makes for civilized existence.

[From the Johnstown (Pa.) Tribune-Democrat, May 6, 1969]

**SDS WILL FADE OUT, MITCHELL PREDICTS**  
(By Vera Glaser)

WASHINGTON.—Attorney General John Mitchell expects the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), which is inciting violence on the nation's campuses, to phase out and disappear before long.

"You saw what happened to the DuBois Clubs, didn't you? It will be the same with SDS," Mr. Mitchell told NANA.

The W. E. B. DuBois clubs, a Communist-dominated campus organization, had 36 chapters in early 1966, organized in many cases by sons and daughters of old-line party members.

Not too much has been heard of them since SDS took over the headlines, fomenting hostility at Columbia, Chicago, San Francisco State, Harvard and other universities.

SDS is active on 200 U.S. campuses, Mr. Mitchell said, giving them more than five times as many chapters as the DuBois Clubs.

**PEKING ORIENTED**

Moreover, according to the respected Spivack Report, SDS is dominated by Peking-oriented Communists.

The problem, as Mr. Mitchell sees it, is "separating the idealistic, impressionable young people in SDS from the hard-core revolutionaries manipulating them."

Money to support SDS and such other guerrilla groups as the Black Panthers and RAMs is coming from "outside the country," Mr. Mitchell said, but would not be more specific about the source.

"We have infiltrated them completely," he said. "The black groups are fragmented. They're kooky. They are not out to change our society, they want to destroy it. But they can't agree among themselves which way to go."

**HOOVER PREDICTION**

The campus disruptions were foreseen by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, who warned a year ago that New Left leaders were planning a "widespread attack on educational institutions," relying on dissidents and militants to bolster their effort.

His prediction that "revolutionary terrorism" would invade college campuses has proved to be accurate.

Some of the explanation may lie in the Spivack analysis, which states that:

"The takeover of SDS by the Maoists has been a steady process. But in the wake of McCarthyism, nearly 15 years later, it still is considered unfashionable to label Communists as 'the enemy' or even to acknowledge that there are hard-core Communists (mostly of the Peking variety) deeply involved in everything from the March on the Pentagon to the takeover at Cambridge.

**SADLY MISLED**

Spivack quoted Harvard's Dean Ford as saying that the students who seized University Hall were "many of the usual earnest, confused, concerned students, but there were many others, and any one who thinks we were dealing only with a group of young people trying somehow to express their moral revulsion of bloodshed overseas is sadly misled."

Others at Harvard were said to have noted, almost casually, the role of the Maoist Progressive Labor Party in what happened there.

University officials who stood by and let it happen, probably to avoid accusations of neo-McCarthyism, have become casualties of their liberal credo.

In the circumstances, the attorney general's prediction that the SDS will dry up and blow away seems a bit optimistic.

**RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE**

**HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. BEALL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I recently sent a questionnaire to the people of the Sixth District of Maryland in order to have the advantage of their thinking on some of the important issues facing us today.

I think it is particularly significant that 40,000 men and women in the Sixth Congressional District took the time to complete this questionnaire and return it to us. This I think is indicative of the interest that our citizens have, not only in our Government, but in the questions before us for consideration in these trying times.

The results of the questionnaire are as follows:

[Answers in percent]

1. Should the Federal Government guarantee an annual income to citizens living in poverty?

Yes ----- 14.1  
No ----- 77.8  
Undecided ----- 8.1

2. Should the electoral college be abolished and the election of the President and Vice-President be based on popular vote?

Yes ----- 79.7  
No ----- 13.4  
Undecided ----- 6.9

3. Do you favor President Nixon's proposal for the A.B.M. project?

Yes ----- 46.1  
No ----- 28.9  
Undecided ----- 25

4. Do you favor the Federal Government spending money for the Super Sonic Transport plane?

Yes ----- 24.6  
No ----- 60.4  
Undecided ----- 15.0

5. Do you favor Federal registration of firearms?

Yes ----- 36.7  
No ----- 59.3  
Undecided ----- 4.0

6. Do you favor the Federal Control of the Potomac River?

Yes ----- 41.6  
No ----- 38.4  
Undecided ----- 20.0

7. Do you agree with the present course of action being followed in the Viet Nam War?

Yes ----- 17.5  
No ----- 69.3  
Undecided ----- 13.2

8. Do you favor the Federal Communications Commission's proposal to ban cigarette advertisements on television and radio?

Yes ----- 57.6  
No ----- 35.0  
Undecided ----- 7.4

9. Do you agree with the proposal to convert the Post Office into a government owned

corporation to operate on a self supporting basis?

Yes ----- 60.3  
No ----- 24.0  
Undecided ----- 15.7

10. What action would most likely lessen the tax load on the lower and middle income taxpayer?

a. Raise standard deductions ----- 25.2  
b. Raise standard exemptions ----- 48.2  
c. Set minimum limit under which no tax would be paid ----- 26.6

11. Do you favor:

a. Reorganization of the present draft ----- 68.8  
b. Abolishing the draft and moving to an all volunteer army ----- 31.2

12. Do you favor:

a. Continuing space budget at the present level ----- 46.5  
b. Decreasing space budget ----- 43.8  
c. Increasing the space budget ----- 10.2

**TURBULENCE ON THE CAMPUS**

**HON. ADAM C. POWELL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following letter from the distinguished Franklin W. Wallin, president pro tempore, of Colgate University, Hamilton, N.Y., to the President of the United States on May 15, 1969:

COLGATE UNIVERSITY,  
Hamilton, N.Y., May 15, 1969.

The President,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Student Senate and the Faculty of Colgate University have voted overwhelmingly to instruct me to send you this communication. We note with deep concern the press reports of recent statements by members of your Administration attributing the cause of recent campus disorder to a "small minority of students," or to a lack of "backbone" in administrators. Such statements, we fear, denote a grievous misunderstanding of these difficulties, and divert attention from their broader import.

The turbulence which afflicts the universities reflects only in part internal grievances within these institutions. The universities must immediately attend to those problems of internal policy and structure which aggrive members of their communities. But in larger measure the turbulence reflects a more profound disaffection which may be traced to the state of the nation. The protests are directed at shortcomings not only of higher education but of the social order which it serves. At the roots of campus disquiet are the disillusionment of students and faculty whose ideals and hopes are affronted by the lamentable quality of our national life. Engaged in the pursuit of knowledge and the cultivation of humane sensibilities, they are acutely aware of the glaring gap between the promise and performance of American democracy. The protracted war in Vietnam, the persistence of poverty and hunger in affluent America, and the pernicious racial divisions within the society engender doubt and cynicism with respect to all of the society's institutions. The resulting despair and sense of impotence are manifest in the anger and belligerence of campus protest.

Unless national priorities are recorded and pressing problems are solved, campus unrest is likely to persist. Meanwhile, censure and reprisals by the government are likely to compound these difficulties. Official preoccupation with the symptoms rather than the causes of university turmoil threaten to deepen disaffection and disunity.

We at Colgate University have acknowledged the need for institutional reforms at all levels, and have initiated some measures to institute these changes. Additional measures are contemplated. It is urgent, also, that the nation's political leaders acknowledge the maladies of our national life, and act promptly to remedy them. Statesmanship in this task will alleviate the basic causes of campus disorder; it will also enlist the idealism and dedication of a college generation fervently committed to the nation's highest moral purpose.

Respectfully yours,

FRANKLIN W. WALLIN,  
President pro tempore.

GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest in and discussion of a guaranteed annual income for Americans, I thought it appropriate that my colleagues be able to read Editor Paul Durham's editorial of April 17, from the Dibold, Tex., Free Press. I feel the thoughts expressed by him are worthy of consideration.

The editorial follows:

GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME

The American people will never accept the idea of a guaranteed annual income, chiefly to replace our tottering welfare setup. Proponents of the measure—actually right now it's just an idea, not a measure—claim in effect that there is enough money for everybody to have a guaranteed annual income.

The welfare system we have now is antiquated, they say, in that it perpetuates the "fatherless" family. That is, families with large numbers of children can't get welfare payments if there is a husband-father on the premises. So, to skirt the issue, we have what are called "fatherless" families. The list grows by leaps and bounds each year.

Intellectuals claim that the system should be changed, and possibly replaced by the guaranteed annual income. Giving low-income citizens a taste of good money on a guaranteed basis will make them want more of it and result in their getting a job. This, in essence, is what we understand the proponents of the guaranteed annual income are saying.

We agree that the welfare system needs considerable overhaul. It simply is not working. Welfare rolls are getting longer, and at a frightening pace. We agree, too, that it doesn't make much sense to make liars of low-income people, which is what we do when we force them to disclaim the existence of any man around the house.

But we fail to see how the guaranteed annual income will correct the situation. It will only make matters worse.

How, for instance, will you explain to the average working man that it is justifiable to pay anyone \$3,000 or \$5,000 a year for not working? How can you justify one man getting out of bed and going to work six days

a week, while some other guy who is able to work doesn't work a day the whole year, yet is "guaranteed" a specific annual salary?

The average American will not accept that, not in theory and certainly not in practice. Even if the plan were workable, it would do incalculable harm to the great American dream and to the morale of our people.

You will find few Americans who object to feeding hungry children or hungry adults. At the same time, you will find few who are sympathetic with another American who is able to work and will not.

Politicians who think the guaranteed annual income will work had better get out of their overstuffed chairs and find out the peoples feelings on the matter. It simply will not work.

We are not suggesting that the welfare dilemma has any easy answer. It is a terrifying problem, to say the least. Our only suggestion might be to tighten the pocketbook in an attempt to break the welfare "chair"; to upgrade education in areas most beset with the problem; to pay few checks to the people who are able to work.

These things are being done, of course. We suggest we do more of this, and talk less about guaranteeing anybody anything—other than his freedom and the right to make his own way in the world.

—P. D.

VANDALISM

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Southside Sun, my hometown newspaper recently carried an editorial concerning vandalism at a local elementary school which, in my judgment, expresses the concern and dismay of all responsible citizens about acts of violence and irresponsibility being done either in the name of some cause or for sheer abuse.

During the course of this vandalism, black paint was smeared on the flag of the United States. The newspaper rightly states that the physical damage at the school can be repaired and adds:

But what can be done to right the mind of the child in the classroom where the flag of the United States was stained by the hand of the vandal?

The editorial is so well written and so well expresses the thoughts of many Americans that under unanimous consent I submit the editorial for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the Southside Sun, May 15, 1969]

VANDALISM

Vandals went through the Parklane School Thursday breaking windows, turning over desks, throwing paint on the walls and destroying anything their hands fell on.

As a final insult they threw black tempera paint on the flag of the United States. This single act of defiance, of destruction, of pointless vandalism is symbolic of the damage to the school and in a larger sense of the trend of events in our country.

The destruction at the Parklane school looks as though it is the work of children. There was apparently no attempt to steal anything from the building, television sets and musical instruments which could have been sold were not taken.

The school was in such disorder that no classes could be held on Friday and the students were sent home for the day. The vandals had stopped up the sinks and left the water running all night. The fire department was called and spent all morning pumping water out of the building.

Walking through these rooms left in shambles you could only wonder who could do this type of thing and the answer keeps coming back—children.

But why would they do it? Was it purely for fun? It seems incredible that they would resort to tearing up a school room for entertainment. East Point has an excellent Recreation Department. There are community playgrounds available. East Point is not a concrete jungle. The playground at Parklane School has been made available for children and has been used by them after school. There are literally dozens of Little League teams, with adults offering an outlet for youthful energy.

Parklane is a modern school with modern equipment and cheerful, sunny rooms. Why should a group of children tear up a schoolroom for fun when there is ample organized recreation or just playgrounds for small groups to organize their own playtime. . . . It seems that there is only one answer to this question.

As surely as the fabric of the American flag was stained by the paint thrown by the vandals at Parklane School, there is a tear in the fabric of American morality. Children hear of campus take over and of destruction by college students. But worse they hear that the Deans give in to the student demands. Campus rioters tear up administration buildings and then are turned loose without even a slap on the wrists. Faculty members and administrators are kidnapped and subjected to abuse and ridicule by students and no action is taken by the police.

The minds of children are impressionable and they are quick to learn. It seems that the vandals of Parklane School have learned their lesson too. Tear up a schoolroom just for fun. It is the thing to do now. Don't worry about the police they will not do anything.

But the police do not deserve the blame. Their hands are tied by laws designed to protect the criminal, not to protect the citizen or his property. Fingerprints were taken at the Parklane School, but no child may be fingerprinted. There are suspects in this case of vandalism, but they can not be questioned except in the presence of their parents or lawyers. Should they ever be brought to the bar of justice there are hundreds of technicalities that will, and have, allowed the guilty to walk away from his crime completely free.

There is a tear in the fabric of American justice as surely as there are stains on the flag in the classroom at Parklane School. Prayer is banned from the classroom where the vandals ran riot by a court that has ruled that pornography is legal.

But the physical damage at Parklane School can be repaired. The overturned desks can be righted. The paint can be washed from the walls. Textbooks damaged by water can be replaced.

But what can be done to right the mind of the child in the classroom where the flag of the United States was stained by the hand of a vandal. This is not the first time this school year that vandals have done their work in the school and have made their impression on the minds of the students.

Will they understand why they were sent home for a day? Will they understand why the poor sap, the taxpayer, will continue to pay his school taxes to repair the damage of the vandals? Or will these children join in the trend toward anarchy, to violence and disrespect for the flag of the United States?

STATISTICS ARE VALUABLE IN CRIME CONTROL AND UNDERLINE THE NEED FOR DRUG LEGISLATION

**HON. CHARLES H. WILSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Census and Statistics Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I am most interested in examining the value of creating a National Crime Statistics Center to help us achieve a clearer understanding of crime and those who are responsible for its soaring increases. One aspect of crime which has had a tremendous increase within a few short years is the unlawful use of drugs. Accordingly, I have sponsored H.R. 9313 to supply drug education materials for young people in our schools, and H.R. 11166 to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Marihuana and Other Hallucinogenic Drugs.

The need for these pieces of drug legislation has recently been statistically underscored by the California Department of Justice's Bureau of Criminal Statistics in their advance report on 1968 drug arrests in California. I submit this report because I think it demonstrates the usefulness of statistical compilation in helping us to comprehend the degree of severity in crime increases in various areas of the country and because it also underlines dramatically the need for realistic legislative responses to the increasingly serious drug situation in the United States today.

The report follows:

[From the California Department of Justice, Bureau of Criminal Statistics]

**1968 DRUG ARRESTS IN CALIFORNIA ADVANCE REPORT**

The Bureau of Criminal Statistics has made several important changes in the gathering and presentation of drug arrest data shown here.

Total drug arrests are shown by county as reported to the Bureau by the policing agencies in California. To develop detail beyond these gross counts, the Bureau analyzed the arrest reports, rap sheets, court disposition documents and other source materials for 80 of each 100 individuals arrested on drug charges. Details of the sample are shown in the first two tables and, for ease of comparison, data for earlier years were re-cast on a sample basis also.

Data here are based on preliminary figures. Some minor changes may be made in refining the information. These changes will be shown in the annual report, *Drug Arrests and Dispositions in California*.

**ADULT OFFENSES**

Based on police counts, adult drug law violations rose from 39,246 in 1967 to 64,639 in 1968; a 65 percent growth quite close to the 66 percent increase recorded for 1967. Thus, drug arrests continue to grow at about the same rate as before. The most noteworthy feature of the sample data in Table 1 is the drop shown in the proportion of marijuana offenses from 56.5 percent in 1967 to 49.5 percent in 1968. Conversely, dangerous drug law violations for adults rose from 20 to 32 percent.

Table 3 shows that Riverside and San

Bernardino counties have joined the ranks of those reporting more than 1,000 arrests.

**JUVENILE OFFENSES**

Juvenile arrests totaled 29,947 in 1968 in contrast to 13,911 recorded in 1967. This 115.3 percent growth of juvenile arrests for drug offenses is also based on totals submitted to the Bureau by the police. The sample on juvenile arrests reflected much of the same tendencies as the adult arrests. As marijuana lost ground, dangerous drug arrests increased and now represent a larger proportion of the total juvenile arrests than before.

Seven counties not listed in 1967 reported

juvenile arrests in 1968—Amador, Mariposa, Modoc, Siskiyou, Tehama, Trinity and Tuolumne.

Among the major counties, only San Francisco shows virtually no increase—520 as against 503 in 1967. Most of the other counties had increases—some well over the 100 percent mark: San Diego, 160.7 percent; Fresno County, 235.6 and Kern, the largest growth of all, 382.6 percent.

The smaller counties recorded more extraordinary fluctuations because of their smaller 1967 totals. Glenn County, for instance, rose from 1 to 8 arrests or a 700 percent increase; Shasta rose from 8 to 37 or a 362 percent growth.

TABLE 1.—ADULT DRUG LAW VIOLATIONS REPORTED BY CALIFORNIA LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES DURING 1968 COMPARED TO 1960 AND 1967

[30 percent sample data]

Area and offense	1960		1967		1968		Percent change 1968 over 1967	Percent change 1968 over 1960
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Statewide.....	5,300	100.0	13,986	100.0	20,824	100.0	48.9	292.9
Marijuana.....	1,282	24.2	7,900	56.5	10,297	49.5	30.3	703.2
Opiates.....	2,755	52.0	2,489	17.8	2,549	12.2	2.4	-7.5
Dangerous drugs.....	1,054	19.9	2,820	20.2	6,645	31.9	135.6	530.5
Other offenses.....	209	3.9	777	5.5	1,333	6.4	71.6	537.8

TABLE 2.—JUVENILE DRUG LAW VIOLATIONS REPORTED BY CALIFORNIA LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES DURING 1968 COMPARED TO 1960 AND 1967

[30 percent sample data]

Area and offense	1960		1967		1968		Percent change 1968 over 1967	Percent change 1968 over 1960
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Statewide.....	484	100.0	4,411	100.0	9,787	100.0	121.9	1,922.1
Marijuana.....	259	53.5	3,294	74.7	5,698	58.2	73.0	2,100.0
Opiates.....	43	8.9	86	1.9	162	1.7	88.4	.....
Dangerous drugs.....	168	34.7	849	19.3	3,323	33.9	291.4	978.0
Other offenses.....	14	2.9	182	4.1	604	6.2	231.9	.....

Note: Percentages not computed on bases less than 50.

TABLE 3.—ARRESTS OF ADULTS FOR DRUG LAW VIOLATIONS REPORTED BY CALIFORNIA LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES, JANUARY-DECEMBER 1968, AREA AND COUNTY BY OFFENSE

Area and county	Total	Marihuana	Opiates	Dangerous drugs	Other offenses
Total.....	64,639	33,573	10,411	13,459	7,916
Southern California:					
Los Angeles.....	32,910	13,779	6,577	6,843	3,711
Imperial.....	246	127	34	69	16
Orange.....	4,777	2,791	350	1,108	528
Riverside.....	1,327	774	64	294	195
San Bernardino.....	1,385	640	207	417	121
San Diego.....	6,114	3,198	106	2,175	635
Santa Barbara.....	487	292	62	65	68
Ventura.....	1,265	657	191	203	214
San Francisco Bay:					
San Francisco.....	3,857	1,945	1,294	384	234
Alameda.....	3,761	1,714	910	685	452
Contra Costa.....	918	588	89	135	106
Marin.....	478	312	25	91	50
Napa.....	109	89	2	5	13
Solano.....	690	332	145	128	85
Santa Clara.....	1,335	940	118	138	139
Sonoma.....	208	169	3	9	27
Sonoma.....	283	231	.....	35	17
Balance of State:					
San Joaquin Valley:					
Fresno.....	484	266	45	93	80
Kern.....	383	233	12	79	59
Kings.....	12	6	.....	4	2
Madera.....	30	18	2	1	9
Merced.....	57	49	.....	5	3
San Joaquin.....	251	160	17	37	37
Stanislaus.....	258	147	15	67	29
Tulare.....	141	76	15	20	3

TABLE 3.—ARRESTS OF ADULTS FOR DRUG LAW VIOLATIONS REPORTED BY CALIFORNIA LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES, JANUARY-DECEMBER 1968, AREA AND COUNTY BY OFFENSE—Continued

Area and county	Total	Marihuana	Opiates	Dangerous drugs	Other offenses
Balance of State—Continued					
Sacramento Valley:					
Butte.....	109	99	1	8	1
Colusa.....	2	2	.....	.....	.....
Glenn.....	8	7	.....	.....	.....
Placer.....	135	129	.....	5	1
Sacramento.....	657	384	76	96	101
Shasta.....	52	38	1	10	3
Sutter.....	25	20	1	1	3
Tehama.....	7	6	.....	1	.....
Yolo.....	105	94	.....	5	6
Yuba.....	26	22	.....	2	2
Other counties:					
Amador.....	6	5	.....	.....	1
Calaveras.....	23	23	.....	.....	.....
Del Norte.....	3	3	.....	.....	.....
El Dorado.....	199	130	8	27	34
Humboldt.....	115	89	.....	11	15
Inyo.....	21	15	.....	1	5
Lake.....	17	11	.....	4	2
Lassen.....	6	5	.....	.....	1
Mariposa.....	34	28	.....	6	.....
Mendocino.....	77	59	.....	13	5
Mono.....	21	21	.....	.....	.....
Monterey.....	464	343	17	42	62
Nevada.....	699	38	1	22	8
Plumas.....	15	12	.....	3	.....
San Benito.....	6	5	.....	.....	.....
San Luis Obispo:					
Obispo.....	338	254	14	51	19
Santa Cruz.....	291	170	9	50	62
Sierra.....	1	1	.....	.....	.....
Siskiyou.....	19	12	.....	7	.....
Tuolumne.....	22	15	.....	2	5

TABLE 4.—ARRESTS OF JUVENILES (UNDER 18 YEARS) FOR DRUG LAW VIOLATIONS REPORTED BY CALIFORNIA LAW-ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES, JANUARY-DECEMBER 1968

[Area and county by offense]

Area and county	Total	Marihuana	Opiates	Dangerous drugs	Other offenses
Total.....	29,947	16,754	838	8,240	4,115
<b>Southern California:</b>					
Los Angeles.....	14,133	7,208	394	4,588	1,943
Imperial.....	66	34	.....	13	19
Orange.....	2,790	1,571	39	758	422
Riverside.....	680	400	7	161	112
San Bernardino.....	823	404	22	261	136
San Diego.....	2,573	1,284	81	1,068	140
Santa Barbara.....	340	237	23	34	46
Ventura.....	843	413	37	182	211
<b>San Francisco Bay:</b>					
San Francisco.....	520	398	63	35	24
Alameda.....	1,600	1,075	97	259	169
Contra Costa.....	658	483	5	109	61
Marin.....	412	323	3	40	46
Napa.....	57	44	.....	12	1
San Mateo.....	582	400	5	95	82
Santa Clara.....	927	732	12	112	71
Solano.....	132	70	1	13	48
Sonoma.....	136	85	.....	18	33
<b>Balance of State:</b>					
<b>San Joaquin Valley:</b>					
Fresno.....	443	173	2	107	161
Kern.....	415	230	2	100	83
Kings.....	19	16	.....	3	.....
Madera.....	6	4	2	.....	.....
Merced.....	51	36	6	6	3
San Joaquin.....	165	114	4	25	22
Stanislaus.....	139	64	.....	32	43
Tulare.....	93	44	1	10	38
<b>Sacramento Valley:</b>					
Butte.....	56	44	.....	7	5
Colusa.....	3	.....	.....	.....	3
Glenn.....	8	7	.....	1	.....
Placer.....	29	27	.....	1	1
Sacramento.....	314	199	15	63	37
Shasta.....	37	27	.....	2	8
Sutter.....	18	6	1	3	8
Tehama.....	8	3	.....	.....	5
Yolo.....	66	59	.....	2	5
Yuba.....	22	22	.....	.....	.....
<b>Other counties:</b>					
Amador.....	1	.....	1	.....	2
Calaveras.....	4	2	.....	.....	1
Del Norte.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....
El Dorado.....	62	40	.....	6	16
Humboldt.....	75	44	.....	20	11
Inyo.....	7	6	.....	.....	1
Lake.....	9	7	.....	2	.....
Mariposa.....	5	3	.....	2	.....
Mendocino.....	37	33	2	.....	2
Modoc.....	1	1	.....	.....	.....
Mono.....	8	4	.....	.....	4
Monterey.....	206	150	6	29	21
Nevada.....	51	9	.....	24	18
Plumas.....	21	17	.....	4	.....
San Luis Obispo.....	88	60	1	12	15
Santa Cruz.....	189	134	6	20	29
Siskiyou.....	6	1	.....	.....	5
Trinity.....	4	4	.....	.....	.....
Tuolumne.....	8	3	.....	1	4

Source: Bureau of Criminal Statistics, Sacramento, Calif.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF STEUBEN SOCIETY

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Steuben Society of America on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

The Governor of New York has proclaimed this week "Steuben Society of America Golden Jubilee Memorial Week" and I am pleased to join in this tribute.

I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the outstanding job done by the general chairman for this golden jubilee—the Honorable Albert H. Bosch, a former Member of Congress and my predecessor as Representative for the Seventh District in New York.

I also wish to congratulate Mr. Ward

Lange on his reelection to a seventh term as national chairman of the Steuben Society.

The strength of the society lies in its commitment to protect political liberty by preserving equal opportunity for all Americans.

The major legislative goal of the society for this year is an amendment to the U.S. immigration law to secure fair treatment for all northern Europeans who have found it more difficult to come to the United States since passage of the 1965 act.

In this connection the Steuben Society has joined forces with the American Irish National Immigration Committee to support this legislation.

As a cosponsor of this bill to amend the immigration law, I look forward to working for the same legislative goal and I wish the society continued strength to represent Americans of German descent during this golden jubilee week.

YOU CANNOT PACKAGE CONSUMERS

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I have always maintained that consumers choose one product over another for a wide variety of reasons, and not on the basis of price alone. Our husbands would think us mad, indeed, if we asked them how much per pound they paid for the new car.

In effect, though, there are some well-meaning individuals who think that the judgments we housewives make in the supermarket are based on the wrong things, and they have set out to "correct" all of this. They seem to think that our value judgments are somehow inferior to their own, and that we housewives can, by the stroke of legislation, all be neatly packaged and labeled. Well, I for one, do not believe it. Neither, I am happy to note, does Don Robinson, editor of NAM Reports, published by the National Association of Manufacturers.

In the May 19 issue of NAM Reports, Mr. Robinson has done a particularly good job of illustrating the difficulty in making flat statements about comparison shopping and the choices made by consumers. I recommend the article as good eye-opening reading to my colleagues, and include it at this point in the RECORD:

SENATOR'S 60 LADIES AND THE SURPRISING EXPLANATION OF WHY THEY FLUNKED TEST ON SHOPPING CHEAPEST

Sen. Gaylord Nelson is on the warpath again, introducing a new packaging and labeling law to do what he says the present one has failed to do. That is, it hasn't made price comparisons between sizes and competing brands any cinch.

The Senator's bill, familiarly known as "S. 1424," aims at making such comparisons as easy as filling out a Federal income tax form. The Senator asserts that a high order of mathematical ability is required now to make price comparisons, notes that housewives can't tote computers around in their shopping carts, and therefore in practice would require Joe the corner grocer to buy or rent a computer of his own.

For the retailer would be required when he marks his price on merchandise to mark also the price per ounce or other basic unit.

Why not, the Senator asks, when they do it on meat and fish?

There are special scales that so label meat, fish, cheese and such items for supermarkets, but such marking is confined to items with short shelf life. Any good store disposes of unsold fresh goods like this very quickly. But the retailer has a problem with, say, corn flakes. Suppose a certain size box is put on the shelf at 27 cents. The grocer finds his competitor is selling them for 26, so he lowers his own price. Come Thursday, his co-op grocers' association has them advertised three days special at 24. Monday they go back to 26 again. Tuesday, our friend discovers that due to the routine Russian crop failure there is a routine corn shortage, and the wholesale price rises, requiring him to mark up to 27.

Such a series of changes (not uncommon at the retail level) is troublesome enough now, and such changes can happen daily at many places in every aisle. Imagine what chaos if Joe the grocer had to mark his boxes with the cents and hundredths of a

cent per ounce that such changes would bring about!

The good Senator was anguished to learn that five California ladies were unable to choose the cheapest-per-unit offerings among lists of 70 items any better after the Packaging and Labeling law had been put into effect than before. In fact they did a little worse.

One reason, Senator, is that women shoppers haven't had much practice in choosing the cheapest items in their regular shopping, because the cheapest is seldom what they are seeking. Your obedient servant discovered this by going through four incoming bags of groceries and asking why the items were chosen.

The hand dishwashing detergent was chosen because it smells wonderful and is easy on the hands. It also seems to do more work per squirt than a cheaper brand.

The dishwasher detergent was chosen because it was cheapest and there are no troubles with the dishwasher no matter what is put into it. Any trouble finding out which was cheapest? No. There were these big boxes on special to introduce a new brand.

The sirloin steak was selected because yr. obd. svt. said he was hungry for steak. It was chicken which was on sale.

The paper towels were chosen because they match the kitchen. The bathroom paper was chosen because it has flowers on it and what the heck it's Spring.

The scouring cleansers were chosen: 1. Because the itty bitty plastic cans with removable labels fit on the medicine cabinet shelves. 2. The big ugly cans are cheap and guests don't look under the kitchen sink.

Five pounds of granulated sugar was bought because we needed sugar.

A similar purchase was 10 pounds of flour.

But also in a bag was two pounds of a special flour that won't congeal, clot, lump or whatever. It was purchased without regard to the price of any other flour because "I've always wanted to try some."

There were eight number 10 cans of string beans. They were bought because they were eight for a dollar, and we can always use string means. Nobody in our house knows how many ounces or how much per ounce this is, but we all know that number 10 cans of string beans usually are much more.

There was a pound of margarine of a brand acceptable to this family (not the cheapest) because Mr. Nelson's cohorts have supported butter to a price level mllady finds excessive.

There were five pounds of California table grapes, because the store was being picketed by SDS types trying to get everyone to boycott table grapes. (The kids enjoyed them.)

The cereal was selected by a headstrong four-year-old because there was a Wacky Racer in the box.

Some pompano was purchased because everyone will eat it, and you can't get fresh pompano around here too often.

The store's own brand of facial tissues were bought because they were cheapest, and the boys use them for everything.

A premium brand of facial tissues (pink) was purchased for use in the baby's room, because she's the first girl and we haven't gotten over that joy yet.

Six cakes of soap were selected because they 1. smell good. 2. irritate no family member's skin. 3. match the color of the bathrooms. 4. seem to last better when the kids forget to fish them out of their bath water, as they've been told to do a thousand times if they've been told once.

A washday detergent was chosen because there were two cold water brands on the shelf and the other one gave some of us the itch.

A gallon of fabric softener seemed a good idea, with a baby in the house, and all.

So it went. The lady was completely satisfied that she had bought well for this family in these circumstances. Given a list of 70

items to be bought for price alone, the lady's whole thinking processes for shopping would have to be altered.

No matter what Joe's computer works out about prices per ounce on detergent, our house will still contain the one that doesn't itch any of us. No matter what price the soap may be per ounce, it had better smell good and not dissolve too quickly in the bath water.

Does the Senator want to quarrel with the lady?—Don Robinson.

## LET US END RESTRICTION ON OIL IMPORTS FROM CANADA

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the national system of oil import quotas has been in operation since 1955 and its establishment was justified as essential to national security.

Is the quota system still necessary? Is it still essential to national security? This is a matter which is now under expedited study by a cabinet-level force.

I am well aware of the pressures pro and con for the oil quota program and I am convinced that modification is in order, preferably on a gradually reduced control basis.

Of most concern to my home area of Buffalo and western New York, however, is the restriction which has been imposed upon the importation of oil from Canada. This limitation is by executive action outside the import program. Canada is exempt from the national quota system.

The limitation on imports from Canada has worked a particular hardship upon the petrochemical industry in my area. Indeed, we stand to lose two important industries unless the arbitrary limitation is eased.

Regardless of whether changes are made in the basic oil import program, it is essential that the administration take into careful account the effect upon other American industries of its executive action on Canadian oil imports.

The oil flow allowed from Canada not only is inadequate, but also has been fluctuating in a manner that creates serious instability in the petrochemical industry.

As I have said, Canadian oil was exempted specifically from the Federal oil import control program and yet the administration has seen fit to impose arbitrary restrictions which have had devastating effect upon our area.

I have again brought this matter to the attention of the administration, and I hope sincerely that the task force will give it due consideration, although there is real reason to wonder whether we can wait much longer for a change in policy.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks editorials from two local newspapers:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, May 12, 1969]

### EASE OIL QUOTAS

Forty-six members of Congress have proposed that the national system of oil-import

quotas be gradually eliminated, and there is increasing evidence that this subsidy for the domestic oil producers should be substantially modified at least.

To most Americans, this system of protective quotas, which shelters domestic oil producers from broad foreign competition, is about as clear as nuclear physics or abstract art. But the sole justification under a 1955 law is national security.

Under that law a President is authorized to restrict the amount of imported oil when its volume would impair national security. Since 1962, this has meant that the amount of imported oil couldn't exceed 12.2 per cent of domestic production.

Recent testimony by economists and others before a Senate subcommittee suggests, however, that the national-security rationale is now very fragile indeed, and that the quotas may have spawned more problems than they solved—except for the oil producers. It has been argued that these quotas, by restricting competition from abroad, have lessened competition here at home, thus keeping the prices American consumers pay for oil and gasoline and other products artificially high; that it encourages production in the U.S. of less efficient wells; and that it damages the competitiveness of domestic oil and chemical industries in world markets.

As to the central contention that these protective quotas serve the national security, there have been several persuasive rebuttals.

The 1968 discovery of oil reserves in Alaska lessens the need-to-conserve argument, to some degree. And Wayne A. Leeman, economics professor at the University of Missouri, made the rather obvious point to the Senate subcommittee that quotas restricting foreign imports might even hasten now, in peacetime, the depletion of U.S. reserves which could prove more needed later in times of conflict.

If the aim is to conserve oil for times of crisis moreover, then that aim seems to be contradicted by such tax incentives as the overly generous oil-depletion allowance, which spur the exploitation of domestic reserves.

President Nixon in late March named a Cabinet-level task force to review oil-import policy. Probably Congress should hold off on any revision of these policies until the administration has had a chance to shape its own recommendations.

On the basis of what Congress has already heard, however, it should be skeptical of any proposals that don't seek to considerably ease a quota system which dulls competitiveness, contributes little to national security, prolongs a protective and elaborate subsidy structure in a nation committed to free trade—and forces American consumers to pay unnaturally high prices for oil products.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier Express, Apr. 9, 1969]

### USE OF CANADIAN OIL HERE IS IMPERATIVE

On the premise that federal policy ought to be geared primarily to benefit the economy of any area of the United States at a geographical disadvantage in obtaining resources to promote its industry, the Niagara Frontier is justified in pressing for an easing of restrictions the U.S. imposes on Canadian crude oil imports.

The Interior Dept. hardly will make much sense if it does not allow additional import allotments to a region whose oil refining and petrochemical industries are in need of supplies that cannot be provided economically from U.S. sources.

A sound case on economic grounds for the allowance of greater use of across-the-border pipeline facilities has been made by the Greater Buffalo Development Foundation. That case merits the sympathetic attention of the federal government despite any other considerations that led to the import controls imposed in 1960.

The production, distribution and refining of oil is a gigantic, highly competitive and complex business in which the geography of oil production is a factor. The finished products are in such universal demand and constitute so great a prerequisite for economic health in every community that usual limits fixed by government on supplies of raw material are peculiarly onerous in the case of crude oil.

The Niagara Frontier should be allowed to capitalize on its proximity to Canadian facilities. If the opportunity continues to be denied it, some tall explaining backed by more than a mere policy statement is due it.

#### AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

### HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is one item in the USDA budget I want to call to the attention of the Congress. This is the agricultural conservation program which is authorized in the basic legislation of 1936 at \$500 million annually. While the program has gone through several name changes, it is now known as the ACP and is administered by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service. After several reductions in the size of the program, the appropriation stabilized at about \$250 million in the mid-1950's. The program has operated at this level since that time until the last 2 years when the recession cuts reduced the figure to \$195.5 million exclusive of the administrative funds. It seems to me that if \$500 million were needed for this program in 1936, when each dollar bought much more in goods and services than the dollar does today, we certainly need as much today.

However, on several occasions in the past decade and a half, the President's budget to Congress has contained about a 50-percent cut in funds for the agricultural conservation program, a cut from \$220 million to around \$100 million, plus the administrative funds. This year President Johnson's budget proposed to cut the program from \$195.5 million for the 1969 program to \$100 million for the 1970 program, and President Nixon, in his recent budget message to Congress proposed that the program be eliminated entirely.

This is a program under which the Government shares with the farmer the cost of carrying out needed conservation practices usually on about a 50-50 percent basis. Many conservation practices are of no immediate value to the farmer. They protect soil and water for the future good of all the people and farmers just cannot afford to perform them completely on their own. For these reasons Congress has consistently restored the authorization for this much-needed program to \$220 million and as soon as the budget permits, it is imperative that we do so again.

In 1968, for example, over 4 million acres were seeded to permanent cover crops such as grasses, over 1 million acres were seeded to additional crops for

rotation cover, over 3 million acres were seeded to cover for soil or watershed protection, 1.1 million acres of improved cover on rangeland were established and 4 million acres were seeded to winter cover crops. All of these help prevent wind and water erosion of valuable cropland. Almost 2.5 million acres are served by wells drilled for livestock water to aid in distribution of livestock to prevent overgrazing, 3.2 million acres are served by reservoirs built in 1968 for agricultural use. About 2.6 million acres are served by reorganized irrigation systems which conserve water and prevent washing and seepage. Stubble mulch to prevent erosion of summer fallow land was carried out on 2.7 million acres and other wind erosion measures were carried out on an additional 800,000 acres. These are but a few of the conservation practices carried out with the aid of this program in the 1 year, 1968.

Many counties have special practices to meet particular and often peculiar local problems. Many of these are designed especially to assist low income farmers carry out conservation practices and in such cases the cost share provided by the Government can be as much as 80 percent of the cost of performing the practice. Other practices, in addition to conserving soil and water, are especially beneficial to wildlife or enhance natural beauty.

ACP is used in every agricultural county in the United States. In 1968 about a million farms participated in the program. During the 5-year period 1964-68 more than 2,291,000 different farms carried out practices under the program. Requests for assistance in carrying out these conservation practices greatly exceed available funds even with a \$220 million program. There is a national limit on payments to a person of \$2,500 per farm—except under pooling agreements the limit is \$10,000. Many States and counties establish lower limits so they may assist more farmers. The average payment under the regular ACP in 1968 was \$210.

The ACP is administered by elected farmer community and county committeemen and by appointed farmer State committeemen. The authority for these committeemen is contained in the basic legislation establishing the agricultural conservation program. These committeemen also administer other assigned programs such as the emergency ACP to assist in drought, flood, et cetera, the voluntary wheat and feed grain diversion programs, the cotton programs, programs for peanuts, tobacco, rice, naval stores, sugar cane and sugar beets, wool, price support loans, and so forth. The chairmen of State and county committees are chairmen of State and county USDA Disaster Committees. The county office managers and the State executive directors are chairmen of the respective defense boards. All of these activities would be jeopardized if the program—ACP—which provides basic legislation for the committee system itself, were abolished.

In the interests of agriculture and of the entire population, present and future, we cannot permit the program to be dropped. We should, instead, be re-

storing the program to the authorized level in order to preserve the soil for future generations in a condition needed to supply the rapidly expanding population with adequate supplies of mineral-rich food.

#### SOVIETS GREATLY INCREASING MILITARY STRENGTH

### HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union is presently carrying on a crash program to greatly increase its military strength.

Mr. Richard Wilson discusses this Soviet military buildup in a May 2 article in the Washington Evening Star entitled "Soviets Greatly Increasing Military Strength." Mr. Wilson quotes Rear Adm. H. G. Rickover as having stated:

By the end of this year [1969], we face the prospect of losing the superiority in nuclear submarines we have held for many years. The Soviet Union is surging forward with a naval and maritime program that is a technological marvel.

These words are particularly significant coming from the man generally credited with having created our nuclear Navy.

I urge my colleagues to read Mr. Wilson's article, which I am inserting in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks.

#### SOVIETS GREATLY INCREASING MILITARY STRENGTH

(By Richard Wilson)

Nothing enrages the antimilitary groups in Congress more than to be accused of advocating unilateral disarmament. This, of course, is what they do propose in effect but unilateral disarmament sounds empty-headed, and it is.

The Soviet Union is greatly increasing its military strength. We would call it a crash program in this country. The expansion's most ominous phase is in the means of delivering nuclear weapons. At the same time, the anti-military groups in Congress are advocating reductions in critical military programs including the deployment of antiballistic missiles. If this does not amount to unilateral disarmament then the words have no meaning.

In response to an inquiry from Sen. John O. Pastore, D-R.I., Rear Adm. H. G. Rickover, whose stubborn advocacy is credited with having created our nuclear Navy, has given a chilling prospectus of growing Soviet strength in the seven seas. Rickover quotes Admiral Gorshov, commander-in-chief of the Soviet navy, as having recently said: "The flag of the Soviet navy now flies proudly over the oceans of the world. Sooner or later, the U.S. will have to understand that it no longer has mastery of the seas."

The Soviet Union has decided to gain its own kind of naval superiority over the United States and is in the process of doing it through a major expansion of its submarine forces into the world's largest underseas navy. At the present rate the Soviet force of nuclear submarines of the Polaris type will overtake and exceed the United States force by the end of 1970.

"By the end of this year," Rickover wrote, "we face the prospect of losing the superiority in nuclear submarines we have held for many years. The threat posed by their sub-

marine force—with their new ballistic and cruise missile launchers and new attack types, is formidable. If more sophisticated types are added in the near future, as is likely considering their large number of designers and extensive facilities, the threat will rapidly increase."

Rickover says the Soviet Union is "surging forward with a naval and maritime program that is a technological marvel." "They now have," he continued, "a new submarine force of about 375; we have 143, which includes 61 diesel submarines, most of which are of World War II vintage. Thus the Soviets have a net advantage of about 230 submarines."

To achieve this, Rickover said, the Russians greatly expanded and modernized submarine building facilities, with one of their numerous yards with several times the area and facilities of all U.S. yards. They use modern assemblyline techniques under covered ways, permitting large-scale production regardless of weather conditions.

From Rickover's report and other sources it can be fairly concluded that at about the time Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev was deposed central decisions were made in the Soviet ruling apparatus on a large military expansion. Resources were diverted from the farm sector of the Soviet economy to defense. Outlays for defense rose sharply in 1966-67 after remaining static since 1962.

At about this same time decisions must also have been reached on the deployment of the SS9 super rocket which could theoretically give the Soviet Union a first-strike nuclear capability. President Nixon has stated that after the decision in 1967 to deploy the American Sentinel antiballistic missile system it was discovered that the SS9 deployment in Russia was 60 percent greater than had been thought. It was also discovered that estimates of Soviet strength are much more precise today than formerly owing to aerial reconnaissance from orbiting satellites with their fantastic cameras which have photographed a man walking down a Moscow street. When Rickover describes the huge Soviet submarine yards he can do so confidently because they have been photographed.

What President Nixon has been saying, and Defense Secretary Laird has been emphasizing, and Admiral Rickover has been documenting is either a morbid fairy tale or there have been significant military developments in the Soviet Union of an extremely ominous nature.

These developments do not give much encouragement to future attempts at unilateral disarmament, or they will not when the Nixon administration decides to tell all that it knows about the Russian expansion.

Rickover's final comment is worth noting. "I suggest," he wrote, "that by keeping secret our knowledge of Soviet strength at this time we may lose more than by confiding the truth of the danger we face to the American people."

#### SAFEGUARD IS NEEDED

### HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, radio station WHBL in Sheboygan, Wis., recently broadcast an editorial in support of President Nixon's decision to deploy the Safeguard antimissile system. I recommend it to my colleagues.

#### SAFEGUARD IS NEEDED

A Congressional showdown on the proposed Nixon Safeguard Anti-Ballistic Missile System is shaping up.

More and more, the pros and cons of this defense system plan are being clarified.

Critics of the plan, including Wisconsin Senators Proxmire and Nelson, contend that the ABM would provide very little protection for the U.S., trigger a new round of arms escalation, hinder negotiations for disarmament, and cost too much money that should be used to meet domestic needs.

Proponents of ABM say that it would provide a phased beginning of a full ABM defense, protecting our strategic nuclear weapons. Initially, the objective is to protect defense systems at two Minuteman missile bases where about one-third of our deterrent force is located.

Such a system would provide protection from possible attack by the Red Chinese in the mid-1970's, prevent a possible unintentional launch of missiles by the Soviets, and preserve our deterrent force thereby preventing a nuclear attack from succeeding.

Proponents also assert that the Soviets have already built their own ABM system which is much more extensive than ours and that we have assurance that any negotiations with the Russians will not be impaired.

As for the cost of the program, the Administration says the top figure would be six billion dollars, not the considerably higher figure which the critics use.

We believe that the proponents have proved their case for ABM beyond a shadow of a doubt. We believe in the interests of national security that it is far wiser to rely on the advice and judgment of our defense experts, both civilian and military, than on the politicians.

But the politicians will decide the fate of ABM and the future security of the United States. You can make your voice heard by writing to your U.S. Senators and Congressman and urging them to approve expenditures of the Safeguard Anti-Ballistic Missile System.

We cannot hide our heads in the sand. The ominous threat to our security is all too clear. The ABM system must be approved.

#### MARITIME DAY

### HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, today is Maritime Day—although I doubt that we have very much to celebrate, in view of our waning position on the oceans of the world. I do not know what day the Soviet Union sets aside to honor its maritime achievements—but certainly they have a lot more to boast about than we do.

Less than a quarter century ago, Mr. Speaker, this country was the world's maritime leader in shipping and shipbuilding. Today we are fifth in shipping, and ninth or 10th in shipbuilding. The Russians, on the other hand, have come up from being a maritime nonentity to a position where they threaten to surpass us in the size of their fleet. What is more, 80 percent of the Soviet fleet is less than 10 years old—while 80 percent of the American-flag fleet is more than 20 years old. So in addition to size, the Russians can boast a newer, faster, more efficient fleet.

It may be that the Soviets will never dominate world shipping. It may be that we need never fear that American im-

ports and exports will some day be moving in ships flying the "hammer and sickle." But the fact that the Soviets are moving ahead at flank speed in the development of their merchant fleet capabilities is an ominous sign. It shows the reliance—economically, militarily, and politically—that the Soviet Union places on its maritime capabilities. Contrast this to our failure as a nation to exploit our technological skills and our failure to exploit the edge we held over everyone else at the end of World War II. One would be justified in assuming that the United States sees no economic, military, or political advantage to having a strong merchant fleet—even though history repeatedly has demonstrated that a nation can neither be strong nor free unless it is a maritime nation.

Someday, Mr. Speaker, we may substitute action for words, and get on with the job of rebuilding our merchant marine. I trust that that time will not be too far off—or otherwise it might be too late to try to rescue our sinking merchant fleet.

#### THE NATIONAL CHILD ABUSE ACT OF 1969

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, there are few realities in life more repugnant to consider than the abuse of a child by his own parents. Yet the social monster of child abuse can be found today among people of every educational, religious, socioeconomic, and geographical background in America. All 50 States have now enacted laws providing for mandatory reporting of suspected cases of child abuse; but the problem remains formidable. Not only must we provide better protection and rehabilitation for the children who have been mistreated, we must also see to it that their parents receive the professional help they need to accept and perform their normal parental roles.

Despite the steps already taken to prevent abuse of children, there is still a long way to go. The legislation I am introducing today known as the National Child Abuse Act of 1969, would help us cover the distance still remaining. It would provide the framework necessary for State and Federal Governments to coordinate a national attack on this terrible problem. The strength of this legislation comes from several powerful sources.

First of all, it provides that as soon as a case of child abuse is reported to the appropriate police authority, the protective services of the State are automatically brought to bear on the welfare of the child. It also would mean that any doctor, social worker, schoolteacher, or welfare worker who knowingly or willfully neglects to report suspected cases of child abuse, would be guilty of a misdemeanor.

The bill also provides immunity from civil or criminal liability for any person, who, in good faith, makes a report pur-

suant to this act. These provisions are particularly important because some State laws still single out the medical profession as the only reporting group. My bill not only requires reporting from all groups which have occasion to observe cases of child abuse, but from any individual who makes a report in good faith. The broader provisions of my bill would therefore increase reporting effectiveness many times over.

Some State laws on child abuse have unwittingly created a strong deterrent to medical reporting by allowing a reporting doctor to become enmeshed in extensive litigation. Any reporting doctor, once burned, is likely to be twice shy. By providing legal immunity for any person reporting in good faith, my bill would effectively remove such a deterrent.

Other provisions of this legislation strike out in new directions. In cases where parents who receive welfare payments are found guilty of child abuse, the bill provides for an immediate cutoff of Federal welfare funds. Funds would also be stopped immediately if it is determined that those parents receiving welfare payments are also drug addicts. Welfare funds involved would then be transferred to the person or agency responsible for the care of the child or children involved. Further, in homes where either parent is a known or reported drug addict, there would be mandatory removal of an abused or neglected child.

The bill also requires that the abused child or children be provided specific legal representation, and it allows a child's legal representative to appeal without delay if he is dissatisfied with the judge's decision. In addition to medical examinations, color photos showing injuries received by the child or children would be allowed as evidence. For parents accused of mistreating children, mandatory psychiatric examinations would be required.

The final, and in some respects most important provision would establish a child-identification system by requiring the Federal Government to issue social security numbers to all newborn babies. It would also be mandatory for hospitals and/or doctors to file the social security number of all children who are being treated because of abuse or neglect. Upon enactment, the provisions of this act would be effective immediately.

The hideous spectre of child abuse has assumed many guises throughout history. For centuries the physical maltreatment of children has been justified on grounds which have ranged from expelling evil spirits and pleasing certain gods, to transmitting educational ideas and maintaining discipline. Modern man, however, is repelled by the savagry of these ancient beliefs, and is reluctant to admit that such cruelty could be practiced today. The tragic evidence, however, is to the contrary. Despite existing legislation, more than 9,000 cases of child abuse were reported in 1968. According to a recent report of the New York Medical Society, the neglect and abuse of children is actually increasing. Only 2 weeks ago, Dr. Vincent Fontana, medical director of the New York Foundling Hospital, stated that: "One or two children are killed—

actually killed—by their own parents every day in this country." Dr. Fontana has called the shocking increase of child abuse an "epidemic which deserves immediate attention."

Though child abuse is an old human phenomenon, what is new today is the increase and violence in the attacks on infants and young children by their parents or other guardians. Beginning in about 1960, evidence documenting this has been steadily accumulating. In 1961 the American Academy of Pediatrics sponsored a symposium on "The Battered Child" which served to focus the spotlight of national attention. A few months later, the Children's Bureau in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare drew up a statement of principles and guidelines for State legislation on reporting cases of child abuse. The gruesome toll continued to rise, and in 1964 the American Medical Association stated that parental abuse of children was probably "a more frequent cause of death than such well-recognized diseases as leukemia, cystic fibrosis, and muscular dystrophy."

Today we realize that the term "child abuse" describes many kinds of maltreatment. But whether we say "battered child," or "neglected child," or "abused child," or simply use the word "cruelty," they all add up to the horrible truth that thousands of children in this country are being killed and maimed with calculated finesse. The American Hospital Association has described some of the major causes of infant deaths:

On record are thousands of cases of "falls." Strangulation followed by passing a pillow against the child's face until death happens frequently. Little ones have been placed on windowsills with the hope that the plunge will be fatal. Bathtubs have long been favorite vehicles for infanticide. Placing babies in ice cold water with a stay in the refrigerator is an effective killer as is boiling water. Sexual assaults are not uncommon. Starvation is resorted to frequently. Children are chained to beds to keep them out of sight.

The unwillingness of normal human beings to face the brutal facts of child abuse is understandable, but it must not be permitted to blunt the force of our concern. The incidence of child abuse is neither isolated nor accidental, but occurs with a terrible regularity.

Congress has both the power and the means to combat this problem. The legislation I am introducing today would permit the final battle to begin. As the noted psychiatrist Robert Coles has observed:

It is nothing short of a scandal that we allow crushed and terrified parents a continuation of their misery in their own children. Surely here there can be no real disagreement about the need for immediate action. Lives are in the balance.

HONORING ED EDMONDSON

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Muskogee area region of the National Congress of American Indians on May 9, 1969,

adopted a resolution honoring our distinguished colleague from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON). The sentiments expressed by this group, representing many thousands of American Indians, are shared by his colleagues in the Oklahoma congressional delegation and by all who know of Ed EDMONDSON's many contributions in behalf of American Indians. Under the unanimous-consent agreement I include the resolution honoring Mr. EDMONDSON:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Congressman Ed Edmondson of Muskogee, Oklahoma, was elected as Congressman for the Second District of Oklahoma in 1952 for the 83rd Congress, and

Whereas, Congressman Edmondson has continuously rendered outstanding service to the Indian people, and

Whereas, Congressman Edmondson has worked tirelessly and unselfishly to improve the social and economic status of the Indian people.

Now therefore be it resolved that Muskogee Area Region of the National Congress of American Indians goes on record commending Congressman Ed Edmondson for his unexcelled service to the Indian people, not only of his own District of Oklahoma, but for all Indians throughout the entire United States.

Adopted this 9th day of May 1969 at Tahlequah, Oklahoma.

HAMPTON W. ANDERSON,  
Regional Vice-President.

Attest.

ELIZABETH SMITH,  
Recording Secretary.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM TO FIGHT HUNGER

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with many of my colleagues in commending President Nixon for his strong and effective program to fight hunger. As the President said, "That hunger and malnutrition should persist in a land such as ours is embarrassing and intolerable."

Despite our vast material abundance and agricultural wealth, many Americans suffer from malnutrition. It is absolutely unacceptable for us to tolerate this situation any longer. It is unacceptable that young children, through no fault of their own, should be stunted in their physical and mental capabilities because proper food is not available.

The President's recommendations are the culmination of several years of study and debate here in the Congress. Last year many of us called on President Johnson to make major improvements in the food stamp and food distribution programs and introduced legislation to create a Special Commission on Hunger. As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I was especially concerned about the importance of food programs for the future of our Nation's young. But no support was forthcoming from either President Johnson or Secretary Orville Freeman.

It is gratifying that we now have a President who is concerned and who is

willing to do more than just talk about solving the problems of our poor.

The major thrust of the President's program will be toward improvement in the food stamp program. Under the program poor families will be provided with enough food stamps to purchase a nutritionally complete diet. The Department of Agriculture estimates this to be \$100 per month for a family of four. The cost will be no greater than 30 percent of the income of the recipients and, for the very poorest they will be provided on a free basis. The food stamp program will be expanded into the 440 counties in the country which do not presently have programs.

Concurrently, there will be a special effort to provide nutritionally rich foods for mothers during pregnancy and for infants. Malnutrition during this period can cause irreparable harm to children. Needy pregnant women and mothers of infants will be issued vouchers, redeemable at food and drug stores for infant formulas and other highly nutritious special foods.

The President has taken an enormous stride forward in our efforts to assure equal opportunities for all our citizens. I hope that we in the Congress will promptly provide him with the legislative tools to make his program effective and, at the same time, provide sufficient funding so that it will not be an empty promise.

We simply must no longer tolerate hunger in this the most abundant nation of all.

#### NEGLECT IS SINKING NATION'S FLEET

### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, today our Nation is observing National Maritime Day, yet our merchant fleet is a sad sixth in the world. The state of our fleet and the problems facing this mighty industry have been well documented by Helen Delich Bentley in the *Baltimore Sun*.

I insert Mrs. Bentley's article from today's edition of the *Sun* at this point in the RECORD:

#### AROUND THE WATERFRONT—NEGLECT IS SINKING NATION'S FLEET

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

As National Maritime Day, 1969, is observed today throughout the United States, all facets of the sadly divided, bitterly segmented industry agree on one point—namely, that the U.S. must determine whether its merchant marine is to become an instrument of national policy.

If it is, a course of rehabilitation and revitalization should be followed.

#### COLD WAR WEAPON

If it is not, then no one should worry any longer whether there are merchant ships on the high seas flying the American flag.

Among the leading nations who use their merchant marines as instruments of their national policy are: the Soviet Union, Japan, Norway and the United Kingdom.

There are many others, but these are the nations one can place at a level with the

U.S., nations whose merchant fleets are important to the U.S. in one way or another—either from the standpoint of friendly competition, or as weapons in the cold war.

#### RUSSIAN POLICY

The Russians have been very blunt in telling the world that they expect to double their present 12,000,000 deadweight tons of merchant shipping by 1980. As they have built up their present tonnage—80 per cent of which is less than ten years old—they have clearly used their merchant ships as instruments in a drive to win over as many nations as they can and to carry out their national policy.

Their small passenger ships are used to transport students from developing countries to Russia to learn, and to bring to them experts and soldiers offering first-hand aid. Their tankers are still built on a small scale so that they can transport Soviet petroleum products directly into the shallow ports of these nations.

The Soviets want more freighters and other cargo carrying vessels so they can increase their own trade, and also to enter more third-flag trade routes in order to earn dollars.

Vikto Bakayev, Minister of Mercantile Marine in the Soviet Union, has stated that his country has taken into consideration the growth of population and the development of world industrial and agricultural production, along with the expansion of trade among the countries of the world. It has reached the conclusion that the scope of international shipping by water will reach 3 to 3½ billion tons by 1980, up from the 2 billion tons in 1968.

#### JAPANESE POLICY

The Russians intend to have enough ships on hand to more than carry their share of that cargo.

The Japanese have prescribed that their merchant marine should carry 60 per cent of the Japanese exports and 70 per cent of the Japanese imports by 1975. To meet this target, it is planned that 2,050 ships of 29 million gross tons will be built in Japanese shipyards between now and 1975.

The Japanese reached that determination after the Ministry of Transport and the Shipping and Shipbuilding Rationalization Council called upon a specially created industry advisory group, the Shipping Policy Division, to "conduct studies on a policy from the National economic viewpoint for the growth of the Japanese shipping industry."

Among the conclusions reached, according to a Tokyo publication, were the following:

1. It is essential to expand the Japanese merchant marine for improvement of the shipping payments position.

2. It is necessary to work out measures for having access to funds needed for expansion of the Japanese fleet of ocean going ships, and for the training of more seamen.

3. Government subsidies are needed to strengthen the Japanese shipping industry's business standing, and to augment its international competitiveness.

The entire existing Japanese merchant marine is less than 15 years old.

On this Maritime Day, 1969, this is the position of the U.S.:

1. The U.S. today is carrying only about 5 per cent of its foreign commerce on American-flag bottoms. This percentage has been dropping sharply every year—from a high of 57.6 per cent in 1960.

2. The U.S. ranks a weak 11th in merchant ship construction in the world.

3. The average age of the U.S. fleet is 23 years; in another 2 years, more than 2 out of 3 ships in the American fleet will be over 25 years in age and totally uneconomical.

4. The U.S. fleet is plagued with critical inter-union bickering.

5. The U.S. active fleet ranks a weak 6th in status in the world.

#### DECISIONS ESSENTIAL

If the U.S. determines that the American merchant marine is to be an instrument of its national policy, the nation must be sold on the idea that a healthy maritime industry not only provides major employment opportunities, but also greatly aids the balance of payments opportunities, while assuring the economy a steady flow of world trade, and the country a necessary defense weapon.

One thing for certain on this National Maritime Day is that the U.S. must soon come to grips with the problem of whether it intends to make the merchant marine an instrument of national policy, or whether it intends to turn over all of its maritime commerce to foreign interests and depend solely on them.

#### MINORITY REPRESENTATION ON SCHOOL BOARDS

### HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in Congress a discussion paper entitled "Minority Representation on School Boards," by Dr. Howard A. Matthews, director of the Division of Manpower Development and Training of the U.S. Office of Education. Dr. Matthews recently presented his paper during a panel discussion at the annual meeting of the National School Boards Association in Miami, Fla., on April 14, 1969. Its contents were highlighted in the education section of the May issue of *Government Executive* magazine.

In his presentation, Dr. Matthews points out the need for overhauling the procedures of school boards so that they might be more responsive to the needs of the people the boards are designed to serve. He makes concrete suggestions as to how this can be accomplished by suggesting various methods of involving people from all segments of the community in the administrative processes of school boards. Dr. Matthews' suggestions not only relate to the operation of school boards, but to the functions of similar administrative bodies which require community involvement as a necessary part of their operation.

The text of the paper by Dr. Matthews is as follows:

#### MINORITY REPRESENTATIONS ON SCHOOL BOARDS

People react to all government in terms of the governmental agency with which they have the most frequent and intimate contact. The public school is that agency for most people. The public reaction to poor administrative practices or procedures of any school board has an erosive effect upon the attitude of the public toward the rapidly proliferating assortment of other local agencies of government, which I shall discuss in a few minutes. This is especially true where the public in general, and minority groups in particular, have little or no real opportunity to participate in making the policies and rules for programs affecting them.

Subsequent to the "poor people's march" on Washington, numerous Federal, State, and local administrative agencies adopted a policy of soliciting minorities to serve on a host of existing or newly created advisory committees. Such committees generally are

oriented to a specific problem area like new school construction, vocational education, etc. The school board, however, is not bound in any way to accept the recommendations of such committees; hence, meaningful participation in the decision-making process is remote at best by this means.

Prominent leaders representing minority groups at the recent White House Conference on Civil Rights asserted that the problems of the Negro and other minorities in the blighted neighborhoods of large city school districts were attributable in large measure to lack of membership on policymaking boards which run the schools. As a solution, several minority group leaders suggested in press interviews that the composition of school boards be altered by the appointment or election of representatives from the minority groups to the boards.

I am not sure the solution to the problem of participation of minorities in running schools really lies in placing a voting member from each minority group or sub-group in a community on all school boards. In Washington, D.C., if each minority group or faction which results in sub-groups were to have voting representation on the school board, the size of the board would be colossal. In fact, the board would probably have to rent Constitution Hall for meetings just to seat its members.

The real issue, it seems to me, is making the school board policy formulation and rule making procedures such that minorities are actually participants in both the form and substance of the policies and rules. This is not to say, however, that one should operate at the exclusion of the other. Certainly other members of this panel will address the problems of recruitment, election, and/or appointment of board members from the minorities of the community. However, with no change in the current practices of policy formulation and rule making by many administrative boards, or where a board has no written codes, or where a board does its business in executive sessions, such membership will be nothing more than a facade. It is to this aspect of the problem that I will address my remarks.

In 1955 the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) and the National School Boards Association (NSBA) issued a joint publication entitled, "Written Policies for School Boards." The impressive agenda for this conference has several sessions devoted to the subject of written school board policies. When all school boards do this, they will have taken a faltering step toward making possible minority participation in management and operation of the schools.

The AASA and NSBA statement said, among other things, that there should be a clear-cut delineation between school district policy and the rules and regulations which implement school district policy. They are two separate functions. The AASA and NSBA, however, stopped short of saying how the board and the superintendent should go about implementing their recommendations. It is with the implementation of these recommendations that a relevant role for minorities (and for all citizens, for that matter) can be found.

Modern students of school board operations and of administrative law agree with this publication of nearly a decade and a half ago. They argue, however, that the school board should devote its energies solely to establishing a broad framework of written policies within which school administrative personnel can function. This frees the school board from having to consider a specific problem and ruling repeatedly on it. This broad framework of policies guides the superintendent and his staff as they make rules and regulations to give effect to the policies. It also provides an orderly mechanism for minorities and others who deal with the board and its agents.

Policymaking is, and rightly should be, a board responsibility. The responsibility for policy implementing rules is usually the ultimate legal responsibility of the board because a board cannot delegate its power to delegate. However, the authority to develop specific rules and regulations must by the very nature of the technical competence required, fall upon and be delegated to superintendents and other professional staff who are constantly available to the public. The old-timers who write in school law and in school administration theory, as a general rule, reject this concept of delegation to superintendents and other employees.

Over the years, gallons of ink have been spilled in the professional educational journals on the subject of delegation by "experts" in school law (usually professors of school administration). They have meticulously drawn a heavy line of demarcation between the duties of superintendents and the authority of boards to delegate discretionary functions to superintendents. The usual authority cited for this position is court of record cases dating back nearly a century. Some of these cases were concerned with fact situations, not actually involving the school community, which occurred when the office of superintendent was something analogous to the modern day secretary of the school board.

These traditional school law experts would restrict the superintendent, as an agent and/or employee of the board to purely ministerial functions. They argue that boards are without authority to delegate any discretionary authority to superintendents in establishing policies or in making rules and, in addition to archaic court cases, cite piously in support of their position the time honored doctrine of "constitutional limitation."

According to this doctrine, there is imposed constitutionally (Federal and State) a separation of powers into the trifurcation—legislative, judicial, and executive. The basic manifestation of this separation doctrine is the maxim against delegated power. This means that what the people have vested in a legislative body by State or Federal constitution cannot be delegated to a subordinate body, let alone redelegated to an administrative officer. Therefore, there has grown over the years a considerable body of theoretical support in the school law and school administration community for the notion that boards of education have no authority to allow superintendents or other administrative officers to promulgate rules having the force and effect of law within the broad framework of written school board policy statements. Superintendents who attempt to work in opposition to this concept frequently find it occupationally hazardous.

It is a matter of historical fact that proscription of such delegated power as well as the rigid separation of constitutional powers of which it is an offshoot have simply failed to survive the ravages of time. The delegation of legislative power, though frequently softened by some authors and jurists with the appellation "quasi," is at this time uniformly acknowledged by students of administrative law as proper and, in fact, as a necessary ingredient of modern government. The demands of citizens for local units of government have simply required the doctrine of separation's virtual emasculation from the national and State scenes, pious pronouncements in a few old court opinions, outdated State constitutions, and articles on school law to the contrary notwithstanding.

As one studies recent legislative enactments, Federal and State, he cannot help but be impressed with the declining specificity in the laws which add necessary new services for people and/or new units of local government.

As life continues to become increasingly more complicated, citizens at the local level demand more specialized services to protect

them from each other, pollution, ignorance, land use, etc. For the most part, State laws create local units of government of all sorts. State laws usually authorize such units to establish rather narrowly specified programs of services. Generally, Federal interest is expressed through "grants-in-aid" or "purchases of services" legislation which use local units of government as "multipliers" to carry out any Federal interest in such services. Specificity in program implementation is accomplished by local agencies through the rule making process. The net result over the past 20 years has been a fantastic proliferation of overlapping local governmental administrative units with rule making powers.

The most recent census of governments indicates that over 90,000 such local units of government operate among the 50 States. These include general purpose units for cities, counties, boroughs, towns, villages; and, special purpose districts presided over by administrative boards which appoint administrative officers responsive to the board, but not directly responsive to the voters. This latter class of agencies is sometimes referred to as a "headless fourth branch of government." The latter group includes such entities as school districts; water, soil, and conservation districts; urban renewal districts; health districts; water pollution districts; sanitation districts; dog abatement districts; mosquito abatement districts; etc. Almost without exception these entities have taxing authority. Most of these local agencies are presided over by an elected or appointed board or commission which is authorized by law to prescribe "... such reasonable rules and regulations not inconsistent with the law as may be necessary. . . ." (I do not remember ever reading an enabling statute authorizing such a new unit of government to make "policies".)

These administrative rules and regulations, having the force and effect of law, control more of the daily activities of the American citizen and occupy more shelf space (those that are written) than do the total statutes at large of the Federal and State governments put together.

Countless such rules and regulations are made daily in all parts of the country by these administrative boards and commissions, often with little regard for the rights, interests, and privileges of the parties affected, and often in "star chamber" executive sessions from which the public is excluded. In legal theory these administrative rules are actually "administrative laws" because, as we have mentioned, they have the full force and effect of a statute.

To illustrate the profusion of local agencies of government, let us examine a single community near Chicago. In it can be found two counties, three townships, a village, four school districts, a sanitary district, a mosquito abatement district, and a tuberculosis sanitarium district. All of these units have differing boundaries. Each was created by a distinct law or set of laws passed by the State legislature, and not one is controlled by any other centralized or coordinating agency of government. Each is managed by one of these administrative boards or commissions whose rules and regulations have the force and effect of law. Each board or its administrator can invoke sanctions that are as valid and binding on minorities, and others, as laws passed by the legislature of the State or the Congress of the United States.

Within the overall Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area of Chicago (a Bureau of Census term for a socially and economically describable area) there were, at last report, six counties, 246 municipalities, 114 township governments, 340 school districts and 354 special districts and the community I described. This intergovernmental complex involves over six million people!

A recent census analysis shows that more than half a million elected public officials preside over local units of government throughout the country. Over half of these units serve fewer than 1,000 persons. The National Commission on Urban Problems in its report to the Congress and to the President on December 12, 1968, found that most of these local governmental units—particularly those related to large urban areas—were extremely small, geographically. Among other things, the report says that about one-half of the municipalities in the average Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) have less than a single square mile of land area. Probably 60 percent are smaller than two square miles, and four-fifths have a land area less than four square miles (corresponding to a square two miles on each side). Fewer than 200 SMSA municipalities in the United States include as much as 25 square miles of land. The average SMSA central city has more than four overlaying local governments.

On the average, there are about 90 units of government per Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, and the average resident of any metropolitan area is served by at least four separate local governments, i.e., county, municipality or township; one or more school districts, plus from one to perhaps a dozen separate special districts concerned with rats, sewers, mosquitoes, dogs, pollution of some sort or another, zoning regulations, etc. In addition to differing population size, boundaries, and purpose, seldom do local units follow the same procedures and practices in exercising their rule making powers.

The racial, ethnic, religious, or other characteristics which identify minority groups tend to complicate the problem by creating a geographical dispersion of minority groups called "de facto segregation." A different minority group mix is found as one moves across local jurisdiction boundaries.

Imagine the confusion that exists when citizens attempt to struggle through this administrative agency labyrinth. Suppose that a member or leader of a local minority group wanted to question a rise in his property taxes in terms of the programs of his school or those he thinks are somehow related to the school. With property taxes levied upon him by three to six separate local taxing units, to which should his protest go? On which board (or how many boards) should he serve to solve the problems?

The following are a few of the simple problems which suggest the frustration, possible indecision and delay he might experience. They are typical of situations which simply having a minority member on one local school board (or any other board for that matter) is not going to completely solve:

1. Police protection in or near schools: Might involve one or more different school districts (some people live in as many as three types of school districts, such as high school, elementary, area vocational school) a municipality; or, in suburbia, perhaps also a county or township.

2. The interrelated neighborhood effects of street cleaning and refuse collection; location of schools and/or public playgrounds; placement and maintenance of public housing; locations of health clinics and welfare service centers; etc. Functions generally handled separately or alternately by municipalities; school districts; special districts for each different type of service; county governments; and/or, one or more combinations of any of these.

3. Health care for school children or the school's relationship to community social welfare and recreation programs. Functions involving school districts; welfare boards; recreation boards; municipal governments; or, perhaps State and federal governmental agencies merely housed locally.

At this time the Congress and various associations of State and local officials are

searching for the coordinating mechanism. Until this mechanism can be found to minimize the uncoordinated operation and overlap of local governmental agencies, it seems to me more important to achieve some consistency in the practices followed by these entities in doing the public's business than to attempt to place one or more "minority" representatives on each governing board, council, or commission.

About ten years ago the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws suggested one solution. Generally, the Commissioners as well as other authorities in administrative law agreed that to protect the rights, interests, and privileges of all citizens the process of policy development and rule making should at least provide:

1. Notice of the proposed policies and rules, amendments, or repeals, to the public, and particularly to interested parties, or parties likely to be affected.

2. Legislative type hearings to afford individuals an opportunity to be heard, both orally and in writing, on proposed policies and rules, amendments, or repeals.

3. Publication and systematic revision and updating of all policies and rules affecting the public. Policies and rules not published and filed with appropriate officials such as chief State school officers, county recorders, clerks of the court, or others having custody of public documents, would have no force or effect.

4. Delayed effectiveness of a policy or rule, amendment, or repeal to allow adjudicative review and an opportunity for affected parties to challenge proposed policies and rules, amendments, or repeals in a court of competent jurisdiction and stay their becoming operable if substantial and material rights of affected parties would be prejudiced because the administrative process or decisions are (a) arbitrary; (b) outside the powers of the board; (c) accomplished without proper regard for the procedure required in policy setting or rule making; (d) in violation of the law or, (e) unsupported by competent evidence in view of the record.

Local public school boards (and all other administrative boards and commissions) should be required to follow a similar orderly and systematic administrative procedure in policy setting, and their agents in rule making, particularly where the rights and privileges of individuals are concerned. In this way, all persons dealing with rule making bodies would have at minimum a simple consistent pattern they can understand and follow.

Much of the unrest among students, teachers, and others in the school enterprise today results from their lack of meaningful involvement in developing policies, rules, and regulations. Additionally, they resent a multitude of "unwritten rules." Something similar to policy and/or rule making (or is rule making) takes place when a particular course of action is repeatedly followed. An administrative practice or policy, even when unannounced or wholly negative, may have the practical effect of a formal written rule—the "this is the way we do it here" kind of thing. The lack of a formal, well-organized rule making process is bad enough without the frustration that exists as citizens, and particularly those from the disadvantaged community, try to wend their way through a choking underbrush of unwritten rules and regulations.

I am convinced that it is highly unlikely that meaningful involvement of minorities with regard to establishing policies and rules and regulations relating to school integration, curriculum innovation, personnel systems, board-superintendent relationships, teacher and student militancy, etc., will be permanently improved on the current piecemeal pressure point basis. They will only begin to approach solutions when clear-cut administrative procedures are established which

boards of education (and other local administrative agencies that I have identified above) must follow in establishing policies or implementing rules that affect the rights, privileges, and interests of citizens, and particularly the parties likely to be affected directly by such policies and/or rules.

There is undoubtedly no more tractless morass in the whole legal bibliography than rules and regulations of the local public administrative boards and agencies.

The problem takes its origin in large measure from the fact that when legislatures have created these various local administrative units in response to the demands of citizens for specialized service of one sort or another, legislatures have not at the same time set forth firm standards by which such agencies exercise their legislative and adjudicative functions. The typical grant of authority to a school board concludes something like this, "... and such board is authorized to make such reasonable rules and regulations not inconsistent with the law and with the rules and regulations of the State Board of Education as may be necessary for its own conduct and for the conduct of the school system."

In some States there are statutes (or court decisions) which require a regular monthly meeting of the school board on a specified date. Only at such meeting may the board pay bills, call for bids, open bids, etc.

"X" number of board members must be present to have a voting quorum, etc., but for the most part, few States tell a local administrative school board, public utility district, mosquito district, or any other kind of an administrative board, the process it must follow in developing policies or in making rules and regulations having the force and effect of law. In other words, there are few (if any) standards prescribed by law (except some derived from a few court cases) which boards must follow in exercising these important legislative and adjudicative functions.

In order to bring about improvement in the practices and procedures of boards in the exercise of the rule making powers and to guarantee protection to the rights, privileges, and interests of minorities, serious consideration should be given by all boards of education (and other administrative boards, for that matter) to the following recommendations:

1. Policy statements should be broad and general. There should not be included within the policy statement the rules setting forth the conditions of policy application, related penalties, enforcement, etc. This should be accomplished by rules and regulations issued by the school administrative staff in the manner outlined in the following statements.

2. All policy statements should be in writing and should be codified by subject matter area, and published. The actual wording of board policy statements should be accomplished by the superintendent or other appropriate school administrative staff members with legal assistance from the school attorney and, where feasible, the State education agency. Policy statements should become final and effective only when established according to the administrative procedures outlined in paragraphs 6 through 14.

3. The rules for implementing board policies should be promulgated by the superintendent or other appropriate administrative school officials. Rules should be codified by subcode numbers which identify the policy statements implemented by such rules. Rules should become effective only after they have been reviewed by the school board for consistency with the policy statements they implement.

4. Each school board should have written by-laws or rules of procedure published in a special publication and available to the

school board, school district employers, and the public. Included in the by-laws should be rules governing both formal and informal procedures the board uses in setting policy and its administrators in developing the rules to implement such policies. All such by-laws, or rules of procedure, should also be filed with the chief State school officer and with local public officials such as the county recorder or clerks of the courts who have general custody of public records in the geographical area served by the district. They also should be placed in all school libraries and in the public libraries in the community, and should be free of charge.

5. To assist persons dealing with the school board or its administrative officials who exercise rule making powers, each board should insofar as practical, supplement its by-laws with descriptive statements of the procedures individuals, organizations, or agencies should follow in dealing with the board, or its administrative officials, in proposing policies to the board or implementing rules to the administrative staff. All contact by such parties with the board should be through the superintendent.

6. At least 30 days prior to the final vote and adoption of any proposed board policy statement (or amendment or repeal) which involves the rights, interests, or privileges of employees, pupils or the public, unless otherwise provided by law, each school board through the superintendent should publish or otherwise circulate in the school district notice of the proposed policy (or amendment or repeal) and afford interested parties, or persons likely to be affected by the proposed policy (or amendment or repeal), an opportunity to submit data or views, orally or in writing, concerning the proposed policy (or amendment or repeal). Such interested or affected persons should be afforded an opportunity to be heard informally before the superintendent or other appropriate administrative hearing officer, if a request for such hearing is filed with the superintendent in writing at least 20 days in advance of the effective date of the proposed policy (or amendment or repeal). Affected parties should be afforded a formal hearing before the board only under circumstances outlined in paragraphs 10 and 11 below.

7. The final voting action upon board policy statements, unless otherwise provided by law, should be in an open public meeting and the vote recorded by member.

8. Policy statements should be adopted by the school board only after the rules to implement such policies have been prepared by the superintendent or other appropriate school administrative official and reviewed by the board to insure consistency with board policy.

9. Each policy statement adopted by the school board and implementing rules promulgated by administrative officials should be filed with the public officials named above. Unless otherwise provided by law, policy statements and proposed rules involving the rights, interests, or privileges of employees, students, or the public should take effect not earlier than 30 days following such filing except that emergency policy statements and rules concerning health, safety, and morals may take effect immediately upon filing.

10. Regarding informal hearings, any person likely to be affected by the provisions of a proposed policy statement (or amendment or repeal) who desires to contest the provisions or intent of the proposed statement, and who requests a hearing in writing delivered to the superintendent at least 20 days in advance of the proposed policy statement, should be afforded an opportunity to appear before the superintendent or other hearing official (other than a school board, or member thereof). The superintendent or other hearing official should make a finding of fact and prepare a written report and proposed written statement of decision for the school

board. Such report and statement should be delivered to all board members and handed or mailed to the party contesting the proposed policy (or amendment or repeal).

11. Concerning formal hearings, any affected party who desires to contest the report of the superintendent provided in paragraph 10, and/or statement of decision prepared by the superintendent or other hearing official for the board and who so requests in writing 10 days following receipt of such materials from the superintendent, should be afforded a formal hearing before the school board, provided, however, that his written request for such hearing shows how such person will be adversely affected or his rights, interests, or privileges impaired or prejudiced by the proposed policy statement of decision for the board prepared by the superintendent or other hearing officials.

12. The affected party contesting the proposed policy statements (or amendments or repeal) should be notified in writing of the formal hearing date, time, and place and the facts at issue at least 10 days in advance of the formal hearing. At such hearing, the complainant should have the right to legal counsel, to examine witnesses, and to present evidence.

13. The decision rendered by the board should be in writing and stated in full in the board minutes. It also should be delivered or mailed to the complainant within five days following the final action of the board.

14. The superintendent and/or other appropriate school administrative officials responsible for the issuance of rules to implement contested policy statements should defer issuing rules implementing a contested policy statement pending adjudicative action by the school board.

15. Any policy statement (or amendment or repeal) involving rights, interests, or privileges, of employees, students, or the public not adopted in conformity with the procedures enunciated in paragraphs 6 through 14, should be void and of no effect.

16. After the complainant has exhausted the remedies described above or otherwise provided by law, he should be able to seek judicial review of the proposed policy statement or rules and regulations, (or amendment or repeal) by filing an action in a court of competent jurisdiction. The reviewing court should be able, at its discretion, to stay the effectiveness of the policy statement or rules and regulations, (or amendment or repeal) upon such terms as it deems proper. The final action of the court should be either to affirm the decision of the board or reverse or modify the decision if substantial rights of the affected party would be prejudiced because the administrative findings, inferences, or decisions are: (a) arbitrary; (b) outside the powers of the board; (c) accomplished without regard for the administrative procedures required in policy setting or rule making; (d) in violation of the law; or (e) unsupported by competent material and substantial evidence in view of the entire record as submitted.

17. The superintendent of schools or other appropriate school administrative official should cause to be published annually a compilation of new policies, and amendments, or repealed policies resulting from board or court action. Such compilations also should include new or amended implementing rules for such policies as a separate section and should be filed with the officials named in paragraph 4, as well as with all administrative officials of the school district, libraries of the community and the school district, and such other individuals, organizations, or agencies as may request these compilations, which should be free of charge.

18. Policy statements of the school board and implementing rules of its officials should be reviewed and revised at least every three years for the purpose of incorporating the content of the annual compilations described in paragraph 17, above.

19. The traditional curriculum for the preparation of the superintendent of schools and other administrative positions should be drastically overhauled to lessen the emphasis upon "court law," increase the emphasis upon administrative law and update archaic statutes.

20. The position of the superintendent of schools should be strengthened by legislation, if necessary, making him an administrative officer with rule making powers to be exercised in the manner described earlier.

The model administrative procedures process which I have suggested may sound a little unwieldy, especially in a society which ambivalently asks for efficiency, speed, and complicated services all at once. What I have suggested is an interim process. It should be refined and become part of any long-range plan to bring order to expanding local governments which have grown like "Topsy."

Because most of the local units of government are creatures of the State either in response to citizen demands for services, or to obtain demands for services, or to obtain the advantage of funds derived from federal sources, the State should take the initiative to eliminate the small and inefficient units of government, and otherwise bring about some degree of consistency in the way units of local government serve the public. Uniformity should not be an end in itself. The strength of a free society lies not in its uniformity but in its diversity. There can be consistency, however, in the procedures employed by such a society in its perfection and perpetuation.

#### SELECTED REFERENCES

- American Association of School Administrators, and National School Boards Association. *Written Policies for School Boards*. Washington, D.C. The Association, 1955.
- Burrus, Bernie R. *Administrative Law and Local Government*. Ann Arbor; Legislative Research Center, University of Michigan Law School, 1963.
- Colvin, A. Howard. *Administrative Procedure Laws in the United States: A Comparative Study*. Austin: Texas Judicial Council, 1957.
- Davis, Kenneth Culp. *Administrative Law Treatises*. Vol. 1, St. Paul: West Publishing Company, 1958.
- Gruening, Ernest H., Senator from Alaska. "Rules Versus Policies in Education, The Views of Howard A. Matthews". Statement on the Floor of the United States Senate, Congress of the United States. *Congressional Record—Senate*. Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C. June 27, 1967. Vol. 113, No. 102.
- Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States. "Employment and Manpower Problems in the Cities; Implications of the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders". *Hearings Before the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress of the United States*. 90th Congress, 2nd Session, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. May 28, 29, June 4, 5, and 6, 1968.
- Matthews, Howard A., "The Rule Making Power of Public School Boards—An Analysis of the Practices and Procedures of Selected Boards". *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation*. The George Washington University, Washington, D.C. June 1964.
- , "Differentiate Between Policies and Rules". *The American School Board Journal*, May 1967.
- Muskie, Edmund S., Senator from Maine, "The Challenge of Creative Federalism". Statement on the Floor of the Senate of the Congress of the United States. *Congressional Record—Senate*. Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C., March 26, 1966. Vol. 112, No. 52.
- National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. *Uniform Laws Annotated*. Brooklyn: Edward Thompson Company. Vol. 90, 1957.

National Commission on Urban Problems, Paul H. Douglas, Chairman; "Building the American City. Report of the National Commission on Urban Problems to the Congress and to the President of the United States". *House Documents No. 91-34, 91st Congress, 1st Session*. Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C. December 12, 1968. 500 pages.

Netzer, Dick. "Impact of the Property Tax—Effect on Housing, Urban Land Use, Local Government Finance". Supplied by the National Commission on Urban Problems to the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress of the United States. 90th Congress, 2nd Session. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1968.

Reuss, Henry S. Congressman from Wisconsin, "The State and local Government Modernization Act of 1969; A Program of Federal Grants to States which Take Steps to Modernize State and Local Government". Statement on the Floor of the House of Representatives, Congress of the United States. *Congressional Record—House*. Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C. January 8, 1969. Pages 328-331.

Ways, Max. "Creative Federalism and the Great Society". *Fortune*: January 1966, page 121 ff.

### THE DETERIORATION OF OUR MARITIME FLEET

**HON. WILLIAM D. FORD**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, once again the observance of Maritime Day finds us facing a crisis in terms of our merchant marine capabilities. The deterioration of our fleet has reached the point that we soon may have to consider that the United States no longer has a fleet.

This fact is especially alarming in light of the present state of international affairs, for the importance of sea power, particularly in time of emergency, cannot be underestimated.

It is essential that we have adequate sea transportation resources in times of crisis. But we cannot expect to have a merchant marine capable of reacting to world crises unless we develop that fleet in peacetime.

Yet what are we doing, Mr. Speaker? We have so ignored this fact that today, nearly 95 percent of our trade moves in foreign-flag vessels. And we have no assurance that these vessels—which profit so handsomely from our peacetime trade—would be made available to us in time of crisis. In fact, Mr. Speaker, past history suggests quite the opposite.

Presently, our most formidable rival in world affairs—the Soviet Union—is engaged in a massive merchant marine expansion program. Unless we do something, it is quite apparent that the Russian merchant fleet will easily outrank ours in the next few years.

I feel it is in the national interest for the United States to restore the merchant marine to its proper place among the fleets of the world. This will insure our Nation's security against any future crisis—it will help us improve our balance-of-payments position—and it will add to our domestic economic strength.

I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that there are bills pending in this session of the Congress to achieve the goal of a healthy, balanced merchant marine; in fact, I have the privilege of being a cosponsor of several of the bills in question. It is my urgent hope that we get moving on this legislation, so that our actions in support of our merchant marine more nearly parallel our words of praise for the role this industry plays in war and peace.

**JOHN CARDINAL WRIGHT**

**HON. JAMES G. FULTON**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

DIOCESE OF PITTSBURGH,  
Pittsburgh, Pa., May 14, 1969.

HON. JAMES FULTON,  
New Federal Building,  
Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR MR. FULTON: Enclosed please find a copy of a brief biographical sketch of John Cardinal Wright.

Your office had asked for some biographical information that might be used as an introduction in conjunction with the news articles carried in the New York Times. This biography was put together by the Cardinal's office for just such purposes.

I hope this suits your purposes and is of some help.

Many thanks, again, for joining the Cardinal and his party in Rome at the time of his elevation to the College of Cardinals.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. DONALD W. WUERL.

[From the New York Times, May 3, 1969]  
POPE NAMES WRIGHT, NEW U.S. CARDINAL, TO OVERSEE CLERGY

(By Robert C. Doty)

ROME, May 2.—John Cardinal Wright, Bishop of Pittsburgh, was named today by Pope Paul VI to head the Vatican congregation dealing with the problems of an increasingly turbulent Roman Catholic priesthood.

The 59-year-old prelate becomes prefect of the Congregation of the Clergy, which is responsible for the supervision of the spiritual welfare of priests. He replaces Jean Cardinal Villot, the Frenchman who was named Wednesday as the new Vatican Secretary of State, in effect its Premier and Foreign Minister.

Pope Paul also published today an apostolic constitution consolidating and making definitive the changes in the missal, the Catholic prayer book, that were decreed by the Ecumenical Council Vatican II and further refined by the 1967 meeting of the Synod of Bishops.

A Vatican spokesman, presenting the document, answered a question whether it foreclosed further liturgical experiment by saying that the constitution was "definitive." The changes in the missal, the first major ones since it was promulgated in 1570, deal mainly with the wording of the liturgy and the celebration of the Eucharist.

The Pope also ended the 1,900-year-old rule that women must cover their heads in church. He did this by not mentioning the practice, an omission that Vatican spokesmen said repealed the rule.

The Boston-born Cardinal Wright is the third United States churchman to reach prefectorial rank in the central administration of the Catholic church. The late Samuel Cardinal Stritch of Chicago was named prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in 1958, but died before assuming the post, and Francis Cardinal Brennan, a Pennsylvanian, was briefly head of the Congregation of the Sacraments before his death in Rome last July.

#### FOUR WERE ELEVATED

Cardinal Wright was one of four United States prelates elevated to the Sacred College of Cardinals this week.

After his appointment today, Cardinal Wright, in a speech to the clergy of his titular Roman church, Jesus the Divine Master, declared his position to be one of social openness and theological caution.

"In our moment of history," he said, "the history of the church and the history of mankind, a 'liberal' social attitude and 'progressive' spirit are the need of the hour. But these require as an indispensable condition of their health and effectiveness a jealous regard for doctrinal soundness, a commitment to the faith that is unqualified save for human frailty."

Far from being incompatible, he said, theological and doctrinal conservatism and social progressivism were natural allies, "particularly in the crisis of our present culture, our political order, our very civilization."

#### U.S. PRIESTS IN MOVEMENT

With United States priests contributing a large share of the clerical "contestation" of authority, it is considered here to be appropriate that an American prelate should be charged with responsibility for their spiritual welfare.

Discussing the changes in the missal, one expert said that the over-all effect of the Pope's document was to "promote the whole idea of a simpler, unified approach, a single ceremony involving closely priests and faithful."

Such profound changes as the turning around of altars so that the celebrant priest faces the communicants and the authorization of masses in vernacular tongues instead of Latin have been in effect since the end of the Ecumenical Council in 1965.

Other changes have been the subject of authorized experiment—and sometimes unauthorized, as in jazz masses—pending the final codification published today.

#### EBULLIENT, INTELLECTUAL PRINCE OF THE CHURCH: JOHN JOSEPH WRIGHT

(By Damon Stetson)

Several years ago John Joseph Wright, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Pittsburgh, was asked how many people he had in his diocese.

"More than two million," he replied, causing a reaction of disbelief in his questioner, who knew that there were not two million Roman Catholics in the Pittsburgh area.

"No," the Bishop agreed, "but there are more than two million souls, and a bishop is not just the bishop of the Catholics."

The stocky, gregarious prelate, who was elevated to the College of Cardinals this week and was named yesterday as prefect, or head, of the Vatican Congregation of the Clergy, demonstrated during his years in Pittsburgh his belief that every person in his diocese had a claim on him. Nearly every aspect of the city's religious, civic and cultural life felt the impact of his intellect and strong personality.

No sectarian shepherd, Cardinal Wright, who is 59 years old, brought a vision to his flock that embraced national Catholic problems, a deep concern about peace and an ecumenical spirit. He has been described as both a theological conservative and a social militant.

## A FOE OF RACE DISCRIMINATION

Last fall he headed the committee drafting a pastoral letter at a meeting of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in Washington. Some liberal priests were dismayed because the letter supported Pope Paul VI in his reaffirmation of the ban on artificial means of birth control.

On the other hand, the new cardinal has been a leader in campaigns to eliminate job discrimination and to achieve social justice and civil rights for Negroes. In the summer of 1967, he spoke out strongly against the Vietnam war, calling it "a morally dubious mess" and urging the end of the bombing. He was equally vehement in condemning Vietcong "atrocities."

Cardinal Wright has the heavy build and hearty ebullience of a long-distance truck driver that belie the manner and intellect that won him a reputation as one of America's most brilliant prelates. He has always derived pleasure from simply mingling with people and he delights in plunging into a crowd and indulging in small talk. (He speaks fluent Italian and French.)

The oldest of six children, Cardinal Wright was born in the Dorchester section of Boston on July 18, 1909.

Nights and summers he worked as a stock boy at the Hyde Park branch of the Boston Public Library for 25 cents an hour. That job and another in the city room of *The Boston Post* helped him pay his way through Boston College, where he won more academic and debating honors. The class of 1931 voted him the member who had done the most for the college.

He then entered St. John's Seminary in Brighton, Mass. At the end of a year he was one of the top two in his class and was sent to Rome to finish his studies at the Pontifical Gregorian University.

He was ordained a priest in the chapel of the North American College in Rome on Dec. 8, 1935, and remained to continue his studies at the Gregorian University. In 1939, he received the doctorate in sacred theology after having done voluntary parish work abroad in England, Scotland, and France.

Returning to Massachusetts, he became a professor of philosophy at St. John's Seminary, Brighton, and in 1943 was appointed secretary to the Archbishop of Boston, William Cardinal O'Connell. Named a monsignor in December, 1944, he rose to the rank of domestic prelate in 1946 and was consecrated Titular Bishop of Aegae and Auxiliary Bishop of Boston in 1947. In 1950, Worcester, Mass., became the see city of a new diocese and he was appointed to head it.

When Bishop John F. Dearden, who also became a Cardinal this week, was appointed Archbishop of Detroit in 1958, Cardinal Wright was named as his successor in Pittsburgh and was installed as the eighth Bishop there on March 18, 1959.

While in Pittsburgh, Cardinal Wright formed the Catholic Diocese Commission on Human Relations, initiated the policy of having laymen on the Catholic School Board and got the diocese involved in Project Equality, an interfaith group to promote equal employment.

He also urged greater attendance in Catholic schools by Negro children and initiated the Labor Day Mass, now an annual event.

## BIOGRAPHY OF HIS EMINENCE JOHN CARDINAL WRIGHT

Ever since he first began his priestly work in Boston, Cardinal-Designate John J. Wright has been revered by all who have come in contact with him and who have heard him speak. In many of his memorable talks it has been difficult at times not to feel that there was something unconsciously biographical about them. At any rate, the years seem to have proved it to be so for he now is to become a Cardinal.

Perhaps one could find this unconsciously biographical sense in an address he made in Boston just before becoming the first Bishop of Worcester and just nine years before he became the eighth Bishop of Pittsburgh. In that address he described the life and times of Boston's first Catholic Bishop, John Cheverus. He related that Bishop Cheverus was a man of letters, a preacher extraordinary; an ecumenist before the word was even known as it is today; that he was a tireless traveler in ministering to his people; that the distressed and the poor were his continued preoccupation; that he became a beloved figure in his community; and that he was remembered long after he left Boston—and that his Church named Bishop Cheverus a Cardinal.

The same fits Cardinal Wright. The biography of Bishop Cheverus which he related could be the exact description of the life and times of Cardinal Wright. For the nine years Cardinal Wright labored in Worcester and for the last ten years that he has been Bishop of Pittsburgh, he has left his indelible mark on the hearts of all he has served. A man of prodigious activity, his energy has seemed boundless and his wide scope of interests has been all-encompassing. Pope John XXIII found in him the right man in the right place in the preparatory work of Vatican II. Pope Paul VI found in him, too, the right man to continue in a permanent capacity much of the actual work of Vatican II. His influence there was probably greater than that of any other American. In the Council's conduct and ultimate results his hand was very much apparent. Since the days of the Council he has pre-occupied himself with the search for lasting peace among nations—one of his earliest interests—and the ways in which the Church can both serve and save man in a world perilously close to the chaotic. He only recently attended an Interim World Conference for Religion and Peace in Istanbul, Turkey, where it was established that a permanent Conference will be held in Kyoto, Japan, in September, 1970.

One of his former students in the seminary, Monsignor Francis J. Lally, in a profile for the Boston *Pilot*, said that it has been Cardinal Wright's style that has set him so much apart over the years. His work has been done impressively, but the manner in which it was done has added to its special quality, for his has been a work of joy because it has rested in faith. Long recognized for his intelligence, his industry and administrative ability and often for his wit, he has made a singular, although often lonely, attempt to interpret to Americans generally the meaning of the Church and its message, in terms that would have contemporaneous comprehensibility. He has met with wit—but always with wisdom—the issues of the day in the pulpit, on the platform, and in the press, focusing upon them the revealing light of the traditional faith and illuminating the options available to the committed Christian. In his more than 20 years as a Bishop, he has offered a leadership in the ancient tradition of the Church Fathers which does not fear to judge the world even while evangelizing it.

The many accomplishments of Cardinal Wright in Boston and Worcester have been repeated in his all-too-short 10 years as Bishop of Pittsburgh and its diocese of 900,000 souls. His work in the ecumenical field has been predominant in that he willingly appeared with Protestant and Jewish programs very frequently. He established the Labor Day Mass at St. Paul's Cathedral and it has become an annual feature now held in the Civic Arena because of the vast crowds that attend. He established the Diocesan Ecumenical Council in 1964 and also introduced the Institute of the Person and the Common Good in Western Pennsylvania in cooperation with the Council of Churches and Jewish organizations of the area. The

crowning point to most was the Cardinal's dialogue sermon with Bishop Nichols of the Methodist Church during the 1969 Prayer Service for Christian Unity. His work in Project Equality for Western Pennsylvania is well known. He has been active day and night in all human relations efforts and in all civic and humanitarian programs, particularly those for children, the poor and the babies of unwed mothers.

These works have extended even beyond Pittsburgh—to the extreme poor of Chimbote, Peru, where today Pittsburgh has a contingent of priests and nuns assigned to work in the mission that is closest to the Cardinal's heart. The fruits of their accomplishments take bud in the same zeal at work in Pittsburgh where dozens of parish groups, the Diocesan Council of Catholic Women and a special active group of active laymen called the Chimbote Founders, stand behind the missionaries with material and moral support. Cardinal Wright has made four personal visits to Chimbote since 1962.

During his tenure in Pittsburgh Cardinal Wright has ordained 152 seminarians to the priesthood, established 21 new parishes and merged three others to give the diocese of six counties 319 parishes and 26 missions in all. His work in the field of education, too, has brought him commendation from Catholic and public educators throughout the country. He has established 25 new elementary and 10 new secondary schools. He also established St. Paul's Seminary in Crafton, founded the Pittsburgh Oratory and established the Lay Volunteer Apostolate; converted McGuire Memorial Nursing Home at New Brighton to a facility for retarded children from birth to seven years of age.

From the time of Cardinal Wright's student days in the Eternal City to these last few years centering around Vatican II, he has never been more at home than when he walked Roman streets, prayed in Roman churches and lived under Roman skies.

He is first and foremost Boston, although not of the "proper" Bostonians as the Cabots and the Lowells, but the bright, confident and immensely practical Irish-Catholic Bostonians who have left their mark on the city.

He also is a son of Paris, but not the Paris of today, as the Greensburg *Accent* noted; rather, the 17th Century Paris with its great theologians and preachers—the Paris of Bossuet, Bourdaloue and others, the capital that still echoed the faith of the people of the little villages such as Domremy and Chinon, of which city on the Loire the new Cardinal is an honorary citizen (as was Rabelais!).

Above all, Cardinal Wright is a son of Rome where he was mostly formed; Rome, which he identifies with civilization. In Rome and what it stands for he sees abiding values, rising phoenix-like above depredations of barbarians, new and old. He is a son of Rome that produced such Cardinal-theologians as Bellarmine, Franzelin and others.

If it be true that Cardinal Wright now goes to Rome to serve, Pittsburgh and Western Pennsylvania will have lost a Bishop and Worcester and Boston a friend. But the Church throughout the world will have gained a leader.

## QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS, 1969

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I have recently tabulated the returns from my 1969 congressional questionnaire which was sent to all boxholders in the Minnesota Sixth Congressional District.

I found the answers to these questions very interesting and most helpful to me.

Because I think my colleagues, too, will find this tabulation both interesting and helpful, with your permission, I hereby insert the tabulations of results in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ZWACH 1969 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS, SIXTH DISTRICT, MINNESOTA, MAY 22, 1969

[Answers in percent]

1. Do you believe social security and veteran's benefits should be increased to keep pace with the cost of living?

Yes ----- 76  
No ----- 19

2. Do you favor expulsion of students who violently disrupt the academic life of colleges and universities?

Yes ----- 93  
No ----- 5

3. Do you favor lowering the voting age from 21?

Yes ----- 31  
No ----- 64

4. Do you favor returning to the States and local governments, a percentage of the money now collected in Federal income taxes?

Yes ----- 81  
No ----- 12

5. Do you approve the President's order to take politics out of the Post Office?

Yes ----- 90  
No ----- 6

6. Should the Federal Government provide programs of incentives and aid to help create jobs in the countryside?

Yes ----- 64  
No ----- 27

7. Do you believe economic equality for agricultural producers can best be established by—

Maintaining present price support policies? ----- 22

Returning to free market operations? ----- 26

Providing increased bargaining power for farmers? ----- 39

Long-term retirement of crop acres? ----- 13

8. Do you favor placing a limit on farm crop diversion payments?

Yes ----- 75  
No ----- 11

9. Do you favor increased Federal aid to private and parochial schools?

Yes ----- 38  
No ----- 55

10. Do you believe the Voyageurs' National Park would be an economic asset to Minnesota?

Yes ----- 62  
No ----- 24

11. Do you believe the U.S. Post Office Department should have the authority to declare printed matter obscene, thus non-mailable?

Yes ----- 74  
No ----- 19

12. Do you believe the 10 percent surtax should be—

Continued until inflation is under control? ----- 53

Removed this year under any circumstances? ----- 37

13. In regard to the electoral college, would you—

Keep present system? ----- 11  
Abolish it and elect the President by direct popular vote? ----- 69

Apportion the electoral vote of each State on the basis of each candidate's vote in that State? ----- 14

Award electoral votes by congressional districts? ----- 6

14. Which selective service proposal do you favor—

Continuing the present system? ----- 28  
A draft lottery at age 18? ----- 26  
A volunteer career military service? ----- 43

15. Do you favor the appointment of Federal judges for a definite term of years, subject to reappointment?

Yes ----- 76  
No ----- 14

16. Do you believe legislation is needed to properly protect automobile insurance policy holders?

Yes ----- 80  
No ----- 11

17. Do you feel the President is exercising good leadership in his efforts to reduce world tensions?

Yes ----- 71  
No ----- 13

18. Considered the greatest problems facing our Nation today were, in order: Vietnam, Inflation, Law & Order, Student Unrest, and Low Rural Income.

PRESIDENT NIXON SHOULD HOLD ASSAULT ON JOB CORPS

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, when the Nixon administration first leaked its intent to smear those Job Corps centers scheduled for closing, I issued my challenge for the President to reveal his information rather than just hint at the shocking extent of scandal in an effort to frighten off persons interested in saving the program. The matter of scandal in the Job Corps was handled in the same "if you only knew what we knew" strategy being perpetrated by this administration.

I call to the attention of my colleagues the excellent comment of Columnist Carl T. Rowan who addressed himself to the subject of the Nixon assault on the Job Corps. The column appeared in the May 18 Sunday Washington Star.

The column follows:

PRESIDENT NIXON SHOULD HALT ASSAULT ON JOB CORPS

(By Carl T. Rowan)

It surely reflects no credit on the Nixon administration that it has begun to leak "horror" stories to the press to justify closing 59 Job Corps centers.

But, just as many Job Corps supporters expected, the governmental hatchet artists have leaked "secret" reports of rape, narcotics use, homosexuality, larceny, and theft by Job Corps trainees. The obvious ploy is to build up enough resentment among "decent" Americans to force silence on the part of Congressmen who are trying to convince President Nixon to leave the centers open.

Now what about the "secret" reports that are so full of horror stories?

As director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Sargent Shriver was acutely aware that Job Corps trainees had not been re-

cruited directly from Sunday school. Many of these youngsters were from the toughest ghetto areas where violence, theft, sexual assault are not exactly a rarity. Knowing that some serious misbehavior was inevitable, Shriver set up inspection teams to uncover it immediately so that the Job Corps and OEO could take necessary corrective actions.

This is the information that Labor Department officials were referring to in what Rep. Carl D. Perkins, D.-Ky., called "the lowest-down press release I ever saw in my life."

Labor Department officials have subsequently disavowed the leak, no doubt because instead of producing a sanctimonious cry of outrage against the Job Corps it produced angry indignation on the part of people who consider the "rape-homosexuality" ploy a shabby way to buttress a bad decision.

The National Council of Catholic Women, Church Women United, the National Council of Negro Women, and the National Council of Jewish Women issued a statement saying that "circulation of such stories is an immoral tactic which blatantly damages the reputation of every young woman who ever attended the Job Corps." They commended "the courage and compassion of those Senators who have introduced a resolution to prevent the mass shutdown of Job Corps centers."

Even the National Police Conference on Police Athletic League and Youth Activities, hardly a "bleeding liberal" organization, jumped into the fray with both feet.

Capt. Harry Untereiner, executive director of the group, referred to 200 boys enrolled in a police training school at the Camp Kilmer, N.J., Job Corps center. He said not one of the "horror" incidents described in the Labor Department leak had occurred at this school.

He said the Police Athletic League has dealt with socially deprived and economically depressed boys and girls for over 25 years and it knows that early misbehavior stems from their social environment.

Noting that "Job Corps was not formed . . . to train the upper middle class, the wealthy or rich," Untereiner said that, nonetheless, "if we look at the suburban areas of our metropolitan centers, we will find there is more drug addiction, homosexuality, and other sex offenses committed proportionately in those areas than there is on or near Job Corps centers."

At the Kilmer center in 1967 there were no rape cases; the FBI reported 5,306 rapes among 16 to 21-year-olds in the nation as a whole. There were 22 narcotics violations at Kilmer as against 48,806 in the same age group as a whole. There were 71 assault cases among the 2,100 Kilmer trainees and 25,875 in the general 16-21 population. There were 65 cases of larceny-theft at Kilmer and 142,995 in the broader population, estimated at 20,640,300 in the 16-21 category.

While the Administration fumbles for ways to defend its decision, thousands of youths are drifting back to areas where they are really likely to produce some horror stories. Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz has said only 800 youngsters have dropped out since the announcement that 59 centers would be closed. An OEO source says 4,500 have dropped out.

Shultz says 1,400 Job Corps enrollees have been placed in other manpower programs. Telegrams going to Perkins's office say it isn't so and isn't likely to be so because many of the youngsters cannot qualify for other manpower programs.

All this disruption comes just when the Job Corps was making inroads with the craft unions, long an impregnable barrier to the entry of newcomers, Negroes especially, into various trades. The Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators & Paperhangers of America has entered contracts with 38 centers, guaranteeing apprenticeships for Job Corps trainees. Similar pacts had been made with the AFL-CIO Marine Cooks and Stewards Union, the

United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, the International Union of Operating Engineers, and the Kentucky State Building Trades Council.

In the name of economy, or puritanism, or something, someone has sold President Nixon a very bad bill of goods. He ought to renounce it immediately.

TRIBUTE TO THE STEUBEN SOCIETY

**HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the Steuben Society of America, celebrating its 50th anniversary, has a long and proud history of service to our Nation. Composed of Americans of German descent, it was formed on principles emulating those of Gen. Fredrich Wilhelm von Steuben, for whom the society is named.

The organization was formed in 1919 for the purpose of promoting everything that is good in German character and culture, and that might accrue to the benefit and welfare of the whole American Nation. Its basic principles are on the highest level of loyalty, patriotism, and devotion to the American Nation. Its creed perhaps best illustrates the principle to which this organization has been devoted:

One country—A country so fair, tolerant and just that all who live in it, may love it.

One flag—An American flag for American purposes only.

One language—The language of truth spoken in any tongue in which one chooses to speak it.

The aims and purposes of this society are on the highest plane of patriotism, of devotion, and of service to America. They stand for the aid and support of the American Constitution, for aid in defending the independence and sovereignty of the United States, for urging its members to participate in all phases of national life, for offering guidance to its members in making them better citizens.

The society has adopted the name of General von Steuben in continuation of the principles and ideals of this great general. Often referred to as "maker of the American Army" General von Steuben was a Revolutionary War hero who became Inspection General of the American Continental Army.

General von Steuben was born and educated in Germany and served in the forces of King Frederick the Great of Prussia. Recruited by Benjamin Franklin in Paris, he traveled to the American colony in 1778, and immediately joined George Washington at Valley Forge. There he undertook the training of the American forces, and prepared the "Regulations for the Order and Discipline of the Troops of the United States," which became the handbook of the Continental Army.

The year before his honorable discharge from the Army in 1784, he was made an American citizen by the Pennsylvania Legislature. Through his influ-

ence in converting the American Army into an effective and highly disciplined military force, he was an indispensable figure in the achievement of American independence. Because of his dedication to America and to the principles of liberty, the German-American society adopted his name, and, during a half century of loyalty, patriotism, and love for the United States, it has brought additional honor to this great man's memory.

DOUGLAS TAX FRAUD

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Justice Bill Douglas' involvement with tax-exempt foundations and the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions finds his tax-free income source jeopardized by tax deficiencies and fraud penalties. "Good behavior" can hardly be construed to include this.

There is only one solution for Mr. Justice Douglas—follow the example of his brother, Fortas, and resign.

When a Supreme Court Justice has disgraced the Court, why should he insist on such formalities as impeachment?

I include in the RECORD a news clipping from the Washington Daily News: [From the Washington Daily News, May 22, 1969]

FOUNDATION'S HOTEL: DOUGLAS LINKED TO TAX ACTION

(By Dan Thomasson)

The Nixon Administration has initiated a \$4.2 million claim for tax deficiencies and fraud penalties against a Las Vegas hotel-casino whose earnings in part have supported the tax-exempt Albert Parvin Foundation headed by Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas.

The Government claims the Fremont Hotel Corp. owes most of the extra money because it skimmed off part of its crap table earnings before reporting them to the IRS.

The Fremont is owned by the Parvin-Dohrmann Co., whose stock until recently made up a portion of the Parvin Foundation's portfolio. The foundation recently announced it had sold its Parvin-Dohrmann stock. The foundation also has derived income from an interest in the Flamingo Hotel, another Las Vegas gambling establishment.

THREE-YEAR PERIOD

The Internal Revenue Service claim against the Fremont is for the years 1962, 1963 and 1964—before it was acquired by Parvin-Dohrmann. It was filed on March 7 and states that for those years the casino failed to report more than \$5.3 million from its gambling operations.

"It is determined that the omitted income is the result of an underestimate of gross income from crops," the Government claim states. (Such alleged withholding of part of the profits of gambling is known as "skimming.")

In addition, IRS contends that several tax deductions, including those for real estate depreciation and interest, should be disallowed. At one point, the IRS states, deductions claimed by Fremont Hotel Corp. for interest actually were distributions to stockholders.

The Fremont's attorneys, however, have

contested the deficiency and penalty claims on grounds they are inaccurate and that the company's books are correct. They have filed a petition for determination in U.S. Tax Court here.

The IRS civil action against the Fremont follows a Federal criminal charge of income tax evasion thru "skimming" against Edward Levinson, a former Fremont owner who was retained as an executive of the hotel when it was bought by the Parvin-Dohrmann Co. in 1966.

Levinson, who had been a business partner of Robert G. (Bobby) Baker, former secretary to the Senate Democrats, in a corporation once represented by resigned Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas, entered a no contest plea in Federal court in Las Vegas to charges of having helped file a false tax return. Levinson was fined \$5,000 March 28, 1967.

The Government then moved to dismiss other charges against Levinson and against five others, three of whom were former employe-stockholders of the Fremont.

SUIT DROPPED

Two days later Levinson dropped his \$2 million invasion-of-privacy suit, filed three years earlier against four FBI agents whom he had accused of electronic bugging of his hotel office. The Justice Department admitted having installed the electronic device which had picked up conversations between Baker and Levinson in 1962. The bugging incident has been used by Baker to support claims he was the victim of massive Federal eavesdropping in his present appeal from convictions handed down in 1967.

The mild penalty given Levinson and his decision thereafter to drop the suit against the FBI brought immediate charges in Congress of a deal.

But Mitchell Rogovin, then assistant attorney general in charge of the tax division, denied any deal had been made with Levinson. Mr. Rogovin since has gone into private practice with Mr. Fortas' old law firm, Arnold and Porter.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS PROTESTS JOB CORPS CLOSING

**HON. ED EDMONDSON**

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the League of Women Voters of Bartlesville, Okla., has joined the growing number of individuals and groups who believe 59 of our Job Corps centers should not be closed.

Mrs. Walter Cox, president of the league in Bartlesville has written me to express the league's position, and some very good points are made. I would like to have this statement by the League of Women Voters of Bartlesville appear in the RECORD, and I would particularly like to call attention to the league's concern that provisions be made for all enrollees if the centers are to be closed.

The letter follows:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF BARTLESVILLE, Bartlesville, Okla., May 16, 1969.

Re opposition to abrupt closing of Job Corps centers.

HON. ED EDMONDSON, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EDMONDSON: The League of Women Voters of Bartlesville opposes the abrupt

closing of 59 Job Corps Centers on July 1. We are aware that these centers have been experimental but have supported them as a means to try to provide equal opportunity for education and employment to the disadvantaged. It seems unrealistic to assume that adequate replacement facilities could be set up by July 1. We feel that it is important that the training programs which have been started be continued and that all enrollees have a place to go when the present centers are closed.

We know that you have opposed closing of the two centers in Oklahoma. Your concern for this program and the other anti-poverty measures has the support of the Bartlesville League.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. WALTER COX,  
President, Bartlesville League  
of Women Voters.

## SERIOUS GAPS IN OUR EDUCATIONAL GOALS

**HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the great lipservice that is being paid to educational goals on all levels, the squeeze grows tighter in the educational field. There must be a greater understanding on all levels of the problems involved. Recently, I touched upon some of these matters in an address to the Student Financial Aid Administrators of the State and City Universities of New York.

The text of my address follows:

### SERIOUS GAPS IN OUR EDUCATIONAL GOALS

(Address of Hon. BERTRAM L. PODELL, before the Student Financial Aid Administrators of the State and City Universities of New York, State University Conference Center, Oyster Bay, L.I., New York, May 16, 1969)

Ladies and gentlemen, I am very happy to be with you this morning. And I am particularly pleased to be addressing an audience which shares so deeply with me the interest and involvement in higher education as you do. Never have the problems of our colleges and universities been more critical than they are today. Enrollments have increased by nearly 4 million students in the past decade. Today some 7.5 million students are attending our colleges and universities and more than 700,000 of these students are here in New York. The expression "college squeeze" can now be taken literally.

But the rapid increase in numbers is only one aspect of higher education's growth. The functions and the activities of the colleges have greatly expanded. We expect our colleges and universities not only to train the professionals needed in government, industry, education, science and medicine, but we expect them to invest greater energy in public service functions, to concentrate more of their resources on the solution of many of our social problems. We also expect them to conduct research in nearly every possible area, especially those areas considered to be of national interest.

As you know, this expansion of higher education in terms of both quantity and quality has been expensive. Inflation has aggravated the problem. And it is likely that higher education costs per student will continue to rise. It is true that tuitions have been raised at a startling rate. But it is also true that income from tuition and fees is paying for a smaller and smaller percentage of overall college costs. I think that it has

become apparent that institutions can not realistically look to this source of income to meet their costs. As one college president put it, mounting tuition costs are "pricing us out of the market . . . we are reaching a point of diminishing returns." The effect is, of course, that of putting college beyond the reach of a larger and larger segment of our college-age population.

The institutions rightfully look to the State governments and to the Federal government for greater levels of support. The States are making an impressive effort. In 1968-69 the States appropriated some \$4.5 billion for colleges and universities. This is nearly a 40% increase over 2 years ago and a 224% increase over an 8 year period. New York kept pace with a 37% increase over 1966-67 expenditures.

There are, of course, the private sources of support and it has not been proven that these have been tapped to their fullest. Corporate philanthropy currently represents a small percentage of institutional income. Apparently alumni, and presumably those in corporate positions as well, are fairly ignorant of the financial situation of our institutions of higher learning.

A special study conducted by the council for financial aid revealed that "82 percent of persons in managerial positions or the professions do not consider American business to be an important source of gift support for colleges and universities. 59 percent of persons with incomes of \$10,000 or over do not think higher education has financial problems. 52 percent of college graduates apparently are not aware that their alma mater has financial problems." This is certainly a discouraging revelation but I think it gives the institutions an indication of a serious communications gap which needs to be corrected.

Some publicity has been given to the opportunities some institutions have to increase their endowment income substantially through bolder investment policies. Attention has also been given to the effectiveness of successfully employing stricter management practices in higher education administration. There probably is room for improvement in both of these areas, but neither is going to provide the broad base of support which our institutions are going to require.

It is not surprising that the Congress recognized some time ago that the Federal Government had the responsibility to assist substantially in the financial support of colleges and universities to assure the Nation with an increasing supply of highly educated manpower resources. Through the assistance provided under the Morrill Acts and related legislation the State universities and land grant colleges developed into some of the most outstanding institutions in the world. Under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 grants and loans were made available for the construction of graduate and undergraduate academic facilities.

But I believe that colleges and universities and the respective higher education associations made their strongest case and elicited the broadest support in 1965, with the passage of the Higher Education Act. It is, to be sure, something of a piecemeal approach but it attacks some of higher education's most pressing problems. It also demonstrates to an unprecedented degree the realization that higher education constitutes a precious national resource essential not only to the achievement of our national goals but also to the achievement of the personal aspirations of our individual citizens.

The purpose of this legislation as set forth in the law is "to provide financial assistance for students in post-secondary and higher education." It is the latter part of this statement which I would like to examine, the provision of financial assistance for post-secondary and higher education. The student

assistance programs of title IV of the higher education act are not the first, although I do think they reflect a new direction.

For 10 years graduate and undergraduate students have been taking advantage of NDEA loans. Graduate students have also had the availability of NDEA fellowships. The purpose of both of these programs was to make higher education and post-baccalaureate education available to a greater number of young people. But I've always had the impression that it was the need, underscored by the Russian sputnik success, for the more college trained people and better elementary and secondary teachers which was the primary reason for which these programs were enacted.

The tone of the discussion on broadening the access to higher education seems to have changed during the 60's. It seemed to become more generally accepted that equality of opportunity was impossible without equality of educational opportunity, that equality of educational opportunity does not truly exist when it depends on family income.

Russell Thackery, the executive secretary-treasurer of the association of State universities and land-grant colleges used these words:

"What I hold as an article of educational faith, of faith in democracy, of faith in this country, is that we ought to provide the maximum degree of equality of opportunity. No man or group of men is wise enough to judge the heights to which an individual may rise, the contributions he or she may make, if given the chance . . . the men and women of a century ago, in a country torn by internal dissension to the point that its existence was threatened; bankrupt and dependent on printing press money, had the courage to give away vast areas of the public domain in the faith that education of young people was a better investment by far than the hope that a huge land speculation might some time balance the budget. I hope and believe that we have the same courage and faith to meet the opportunity of the 1960's."

Presidents Kennedy and Johnson lent the weight of their support to the movement to expand educational opportunity and made numerous recommendations to the Congress some of which have subsequently been enacted into law. The major programs, of course, were included under title IV of the Higher Education Act. The work-study program, initiated by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, was expanded by the law and transferred to the U.S. Office of Education. A new program of insured loans was introduced as well as a program of educational opportunity grants. I think that there is a certain validity to this "package" approach which you would certainly be able to verify. But it seems to me that the availability of several different forms of student assistance gives greater flexibility in meeting the individual financial needs of the students.

There have been many legitimate questions asked about the effectiveness and operation of our present programs of student assistance, I have heard people ask, for example, about the NDEA student loans. I, personally have heard little but praise for this program. It appears to me to be highly successful. By fiscal year 1968 over 400,000 students were receiving student loans. And a study of Federal student loan programs last year, conducted by the college entrance examination board, indicated clearly that the NDEA loans are being utilized by students from the lower income groups as was intended. In 1966 over half of the student borrowers came from families with incomes of less than \$6,000 a year.

Regarding the teacher "forgiveness" provisions of the program it appears to be a fairly popular aspect of the program. There have been some recommendations that the cancellation provision be eliminated and others that it be expanded. The 1968 amendments leave existing law unaffected except

that while the NDEA loan program was extended for 3 years, the loan forgiveness feature was only extended for 2. Until more effective means are developed to encourage the entrance of qualified students into the teaching profession I would strongly urge the retention of the loan forgiveness provision. However, over the long haul I am convinced that educational excellence will not be achieved until we are able to pay teachers the high level salaries their professional services require.

Another aspect of student assistance programs which was discussed in regard to the higher education amendments of 1968 and which I imagine is of no little concern to you is the allotment formulas for these programs. The distribution of educational opportunity grant and NDEA student loan funds is based on the number of full-time college students enrolled in the State. One-third of work-study funds are also allotted on this basis. I am pleased to report New York has not done badly under this system. In fiscal year 1968 under the educational opportunity grant program more institutions in New York received more money to assist more students than any other State in the country. 147 of our schools received allocations of nearly \$11 million and aided nearly 21,000 students, as compared with 121 institutions in California which received \$8.2 million to aid 16,000 students.

That the use of a State's full-time enrollment as a basis for the distribution of student aid funds is not the only or necessarily the best formula as suggested by some of the proposed higher education amendments in 1968. The House version of the higher education amendments would have changed the present State allotment formula to an allotment based on institution requests. It seems to me that so doing would help to eliminate the disparity which exists between the amounts institutions are requesting and the amounts they are actually receiving. Under existing law when allotted funds are insufficient to meet all approved institutional requests, institutions in some States receive a greater proportion of their approved requests than institutions in other States. How successfully a distribution of funds on an institutional request basis would have worked is a moot question because the proposal did not survive the House-Senate conference on the bill.

A House amendment which did survive the 1968 conference and one which must simplify many lives is the new institutional matching requirement. The '68 amendments consolidate the maintenance-of-effort provisions of the College Work-Study and the Educational Opportunity Grant programs. Previously each program had separate provisions governing maintenance-of-effort requirements. Effective July 1, 1969 an institution participating in these 2 programs need only provide assurance that it will continue to spend in its scholarship and student assistance programs not less than the average annual expenditure for such purposes during the most recent 3 year period prior to the date of agreement.

I am pleased that colleagues like myself exhibited forceful enough strength so that the 1968 amendments also took action on a problem which has plagued all of our educational institutions for years—the uncertainty as to when and how much Federal funds would be available to them under the various education programs. The 1967 Elementary and Secondary Education Act amendments authorized advance funding of ESEA programs and on an academic year basis. The '68 higher education amendments provide for one-year advance funding for all programs under the Higher Education Act, the National Defense Education Act and the Higher Education Facilities Act. They also provide that appropriated funds be made available for expenditure by the in-

stitution on a school year rather than a fiscal year basis. Of course in order to make advance funding accomplish its purpose, Congress is going to have to make 2 appropriations in one year. That should take place this year for all education programs. Unfortunately, it is proposed by the administration in only one major program for 1971.\*

One problem relating to the funding of education programs generally, including the student aid programs, is the authorization versus appropriation problem. When Congress authorizes funds for a given year and for succeeding years an effort is made to indicate the extent of educational needs. It is disappointing to me that the appropriations never seem to approach the sums indicated as the level of need in the authorizing legislation.

Now the President has offered a budget for the fiscal year beginning this July 1st which takes a step backward. I am very disappointed that we are asked to maintain last year's level of funding of student aid programs. The time is not for maintenance but for desperately needed expansion and extension of educational opportunity as a national goal.

The budget cuts are especially disappointing to those of us in Congress who have worked hard for expanded educational opportunity. In March of this year I introduced a measure, H.R. 9626, later refined by H.R. 11275 to help lower the financial barriers which prevent many capable and deserving students from pursuing their educations. My bill would amend the Higher Education Act to double the maximum amount of an educational opportunity grant from \$1,000 to \$2,000 and would reduce the minimum grant to \$100 a year. In terms of rising tuition costs and the limited financial capability of low-income students I believe that this expansion is of absolute necessity.

In regard for my concern in the serious gaps that exist for student assistance I have introduced legislation paralleling that introduced by Senator Mondale in the Senate.

This bill would among other things add to title IV of the Higher Education Act a new program of student opportunity grants. As I propose it this program would differ from the educational opportunity grants in a number of ways. The maximum student opportunity grant would be \$1,500 as opposed to the maximum educational opportunity grant of \$1,000. Also it would be for part-time as well as full-time study at not only the undergraduate level but also at the post-secondary vocational, and the graduate and professional levels. In addition, the new program would not require the 50-50 matching of Federal funds which the educational opportunity grant program does. However, the new program would provide cost-of-education allowances to the institutions which enroll student opportunity grantees. This is intended to alleviate somewhat the need of the institution to increase tuition charges.

It would further establish a higher education loan bank as a private nonprofit corporation whose purpose would be to provide loans guaranteed by the Federal Government for post-secondary vocational, undergraduate, graduate, and professional study. The bank would make loans directly to the students, unlike the NDEA and guaranteed loan programs. At present it is difficult for students to obtain guaranteed loans from banks and other lenders. Students under this program would have 30 years to repay the higher education loans.

There is one last point I would like to mention briefly and it concerns the current student unrest which is plaguing so many of our colleges. I believe that it is very easy to overreact to the tactics and violence of these out-

bursts and be so indignant that we fail to investigate with a clear head the underlying causes for such outbreaks. I hate the classifications of "hard-liner" and "soft-liner" because I firmly believe that there is no room within the academic community for violence or the destruction of property or the denial of the rights of others to continue their educations. I do believe that students who place themselves outside of the academic community through the use of such tactics are subject to appropriate discipline and I believe that such discipline must be determined and administered by the institution, or where appropriate, the local law enforcement agencies.

I hate to see the Federal Government intrude into the internal workings of the university to punish students or local misdemeanants. I rather align myself with the remarks of President Nathan M. Pusey of Harvard that if there is an answer to prevent disorders "the answer to this has to come from within the university community itself . . . I think it has to come from the students and faculty primarily and it will come only as these groups, themselves, come to see that this kind of disrupting activity is something that can't be tolerated. . . ." To add to Pusey's wisdom I would say that I conceive a resolution of the student unrest issue in the actions and behavior of the 97% of the student body who will and are cooperating in the academic thrust of institutional life. I really do not see that the withholding of Federal student assistance will prevent future disorders.

You, as professionals in direct contact with student and faculty efforts are, of course, indispensable if order is to be achieved. And I applaud what I have perceived of your dedication. Within the university we have always encouraged the frank expression of views and cherished freedom of speech and opinion. I am confident that order will be restored to the academic community without sacrificing educational opportunity.

#### MASONIC DAY—A MOMENTOUS OCCASION

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on a stormy day, April 19, 1969, at Richmondtown, Staten Island, I was privileged to be the principal speaker at an otherwise colorful pageant held by several thousand Masons. The historic conclave marked the dedication of the Richmond Masonic Museum and Masonic Library which will be a cultural, educational, and historic facet to the people of the State of New York. Freemasonry is one of the world's oldest fraternities and Masons have played an important part in the formation of our Nation. Therefore, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following program from that momentous day and a revealing history of Freemasonry on Staten Island.

On April 19, 1969, Saturday afternoon, a large Masonic Conclave took place in the Richmond Masonic District (Staten Island, N.Y.). This convocation of Free and Accepted Masons was the first in a year long program of auspicious events which would culminate in the dedicative ceremony of the Richmond District Masonic Museum and Library sometime in 1970. Both the conclave and the mu-

\* Title I ESEA.

seum were and will be respectively located in the Richmondtown restoration area. The program included the opening of a meeting in the old courthouse on Center Street by the American Lodge of Research F. & A. M. under the acting master, R.W. Arthur Brown, and R.W. Dominick M. Rufulo, Sr. Warden. The general chairman of the Masonic conclave and the museum-library project was R.W. Alexander A. Bleimann, the present district deputy grand master of the Richmond Masonic District. There were present the M.W. Charles Francis Gosnell, grand master of masons in the State of New York, with his grand marshal LaVerne W. Getman; the deputy grand master R.W. William R. Knapp with his deputy grand marshal (acting) R.W. Albert G. Pfluger; the grand secretary R.W. Wendell K. Walker. The metropolitan district deputy grand masters association was represented by R.W. Arthur W. Juller, R.W. John F. Dams, R.W. Max L. Kamel, R.W. Alexander A. Bleimann, R.W. Calvin Raff, R.W. Milton R. Goldman, R.W. Harold F. Presley, R.W. John V. Flockhart Sr. Several grand lodge officers were also present with grand representatives.

Director of arrangements R.W. Pasquale J. Lombardi, grand steward of the grand lodge of New York; program director and master of ceremony Alfred J. Cawse, Jr.; protocol chief W. Victor D. Lederhandler; chief of security William Reyecraft and W. Milton Jirak; historian R.W. Wilbur L. Decker; director of finance W. Phillip DePaul.

The masonic conclave was under the sponsorship of the Richmond Masonic Association whose officers are: W. John W. Wall, president; W. Samuel T. Weening, vice-president; W. Victor D. Lederhandler, 2nd vice-president; R.W. Wilbur L. Decker, secretary; W. John W. Davis, treasurer.

Also present were the sitting masters of the nine masonic lodges. W. Paul T. Framhein, Jr., Richmond lodge; W. Everett M. Hannah, Huguenot lodge; W. Melvin L. Kirby, Tompkins lodge; W. Harrison J. Laemmerhirt, Beacon Light lodge; W. Michael Daum, Aquehonga lodge; W. Nathan Giventer, Great Kills lodge; W. H. Arnold Johnson, New Dorp lodge; W. Fred Cericola Jr., LaGuardia lodge; W. Conrad H. Eriksson, Klopstock lodge.

The famous Daniel S. Tompkins Holy Bible was used to adorn the altar during the opening and closing ceremonies of the meeting of the American Lodge of Research F. & A. M. The Bible is at present owned by Tompkins Lodge of Masons. The Tilers of the Lodgeroom were Asa Eick, Joseph Andriulli, and Emil Baker. The Grand Marshall LaVerne Getman escorted in the Grand Master; the Acting Deputy Grand Marshall A. Pfluger escorted in the Deputy Grand Master; and Bro. Eugene R. Bleimann escorted in the District Deputy Grand Master of the Richmond District.

The Richmond Masonic Glee Club, under the Director, O. William Erikson, and the President David Olson Sr., provided several vocal selections both in the Lodge meeting and during the outdoor public ceremony.

After the closing of the Lodge meeting, a processional began on Center Street directly outside the Old Courthouse led by the Totenville High School Band under the leadership of Bro. Ray Kirschmeyer. The Tall Cedars of Lebanon, Richmond Forest No. 66, whose Grand Tall Cedar is Rocco D'Angelo, and the Staten Island Shrine Club, whose President is Ruppert Minick, dressed in full organization regalia formed an Honor Guard for the Grand Master.

During the entire afternoon hundreds of Masons and Masonic dignitaries wore masonic regalia and the aprons of highest rank.

At the outdoor ceremony, Mr. Arnold V. Schwartz, President of the Staten Island Historical Society, officially accepted the

Masonic Order to create the Masonic Museum and Library under the Director of the Richmondtown Restoration Program, Mr. Loring McMillen.

Congressman John M. Murphy was one of the principal speakers as was the Honorable Robert T. Connor, Borough President of Richmond, who also presented the Richmond Masonic Association with a Borough Presidential Proclamation, designating April 19, 1969, the first day of Masonic Week. Other speakers were R.W. Alexander A. Bleimann and M.W. Charles F. Gosnell. After the program was completed, a Grand Chaplain of the Grand Lodge of New York, Navy Commander and Rabbi William Kloner pronounced the benediction.

The following treatise is the historical account and background of Masonic activities on Staten Island for nearly two hundred years, as summarized by the Historian; on April 19, 1969:

Most Worshipful Brother Charles F. Gosnell, Officers of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York, Honorable Robert T. Connor, Borough President, Honorable John M. Murphy, Congressman, brethren and friends.

We are gathered here today for a momentous occasion which will long be remembered by all and in the annals of Freemasonry throughout the State of New York.

Freemasonry is one of the oldest fraternities which has existed since Biblical times reverting to the building of King Solomon's temple, on Mount Moriah by Operative Masons.

The modern era of speculative Masonry began with the formation of the Grand Lodge of England in the year of 1717.

In the history of our country, Masons have played an important part in its formation.

Of the 56 signers of the Declaration of Independence, 53 were Masons.

During the War of Independence—Staten Island was a tory stronghold, on which over 75 regiments of British soldiers were stationed at various times. Every regiment with one or two exceptions had their own Masonic lodge working under warrants granted by the Grand lodges of Ireland, Scotland and England.

The following British military Masonic lodges were stationed on Staten Island, New York after 1754:

*Royal Regiment of Artillery, 4th Battalion*—Composed of nine companies, five of which were stationed on Staten Island: Company No. 35, Company No. 36, Company No. 38, Company No. 39, Company No. 42.

The Grand Lodge of England ("Ancients") issued warrant No. 209, Feb. 16th, 1779 to establish a lodge in this battalion. There is no record of the lodge after 1779.

The Grand Lodge of England ("Ancients") also issued a warrant No. 213, July 3, 1781 to brethren in this battalion, and the lodge was constituted in New York on October 18, 1781.

*The 17th Light Dragoons (Duke of Cambridge's Own Lancers)*—Stationed on Staten Island 1776, Grand Lodge of Ireland Warrant, Oct. 5, 1769 as Lodge No. 478. Joined Provincial Grand Lodge of N.Y. in 1782, and continued in existence until 1795; warrant cancelled in 1817.

*The 7th Regiment, Royal Fusiliers*—Stationed on Staten Island in 1777, Grand Lodge of Ireland Warrant, April 1, 1752, No. 231.

*The 10th Regiment, Lincolnshire Regiment*—Stationed on Staten Island in 1776, Grand Lodge of Ireland Warrant on August 3, 1758, No. 299.

*The 17th Regiment, The Leicestershire Regiment*—Stationed on Staten Island 1776, Grand Lodge of Ireland Warrant June 24, 1743, No. 136. Grand Lodge of Scotland Warrant Nov. 12, 1771, No. 168/169. "Unity Lodge." The warrant, now in possession of Union Lodge No. 5, G. R., Delaware, at Midleton, bears the number 169.

The 22nd Regiment, The Cheshire Regi-

ment.—Stationed on Staten Island 1776—Grand Lodge of Ireland Warrant, Nov. 28, 1754, No. 251, and a duplicate of this warrant was issued on Na. 6, 1791, to replace the original which according to the Grand Lodge Register was lost in 1759 on the Mississippi River. The warrant was lost probably at Roche D'Avons in 1764, when the regiment was ambushed by Indians and practically exterminated.

The 23rd regiment, Royal Welch Fusiliers.—Stationed on Staten Island in 1776, Grand Lodge of Scotland Warrant Jan. 11, 1751, No. 63. Another warrant No. 131 was issued to replace No. 63 which was lost in the Seven Year's War. Captain Edw. Evans was the master in 1767.

The 26th regiment, The Cameronians.—Stationed on Staten Island in 1777—Grand Lodge of Ireland Warrant, Dec. 7, 1758, No. 309. No. 309 was exchanged for No. 26, in 1823.

The 27th Regiment, Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers.—Stationed on Staten Island in 1776—Grand Lodge of Ireland Warrant in 1733, No. 23, and another warrant on Feb. 7, 1749—1750, No. 205, was issued because No. 23 was probably lost, but turned up when the regiment was in St. Lucia after 1783, and remained on the Grand Lodge Register until 1801.

The 37th Regiment, Hampshire Regiment.—Stationed on Staten Island in 1776, Grand Lodge of England ("Ancients" Warrant May 19, 1756, No. 52. The lodge was represented at the inauguration of the Provincial Grand Lodge of New York on 5th December 1732, and at meetings of the Provincial Grand Lodge held on Jan. 2 and Feb. 5, 1783.

The 40th Regiment, South Lancashire Regiment.—Stationed on Staten Island in 1776, Grand Lodge of England ("Ancients") Warrant: 1759, No. 42.

The 44th Regiment, Essex Regiment.—Stationed on Staten Island in 1776, Provincial Grand Lodge of Quebec in 1760—1762 Warranted, No. 14. Provincial Grand Lodge of Quebec Warrant Sept. 12, 1784, No. 18, registered by Grand Lodge of England ("Moderns") Nov. 15, 1784, No. 467, "Rainsford Lodge", named after a colorful and active Mason, Colonel Charles Rainsford Commander of the Regiment in 1781, and who was Grand Steward of the Grand Lodge of England in 1769.

The 46th Regiment, South Devon Regiment, later the Duke of Cornwall's Light Infantry.—Stationed on Staten Island in 1776—Grand Lodge of Ireland Warrant March 4th, 1752, No. 227.

The 52nd Regiment, Osfordshire, Light Infantry.—Stationed on Staten Island in 1776, Grand Lodge of Ireland Warrant August 6, 1761, No. 370.

The 64th Regiment, The North Staffordshire Regiment.—Stationed on Staten Island in 1776, Grand Lodge of Scotland Feb. 2, 1761, No. 106 "Duke of York's Lodge."

In the Period of the Revolution, a Provincial lodge convened in the Old Guyon-Clark Homestead at New Dorp, the Lodge was composed of British Officers and Soldiers, and a few residents of the Island. Meetings were held at intervals until the Evacuation of the British in 1785. These officers, together with Prominent Masons of the City, were entertained at Nautilus Hall. A few years later, a meeting was held at the Home of Governor Daniel D. Tompkins, who was also Grand Master of the State of New York. He had established his Residence on Staten Island and attempted to start a Masonic Lodge on Staten Island. More than a year later a meeting was held at the Home of General Van Buren, in Tompkinsville.

As a result of the meetings and a picnic held on the Lawn of Old Nautilus Hall—Richmond Lodge was formed, the First of the Ten Lodges to be formed on Staten Island.

The First Regular Communication of Richmond Lodge No. 384 was held in Nautilus Hall,

on July 6, 1825, after a few years moved to a Building owned by General Van Buren.

In 1832, Cholera and Yellow Fever scourged the Island from end to end, and it was necessary for the Lodge to close its Doors until the frost removed the Epidemic.

In 1839 Richmond Lodge was Granted a New Charter and became No 66 instead of 384.

In 1849 Richmond Lodge surrendered its Charter but did not entirely disband. Meetings were held in Members Homes and Re-organization was discussed.

On March 21, 1851, Richmond Lodge Re-organized and met at the home of Bro. George T. Swaine, opposite the Dutch Reformed Church in Port Richmond. The Lodge erected a Temple at the corner of Richmond Avenue and Bennett Street, Port Richmond which was dedicated in 1898. Here the Lodge remained until a New Temple was erected on Anderson Avenue, Port Richmond in 1925. Hit a fatal Blow by the Depression, the Lodge was forced to give up the Temple and moved to "The Odd Fellows Hall" on Harrison Avenue, Port Richmond and now meet in their own Temple located at 789 Post Avenue, West Brighton, Staten Island.

**TOMPKINS LODGE NO. 471**

The Second of the Lodges on Staten Island was Tompkins Lodge No. 471. A Warrant was issued on December 6, 1853 authorizing the opening of the Lodge at Stapleton, Staten Island. The First Meeting was held in the Old Tompkins Lyceum located at a spot later occupied by the German Club Rooms. In 1856, they moved to Masonic Hall located at what was then Front & Minthorne Streets in Tompkinsville. A year later the Building was destroyed by fire and the Lodge lost everything. On March 31, 1859, a new Dispensation was granted and a meeting was held on April 5, 1859, in Tompkins Lyceum. In the following year it moved to the Weed Building on the West side of Griffin Street and in May 1866 to Egbert Hall and on May 1, 1876 into the Tynan's Building and Occupied the present Temple at Bay and Sands Streets Stapleton Staten Island in 1901.

**HUGUENOT LODGE NO. 381**

The Third of the Lodges on Staten Island was Huguenot Lodge No. 381. It was instituted on May 19, 1855 and met in the Odd Fellows Hall, on Amboy Road. In 1859 the Lodge moved to the Chapel of St. Pauls Methodist Church until 1883 when rooms were procured over Fisher's Drug Store at Main & Arthur Kill Road, then met in the Knights of Pythias Hall and in 1909 moved to their present Temple on Main Street, Tottenville, Staten Island.

**AQUAHONGA LODGE NO. 685**

The Fourth of the Lodges on Staten Island was Aquahonga Lodge No. 685, (Not to be confused with Aquehonga Lodge No. 906) was granted a Charter in 1868, and surrendered it in 1887. The First meeting place was in the Grand Jury Room at Richmond. Later the Lodge moved to New Dorp to a Building owned and occupied by Henry A. LaVaud at New Dorp Lane and Richmond Road, later moved back to Richmond in a building opposite St. Andrews Church. There is no record of the reason for the surrender of the Charter.

**BEACON LIGHT LODGE NO. 701**

The Fifth of the Lodges on Staten Island was Beacon Light Lodge No. 701, on June 15, 1870, Beacon Light Lodge was awarded its Charter and met at the "Old Athletic Club Building" located on the waterside of Richmond Terrace approximately 85 feet East of Broadway, West Brighton, Staten Island, and in 1872 moved into "Village Hall" Lafayette Street, New Brighton, Staten Island until 1942 during the Second World War was forced to find new Quarters and moved to Tompkins Temple, Stapleton, Staten Island and moved to Great Kills Temple, Great Kills,

Staten Island in 1966, its present meeting place.

**KLOPSTOCK LODGE NO. 760**

The Sixth Lodge located on Staten Island was Klopstock Lodge No. 760, Instituted in 1875, first met in Tynan's Building and later moved to Tompkins Lodge Room, Stapleton, Staten Island and presently meets at Great Kills Temple, Great Kills, Staten Island.

Although a Part of the Ninth Manhattan District, Klopstock Lodge has played an important part in Staten Island Masonry and has always been considered one of our Group.

**AQUEHONGA LODGE NO. 906**

The Seventh Lodge located on Staten Island was Aquehonga Lodge No. 906, Instituted on May 13, 1913 and met at Tompkins Masonic Temple, Stapleton, Staten Island now meet at Richmond Masonic Hall, West Brighton, Staten Island.

**GREAT KILLS LODGE NO. 912**

The Eighth Lodge located on Staten Island was Great Kills Lodge No. 912, Instituted on January 12, 1914 and met at 22 Hillside Terrace, Great Kills, Staten Island until their own Temple was completed in 1926. Like Richmond Lodge the Depression put too great a strain upon their finances for them to be able to hold the Building. Heroic effort on the part of the Officers and Members happily brought it back into their possession.

**NEW DORP LODGE NO. 1092**

The Ninth Lodge located on Staten Island was New Dorp Lodge No. 1092, Instituted on June 18, 1928 met at Miller's Hall on Amboy Road. At the time of its Institution it was known as "Sojourners" Lodge, a name later changed to Fort Wadsworth Lodge and still later to "New Dorp Lodge". In 1929 moved to Koch's Hallon New Dorp Lane and Second Street until 1947 when it moved to Great Kills Temple, Great Kills, Staten Island.

**LA GUARDIA LODGE NO. 1130**

The Tenth Lodge located on Staten Island was LaGuardia Lodge No. 1130. In 1949, nearly a Century and a quarter after the beginning of Organised Masonry on Staten Island, a Dispensation was granted to form a New Lodge to be known as LaGuardia Lodge after Florrello LaGuardia former Mayor of New York City. It was instituted on June 17, 1949 and met at Great Kills Temple, Great Kills, Staten Island and later moved to Richmond Masonic Hall, West Brighton, Staten Island.

We have a number of Masonic Landmarks on Staten Island but we consider the following as most important:

Stapleton Masonic Temple, 514 Bay Street, Stapleton, Staten Island.

Tottenville Masonic Temple, 236 Main Street, Tottenville, Staten Island.

Great Kills Masonic Temple, 4095 Amboy Road, Great Kills, Staten Island.

Richmond Masonic Hall, 789 Post Avenue, West Brighton, Staten Island.

CYO Building. Formerly "Richmond Masonic Temple," Anderson Avenue, Port Richmond, Staten Island.

Village Hall, Lafayette Street, West Brighton, Staten Island (Home of Beacon Light Lodge for over 70 years).

The Garibaldi-Meucci Memorial Museum, Rosebank, Staten Island.

Our National Landmark is the "George Washington Memorial" in Alexandria, Virginia, to which every New York Mason supports.

The nearest thing to a New York Mason's heart which is supported by all, is our "Masonic Home in Utica," New York for our Elderly Brethren, their wives and widows and the Orphans of Masons, by our contributions to the "Masonic Brotherhood Fund." On the Grounds of the Home we also have a Research Laboratory, researching the diseases of the aged on "Geriatrics."

WILBUR L. DECKER,  
Historian, Richmond Masonic District  
Museum and Library Historical Society.

**HOUSING PROGRAM**

**HON. LLOYD MEEDS**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we Members of Congress get letters from constituents that demonstrate such a clear understanding of a particular matter and make such an urgent and rational appeal to the Congress to be concerned with the problems that we are tempted to share the letter with other Members.

I have received such a letter from Mr. Robert L. Kahn, Multifamily and Special Projects Division of the United Homes Corp. His concern is one that a great many of us in this Congress share; making a program work to assure adequate housing for the elderly, the infirm, the poor and, very importantly, the families in the \$5,000 to \$8,000 income bracket. As Mr. Kahn points out, we have a promising program. But the program is of only minor value if it is not funded adequately.

Mr. Kahn also underlines a point that is of increasing concern to me; the way in which Congress will authorize programs that hold out great hope for solving some of our emergent social problems and then renege on the "promise" when appropriations time comes. We do it again and again.

Finally, this letter points up the real dilemma that we Members of Congress have to deal with. If we must cut Federal spending in order to help fight inflation, what do we cut and how much? It is not an easy problem as we all know. Many, on the outside looking in at us trying to make these decisions, do not understand the complexity of the problem.

But Mr. Kahn's letter presents an argument on behalf of his program that is worth attention.

For all these reasons, and because Mr. Kahn has done his homework, I insert his letter in the RECORD and urge each Member of Congress to take the time to read it with care:

UNITED HOMES CORP.,  
May 10, 1969.

The Honorable LLOYD MEEDS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are now processing an application for an F.H.A. Section 236 rental housing, interest subsidy, loan through the Seattle F.H.A. Insuring office for a 220 unit project at Everett, Washington, within one mile of the new Boeing Plant. In addition, we are in process of having zoned a 35 acre parcel in Portland, Oregon, which we have under option, for 500 units of similar housing. We are also studying the possibilities of erecting two high rise buildings, one in the Northgate area of Seattle and the other in downtown Tacoma, Washington, for housing for the elderly under Section 236. The total number of units contemplated at this time is over 1200.

By the application of Section 236 we are able to bring well designed rental housing to families in the \$5,000-\$8,000 earnings bracket within the proper economic limits of not more than 25% of their annual income.

Our most pressing problem at this time is to obtain the letter of feasibility from the F.H.A. on the Everett project. We have made

a proposal and a request for feasibility to the F.H.A. Insuring office in Seattle and according to word received from them they had made such a finding of feasibility substantially as proposed by us and forwarded our papers to Washington, D.C., by way of the San Francisco zone office, for allocations of interest subsidy funds, a prerequisite to issuing a formal letter of feasibility to us.

These papers were received in Washington on March 3, 1969, but prior to their arrival the available funds had been preempted by earlier applications (many of which were in existing 221(d)3 commitments which were being converted to Section 236).

Of 48 requests for feasibility which had been forwarded to Washington by the Seattle office, 35 of them were returned and letters were issued to the applicants similar to the one received by us. This letter notified us that processing had been discontinued and only at such time as new funding was available would the processing continue. This experience, of course, is paralleled throughout the country and there is now a tremendous backlog of applications waiting for new funding.

When the 1968 housing law was passed in August of last year, the Congress authorized \$75 million dollars to cover the first year of interest subsidy for projects insured during that fiscal year. The law further stated that an additional \$100 million was authorized in the 1969 budget and an additional \$150 million in the 1970 budget. However, these are simply legal authority for appropriating the money but do not themselves constitute an appropriation. Congress saw fit last session to appropriate \$25 million out of the \$75 million allocated.

We are told that H.U.D. Secretary Romney has requested Congress that the additional \$50 million dollars authorized for F.Y. 1969 be appropriated immediately and that the \$100 million dollars for F.Y. 1970 be included in the new budget. We have received various reports that the supplementary appropriation is now under study and is contemplated to be voted on during the month of May.

It is now so well recognized that there must be some form of subsidized housing for people of low income that most of the large lobbying groups such as the Home Builders Association and the National Association of Real Estate Boards, who in the past have been opposed to public housing, have recommended not only the passage of Section 236, but the appropriations for it.

There have been a number of efforts made over the last 30 years to solve this problem, the best known of which, of course, has been Public Housing. This program has had many drawbacks in the past (which need not be explored at this time) and at the present time is going through the "Turnkey" phase which holds out good promise. However, this only answers the needs of the very lowest income group and does not affect at all that \$5,000-\$8,000 group which we are discussing. Public Housing pays only a minor portion of the normal Real Estate tax and for that reason is found objectionable by many people. Other avenues, which have been tried recently with some degree of success have been the F.H.A. Below Market Interest Rate Loans and the Rent Supplement Loans. These programs were beginning to achieve some good results but it was felt that the provisions under Section 236 went more directly to the heart of the problem and did not require the vast sums of special appropriations for buying the mortgages through FNMA. Therefore, they are being phased out and no new applications are being processed.

There are only a limited number of ways in which housing costs can be reduced. The end product, the rent which is charged to the tenant, is comprised of a number of factors, the profit to the operator being the least of these. The major items being:

- (1) The original cost of construction.
- (2) The interest rate.
- (3) The real estate taxes.
- (4) The operating expenses.
- (5) Profit.

Let us explore each of these items:

(1) The cost of construction has been increasing steadily. There are no technological breakthroughs now available to us which will have the necessary impact on costs. The Editors of House & Home have pointed out repeatedly in their editorials that this cannot be looked to as the answer. The best that can be hoped for at this time is sufficient betterment of technique and products to enable us to stay even. For the past several years we have been involved with a 4% annual increase in construction costs.

(2) The interest rate subsidy is by far the best approach as this permits the total population to assist those in need of help on a national basis and does not place the full impact on those given communities where the need is greatest. There is nothing new in this approach as it constitutes the basis for many of the acts of Congress which provide subsidies for many special groups, which in the long run are paid for by the total population.

(3) The reduction of taxes, of course, has been applied in some special cases, notably in housing for the elderly sponsored by non-profit groups and in the special programs of New York City and New York State where tax abatement is part of their program. If this process is carried too far many local communities having a large elderly population, or being situated in climatic regions which attract retired persons would soon find themselves with a much reduced assessment role resulting in much higher taxes for the relatively small population remaining on the tax rolls. Therefore, this approach should not be used on less than a State-wide basis and local communities should receive reimbursement from the State Treasuries where tax exemption has been given.

(4) Operating expenses are a direct result of the costs of labor, utility charges and maintenance material in most cases such expenses are not susceptible to a great deal of downward adjustments regardless of the caliber of professional management. In those cases where better techniques of management are applied it is most likely to result in better maintained or more profitable property, but rarely in a rent reduction to the tenant.

(5) The last of these, the return to the investor is the smallest. In the case of Section 236 we are talking about a 6% limited dividend requirement.

I feel that the urgency of this problem must somehow be made real to the members of Congress. They must understand that their legislative efforts have brought forth a program which will work and which is responsive to the needs of the country, but only if the necessary appropriations are a reality. These appropriations must be compared with other items in the budget and on a proper scale of values a proper sharing of the available monies will result in the speedy passage of the supplementary appropriations bill.

Last week, I attended a Conference of Urban America, Inc., in Seattle. For two days the subject of low rent housing was discussed. Andrew Hess, one of the most productive FHA Directors in the country spoke. Robert Pitt, the Regional Administrator for Zone 6, H.U.D. spoke. All they could tell us was they are stymied—their hands are tied—they have no way of moving without funds being provided. Congress must understand the devastating effect that the on again/off again approach has on the morale of all people working toward solving the low cost housing problem, not only in Government, but also in the private sector. We must be able to plan and use our best efforts with the

knowledge that there is some continuity to the effort. Land options must be obtained, plans and market studies must be arranged. Congress must understand the tremendous lead times involved in the production of housing and what a vital factor proper housing is to the solution of our most pressing social problems in the Urban environment. Allocating \$200 million dollars to clean up the rubble after the riots is not the answer.

We can only hope that Andrew Hess, Seattle F.H.A. Director, was correct in his summation to his speech last Thursday at the Urban American Conference when he stated that he believes H.U.D. Secretary Romney to be a sincere man, who understands the problem and who speaks with full authority for the Administration in requesting the funds. His second point—The Congress of the United States as presently constituted is fundamentally the same Congress that passed the 1968 Housing Act and that, therefore, we must be optimistic that, in logical sequence, the appropriation of additional funds will become a reality. The audience response to this was, in effect "Well and good, but time is of the essence".

It is our sincere hope you will agree with this statement.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT L. KAHN,  
Multifamily and Special Projects Division.

#### GREATER KANSAS CITY'S CONSTRUCTION STRIKE

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 months the construction industry in the Greater Kansas City area has been halted by crippling strikes. Negotiations have reached an impasse and each day the shutdown continues threatens further economic decline throughout the entire area. The gravity of the situation and some of the insoluble problems contributing to the work stoppage are outlined in a letter I received recently from the Builders' Association of Kansas City and in an editorial from station KCMO. I commend both to my colleagues for their serious consideration:

MAY 2, 1969.

Congressman LARRY WINN, Jr.,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LARRY: As you are probably aware, we are entering our sixth week of the construction shutdown in the Kansas City area due to strikes by Ironworkers and Painters Unions, which have made exorbitant demands upon our industry.

The Ironworker demands constitute, on a conservative estimate, around \$4.20 per hour increase for a one year period, which amounts to an increase in excess of 80%. The manner in which some of the demands are stated makes it quite difficult to put an absolute figure on certain items as they would not apply to every man and to every job situation across the board; but in terms of the overall costs to an employer, they must be taken into account in some form. Although they have stated they are negotiable on some of these items, after five weeks of strike they have not retracted or moved from any of these requests. The Painters have moved from their original demands, but are still seeking increases in excess of \$1.35 per hour for one year, which

amounts to nearly 30% increase for a one year period. Under this set of circumstances, there is no likelihood of settlement even with the Painters, so long as the Ironworkers are still out on their impossible demands.

Our Association has felt that these demands were so exorbitant and unrealistic that we could not make an offer anywhere in the realm of what was being demanded. We have assured the Unions that we are willing to grant substantial wage and contract changes if their demands were altered to some degree, whereby meaningful negotiations could be conducted.

The work stoppage which is now occurring in our area has created a hardship on employers, employees, and buyers of construction, as well as the local units of government which have construction projects underway or scheduled under fixed budgetary or bond limitations. It becomes more difficult each passing year for employers, particularly those in the construction industry, to fend off large powerful unions in their quest for inflationary and unwarranted cost increases. It would be much easier and less costly for construction employers to accede to these demands on a limited deferred basis and in a sense "buy" their way out of this dilemma, for in the long run the contractors are basically "middlemen" between the unions and the consuming public. The chain reaction of these increases throughout the building trades in this area will amount to a 40% increase in the cost of construction to the public and to the private purchasers of construction.

In periods of nationwide manpower shortages, and a great volume of construction to be performed in most areas of the United States, there is some feeling of futility in attempting to hold the line against this form of inflation in a single given area at such a great cost and loss to individual small contractors. It would seem that if the Congress has any real intent of checking inflation that it should take some affirmative direct action to prevent such inflationary actions at the grass-roots levels, as well as through indirect filtering down measures of taxes, interest, etc. I am sure that the Kansas City situation is being repeated a number of times in other cities and areas throughout the United States, and our existing economic and bargaining system just does not permit the small businessman, which constitutes the bulk of the construction industry, to effectively cope with the powerful and monopolistic unions. We earnestly urge that the Congress do some soul searching to determine if our country can afford to pay the price of the present trends and insatiable appetite of organized labor if it remains unchecked.

Sincerely yours,  
BUILDERS ASSOCIATION OF KANSAS CITY.

**CONSTRUCTION STRIKE**

(By E. K. Hartenbower, KCMO vice president and general manager)

Everybody stands to lose in a prolonged construction strike. Weeks drag into months, and Greater Kansas City is now feeling a pinch from the prolonged construction strike by ironworkers, painters and truck drivers.

Although the numbers of strikers and payroll losses are not too accurate, estimates now range between ten and twelve thousand actual strikers, including walkouts at two major plants not involved in the construction dispute. Payroll losses may run as high as two million dollars per week. It must be remembered that numerous strikers have taken other jobs temporarily, and payroll loss figures are far from accurate.

An immediate side effect of the construction shutdown is loss of business by firms supplying material and services to the struck projects. Individual companies are beginning to see very serious losses unless the labor dispute is settled soon. Claims for unem-

ployment pay are not running excessively higher than normal for this time of year. This, however, could change rapidly.

Despite uncertain figures, individual businesses in Greater Kansas City can report visible effects from the strikes. It is hard for general business to bear such effects while not being directly involved in the dispute. A prompt settlement is the only answer.

ROBERT D. MORAN

**HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, Robert D. Moran, the new Federal Wage-Hour Administrator of the Department of Labor, gave his thoughtful goals for his program as Administrator at his swearing in ceremony May 5. Mr. Moran, a respected attorney and experienced labor arbitrator is, at age 39, one of the Department's youngest Presidential appointees. I am highly pleased to include his views in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues. Mr. Moran's statement follows:

**STATEMENT BY ROBERT D. MORAN**

Today, as I officially assume the position of the Federal Wage-Hour Administrator, I want to convey to those interested in its work my views on the role we will play in carrying out the goals of this Administration. As President Nixon has stated, it is not enough to have laws on the books. What we must do is give them meaning, make them work for the benefit of all our people. My goal as Administrator will be to implement this objective.

The Fair Labor Standards Act was landmark legislation when it was enacted in 1938. In the 31 years of its existence it has made giant strides towards its goal of eliminating "labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers." The delicate balances which were incorporated into this law have had the overall effect of increasing the earnings of those working people most in need of help without curtailing job opportunities.

It is my opinion that the Fair Labor Standards Act has enabled more progress to be made in the continuing battle against poverty than any subsequent or previous congressional enactment. I fully support its high purpose and pledge to administer this law—and all others that have been assigned to the Divisions I now head—with vigor, enthusiasm, and impartiality. Effective implementation of the various statutes in this field requires the cooperative efforts of working people, management, government and the public generally. I plan to expend every effort to promote this cooperation.

The new Administration's goal of law and order with justice includes compliance with labor standards laws. We will be vigilant to see that the wages to which workers are entitled will be paid, that equal pay for equal work becomes more than a slogan and that every possible effort is made to eliminate discrimination in employment on account of age.

At the same time I expect to work closely with the vast majority of responsible employers who have readily complied with the minimum standards established by law in the interest of making compliance less of an administrative burden. It is gratifying to know that most employers maintain labor standards far better than those required by

law. But we are still plagued with those who would gyp, swindle and shortchange low wage workers as well as many who are honestly uninformed as to their responsibility under the law. We shall strive to protect working people from both.

I shall also be seeking new approaches for improving the administration of the wage and hour laws and I will welcome suggestions in this regard from all interested parties. It will be our combined effort which will determine the effectiveness of this legislation and bring about those improvements which must be made if we are to meet the challenges of the future.

Finally, I want to pay tribute to the many dedicated and able employees of the Wage and Hour Divisions. Their reputation for professional skill, competence and solicitude is well known to me. The Wage-Hour investigators rank with the FBI and Secret Service in the elite of U.S. enforcement agents. I am very proud to join them and look forward to working with them in the months and years ahead.

**UNREASONABLE WORLD**

**HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in this age of violent actions and strident voices, it is reassuring to find in our newspapers the calm, rational words of Alan L. Otten. I would like to call to my colleagues attention his column from the Wall Street Journal, May 21, 1969, which deals with the difficulty of maintaining an objective viewpoint in today's world, and therefore include that column in the RECORD:

**UNREASONABLE WORLD**

(By Alan L. Otten)

WASHINGTON.—Somehow, it seems to be getting harder all the time to know and follow the path of right and reason.

More and more, people tend to polarize on controversial issues. The man of good will, trying his damndest to be rational and fair and decent, all too often winds up appearing absurdly naive or hopelessly out-of-date.

Abe Fortas, for example, obviously acted badly. The reason may have been incredibly bad judgment, lack of sensitivity, simple greed, a nagging wife, evil companions or merely misplaced confidence that he could get away with it. Whatever the cause, he acted badly, and every reasonable person must deplore his conduct and lament the damage it did to the court and to faith in government generally.

Yet comparatively few people seem even a little upset by the Justice Department's activity in the Fortas affair. Attorney General John Mitchell admits he privately gave Chief Justice Earl Warren additional information about Mr. Fortas—but refuses to say what this was, leaving suspicions possibly far worse than the facts. The Justice Department subpoenas Louis Wolfson to force him to talk about his relations with the justice, again implying considerable evil-doing; other stories quoting "high officials" suggest that the Wolfson statements are indeed damaging, and that the Attorney General warned he would make his information public by a certain time if Mr. Fortas hadn't quit the Court by then.

The department insists it leaked no stories, made no threats, is much maligned. Maybe so. But the stories certainly came from somewhere, and Chief Justice Warren has never been known as a blabbermouth. It would be nice to demand not only that an associate

justice show greater sensitivity for his job, but also that the Justice Department show greater respect for relations between the Executive Branch and the nation's highest court. Yet to suggest this, in the current emotional atmosphere over Mr. Fortas, risks denunciation as a far-out radical or a nut.

Similarly the man who believes in reasonable and steady progress toward racial integration and a concerted effort to improve the Negro's material lot has been made an unhappy anachronism by new militant Negro leaders preaching black separatism. He must continue to battle with die-hard segregationists still shouting "never" and with white power groups contending the Negro is being helped to move too far too quickly. But now he must also cope with far-out demands for unrealistic "reparations," for financial help to businesses that don't yet have the know-how to succeed, for Negro faculty and student quotas that can't possibly be filled. To the one side he's a nigger-lover, to the other just another hateful honkie.

The dilemma repeats itself endlessly. It's increasingly difficult to steer a middle course in the current campus controversy—to support some legitimate demands of the student activists and yet also insist they act legally and reasonably and not deliberately disrupt the college community. Yet more and more one is driven to choose one side or the other—for the authorities, whether right or wrong; for the students, whether right or wrong.

Editorial writers love to denounce Congressional trips as "junkets" wildly wasting taxpayer funds; lawmakers counter with a blanket defense. The truth is somewhere between. Many Congressional trips are indeed carefree vacations at taxpayers' expense; others are hard-working investigations earning their cost many times over.

So many factors make it difficult to be sensible and fair these days. There's a general disintegration of established authority—the family, the church, local government. The multiple annoyances and aggravations of urban society expose raw nerve-ends. Vietnam hardly provides a backdrop for easy, rational discourse. And the nonsense being talked by responsible political leaders sets a horrible example for the rest of us.

The President's recent Vietnam speech, for instance, was on the whole a valuable exposition of Administration thinking—skillfully combining standard U.S. positions with possibly just enough new flexibility to get negotiations moving. And yet Mr. Nixon jarred at least a few listeners by declaring early in the speech that one course open to him had been instant unilateral withdrawal—and that "this would have been an easy thing to do." Now if anything is clear, it's that this would not have been an easy thing to do, for reasons both strategic and political. Mr. Nixon contributed little to appreciation of the rest of his speech or to the general level of political dialogue by that remark.

Mr. Nixon's communications director, Herbert Klein, is quoted by the UPI to the effect that the Administration is concerned over Ted Kennedy's "effort" to make the ABM into "a campaign issue." What utter nonsense. How in the world does Ted Kennedy's opposing the ABM create a campaign issue any more than Richard Nixon's proposing it? This is not communication, it's noncommunication.

All last year, Democrats in the Senate and House were either conceding major flaws existed in the Job Corps or were conspicuously ignoring the program. Mr. Nixon now proposes to close a number of Job Corps centers, though, and the Democrats howl as though he were attacking motherhood itself. They make no serious attempt to look honestly at the criticism of the program, or the Administration's proposal for reshaping it. Strom Thurmond of South Carolina spends much of

his Senatorial life fighting Federal efforts to deny funds to school districts dawdling on integration. Yet he finds nothing absurd in now demanding that the Government deny funds to student demonstrators.

Or consider Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen, at the White House a few weeks ago, refusing to set forth his reasons for opposing Dr. John Knowles as assistant secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. "That matter has been, shall I say, adjudicated, in the sense that I have nothing more to say about it," the Senator declared. And when pressed to be a little more specific, he explained, "I have made all my discussions, and that is an adjudication for me."

Little wonder that, in such a world, reasonable men falter.

#### SAN ANTONIO POLICE DEPARTMENT OPEN HOUSE

### HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the city of San Antonio, which forms an integral part of the 20th Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, is a notable city in many respects. It has been the pacesetter with respect to human relations since the beginning of urban living in the State of Texas, in fact, in the Southwest United States. Not only is San Antonio the most historical city but it is also a pioneer in the most sensitive area, and that is the relationships between citizens. San Antonio is a cosmopolitan city and it long ago learned the secret of how to get along. Parenthetically speaking, this is the reason why I have been so sensitive about the disturbing and insidious activities of a small group of racists that I have been exposing for the past 2½ months.

Last Sunday, the San Antonio Police Department held a historical event: An open house between the hours of 2 to 6 p.m. More than 1,600 persons on that Sunday afternoon in those few hours poured through the unique San Antonio Police Headquarters, one of the most modern and up-to-date structures in the Southwestern United States. I had the great honor and privilege to have been invited to this event by Capt. H. L. "Hank" Antan, the executive officer of the San Antonio Police Department and the chief of police, George W. Bichsel. Both of these men have distinguished themselves by an illustrious career in law enforcement.

What I and my fellow San Antonians who visited Sunday during the open house saw was most gratifying. We were guided by polite and courteous uniformed members and officers of the San Antonio Police Department. The names they bore reflected every type of national and racial background that we have in our country. The most gratifying thing of all was that we saw no massive purchase of new equipment such as armored cars, tear gas, and all of the paraphernalia that so often and so unfortunately many of the cities have had to strain their budgets to acquire because of the unhappy conditions in those

cities. On the contrary, what we saw in San Antonio was the reflection of a highly efficient, dedicated group of police officers. It was indeed a happy sight and it was the best proof of a happy and sound community.

I take this opportunity to commend to the Nation such outstanding public servants as Chief of Police George W. Bichsel and Capt. H. L. "Hank" Antan and the other notable and dedicated inspectors, officers, and men, as well as the secretarial workers and clerks. They were all present Sunday, and it was indeed a happy sight.

I offer for the RECORD at this point the program and schedule issued by the San Antonio Police Department on the occasion of the open house:

LAW ENFORCEMENT WEEK IN SAN ANTONIO: MAY 11-17, 1969—OPEN HOUSE AT SAN ANTONIO POLICE DEPARTMENT—VISIT YOUR PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITY

Police Open House: 214 West Nueva Street, Sunday, May 18th, 1969, 2:00 p.m. to 6 p.m.

Free parking.

Refreshments will be served in the snack bar by the San Antonio Police Wives Auxiliary.

The San Antonio Police Department is constantly aware of its obligation to our proud heritage and takes great pride in announcing an "Open House" in observation of "Law Enforcement Week" on Sunday, May 18, 1969, from 2:00 to 6:00 p.m.

Special features will include:

- Tour guides of the Police facilities.
  - Firing range (Basement) Demonstration of Police Weapons and Equipment.
  - Uniform Patrol roll call at 2:30 p.m. (Assembly Room).
  - Traffic roll call at 3:00 p.m. (Assembly Room).
  - Narcotic Bureau display.
  - Juvenile Bureau display.
  - Robbery Office (Ident-A-Kit).
  - Training Bureau (Gym facilities and Cadet training).
  - Community Relations display.
  - Radio Maintenance facilities.
  - Records and Identification Offices.
  - Laboratory facilities.
  - Communications (Dispatcher's Office).
  - Accident Prevention Bureau (a short film).
  - Traffic Services Bureau display.
  - Vehicle Maintenance facilities (car wash facilities).
  - Corporation Court facilities.
- The following vehicles will be on display:
- Vehicle with radar unit, Motorcycle, Patrol car, Expressway car, Police wrecker, Paddy wagon, Community Relations Bus, Bexar County patrol car, State Highway patrol car, and Armed Forces Police Detachment Vehicle.

#### INTERVIEW WITH GORDON LUCE

### HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, California has long been credited with one of the finest transportation systems anywhere in the world. Our highway department, probably the best administered anywhere, has worked over the years to provide motorists the safest and most economical freeway and secondary systems available. Californians are proud of the fact that our toll-free roads have been paid for from user fees and not from general fund revenue.

The Reagan administration, when they took office in 1967, placed special emphasis on transportation. To head the all-important position of secretary of business and transportation, they found Gordon C. Luce of San Diego. Mr. Luce is 43 years old and holds a masters degree in business administration from Stanford University. Prior to joining the State service, he was a savings and loan executive in San Diego. As secretary of business and transportation, Mr. Luce serves as overall coordinator of the State's transportation network.

The April 1969 issue of Westways contains an informative interview with Secretary Luce. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the transcript of this interview:

INTERVIEW WITH GORDON LUCE  
(By Paul Ditzel)

The Governor's Task Force on Transportation recently recommended ways in which California could plan and coordinate its current and future transportation requirements.

Major among the Task Force's recommendations was the suggestion that the state develop a transportation master plan that would include the encouragement of urban mass transportation and continued development of the state system of highways, roads and streets.

Formation of the Task Force was the idea of Gordon C. Luce, State Secretary of Business and Transportation. It included 24 business and professional leaders who were assisted by more than 100 transportation specialists. Chairman was architect and planner William L. Perelra, whose views appeared as the first installment (November, 1967) in Westway's recent series, "Transportation: What's Ahead for Southern California?"

In this interview, Secretary Luce discusses the report and related matters.

*Question. What is the significance of the Task Force report?*

LUCE. Let me say, first of all, that there is an unfortunate, but understandable, tendency to weary of discussions of the transportation problem and to vow to do something or to build something before we really know what it is that should be built or done to best serve our economic, social and environmental needs. To their credit, the Task Force did not lay out, in a neat pile, all of the state's transportation problems and then proceed to solve them. Rather, it pointed out that the most serious deficiency in our approach to transportation is our inability to identify and to evaluate our current and future requirements. There is little correlation of presently available information that could correct this deficiency, and even less coordinated planning among land, sea and air modes of transportation.

The Task Force recommended, therefore, that the legislature create and fund a California Transportation Board and an Office of State Transportation Planning and set up Regional Transportation Districts. By correlating present information and plans as well as other material that will be developed, these agencies will evolve a transportation master plan for California—one that would interlock with programs of our neighbor states as well as those of the federal government.

*Question. You mention other plans and there have, of course, been many of them. Is there a danger that this report, because it does not propose concrete solutions, will become another archival curiosity?*

LUCE. I hope not. California cannot afford to cast off the Task Force report as just another study. The Governor and the legislature appreciate that this report was the product of 18 months of study by as knowl-

edgeable a group as has ever been formed anywhere to study transportation. The state could not have afforded to hire this combined expertise, which was voluntarily given to us. At the same time, I don't think we can say that past plans are necessarily bad because they are gathering dust somewhere. The master plan suggested by the Task Force could reactivate many of these plans, including, perhaps, the \$100,000 plan that the state contracted with North American Aviation, Inc. to prepare several years ago.

*Question. What is being done to implement the Task Force recommendations?*

LUCE. Most of the recommendations must be implemented by legislative action. In the meantime, I have appointed Charles G. Beer to the post of Transportation Planning Coordinator for the state. He is helping to prepare the necessary legislation that would bring the Task Force's recommendations into reality. Beer served as a Task Force advisor and project director. For the past six years he has headed the Urban Planning Department of the California Division of Highways, so he is especially well qualified.

*Question. Will the creation of these state agencies result in the employment of large numbers of additional personnel?*

LUCE. No. The Transportation Board would consist of no more than seven members appointed by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the legislature. The Office of Transportation Planning would be small—probably a few planners from the Highway Department, the Finance Department and the Public Utilities Commission. This would be a coordinating team and would retain consultants rather than build a large "in-house" staff. Such an office could assist the Regional Transportation Districts.

*Question. What do you see as the first activity of these new agencies?*

LUCE. Transportation finance. We always seem to end up pondering how we are going to pay for whatever transportation improvement is suggested.

The state does not now have the ability to explore, in depth, how transportation can best be funded. The Planning Office could study other states and learn what they are doing. And it will work with various communities in an attempt to draw up guidelines on how other modes of transportation—rapid transit, for example—could be financed. The Planning Office would also be the focal point for the pooling, coordination and exchange of information, whether it be in regard to land-use planning, coordination of transportation facilities or standardization of equipment—all of which would help lower the cost of systems supplemental to freeways.

*Question. How else can the state encourage solutions to the transportation problems?*

LUCE. Chiefly by passing enabling legislation to permit communities to vote for a half cent sales tax—over and above present sales tax—to provide a fund for any form of transportation they wish, whether it be rapid transit, buses or additional street, highway and freeway construction. We are working on such a bill for presentation to the legislature this year.

Every city is unique in its history and its layout. The community knows—far better than the state does—what they must do to gear their transportation to the needs of their area. We are here to help. But the state must never go into the business of building transportation systems, other than our present and future involvement with highways, streets and roadways.

*Question. You obviously favor the sales tax over other approaches to financing transportation.*

LUCE. Very much so. The sales tax is a more equitable way for us to pay for rapid transit than, for example, further increases in the property tax. I think that most people misunderstand the benefits of a sales tax.

This tax is paid by everybody. Whether or not each person in a community intends to use the transportation improvement, the facility benefits the area as a whole. There are some who argue that a sales tax is a hardship on low-income people, but I think the wealthier person certainly pays his share because his buying power is much greater. Sales taxes can, moreover, be turned off and on, quicker than any other form of taxation, a significant factor considering the urgency for solutions to public transportation problems. Another advantage to the sales tax is the slight cost to the state in collecting it.

*Question. Is this how the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) will be helped out of its present financial distress?*

LUCE. I hope so. There is a bill now that could result in a half cent sales tax—for four and a half years—in the three Bay Area counties that will benefit from BART. Another plan, which I strongly oppose, would double bridge tolls. This solution would require that BART's bonds be refinanced, thus resulting in added interest payments of around \$100 million—almost as much as BART needs to get out of its financial trouble. Increased bridge tolls also would put off for many years the construction of another bridge that is so badly needed in the Bay Area.

*Question. Would you support a state constitutional amendment to permit diversion of highway user taxes for other purposes—such as building rapid transit systems?*

LUCE. No, I would not. Highway user taxes have worked successfully in California. You have only to compare our situation with other states—notably New York—to see just how well it has worked. In New York, the gas tax money has been used for other purposes. Consequently, that state has fallen behind in its highway program. New York now has a \$2½ billion bond issue, which they hope will bring them back on schedule. The special fund for highways has worked well in California. It should not be tampered with.

*Question. Are there other sources of finance?*

LUCE. Yes. I would hope that we could obtain what I feel is due the state from the Federal Highway Trust Fund. When the fund was established in 1956, all the states contributed gas tax money to a national fund for building the Interstate Highway System. Four cents on each gallon of gasoline purchased by Californians still goes into that fund.

We have now put into the fund over a billion dollars more than has come back to the state; the federal government returns only 81 percent of our money. We are considered a "donor" state to help other states, such as Oregon, which gets back 126 percent; Arizona, which gets 138 percent; and Nevada, which gets 167 percent. The citizens of California are building roads in these other states.

While we recognize the validity of the concept and the need for the Interstate system, I believe that we should be getting back more than 81 percent of our money. Even the return of one additional percent of the over \$400 million we annually send to the federal government in gas taxes could result in a sizable amount to further our transportation programs.

*Question. Do you foresee a gas tax increase? And if so, when?*

LUCE. I would hate to say to the taxpayer that we need another two cents on every gallon of gasoline he buys. An increase is, however, inevitable, if inflation and the population growth and transportation demands continue, which certainly seems likely. But I would not expect any increase for at least two years.

*Question. The Task Force recommended that the activities of these new transportation offices be funded by the state highway, aeronautics and general funds. Do you agree?*

LUCE. Yes. I am aware that there are some who are against use of the general fund and some who say all of the cost should be borne by the highway fund. I am, however, opposed to use of the highway fund to pay the whole bill. Funding must come from as broad a number of sources as possible, because so many forms of transportation are under consideration.

*Question. What role might the systems analysis approach hold for the transportation problems we face?*

LUCE. Transportation planning requires a great amount of input, and the only way you can do this is to computerize that input and develop systems from it. Private enterprise has demonstrated these skills. I hope that sometime in the future, after we get the Planning Office off the ground, we will utilize some of these systems analysis specialists.

*Question. To what extent do you see the private and academic sectors working with the state on its transportation problems?*

LUCE. They will play the major role in the years ahead, although they have in the past performed a relatively minor role, considering the state's virtual monopoly in highway work. The state will continue its highway activity, of course, but I think the overall problem in transportation is so broad, considering the other transportation modes, that we must go outside for expertise. Rather than have the state perform studies and do all the planning and building, we have to look to private enterprise and find out who can do the best job and then put them to work doing it.

*Question. Do you think our approach to urban transportation is lopsided in favor of highway, as compared to some other modes?*

LUCE. As I pointed out earlier, the state's role has been primarily in freeway activity, and not among the other forms of transportation. However, I believe the creation and work of the Governor's Task Force demonstrates an increasing interest in other forms of transportation to supplement the highway system.

Additionally, of course, the Bay Area Rapid Transit District is going forward with the development of rapid transit lines on a regional basis.

*Question. Ridership studies in the Bay Area Rapid Transit District are said to be among the best ever made. Does not the Bay Area's desire for rapid transit parallel that of southern California and suggest that a similar system should be built in Los Angeles?*

LUCE. Not necessarily. Rapid transit may be more attractive in certain areas, such as San Francisco, where people have become accustomed to high-density living and have learned to use various modes in addition to the automobile. BART's own prediction in San Francisco is that the completed system will make a 10 to 13 percent dent in motor vehicular traffic on the San Francisco Bay Bridge. Bridge traffic, however, is growing between 4 and 5 percent a year, so they're buying themselves only about two and one-half years of time before they are back to the present carrying capacity of the bridge. I'm not saying we should not try to make a dent, because a dent is better than nothing, provided the public wants it.

*Question. The Task Force said the state should determine the need or demand for mass transit. Do you think people really want to get out of their autos and ride mass transit?*

LUCE. The only way you can win the motorist away from his car is to provide him with a service that is more convenient and perhaps less costly. It remains to be seen whether any mass transit system will appeal to a sufficiently large number of people to really do anything more than make a small dent in the urban transportation problem.

*Question. What is your assessment of the*

*expanded use of buses as a prelude to rail rapid transit systems?*

LUCE. It offers distinct and attractive possibilities. I think the first step before we make a major investment in a fixed rail rapid transit system is to work with something that costs less, can be laid out more quickly and seems to appeal more to the public. No doubt, if a modern type of bus were developed and used special street and freeway lanes, it would offer a flexibility of movement that would attract ridership.

*Question. Should a study, similar to that made by the Task Force, have preceded the recent rapid transit Proposition A proposal that was defeated in Los Angeles?*

LUCE. I believe so. While the rapid transit proposal had some outstanding citizen leadership, there were not enough leaders who were directly involved in its planning so that they could come forward and encourage everybody's support. With an overall involvement of business, professional, academic and transportation specialists—representative of the makeup of the Task Force—the outcome might have been different.

*Question. Some blame rapid transit's failure on the proposed sales tax increase to pay for it.*

LUCE. I doubt very much. People were not voting for or against a sales tax as much as they were not convinced that the system would solve their problem. Proposition A did better than some other measures that were far more financial in nature.

*Question. Noting that Californians are concentrating in three regional areas—Los Angeles, San Diego and San Francisco—the Task Force said it is the "definite responsibility" of the state to encourage, if not directly underwrite, urban mass transit. Do you agree?*

LUCE. No. The state should not underwrite transit. This is a regional issue and it is up to the people of the area to decide if they want it and how they will go about paying for it if they do. I do believe, however, that the state should enable and/or encourage the development of mass transit.

*Question. The Task Force raised the possibility of developing a system of single purpose toll roads in the State of California. How do you feel about this?*

LUCE. I am opposed to toll roads in California, except, possibly, for special uses such as the planned Mineral King Highway, tunnels or bridges. Toll systems are expensive in themselves because you must set up collection facilities and hire collectors. I think the public would prefer to pay a half cent more on their gas tax and have the freedom of driving toll-less highways.

*Question. High-speed train service is receiving much attention on the East Coast, in Canada and Japan. Do you see it offering advantages to the traveler along the San Francisco-Los Angeles-San Diego corridor?*

LUCE. Not particularly. In other areas, people have been train oriented for generations. In California, we are not. We are so accustomed to getting on and off airplanes serving this corridor that it is unlikely high-speed rail service would prove attractive—either in speed or in fares. Possibly it might when air congestion significantly worsens, but by then we will probably have developed the satellite airport concept, which would relieve the major air terminals.

*Question. If the Task Force's recommendations are carried out, would you speculate on the makeup of urban transportation in southern California by 1985?*

LUCE. Anything that is planned for the future in this area should be extremely conscious of environment, design standards, aesthetics and land use, in addition, of course, to mobility. In recent years we have emphasized a program of bringing the park people together with the planners, the architects with the highway engineers, so that some symmetry in transportation planning

results. We must also have a system that serves the needs of all the people. It is to be hoped, moreover, that there will be overall planning and coordination of efforts so that all the transportation modes we decide upon will work together.

There is no doubt in my mind that freeways will continue to be the major mode. We must make better use of them, however. We have an experimental project under way now that uses electronic sensors to monitor traffic along part of the Los Angeles freeway network. Eventually, this could lead to a surveillance system that would benefit motorists by making driving easier and safer. Maybe, too, there are forms of rapid transit that will help southern California's problem. We must, nevertheless, strive for balance and coordination in our transportation systems.

## BOGUS MONEY, THE VERDICT OF AN AMERICAN JURY

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the age-old battle as to whether money as a medium of exchange must have intrinsic value or whether by custom and educated usage money can be a theoretical value was judicially resolved by a jury trial on December 7, 1968, in Scott County, Minn.

The jury found that credit called "instant money" through a bookkeeping entry by a bank was not lawful consideration to support a promissory note.

Perhaps the soaring trend of inflation and the ever-increasing manipulation by the money destroyers to remove the historical metals of intrinsic value are making it harder to fool the people.

The bank having lost the case and wanting to perfect an appeal tendered two \$1 Federal Reserve notes which were refused with the statement that a \$1,000 Federal Reserve note was worth less in value than a 10-cent trading stamp.

Mr. Speaker, I include two news editorials on the paper money case:

[From the Central Valley (Calif.) Valley Times, May 15, 1969]

A \$1,000 BILL WORTH LESS THAN A 10 CENT TRADING STAMP  
(By Jo Hindman)

A recent court ruling that affects your money reveals that Federal Reserve credit and currency—the same you are earning and spending—has no lawful value.

It came about this way: a bank foreclosed by advertisement on a borrower's note, bought the property (loan's collateral) at a Sheriff's sale, sued to acquire possession of the real estate in a case titled: First National Bank of Montgomery (Minn.) vs. Jerome Daly.

Martin V. Mahoney, Justice of the Peace, Credit River Township, Scott County (Minn.) presided at a jury trial on Dec. 7, 1968. The jury found the note and mortgage to be void for failure of a lawful consideration; also the jury refused to give any validity to the Sheriff's sale. The bank lost. Jerome Daly, the defendant, won and kept his land.

The president of the bank which is within the Federal Reserve System, admitted in testimony that the bank "created" the money/credit by a bookkeeping entry, the so-called consideration for the note and mortgage deed; also that no U.S. law or statute existed to give the bank the right to create

money in that manner. Handing down the judgment, Justice Mahoney said, "Only God can create something of value out of nothing."

The bank tried to appeal the case. The appeal fee of \$2 was offered by the bank, using two Federal Reserve Notes (\$1 bills); these were likewise declared unlawful and void. The bank agent failed to appear at a hearing on Jan. 22, 1969 and the appeal was dropped.

By comparison, a humble trading stamp is worth more than a \$1 bill (Federal Reserve Note), or even a \$1000 Federal Reserve Note. The two bills differ only in denomination and perhaps engraved design; each has paper-and-ink value of a fraction of a cent. On the other hand, basic trading stamps—the gold, the blue, the green—each has face value of one mill. Superior to paper money (FR notes), trading stamps have redemptive value in the merchandise offered in the stamp companies' catalogs. The Fed's currency cannot be converted into the gold or silver it purports to represent, and can be exchanged only for more of the same—paper or cheap clad-copper coins.

Fantastic? Remember the foregoing Daly case: a United States court prevented the bank's attempt to redeem its worthless note by seizing Daly's valuable land. The saga is explained with detailed clarity by Mr. Daly, a brilliant lawyer on monetary law, in "A Landmark Decision," price, \$2, 28 E. Minnesota St., Savage, Minnesota 55378.

You say "But paper money has been working out okay."

The practice works if nobody objects. Jerome Daly objected. Do you object to working 23 hours (three days) to pay for a new suit? Or two weeks to buy an automatic washing machine? While Federal Reserve banker needs only to uncup his pen to create and to multiply fiat dollars thousand-fold? "Fiat" means the money cannot be converted into metal coins—gold, silver, etc.

Worse, the Federal Reserve System is a private corporation, not a federal agency, despite its name and the 1913 Act that "blessed" it. The Fed's money-multiplication table appears on page 73 of The Federal Reserve System (1963), obtainable from the system, Wash., D.C., 20551.

Obviously, the wrong needs to be made right, Congress should outlaw the Fed's money-creating racket, should recall the clad-copper coins and replace the silver, should take steps to restore the gold that has been trucked off. Congress not The Fed, should regulate U.S. money.

Your U.S. Senators and Congressmen know, or should know about the critical mess.

#### THE FEDERAL RESERVE'S "INSTANT MONEY" OPERATION IS DECLARED NULL AND VOID BY COURT AND JURY

(By E. F. W. Wildermuth)

The never explained conspiratorial like silence by the news media of this nation has kept most people in ignorance concerning a decision of major importance to all Americans, rendered by a court and jury in Minnesota on the 27th anniversary of the prelude to World War II via sneak attack on Pearl Harbor.

To better understand the importance of this decision a brief review of the wisdom displayed by the framers of the U.S. Constitution is likely to prove helpful.

It was the purpose of the framers of the Constitution to provide for the creation of a firmly established common medium of exchange in payment for goods and services and in settlement of debts.

In an effort to achieve this end, it was mandated in the Constitution that the Congress of the United States shall have the sole and exclusive power to coin money and regulate the value thereof. To insure the uniformity of value of such money, the

power to coin money was denied to the States.

Since the adoption of the Constitution it appears that Americans have become victims of sundry self-styled "do-gooders" claiming wisdom far superior to that demonstrated by the Founding Fathers. Under the guise of "protecting" Americans, laws have been enacted designed to "protect" Americans from almost every conceivable shortcoming of fallible man, many of which have proved to be deadly boomerangs.

#### FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Among those man-made laws which have boomeranged is the Act of Congress approved by President Wilson on 23 December, 1913. This Act created the Federal Reserve System, composed of 12 Federal Banks, their branches and numerous National Banks, etc.

Americans have come to believe that the Federal Reserve Banks are owned and operated by the federal government. The Federal Reserve Banks are privately owned and pay no taxes. The Federal Reserve System is the most complex "instant money" Frankenstein ever created in the recorded history of mankind.

Presently, the money manipulators of the Federal Reserve Board are trying desperately to make their unconscionably high interest rate stick in what must be their futile effort to stem the wild inflation in this nation now about to get out of hand. It is the same Federal Reserve "experts," now striving so mightily, who have wholly failed to stabilize the dollar and curb inflation after having successfully advocated the outlawing of the Gold Standard in 1933.

In this dark hour of financial crisis it appears that the money manipulators of the world, operating through the Federal Reserve System, may have met over-powering adversity.

#### MORTGAGE FORECLOSED

Jerome Daly, an attorney in Minnesota, executed a Note and Mortgage on May 8th, 1964 in the sum of \$14,000.00 to the First National Bank of Montgomery. In the Spring of 1967 Mr. Daly came into arrears in payments in the sum of \$476.00. The Note was secured by a Mortgage owned by Mr. Daly at Spring Lake Township in Scott County, Minn. The First National Bank of Montgomery foreclosed the Mortgage and bought the property at a Sheriff's Sale on June 26, 1967. Not having made payments after the sale or redeemed the property within the 12 months provided therefor by law, the Bank brought an action at common law to recover possession of the property . . . this is where the woes of the Bank began to sprout.

The suit by the Bank was instituted in the Justice of Peace Court at Savage, Minn. After two judges had been disqualified for prejudice and a third refused to preside at the trial, the case was transferred, pursuant to law, for trial before the Justice of Peace, Credit River Township, Scott County, Minn.

On December 7, 1968, the case was tried before Hon. Martin V. Mahoney and a jury of 12. The jury found against the First National Bank of Montgomery and in favor of Mr. Daly.

#### A BOOKKEEPING ENTRY

It was admitted at the trial by the President of the First National Bank that in combination with the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, by virtue of their interlocking activity and practice they were one and the same bank and that they created the entire \$14,000.00 which had been loaned to Mr. Daly, in money or credit upon their books by a bookkeeping entry. It was this "instant money" which the First National Bank of Montgomery used as "consideration" to support the Note and the Mortgage which it allegedly foreclosed. The jury found as a fact that the "instant money" created by the simple act of a bookkeeping entry by the

loaning institution (The First National Bank) was not the lawful consideration required to support the Note it took from Mr. Daly and the Mortgage he gave the Bank as security for the Note. It having been determined that the Note and Mortgage were void for want of lawful consideration, there could be no validity to the so-called Sheriff's sale.

#### "INSTANT MONEY"

There is no law or statute which permits or authorizes the creation of such "instant money" or any other money. Only Congress is vested with the power to create money and the Constitution does not authorize Congress to delegate its power to coin money and regulate the value thereof. Yet, the Federal Reserve Banks have been lawlessly creating "instant money" with impunity for ever so many years . . . until the Court and jury in the Daly case found in essence, if not in fact, that the Federal Reserve Banks are not above the law. It is self-evident that the champions of "instant money" do consider themselves above the law, especially in view of the fact that such is not the full nature and extent of the lawlessness practiced by the Federal Reserve Banks.

Most Americans are not aware of the brutal fact that in addition to their lawless practice of creating money and credit by the act of a bookkeeping entry, the Federal Reserve and National Banks exercise the ultimate prerogative of expanding and reducing the supply of money and credit in this nation. Those fiscal "experts" also indulge in manipulation of interest rates without authority therefor by law . . . sometimes for their self-styled humanitarian purpose of presuming to control inflation, etc. If a continuance of such lawless acts is to be condoned, the creators of "instant money" can any day make paupers of practically every law abiding American, among others, by the simple expedient of controlling the supply of money, credit, etc. The same money magicians who can create money out of nothing can also create, at their whim and caprice, a financial crisis in this nation which will make the financial debacle which plagued Germany in the early 1920's look like a Sunday school picnic. The price of money and the value of money are not one and the same thing . . . A carload of "printing press money" is of little or no value to a person who has not the means of transporting such money to pay for a loaf of bread. Federal Reserve Notes are printing press money.

#### FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES "VOID"

Undaunted by the fact that a Court and jury had judicially determined that the First National Bank of Montgomery could not lawfully create money or credit by the act of bookkeeping entry, it offered two \$1.00 Federal Reserve Notes in payment of the fee required by law to appeal from the judgment obtained against it by Mr. Daly. This "printing press money" was rejected by the Court upon the ground that it was void, among other reasons, because the sole consideration therefor was less than 1c, the cost of printing thereof: that the Notes lack a real or substantial fund for their redemption and because the portion of the U.S. Code which presumes to make such Notes legal tender was void as contravening Article 1, Section 10 of the U.S. Constitution.

Thus, it appears that Government has been permitted to become the enemy of all decent and well disposed Americans largely because Congress has surrendered the sole and exclusive power "to coin money."

Who, among the public officials of this day, undertakes to prove worthy of their forefathers by pledging their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor in pursuit of whatever means are lawful and just in restoring to Congress "the sole and exclusive power to coin money and regulate the value thereof?"

**JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM:  
AN INTRODUCTION TO FREE EN-  
TERPRISE**

**HON. FRANK HORTON**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of young people today are honest, enthusiastic, and conscientious.

Unfortunately, the headlines in today's news go to those seeking to disrupt our society. It is my feeling—and I am sure that many of my colleagues in the House agree with me—that more emphasis should be given to the constructive activities of young people.

In that light, I would like to share with you and my colleagues the results of one junior achievement project in Rochester, N.Y. As many of you know, there are junior achievement programs in 600 to 800 communities across the country. These programs are designed to teach teenagers about private enterprise.

Business and community leaders organize programs in cooperation with local high schools. The young people then form, operate, and finally liquidate the individual business.

An example of such an operation could be the manufacture of a toy by the youthful businessmen. The project would include designing, manufacturing, and then actually selling the product. Young people would handle all the financial aspects of the business, carefully preparing the profit-and-loss sheet and other data.

The junior achievement program demonstrates existing opportunities for young people in the business world. It also serves as a guide for schools and helps them to adapt curriculums to present-day circumstances.

One of the junior achievement projects in my district is a monthly newspaper called the Young Opinion. This newspaper is sponsored by the Gannett newspapers in Rochester. Of the 19 teenagers who put out the newspaper, 18 have won awards for exceptional performance.

An interesting sidelight is the benefit to two particular students.

One came from a very unsettled family background, did poorly in school and had very poor work habits. The student is now in a stable home. Schoolwork has improved tremendously and the student has won two free trips to junior achievement conventions because of exceptional performance.

Adult supervisors at the newspaper tell me that another youngster had no respect for the free enterprise system and was also a poor student when he started. After joining the staff of the newspaper, the student sold \$200 in advertising, applied for a college scholarship and is preparing to enter a cooperative educational program.

The Gannett newspapers have provided an outstanding public service in backing the junior achievement program. Mr. Al Mahar, Gannett director of sales, has worked closely with the Young Opinion staff and is also a member of the area junior achievement board of directors.

Mr. and Mrs. Theodore Warmbold, a husband and wife editor-reporter team for Gannett, are guiding the editorial direction of the Young Opinion. From the fresh, creative look of the newspaper, I would say they have done an extraordinary job with these young people.

Mr. J. Patrick O'Connor, chairman of the Gannett Co.'s junior achievement committee, has supervised the financial, production, and sales end of the operation.

The teenagers include Andrzej Gierczak, president; Vincent Giannantonio, vice president; Arlene Raybould, secretary; Roberta Torrance, treasurer; Patricia Pogroszewski, safety director; Nancy Berry, personnel director; Daniel Muldoon, advertising manager; and Johana Ambrose, Jeanne Barton, Carol Bojinoff, John Huber, Valerie Humnicky, Paul Miller, Robert Minges, Denis Pohl, Bill Ovellette, John Jones and James Wacht.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all of my colleagues here will join with me in wishing these young people success for their future and commending the efforts of all who helped them.

**DRAFT TREATY PROHIBITING NU-  
CLEAR AND OTHER WEAPONS  
FROM THE OCEAN FLOOR**

**HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the International Organizations and Movements Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee and as congressional adviser to the Standing Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Seabed and the Ocean Floor Beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction, I applaud the action of the U.S. Government in proposing a draft treaty banning nuclear weapons and other implements of mass destruction from the ocean floor.

The draft treaty, unveiled today in Geneva, gives effect to proposals which the United States has been discussing during the past 2 years in different U.N. committees.

It constitutes a sensible and cautious first step—a very necessary step—toward the reservation of the oceans for peaceful purposes benefiting all mankind.

The United States has led the movement to make this principle operative in the domain of space; we now propose to extend it to the oceans.

I earnestly hope that the 18-Nation Disarmament Commission, meeting in Geneva, will give prompt and sympathetic consideration to the U.S. proposal.

In an age in which the threat of a nuclear holocaust has become a grim reality, we must exert every effort to extend the area of land, space, and the sea which will be denied to war-type activities.

The U.S. proposal does not jeopardize our national security; it respects the security requirements of all sovereign nations. At the same time, however, it at-

tempts to provide a better, a more secure foundation for future peace.

Contents of the treaty follows:

**DRAFT TREATY PROHIBITING THE EMPLACEMENT OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND OTHER WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION ON THE SEABED AND OCEAN FLOOR**

(Submitted by the United States at the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva on May 22, 1969)

The States Parties to this Treaty, Recognizing the common interest of all mankind in the progress of the exploration and use of the seabed and ocean floor for peaceful purposes,

Considering that the prevention of a nuclear arms race on the seabed and ocean floor serves the interests of maintaining world peace, reduces international tensions, and strengthens friendly relations among States,

Convinced that this Treaty will further the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, in a manner consistent with the principles of international law and without infringing the freedoms of the high seas, Have Agreed as Follows:

**ARTICLE I**

1. Each State Party to this Treaty undertakes not to implant or emplace fixed nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction or associated fixed launching platforms on, within or beneath the seabed and ocean floor beyond a narrow band, as defined in Article II of this Treaty, adjacent to the coast of any State.

2. Each State Party to the Treaty undertakes to refrain from causing, encouraging, facilitating or in any way participating in the activities prohibited by this Article.

**ARTICLE II**

1. For purposes of this Treaty, the outer limit of the narrow band referred to in Article I shall be measured from baselines drawn in the manner specified in paragraph 2, hereof. The width of the narrow band shall be three (3) miles.

2. Blank (Baselines).

3. Nothing in this Treaty shall be interpreted as prejudicing the position of any State Party with respect to rights or claims which such State Party may assert, or with respect to recognition or non-recognition of rights or claims asserted by any other state, relating to territorial or other contiguous seas or to the seabed and ocean floor.

**ARTICLE III**

1. In order to promote the objectives and ensure the observance of the provisions of this Treaty, the Parties to the Treaty shall remain free to observe activities of other States on the seabed and ocean floor, without interfering with such activities or otherwise infringing rights recognized under international law including the freedoms of the high seas. In the event that such observation does not in any particular case suffice to eliminate questions regarding fulfillment of the provisions of this treaty, parties undertake to consult and to cooperate in endeavoring to resolve the questions.

2. At the review conference provided for in Article V, consideration shall be given to whether any additional rights or procedures of verification should be established by amendment to this treaty.

**ARTICLE IV**

Any State Party to the Treaty may propose amendments to this Treaty. Amendments shall enter into force for each State Party to the Treaty accepting the amendments upon their acceptance by a majority of the States Parties to the Treaty and thereafter for each remaining State Party on the date of acceptance by it.

**ARTICLE V**

Five years after the entry into force of this Treaty, a conference of Parties to the Treaty

shall be held in Geneva, Switzerland, in order to review the operation of this Treaty with a view to assuring that the purposes of the Preamble and the provisions of the Treaty are being realized. Such review shall take into account any relevant technological developments. The review conference shall determine in accordance with the views of a majority of those Parties attending whether and when an additional review conference shall be convened.

## ARTICLE VI

Each Party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from this Treaty if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this Treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its Country. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other Parties to the Treaty and to the United Nations Security Council three months in advance. Such notice shall include a statement of the extraordinary events it regards as having jeopardized its supreme interests.

## ARTICLE VII AND VIII

Blank (administrative provisions).

## GET YOUR OWN HOUSE IN ORDER

## HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1969

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, during the incredibly ridiculous New York subway strike several years ago as well as in the case of numerous other strikes which plague New York City constantly, I do not recall any Member of the South Carolina congressional delegation calling upon the President to intervene. Somehow, these strikes seemed to be a matter for the State of New York to settle, or at least attempt to settle.

However, I suppose it is just asking too much to expect some of our colleagues from the State of New York to reciprocate for this common courtesy and decent way of doing things. Frustrated with their own lack of success at being able to resolve the complex problems of "Fun City," they now are turning to the sovereign State of South Carolina in an attempt to inject themselves into the internal affairs of my State.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was very interesting to note that of the 26 Members of the House who asked the President to intervene in the Charleston, S.C., hospital workers strike, 13 of them were from New York City. In addition, they were joined by the two Senators from New York, who themselves were among 17 Senators also asking the President to intervene.

Mr. Speaker, it never ceases to amaze me how far sheer hypocrisy can go. In the case of these House and Senate Members shoving themselves into a matter that in no way concerns them, hypocrisy has gone about as far as it can go. In every State represented by these gentlemen I can point to any number of critical State problems which, by comparison, make the Charleston situation seem like a Sunday school picnic. Nevertheless, I believe that these States can resolve their problems without any interference from me.

Now, instead of calling upon the President to step in and settle the strike, these gentlemen should have called upon national union leaders to abandon their attempts to violate the law and public policy of the State of South Carolina. Of course, this would be asking too much. After all, labor laws have been violated so much in other areas, especially New York City, until I am certain these gentlemen inadvertently forgot that they ever existed.

But, the very least these gentlemen could have done is publicly denounce strike leader Leon Julius Davis, the president of Local 1199 of the Drug and Hospital Employees Union. Surely, they must have known of the Communist activities of Mr. Davis. Perhaps I can refresh their memory. In 1938, Davis was the signer of a Communist Party petition to place a candidate on the Communist Party ballot. Later, while testifying before the House Committee on Education and Labor, he conveniently invoked the first and fifth amendments when asked if he was or had been a member of the Communist Party. The list of Communist and pro-Communist activities by Davis is virtually endless. However, for the benefit of my New York colleagues who may have a short memory, this is the same Leon Julius Davis who in 1960 was characterized by the Greater New York Hospital Association in a public statement as a "ruthless man using the sick and suffering as hostages in an attempt to set himself up as a dictator in our voluntary, nonprofit hospitals." The Hospital Association had ample reason to issue their statement. After all, Davis almost put them out of business because of illegal strikes, demonstrations, and outright violence.

Mr. Speaker, down my way a man—if he is a man—does not throw rocks at the neighbor's dog unless he has first locked up his own dog. Possibly the dog pounds in New York City are run very efficiently. If they are, it is the only thing there that comes to mind. So, if it is not asking too much of these gentlemen who have all the solutions for South Carolina, go home and get your own house in order, then come back and dictate to us. But, until you do, both the people of South Carolina and the people of your areas would be a lot better off if you would just hold your tongue.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I would like to include the following two editorials from the Columbia Record, Columbia, S.C., which point out some very interesting facts that should be considered by our colleagues who have been so quick to meddle in the affairs of my State:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, May 7, 1969]

## CHARLESTON AND LABOR LAWS

Those 26 liberal Democratic Congressmen who asked President Nixon to intervene in the Charleston strike of hospital workers included a sizable number of lawyers. But you'd never know it from their crisp capsulization of labor law in their open letter introduced on the House floor.

Indeed, so faulty is their argument that one wonders whether their law degrees shouldn't be recalled by their institutions. Not only do they misstate the facts of the Charleston argument but they fallaciously

interpret the Wagner Act and all subsequent history about relations between government as employer and public employees.

While the legal complications vary immensely from state to state, some facts of law are incontestable. The Wagner Act did not, as the Congressmen assert, make it clear that collective bargaining should extend into government as employer. Quite the contrary. (Perhaps the fact that exactly half, or 13, of the Congressmen come from union-dominated, strike-crippled New York City conditioned their thought.)

The facts are these: no one can prevent public employees from forming a union. Governor McNair has made this essential element clear in his several statements.

A second fact is equally important: no court can at present order governmental units to bargain or make contracts with public employee unions, except in those states with express provisions therefor.

A Federal court in North Carolina recently sustained these two elements of law. Additionally, the Court upheld the state law which forbids local or state governmental units from doing business with public employee unions. "There is nothing in the U.S. Constitution which entitles one to have a contract with another who does not want it."

Space does not permit extended review of government-organized labor problems, but it should be noted that differentiation can be made between three groups of civil employees: federal, state and local.

Also, it should be noted that a section of the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 made the ban on strikes by federal workers explicit: "It shall be unlawful for any individual employed by the U.S. or any agency thereof, including wholly owned government corporations, to participate in any strike. Any individual . . . who strikes shall be discharged immediately from his employment, and shall forfeit his civil service status, if any, and shall not be eligible for re-employment for three years." This provision was replaced on August 9, 1955, by a new and stronger substitute which made it a felony, punishable by a year's imprisonment and a fine of \$1,000 for a federal employee to strike or assert the right to strike, or knowingly to maintain membership in an organization asserting that right.

Some states recognize public employee unions, but forbid them to strike. Other states do not recognize employee unions. Of those which do, at least 15 states have laws expressly forbidding strikes by these employees—but the laws have been ineffective.

In 1967 the New York legislature replaced its Condon-Waddlin law with the Taylor Law. But even the Taylor law was ignored, prompting New York State Supreme Court Justice Emilio Nunez to remark: "This (teachers') strike by a powerful union against the public was a rebellion against the government; if permitted to succeed, it would eventually destroy the government, with resultant anarchy and chaos." The judge simply echoed what Presidents Calvin Coolidge and Woodrow Wilson had said previously.

On March 7 of this year, the New York legislature revised the Taylor law, effective the first of last month. Courts may now impose unlimited fines on striking government unions, suspend indefinitely dues check-offs and impose mandatory penalties on individual strikers. Each public employee who strikes will lose two days' pay for every day on strike, will be placed on probation for one year and lose all seniority.

The Advisory Committee on State Employment Relations (of the Council of State Governments) is engaged in a comprehensive examination of changing relationships between the government as an employer and its employees. Its findings will certainly sustain the right of any state to recognize, or not to recognize, public employee unions in a bargaining process.

In the interim, it should be understood

that the Charleston confrontation is more a well-financed, sustained assault on the state of South Carolina's position vis-a-vis public employee unions and less a racial matter. Pacific settlement short of union recognition is realistic and attainable. The pity is that the Charleston workers naively chose to move in the very year that, at long last, a state employee classification system was scheduled to be enacted—meeting at least the salary upgrading desired by the hospital personnel. To strike to attain a union that—in the history of America labor relations—is technically and legally not allowed to strike is a basic absurdity.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record,  
May 19, 1969]

#### PROJECTS FOR 17 SENATORS

Seventeen U.S. Senators, with profound expertise in the subtleties of the complex Charleston hospital strike that we did not know they possessed, have asked President Nixon to dispatch a mediator to South Carolina. They did so, they said, "because the importance of the dispute so clearly transcends the boundaries of Charleston, and even South Carolina." They added: "We believe the national interest demands efforts at the federal level to help resolve the impasse."

Interesting. Each of the 17, logically, subscribes to the doctrine that (a) internal affairs of a sovereign state, when they involve "the national interest," should be attended to by the federal Executive, and (b) "strategies of social change" should be non-violent.

All right. The assumptions being accepted, then let us suggest that Senators Thurmond and Hollings chat with their 17 colleagues about the dispatch of federal Executive representatives to each of the their states to help resolve problems that transcend the boundaries of their states and involve "the national interest."

The 17 are Senators Walter Mondale of Minnesota, Jacob Javits, and Charles Goodell of New York, Alan Cranston of California, Thomas Dodd of Connecticut, Fred Harris of Oklahoma, Phillip Hart of Michigan, Edward Kennedy and Edward Brooke of Massachusetts, George McGovern of South Dakota, Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin, Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania, Harrison Williams of New Hampshire, Ralph Yarborough of Texas, Stephen Young of Ohio, and Clifford Case of New Jersey.

Let us consider what the President could do to intervene in affairs of these states that concern the "national interest," transcending their boundaries:

Michigan—Desperate poverty of the Upper Michigan peninsula has not been solved by Senator Hart or the state; black unionists of the United Automobile Workers are rejecting UAW leadership as "discriminatory"; and Michigan's hegemony over U.S. automaking clearly needs in-depth surveillance.

New York City—Permanent offices of almost all Federal agencies are required to control mass corruption in dispensation of federal funds; permanent mediators should be present to help resolve the city's "a-strike-a-day" problems; and HEW must investigate the continuous violence in the city's schools. Surely Javits and Goodell would appreciate President Nixon's help.

Texas—Both federal and foundation funds are being used to create hatred among Mexican-Americans; braceros from Mexico and farmers of Mexico are being starved to death along the border by concerted action of organized American labor.

Oklahoma—A full-scale investigation of oil depletion allowances, on the spot, is an ancient requirement.

South Dakota—Rights of Indian-Americans consistently have been ignored and deserve on-the-spot mediation and improvement.

Massachusetts—The "one-man, one-vote"

philosophy of participatory democracy consistently has been ignored by the notoriously corrupt political structure of Massachusetts, an erosion of fundamental civil rights injurious to the "national interest"; and a full-scale inquiry of organized crime is obligatory.

Pennsylvania—Neither social welfare objectives of state or federal agencies are being met, with constant thwarting by Harrisburg; the City of Brotherly Love remains, in many aspects, a city of arrogant discrimination—particularly in building-trade unions.

New Jersey—Criminal influences upon the political system have been, and are, arrogant; open housing ordinances are ignored despite the best efforts of civil rights groups and ministerial organizations; and an inquiry into automobile insurance in the state should be welcome.

California—An objective inquiry into complaints of non-unionized grape-growers and workers, including violence against non-unionists, is mandatory; and several scores of mediators should be placed on all state college campuses for an indefinite time.

Ohio—Mayor Carl Stokes complains that the Nixon administration isn't seriously interested in the nation's major cities and a team of government officials ought to probe deeply into what has been done and not done in Cleveland and elsewhere—and why.

Wisconsin—A very fundamental civil right of Americans to "freedom of worship" has been violently abused by individuals disrupting Sunday worship services in Milwaukee.

The list is far from complete and quite frankly comes "from the top of the head." Unquestionably, some even more important problems transcending the boundaries of these states and clearly involving the "national interest" have been overlooked. But we are certain that the 17 Senators, all being gentlemen of honor with abiding concern for their own constituents, will ask President Nixon to dispatch the necessary investigative and meditative crews to their states.

At least, we think we are certain. Senators Hollings and Thurmond might do a little checking.

#### CASUAL REFERENCES TO BOYS' CLUBS HARM IMAGE OF "BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA"

### HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Boys' Clubs of America is a congressionally chartered, nationwide, citizens-supported, volunteer organization of over 830 Boys' Clubs serving close to 900,000 boys 6 through 18 years of age. Mr. A. L. Cole of the Reader's Digest has recently succeeded President Nixon as chairman of the national board. President Nixon is now honorary chairman of the organization.

Boys' Clubs of America is the only national, nonsectarian, all-boy, very low dues, building centered, full-time professionally staffed organization with a varied and diversified program which provides continuous informal guidance to all of its members on a daily basis.

Boys' Clubs are open to all boys regardless of race, color, background, or social or economic status. The same applies to professional staffs and volunteer workers.

Historically and currently Boys' Clubs

have a special interest in the disadvantaged boy usually not served by national youth organizations. Since a large percentage of Boys' Clubs are in the ghettos and since 34 percent of the boys are on the poverty level and another large number are near it, Boys' Clubs try very hard to reach the unreached, serve the unserved, motivate the unmotivated, and teach the untaught through programs of recreation, guidance, camping, health services, job counseling and placement, and family counseling to name a few.

Boys' Clubs are in their second century of service in building juvenile decency through programs aimed at promoting the health, social, educational, vocational, and character development of boys.

Unfortunately, there are many groups and organizations in this country which also call themselves Boys' Clubs but are in no way related to or affiliated with Boys' Clubs of America. In most instances these so-called "Boys' Clubs" are limited in scope and purpose. Thousands of athletic groups such as Little League and others call themselves "Boys' Clubs." Any group of boys banding together in their neighborhood can call themselves a "Boys' Club." Although many of these "Boys' Clubs" do provide some constructive activity, the program is seldom if ever as comprehensive in the total development of boys as that of Boys' Clubs of America.

More seriously, some organizations which have doubtful motives are operating under the guise of "Boys' Clubs."

One such example is that of the Boys' Club of Lexington, Ky., which has incorporated as a Boys' Club in the State of Kentucky but whose program and scope is questionable. They are currently under investigation by the House Banking and Currency Committee for tax gimmickry. This club does not have a building or a comprehensive program but as far as we know provides some scholarships to boys in Lexington. It also has a holding interest in a bank and possibly in a group of banks. Equally harmful is the confusion of identity resulting from newscasts about the "DuBois Club," a Communist Party group.

Derogatory publicity by these and other so-called "Boys' Club" organizations does not help the cause of Boys' Clubs of America. Boys' Clubs of America is vulnerable since it cannot control the use of the words "Boys' Clubs." It is difficult to convince the public that some of the less desirable types of Boys' Clubs are not the same kind of organizations as those affiliated with Boys' Clubs of America.

It is important that every opportunity be utilized to interpret the difference between a bona fide Boys' Club affiliated with Boys' Clubs of America and other "Boys' Clubs" in a community. Regular affiliated Boys' Clubs are normally members of a local Chest or United Fund and have a representative, high caliber board of directors responsible for the policy and operation of the Boys' Club. They have buildings, facilities, and camps and are operated by professionally trained workers. They provide a daily program of activities and services which are diversified and wide enough in scope to meet the in-

clination, interest and need of every boy in the community. Boys' Clubs of America affiliates are allowed to use the official Boys' Club keystone insignia on their buildings and stationery.

**FATHER ROMAGNO AT 75—CALM WILL COME AND THE FACTS WILL TALK**

**HON. JAMES J. HOWARD**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 24, 1969, the Reverend Marcellino Romagno, O.Ss. T., pastor of Mount Carmel Roman Catholic Church in Asbury Park, N.J., will celebrate the 50th anniversary of his ordination. He will be honored at a dinner in the Berkeley-Carteret Hotel, Asbury Park.

Father Romagno has made an outstanding contribution to his church and to Monmouth County and he has served as an inspiration to thousands of persons. Father Romagno married my wife, Marlene, and me so we have both had the pleasure of knowing him for some time.

Mr. Speaker, the Asbury Park Press recently published an article on Father Romagno which I found most inspiring. I know that my many colleagues in the House of Representatives will be interested in reading this article about a fine man and at this time I place that story in the RECORD:

[From the Asbury Park Sunday Press, Mar. 30, 1969]

**FATHER ROMAGNO AT 75—CALM WILL COME AND THE FACTS WILL TALK**

(By Ed Reiter)

ASBURY PARK.—There have been many milestones along the priestly path of the Rev. Marcellino Romagno, O.Ss.T.

And as the path grows longer, the milestones seem to grow larger.

Last year Father Romagno marked his 30th anniversary as pastor of Our Lady of Mt. Carmel Roman Catholic Church.

Earlier this month, he celebrated his 75th birthday.

And now he is preparing for an observance that looms as the largest milestone yet: The 50th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood.

It was on July 13, 1919, that John Michael Romagno, third of 10 children in a "simple, struggling" Italian family, took his final religious vows and assumed the name "Father Marcellino" as a member of the Order of the Most Holy Trinity.

As he approaches his golden jubilee, Father Romagno—a short, portly man with an air of quiet dignity—has only happy memories of the last half century.

"I have pleasant remembrances," he says, speaking with a soft Italian accent, "and I do not regret that I chose this kind of life. If someone would ask me if I would start all over again, I would say, 'Yes, I would.'"

The life that he chose actually was that of a missionary priest. The Trinitarian Order sent him to the United States from Italy in 1921 to work in its American missions.

He served at St. Ann's Church in Bristol, Pa., for 17 years—eight of them as pastor—before coming here.

Even today Mt. Carmel technically is a

missionary church, designed to serve Americans of Italian extraction.

"Today, we have all different nationalities in our parish, on account of intermarriages," Father Romagno notes.

"But we still have the privilege of a national parish. That is, those of Italian extraction can still belong here, even if this is not the closest church."

There are some 900 families in the parish now—twice as many as there were in 1938 when he became the pastor. And many of them live in other towns, notably Neptune and Ocean Township.

The parish has acquired more than just new members during the last 31 years. It has gained a whole complex of new buildings, including its present church, at Asbury avenue and Pine street (completed in 1951); its rectory (built in 1955), and its 12-classroom school and convent (dedicated in 1963).

Nor is Father Romagno through with his building program.

He's had plans drawn up for a youth center and gymnasium, and he hopes to have it built this summer.

"The people are surprised that at my age I undertook another heavy task," he relates. "But I felt I was able to do it, and knowing the kindness and generosity of the congregation I started with full confidence."

"The youth should be kept busy all the time," he adds. "They should get tired, so that when they go home they go to sleep. We are building this youth center so they can enjoy themselves and keep away from doing wrong things in the streets."

Amid all the growth of the parish, the pastor has made it his business to know his people personally.

"I know the children, parents, and grandparents," he says. "In 31 years so many have died, been born, and been married."

"In all this time I have always been interested in keeping the families together, giving them some kind of attraction toward the church."

The winds of change within the Catholic church have made the job of the priest more difficult in recent years, Father Romagno admits. He views them, however, without alarm.

"There are many changes that now seem to disturb our minds," he remarks, "but eventually they will do us a lot of good."

"Years ago the people had simple faith, but now we must work in the minds of the people and put the doctrine in different ways. Eventually all the doubts will be cleared up."

"You wait: In 10 or 15 more years the calm will come and the facts will talk. The church will not be destroyed, just purified."

He regards the use of English in the Mass as one example of a change for the better.

"The people did not understand anything in Latin," he says. "Now they attend Holy Mass more effectually and more diligently."

"It was very hard for me in the beginning because of my age, but I willingly accept the changes which the church has made."

Despite his age, he takes an understanding attitude toward younger priests who have forsaken the priesthood because their consciences came into conflict with church regulations.

"We must admire the younger priest today," he declares. "It's very hard to be a priest today. People's minds are all confused with this new ecumenical teaching, and they want to follow their own way, their own conscience."

"Many priests give up the priesthood because they think they can do better in the world. This turmoil happened before, at the time of the Reformation. But the calm came then, later on, and so it will come now, too."

Father Romagno is one of two priests in his own immediate family. His younger brother, the Rev. Michael Romagno, is pastor of a church in Senandoah, Pa.

His own aspiration is "to stay here as long as possible, as long as my mind is clear and I have my health."

"I feel better now than I did 30 years ago," he says. "But a person my age can't foresee so well 10, 15 or 20 years. I must live day by day, year by year."

"When the good Lord will say, 'That's enough, that's all,' I must go and someone else will continue the work of God."

"I'm not indispensable. One pope dies, another one comes. And so it is in the parish: Father Marcellino dies, another pastor comes. The church will go on."

In the meantime, he'll stay on the job. "I enjoy my work," he remarks.

And does he hope to mark his diamond jubilee 25 years hence?

"That," he says, "is up to the Boss."

**THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES CELEBRATES ITS GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY**

**HON. JAMES C. CORMAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the University of California at Los Angeles this week celebrates its golden anniversary. I warmly congratulate the university, its administration, and its student body on this momentous occasion. Not only as an alumnus of the university, but as one who has profited all his life from the high quality of education received at UCLA, do I participate in the well-deserved tributes that are being heaped upon this great institution during this week.

UCLA has a proud record to look back on since it opened its doors in 1919 as the southern branch of the University of California. In 1919, 1,250 students were enrolled. Today, almost 28,000 students are on campus daily; another 80,000 or so are registered in evening extension courses. UCLA is known as one of the very finest universities in the world. It has excelled in scholarship and in athletics. Its alumni have received fame and recognition in many fields of endeavor. Let me cite a few of the men and women UCLA has graduated: Dr. Ralph Bunche, Nobel Peace Prize winner; Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and Nobel Laureate in Chemistry; Agnes DeMille, famous choreographer; Jerome Hines, Metropolitan star; Jackie Robinson, the first Negro to play professional baseball; Louis Banks, managing editor of Fortune magazine; Rafer Johnson, Olympic decathlon winner; Dr. Walto Lyon, scientist who charted the first voyage of the U.S.S. *Nautilus* under the North Pole.

Indeed, UCLA is one of the finest in academia. The energy, integrity, the learning concepts, the hopes and aspirations of its faculty and student body have made it so. In a great measure, its achievements have been possible because of the unusual and prized system of free university education that the State of California has established for its citizens. The State's willingness to invest in the future of its citizens has contributed greatly to the exceptional institution that today is UCLA.

I am not unmindful that the problems which exist at many universities also exist on some of California's campuses, and that these unresolved problems must be solved if academic growth is to continue. Education at all levels is still the most meaningful opportunity this country can offer to its young people. This is especially true of higher education, because from that point, young people become this Nation's leaders—its doctors, scientists, businessmen; its educator, its artists, its writers, its politicians, and its statesmen—or whatever field of endeavor a young person wishes to pursue.

UCLA has extraordinary gifts to offer to these young people to prepare them for their place in society. UCLA's students will—and must—continue to be enriched in mind and in spirit, with freedom to learn and to create on the highest intellectual plane, without which this Nation will become a wasteland.

The university needs only to remember its past 50 years of accomplishments—through wars, depressions, and other times of great social change, to be able to look confidently toward an even greater future.

UCLA will continue to grow. Its influence will continue to be felt, and it will continue to be one of the best in academia.

#### MARITIME DAY

### HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, on this observance of Maritime Day, it would be well if we were to dedicate ourselves to actions in this Congress to bring a new sense of hope to those who operate and man our merchant marine—to the development of a program that will lead to a new era of construction of American vessels and an enlargement of the amount of cargo carried aboard these American vessels.

As we survey the disarray of our merchant marine fortunes on Maritime Day 1969 it must be obvious to all of us, Mr. Speaker, that we need a realistic program to properly carry out the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 so that the maritime industry may prosper instead of continuing to suffer. What is urgently needed is a sweeping program that will lead our ailing fleet to reconstruction and recovery.

A strong merchant marine is vital to U.S. prestige and potency as a seapower and should be commensurate with the U.S. status as a leading world power.

A strong merchant marine provides direct economic benefits for shipowners, shipbuilders and shipworkers, and indirectly benefits every other segment of our economy by serving the commercial needs of the Nation and the world.

A strong merchant marine provides an important means for redressing the deficit in our balance of payments, because to the extent that our imports and exports move in foreign vessels we add to the deficit, and to the extent that they

move in American vessels we contribute toward an eventual surplus.

In short, Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons for having a strong merchant marine. Yet we have ignored these facts and allowed our fleet to practically diminish—and this is regrettable. I would hope, therefore, that we can move forward from this Maritime Day toward a new era of maritime strength.

#### NORWEGIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this week many of us have had an opportunity to share with our admired Norwegian American friends in their celebration of Norwegian Independence Day.

These observances are a poignant reminder that 155 years ago the people of Norway were jubilant over the adoption of their new Constitution and its farsighted assurances of rights and privileges for them and for the subsequent generations to come.

It is no wonder that American citizens of Norwegian birth or extraction place the celebration of Norwegian Independence second only to our own American Independence Day. It is no wonder that these patriotic citizens who have consistently demonstrated their loyalty to this country, its flag, its laws, and its people pay such fervid tribute to their erstwhile homeland and the Constitution which their forebears adopted over a century and a half ago.

This noble and historic document came into being only after the most astute statesmen and proficient legal minds took from our Declaration of Independence and from the provisions for assuring personal freedom emanating from the French Revolution the best statements and principles which they wove into their own historically sound legal structure—a structure so sound and so far seeing that only a relatively few amendments have been required since its adoption on May 17, 1814.

With this magnificent background of independence both in theory and in practice, the people who left Norway to come to the United States brought an attitude of mind and a dedication of purpose wholly consonant with that of the pioneering people of this country.

No element among the races and nationalities who have migrated to our shores in the almost 200 years of its independent existence have made a more significant or lasting contribution to this Nation than those who came here from Norway. It is with both pride and appreciation that we acknowledge their signal influence on our westward expansion. It is with similar pride and gratitude that we acknowledge their great contribution to bringing to this country so many who pioneered and helped to expand this country's important maritime role.

Mr. Speaker, all America can be grate-

ful for what these God-fearing, law-abiding, and hard-working people have done to help build America into its present greatness. No group of new Americans has so quickly been blended and absorbed into the so-called American way than have these descendants of the Vikings. However, no group has been more capable of preserving the joyful customs and wholesome reminders of their forebears. Every American of Norwegian birth or extraction can be proud of his lineage and can be proud of what his people have done to make this country great.

Every American of whatever lineage can be proud of his fellow citizens who celebrate Norwegian independence, and every American can be grateful for what these fine people have done for him personally.

I congratulate once more these friends and neighbors who honor Norway's great constitution and who pay tribute to a country whose love for freedom and justice to all mankind has never wavered.

#### THE TACTICS OF TERROR IN VIETNAM

### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one aspect of the war in South Vietnam which has been either overlooked or ignored in some quarters is the extent to which civilians of South Vietnam have suffered at the hands of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese Communists. It is ironic, when one considers the propaganda war being waged by those who are against the U.S. effort in that beleaguered country, that full disclosure of the terror employed against these people is not given wider and regular publicity. When the U.S. presence in Vietnam is in defense of the South Vietnamese people in their fight to preserve their liberty against Ho Chi Minh, what better justification for our policy can we have than the brutal and widespread killings to which these free people are subjected? It is again ironic that attention is given to the fair packaging issue in order to insure that the housewife gets the proper quantity in a box of raisins, but the same housewife can lose a husband or a son in Vietnam and the cause for which he died is allowed to be buried in a welter of left-wing propaganda. The most simple yet eloquently compelling argument for our being in Vietnam—the protection of the lives of innocent people—goes virtually ignored in many circles. Just let five towns in any given State in our Nation suffer the loss by murder of a mayor, or a policeman, or a civil servant, or a teacher, or any other local leader at the hands of a group whose official policy is terror, and the people would be up in arms—and rightfully and fortunately so. But let literally thousands of village and hamlet chiefs, civil servants, policemen, schoolteachers and other village leaders

be dispatched to their graves over a period of 10 years or more in South Vietnam, by the same inhuman methods and motivated by the same godless philosophy which has snuffed out literally millions of lives throughout the world in the last 50 years, and this slaughter is matter-of-factly noted and forgotten.

One publication which has consistently put proper emphasis on Communist inhumanity to man in South Vietnam is the *National Observer*. One of its correspondents, Peter T. Chew, writing from Saigon, reports on the upsurge in terror in South Vietnam since the beginning of this year. It is indeed tragic that similar extensive articles on this issue do not appear day in and day out, month after month, to drive home to the American people the deliberately inflicted and policy-directed sufferings perpetrated by the enemy in that yet free land.

Accompanying Mr. Chew's article is a picture of a burial scene in South Vietnam which has been repeated thousands of times over the years. This particular picture is similar to others which were published in the weekly magazine, *National Review*, some months ago and which had been obtained from the Defense Department. The title of the *National Review* photo story was: "Vietnam—The Photographs We're Never Asked for."

The lead paragraph explained:

When *National Review* approached the Pentagon to secure photos of Vietcong atrocities, an official said, "You're the first people who ever asked for these." The photos on these four pages are clear—and, we know, sickening—evidence of atrocities outlawed by all laws of war, which have left Vietnam covered with butchered and desecrated corpses.

Under unanimous consent, I shall submit the article, "The Tactics of Terror in Vietnam—Viet Cong Strikes by Scalpel," by Peter T. Chew, and appearing in the May 19, 1969, issue of the *National Observer* for inclusion in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, as follows:

**VIETCONG STRIKES BY SCALPEL—THE TACTICS OF TERROR IN VIETNAM**  
(By Peter T. Chew)

SAIGON.—With both sides pressing peace initiatives, why has the National Liberation Front (NLF) intensified its campaign of terror against South Vietnamese civilians?

Since the first of the year, some 3,000 non-combatants have been assassinated, or have otherwise lost their lives as the result of mounting terrorist activity. In recent weeks—in apparent celebration of Ho Chi Minh's 79th birthday on May 19—terrorist incidents have assumed an especially ghastly quality. Furthermore, the trend is expected to continue in the weeks ahead, President Nixon's peace overture notwithstanding.

There is no single, clear-cut answer. But psychological-warfare specialists say that important clues can be found by careful study of the daily "Roundup of Communist Terrorist Activities" issued by the Vietnamese national police here every evening. Written in chillingly understated prose—"A VC team entered Xom Lang Hamlet, Go Cong Province, took a woman named Phan Thi Tri, aged 33, from her home to a rice field 50 meters away and killed her by cutting her neck with a machete"—the roundup puts one in mind of a stock market of death which is analyzed for information concerning the enemy's strengths, weaknesses, and intentions.

**WATCHING THE COMPUTERS**

"When the computers show, for example, a sharp increase in Viet Cong abductions of villagers in a sector of a province," says a U.S. Government authority, "it is an almost certain bet that we can soon look for a Viet Cong attack in that neighborhood because the villagers have been impressed into service as porters."

Most authorities agree that terrorism is a weapon of the weak, and that this rule of thumb can be applied to the Viet Cong at the present time, decimated as their ranks have been in combat. This is especially true in the Mekong Delta, where North Vietnamese Army (NVA) troops were reported on the move last week for the first time in the traditional Viet Cong stronghold.

As a result of this attrition, the burden of fighting shifted almost completely last year from the Viet Cong to the NVA. The VC were, in a sense, shunted aside. Consequently, they lost face with their allies and with the South Vietnamese people whom they seek to subjugate. They began to lose the momentum that a revolution must maintain in order to succeed.

"The hard fact is that the National Liberation Front is trying to fuff over its impotence," says Douglas Pike, author of the recently published *War, Peace, and the Viet-Cong*, who is considered one of the foremost authorities on the NLF; he served here for nine years with U.S. Government agencies studying the enemy's political and military structure.

**DRAWING ATTENTION TO THEMSELVES**

"The Viet Cong can't raise the troops to do the job, so this terrorism, this rocketing of market places and the like, is a way of drawing attention to themselves on the cheap. They almost seem to be saying: 'Yes, there is talk of peace, but we still count; we are still potent.' It's as though they were afraid that the North Vietnamese will forget to invite them to the final peace settlement."

Other reasons for the terrorism are put forward. With the incessant talk of U.S. troop withdrawals, and Washington's fervent desire for peace, the Viet Cong are passing the word, as they have done before, that the United States plans to "sell out" the government of Vietnam (GVN). By demonstrating that Viet Cong assassination squads, grenade tossers, and mortar crews can strike almost at will, the enemy is saying to the South Vietnamese: "You had better come over to our side before it is too late."

In Saigon during last year's Tet offensive, the Viet Cong started a similar rumor with considerable success, according to a Rand Corp. survey taken after the fighting had ended.

"As variously spun out," says the report, "the rumor was often based on suspicions or fears that the U.S. Government had recently decided that it should pull out of Vietnam. This was considered plausible because of the past record of official U.S. pressure on the government of Vietnam to accept the National Liberation Front as negotiating partner, the existence of factions within the American political scene which favored a Viet Cong [Saigon] coalition government in South Vietnam, the enormous cost of the war to the United States in terms of men, material, and domestic morale...."

**RUMOR OF A SECRET MEETING**

Thus the story spread through Saigon that the United States had met secretly with the Viet Cong and had agreed to allow them to attack the city, so weakening the government of Vietnam that "the United States would have an excuse to begin negotiations, to form a coalition government in Saigon, and to withdraw American troops in short order."

Ironically, the peace negotiations are credited, indirectly, with the increase in Viet Cong terrorist activity. Anxious to control as much of the population as possible when

peace does come, the government of Vietnam, with U.S. assistance and encouragement, began an "accelerated" pacification program late last year, a program that has met with considerable success. To counter this drive, the Viet Cong accelerated their time-tested terror tactics, which, by conservative estimate, have resulted in the deaths of more than 20,000 civilians and the wounding of twice that number since 1957. Their targets were the same as always: the village and hamlet chiefs, civil servants, policemen, schoolteachers, natural leaders of all kinds, self-defense forces, people in the employ of the Americans.

"They are particularly anxious to keep the schools closed," says a U.S. military man. "Not long ago they stopped a school bus and told the children not to go to school. When the children's parents allowed them to continue school, they stopped the bus again the next week, took a little girl off the bus, and cut her fingers off. The school has been closed ever since."

Last week, U.S. officials, who were busy setting the stage in Washington, Paris, and Saigon for President Nixon's Vietnam speech, found the Viet Cong terrorism difficult to ignore. By way of welcoming Secretary of State William P. Rogers to Saigon, the Viet Cong rocketed the runaway of Tan Son Nhut Airport the day before his arrival for conferences with President Thieu.

"The indiscriminate and senseless killing and wounding of civilians in their homes and in the streets only raises questions about the intentions of the other side," said Mr. Rogers. "Symbolic acts of terrorism like those that took place in a number of cities in South Vietnam as recently as yesterday do not reinforce the hope of a settlement."

At first glimpse, much of the killing that has been taking place in recent weeks has appeared to be indiscriminate and senseless. Upon closer examination, however, most of the killing had a specific purpose, was not always indiscriminate, and, to the Viet Cong at least, was anything but senseless.

**READING THE MESSAGE**

Because it is so difficult to terrorize people in the mass—as, for example, Stalin was able to do with his purges—terrorism is more often employed as a scalpel. Hence there is invariably a carefully conceived reason for each attack. Sometimes the reason is quite obvious; sometimes it is incomprehensible to all but the person or persons to whom the "message" is directed.

Take some recent incidents. The other day, a terrorist threw a hand grenade into the yard of Adm. Eimo R. Zumwalt, commander of U.S. Naval Forces, Vietnam. One of the principal uses of terrorism is to gain publicity, and to boost the morale of one's followers. Names make news, and even though no one was harmed in the attack, the attempt was a major news item.

"It might not even have been as complicated as that," says one analyst of the daily terrorism roundup. "The attack was carried out in such an amateurish fashion that it could have been a disgruntled Vietnamese civilian employe of the Navy."

Early one morning, a terrorist tossed a hand grenade into the government's central post office and telegraph office opposite Saigon Cathedral, just a few blocks from the Caravelle and Continental Palace hotels, in the very heart of downtown Saigon. Why? Again, an attack on such an installation is newsworthy and conveys, momentarily at least, the impression that the Viet Cong is ubiquitous. Moreover, the Viet Cong constantly urge the citizenry to stay away from such government installations. The grenade was a reminder.

**DEATH ON A CHOLON BUS**

Two women terrorists boarded a bus in Cholon, the working-class and Chinese section of the city, shot the driver, and set fire

to the vehicle, the driver and a passenger perishing in the flames. Senseless? Probably not, in the Viet Cong view.

"The bus was probably owned by a Chinese businessman," says the analyst. "Now every commercial vehicle moving on the roads in Vietnam pays 'taxes' to the VC or to crooks who claim they are VC. The Chinese are pretty foxy; the businessman probably tried to get out of paying off."

Adding to the terror mix are straight forward attacks upon targets such as police stations and military installations in which innocent bystanders are inevitably killed and wounded. Terrorists casually wheeled a cart up to a police station in Cholon at midday last week and fled when suspicious policemen approached. Seconds later, a 40-pound explosive in the cart ripped through the police station, killing one woman and wounding 26 bystanders.

Another nervy terror squad was surprised in the process of setting up a 60mm. mortar in a school house within range of the heavily guarded Presidential Palace. National police killed one of the mortar-men and arrested two others.

#### SENSELESS ACTS

Regardless of the rationale, Westerners find many acts of terrorism "senseless" in view of the extremely heavy toll of innocent persons. Terrorists one recent morning concealed a powerful bomb in a container and placed it on a street corner in front of a coffee shop in the most congested section of the market in Ben Tre, a city south of here. The bomb killed 6 persons and wounded 42; among the dead were two 60-year-old women and two girls, aged 3 and 12.

Equally horrible, in Western eyes, are the indiscriminate rocketings of market places, hospitals, and shacks of the poor in cities such as Saigon and Da Nang. Such actions are seen as attempts at mass terrorization. They fail because the enemy is not strong enough to send rockets and mortars over in sufficient quantity to induce this effect. As a result, the rocketings have had a tendency to backfire, infuriating many people who had often as not been indifferent to either the Viet Cong or the government. The rocketings have even converted some opponents of the Thieu government.

"Some militant Buddhists came to me in shocked surprise and righteous indignation," says one U.S. official. "They said, as though they had just discovered a great new truth: 'Why, they are killing innocent people with these rockets here in Saigon!' It was all I could do to keep from replying: 'Yes, you're at least getting a dose of what the people in the villages have been living with for nearly 15 years. Maybe now you'll wake up.'"

By far the most grisly, and significant, chapter in the history of Viet Cong and North Vietnamese terrorism in South Vietnam is still unfolding in the city of Hue where, since the end of the Tet offensive last year, more than 2,000 bodies of persons methodically assassinated by the enemy have been dug up from shallow mass graves. Volunteer grave-diggers, many of them teen-agers, are still finding bodies, and officials believe that another 1,000 and possibly 2,000 will be uncovered.

"It was the beginning of the 'night of the long knives' that is standard operating procedure after a Communist takeover," says a U.S. State Department man who has made a study of the Hue massacre. "The North Vietnamese held Hue for nearly a month, and they had planned to hold it permanently as an enclave. The assassination squads worked from prepared lists, just as the Nazis and the Stalinists did. What happened in Hue is just a smattering of what you can expect if the Communists succeed in taking over South Vietnam."

There is reason to believe that President Nixon had Hue in mind when he said in his Vietnam speech last week: "When we as-

sumed the burden of helping defend South Vietnam, millions of South Vietnamese men, women, and children placed their trust in us. To abandon them now would risk a massacre that would shock and dismay everyone in the world who values human life."

When the enemy was finally dislodged last year from the thick-walled Citadel of Hue where they made their last stand, 19 mass graves were found containing the bodies of 1,200 men, women, and children. Many of the dead were the usual victims: city and province officials, national policemen, military personnel, others with a reputation for anti-communism, and Catholic refugees from North Vietnam.

#### REDS TURN ON THEIR ALLIES

But what came as a shock to many was the fact that the Communists also assassinated militant Buddhists who had been involved in earlier attempts to overthrow the Saigon regime, men who had worked with the Communists toward this end. They eliminated, as well, members of numerous antigovernment political parties, foreign missionaries, and medical personnel.

Among the foreigners killed were Father M. Cressonier, 59, and Father Pierre Poncet, 36, of France, who belonged to the Societe des Missions Etrangeres de Paris, Father Cressonier having lived in Hue for 25 years. Two other French priests, members of the Benedictine Order, were also assassinated.

Students and faculty of Hue University were appalled at the murder of three German professors of medicine and the wife of one of them.

"They were discovered April 2, 1968," says a U.S. Government report. "They had been dumped into a single shallow grave in a freshly plowed potato field behind a rural pagoda not more than 1½ kilometers south of the walled city. All had been shot in the back of the head, their hands trussed behind them with wire. The victims were: Dr. Horst Krainick, 59, professor of pediatrics, and his wife Elizabeth (whose body had been mutilated); Dr. Raimund Discher, 44, professor of internal medicine; and Dr. Alois Altkoester, 36, professor of general medicine.

"These people had never done anything warlike or hurtful to the VC," said Dr. Nguyen The Anh, professor of history and rector of Hue University. "And Frau Krainick was a gracious lady. We simply don't understand it."

#### BURIED ALIVE

American and South Vietnamese investigating teams report that "almost half of the victims were found in conditions indicating that they had been buried alive. Many were found together in groups of 10 to 15, eyes open, with dirt or cloth in their mouths. Evidence also was discovered of victims having been clubbed unconscious prior to being buried alive."

In one official report of the massacre there appears this item: "Tang Quang Tu Pagoda. Coordinates: YD 764-240. Number of graves: 13. Number of bodies: 67. Date discovered: From 3/1/68. Comment: Victims shot. Buddhist monk in Pagoda heard nightly executions by pistol and rifle shots in plowed field behind pagoda during first two weeks in February, with victims pleading for mercy. Leader of Vietnam Nationalist Party Nguyen Ngoc Ky, was among victims found here."

In March of this year, a new search for bodies was begun at the instigation of a diminutive 40-year-old widow, Madame Ton That Lang of a neighboring district. Her husband, a school teacher, had been taken from their home by six Viet Cong soldiers six days after the city's occupation.

Madame Lang prevailed upon her district chief to ask for volunteers and trucks to begin a search for bodies in the sandy marshlands not far from Hue. The search was successful. Other committees were formed, other searches were begun, more bodies were found.

"One set of graves was discovered when someone noticed that the grass in that particular field was greener than it was in the next field," says an American official.

Identification, most of the time, has been impossible, for the enemy destroyed the victims' identification cards. One woman obviously had a premonition of her fate: She wrote her name, ID card number, and address in ink on the inside of her underwear.

The first batch of 1,200 bodies found last year was buried in a paddy. But the new finds, totaling 800 bodies so far, are so numerous that it was decided not to waste any more valuable rice-growing land with a cemetery; hence a new burial ground has been established in sandy scrubland.

The bodies are placed in plywood coffins, which are painted red and given numbers. Then mass funerals are held. Among the mourners at a recent funeral was Madame Lang. She hasn't found her husband's body yet. But she hasn't given up the search.

#### MICHIGAN'S BATTERED BABIES

### HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit News recently carried a series of articles written by Ruth Carlton and Kathleen O'Brien on Michigan's battered babies. The tragedy of child abuse with its unbelievable horrors points to an area where there is great need for new approaches by the courts, welfare agencies, and the entire community toward solving this problem. In Michigan last year the reported number of child abuse cases totaled 766, and for the Nation as a whole it is reported that one or two children are killed by their parents every day.

Indeed, too little attention has been given to the innocent victims involved, many of whom are too young to talk and are forced to bear lifelong emotional and physical scars of this brutality. One of the reasons this problem has been overlooked is that it relates to the family and the personal relationship of its members. But this whole problem affects society and it demands solution.

At this point, I place the series in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for everyone to read:

MICHIGAN'S BATTERED BABIES: ARE THEY THE VICTIMS OF THEIR PARENTS' RAGE? OF SOCIAL WORKERS SNARLED IN REDTAP? OR OF A SOCIETY THAT DOESN'T CARE?

(By Ruth Carlton and Kathleen O'Brien)

Two-and-a-half-year old twin girls died last year in Wayne County as a result of burns they suffered when their stepmother poured boiling water on them as they were taking their bath.

A six-month-old baby boy was found weak and close to death in a Detroit home where three other children seemed happy and well-fed.

A two-month-old baby was badly bruised when he was brought into a Detroit hospital emergency room. The mother said he had fallen out of his crib. Later, under questioning, she admitted throwing the baby across the room when he would not stop crying.

These are three of the 766 cases of child abuse reported in Michigan last year; 334 came from Wayne County. Four of the Wayne County children died—all under 27 months of age.

Most of the victims are under three . . . too young to tell what happened to them . . . too small to run away.

Doctors are required by a 1964 state law to report all suspected cases of child abuse to the Michigan Department of Social Services (MDSS). This law also protects the doctor's anonymity.

Still all authorities agree only a fraction of the abuse cases are reported.

Furthermore there is no agreement among authorities about what steps should be taken when a case of abuse is reported.

Should the abused child be removed permanently from the parents?

Should the parents be punished by having their child taken from them?

Or should an effort be made to rehabilitate the parents through social work counseling?

Should the child remain in the home while his parents go through this emotional re-education? Or should he be temporarily placed with foster parents until his own parents have learned to handle their anger and frustration a different way?

"There's a struggle in philosophy of how to handle beaten babies," says Judge James H. Lincoln of Wayne County Juvenile Court.

"The Department of Social Services seems to feel social work should be carried on without court intervention. I object; you wind up with dead kids.

"I want the Department of Social Services to offer social services; but I want them to bring each case immediately to court.

"I want an official petition filed to move the child out of the home on every abuse case."

He says parents will often agree to let children go into boarding homes without the case going to court.

"But two months later when they want the child back nothing can stop them.

"I'm in favor of social work to help the parents. But use the authority of the court to protect the child.

"Even if the court leaves the child in the home there is more control if the case has been reviewed by the court. Then the parents have to let the social worker in. It's different than social work visiting on a voluntary basis," Judge Lincoln says.

"I have a baby in the hospital now so savagely beaten he may not live," says Dr. Marilyn Heins, director of pediatrics for Detroit General Hospital.

He is an 18-month-old boy who weighed only 14 pounds when he was brought in. His tiny back is scarred from beating; his belly bloated from near starvation.

Half a dozen burn spots on his cheeks are the size of a cigarette coal.

His mother had been arrested two years ago when another of her children was brought in brutally abused.

"We (the doctor who examined him, the nurse and social worker who visited the home) all said this is a terrible situation; the children should be removed at once. But nothing happened.

"How many children from that home must suffer before someone takes action to protect the children?" the doctor asks.

A Detroit police woman says: "It is out of our hands. All we can do is report to the Michigan Department of Social Services." (Before the 1964 law, child abuse was reported to the police.)

The implication is: they report to the MDSS and nothing happens.

A social worker says, "One abused child, returned home for lack of proof that his parents were responsible, was dead two months later as a result of 'an accident'."

Another social worker who formerly worked for the Wayne County DSS says: "There is so much paper work involved with taking a child from his home and placing him in a foster home that the social worker can't possibly offer real service to the parents or the child."

Many cases of child abuse still go unreported, says Dr. Margaret Zolliker, director of maternal, child and school health for the City-County Health Departments.

"Most doctors in private practice are gunshy; they won't turn in a case of abuse for fear of being sued." (Even though the law protects their anonymity, a family that takes a child to their family doctor can figure out where the report came from.)

Often the doctor simply cannot believe a patient he knows is capable of beating a child, she says.

"These parents fall into two groups," Judge Lincoln says. "Those who know they are doing wrong to break a child's bones and those who think they are following the Bible on spare the rod and spoil the child."

The greatest need in Wayne County is for adequate marriage counseling, family social work, which could shore up these families, Judge Lincoln says.

"With help for the parents many of the 3,000 kids now wards of my court might be in their own homes. We would not need the constant search for boarding homes and adoptive homes if we prevented the breakdown of the family—the child's own family."

"Child abuse is just one facet of the larger problem—unwanted children," says Dr. Marilyn Heins.

"We should attack it by all methods to prevent unwanted children . . . birth control, legal abortion and subsidized adoption. Anything rather than unwanted kids."

In the meantime Dr. Heins feels the emphasis should be on protecting the child . . . especially the very young child who has no defense.

Dr. Heins says 17 percent of the children coming into Detroit General are there because of neglect or abuse.

In a study of 47 families brought before Wayne County Juvenile Court for child abuse, these facts stand out:

Twenty-six of the 47 abusive parents were under 25 years of age.

Twenty-one of the parents had married before the age of 20.

Half of the parents had failed to graduate from high school.

Many of them were mentally retarded.

Thirty-three of the 47 children abused were under three years old.

In 23 of the families the abuse was confined to one child.

The majority of the families were from the inner city.

But Dr. Zolliker stresses that the problem is not confined to the inner city.

"Although pressures are greater on poverty families who live in the inner city, abuse cuts across all boundaries. It is not limited to any economic group, nationality, race or neighborhood," she says.

Police records show many forms and types of abuse. Children have been beaten with bare fists and baseball bats. They have been burned with open flames, lighted cigarettes, electric irons and boiling water.

They have been strangled or suffocated by pillows or plastic bags. And they have been stabbed, bitten, shot, subjected to electric shock and had pepper forced down their throats.

How does abuse start?

A psychiatrist at Wayne County Juvenile Court says abuse frequently begins when a child cries and the parent cannot quiet him, or when the parent begins to toilet train the child and finds it more difficult than he had expected.

In both cases patience runs out and the parent loses control, according to the doctor.

Children who were unwanted pregnancies or children who have health problems are especially likely to be abused, he says.

"After you have seen some of these children you expect to find a huge brute of a parent who inflicted the abuse. This is not the case. The parents are usually pathetic

people who you think could hardly lift a beer bottle.

"Usually only one parent is the abuser, and it's as often the mother as the father," this doctor says.

Does the parent restrict his abuse to one child?

"We used to think so. But I find when the court moves the abused child to a foster home, the parents single out another child as their victim," says the psychiatrist.

"In checking into the family's history we often find another child in the family died mysteriously."

Doctors are not sure how abused children will grow up. Whether they can ever function as citizens after the terror they have experienced. They do know that quite often the abusive parent was himself an abused child.

Will the baby lying in the hospital with the angry whip marks on his back grow up to abuse his children?

Punishing the parent is not the answer. But what is?

Dr. Heins believes one step might be the formation of an agency that would be able to handle the entire problem of abuse in one facility.

"It is quite difficult to get treatment for parents who abuse their children," says Dr. Heins. "These parents need treatment before the child is returned to the home or we are going to wind up with more dead children."

Ideally such an agency would handle only the problem of child abuse instead of the multitude of problems the Department of Social Services handles.

"No child protective work is really being done when everything is closed Saturdays and Sundays," says Rosemary Klug, chief of women's division, Detroit Police Department.

"On weekends we (the police) are the only protection agency," she says.

"Before the law was changed in 1964, child abuse was reported to the police department and investigated by policemen. Now investigation is left to the agency (Department of Social Services) and reporting is required of doctors. They are not reporting.

"We get very few abuse cases now," Miss Klug said. "On one case last week we arrested a mother and placed the child in custody. We felt the child's life was in danger. But we will probably be criticized by Department of Social Services."

Some of the tiny cries for help from the children are being heard by the authorities.

The important job now is answering these cries before they are silenced forever.

ABUSED CHILDREN TAKE A BEATING: CHILDREN GET HURT WHILE SOCIAL WORKERS FIGHT LEGAL FORMS, REDTAPE

Detroit is failing its abused children. They get lost in a mountain of paper work which buries all efforts of the social workers hired to help them.

The social workers really care about what happens to kids or they wouldn't be there, but they can't cut through the red tape.

While I was supervisor of the Wayne County Department of Social Services abuse department, I took on an abuse case myself just to see what was involved. I thought maybe my staff was not coping efficiently. They were—as efficiently as possible under the circumstances.

On my one case I had to fill out some 30 forms—all of them long. I found myself doing hours and hours of paper work, but not doing a good job where the child and his parents were concerned.

And this was ONE case. My four social workers had an average case load of 35 families with some 130 children.

The paper road-block started 15 or 20 years ago with some simple documents. When a hole was discovered in one, a new document

was written to plug the hole. But no form was ever discarded. Health, Education and Welfare came along and wanted certain information which added more forms—all of them long.

If you care what happens to children and their families, it haunts you. I finally quit. Before leaving I had asked for a revision, cutting paper work, hiring of clerical help to do essential paper work to free social workers to give service.

I still believe it can be accomplished if the public knows the conditions.

The philosophy behind the Department of Social Services approach is sound. Basically it's to try to save the family—to help the parents change so the child can remain with them.

These are the only parents the child has. There is in most of these parents a love-hate relationship toward this child. They do love him. The parents have a great need for maturity, to solve some of their own problems.

We know when we take a child out of his home he does miss his parents even though he's been abused.

But the safety of the child is the first consideration. If he seems to be in danger, he is moved promptly to a carefully selected foster home.

Hopefully this foster home will nourish him for the year or more until he can return to his own home. The social worker will work regularly with the parents to help them mature enough to find different ways to reacting to this child. (Abusing parents are usually immature and reacting childishly to their child.)

The philosophy assumes it will take at least a year for the parents to change. And the social worker would need to see them at least once a week to bring about such a change.

In the meantime the social worker is also helping the child adjust to his foster home, arranging for visits with his own parents and after the visit help the child understand his conflicting emotions.

At the end of this ideal year the child is reconciled with his parents and moved back home.

That's the philosophy.

Would you like to hear how it works? In reality if the social worker visits the parents briefly once in three months she's doing well.

As for that carefully selected foster home—if there is a bed empty in any licensed foster home, the child is put in that bed.

Because the child is thrown into the first foster home available, he may be thrown out of it in a couple of weeks.

These children are usually damaged emotionally by the time they are two years old. They are difficult children to handle. They may be bed wetters, fighters, sulky, withdrawn, unreasonable in their demands for attention.

So they are moved from foster home to foster home to foster home, deteriorating on the way.

And if a child is returned to his own home at the end of the year, the family probably is no different than at the time the child was removed. Nor is the child.

Before quitting my job as a social worker for abuse cases, I also pleaded that some one set up priorities.

You have the hospital demanding that an abandoned baby be removed immediately.

You have Healey Home (a temporary shelter for Juvenile Court) demanding that a child be moved into a foster home, immediately.

You have to calm down a foster mother whose payments haven't arrived for six weeks.

You have another foster mother demanding you remove a five-year-old who wets the bed and beats the other kids.

What do you do first? Some priorities must be established.

Every night I went home haunted by the

things not done. Praying that the next day's papers wouldn't have a tragedy headline. For when you are dealing with abused children the thing you don't have time to do may mean a child will die . . . a parent commit suicide.

So eventually you give up the battle.

#### BATTERED BABY RESCUED BY SOCIAL WORKER: A 53-HOUR DRAMA

(By Ruth Carlton)

Here are the steps one social worker had to take to remove one obviously abused child from the parent's home. We will call her Miss Smith. She works for Wayne County Department of Social Services (DSS).

#### MONDAY

2:10 p.m. Doctor calls Wayne County Department of Social Services. He has just placed a 10-month-old boy in a private hospital whom he believes to be victim of parental abuse.

2:15 p.m. Miss Smith calls him back for his report. Baby has broken arm, black eye, burns on buttocks and possible internal injuries.

3 p.m. Miss Smith goes to hospital to see child; by coincidence meets parents there. Nurse finds private cubicle for them to talk. The parents deny everything. Miss Smith takes their address, tells them she will call on them later this afternoon.

4:20 p.m. To doctor's office, sees correspondence with California doctor who had treated this child before family moved to Michigan. California doctor had suspected parental abuse.

5 p.m. Social worker drives to child's parents' home. They had not told her it was an apartment building. No list of tenants is posted, the caretaker not at home. Miss Smith calls it a day.

#### TUESDAY

9 a.m. Phones caretaker and gets apartment number and telephone number for the parents.

9:30 a.m. Phones parents, explains why she had not kept her appointment the day before, outlines next steps: File a petition with the court (Wayne County Juvenile Court), judge to decide whether child returns to them. Preliminary hearing at Juvenile Court likely within three days. Angry father says he is going to hospital and get his child.

9:45 a.m. Miss Smith calls hospital, asks them to discourage parents about moving child. She assures hospital she is requesting an order of detention from court which she will deliver to hospital later today. Hospital promises nothing. Doesn't want to get involved.

10:15 a.m. She calls court to ask if detaining order can be given by phone. The answer is no. Nothing can be done without first having her written petition for the court to review the case.

10:30 a.m. Social worker types a two-page, single-spaced petition (in quadruplicate).

1 p.m. Delivers petition to court, waits for court order of detention to be typed and signed by judge.

2:45 p.m. Takes detention order to hospital. The father had left an hour earlier with the little boy.

4 p.m. Miss Smith calls the prosecutor. He advises her to request writ of apprehension the next morning.

5 p.m. Calls her supervisor and court to report.

#### WEDNESDAY

9 a.m. Applies for writ at Juvenile Court. 1 p.m. Phones California doctor who agrees to airmail his record of his case and x-rays. These will be vital for the court hearing.

4 p.m. Notified writ is ready. (Here comes a musical comedy situation of who is to serve writ on the parents. Wayne County Juvenile Court, seething under repeated refusals by the state legislature for adequate

financial help, refuses to send an officer of the court to get the child. That, in the court's opinion, is the state's responsibility.

Miss Smith who weighs 105 pounds seems an unlikely person to take a child away from two belligerent parents. Eventually able-bodied man from another office is asked to accompany her.)

4:30 p.m. Calls police in family's precinct requesting an escort.

5 p.m. Picks up writ of apprehension at Juvenile Court, drives by police station to pick up escort.

6 p.m. Arrives at parents' home. As writ is handed to the father, mother picks up the baby and walks into the bedroom. The father follows, closing the door.

6:20 p.m. Father reenters room and announces, "You can take me to jail but you can't take my baby out of here." He returns to bedroom. This scene is repeated several times until the father is persuaded to call his attorney. Attorney advises him to obey court order.

7:15 p.m. The father agrees to allow the child to be taken into care but says he and his wife will go too.

7:40 p.m. They start out . . . the social worker, the man who served the writ, the mother and her two other children in the social worker's car. The baby in the mother's arms. The baby's father drives alone followed by police car.

8 p.m. The child is placed in Detroit General Hospital—53 hours and 50 minutes after the abuse was first reported.

#### THURSDAY

9 a.m. Miss Smith dictates a series of reports on this case to go to the Michigan Department of Social Services in Lansing with carbons to prosecuting attorney and Juvenile Court. Various forms required for this one case fill her day.

11 a.m. She calls home-finder of Department of Social Services to ask for a foster home for the child. Fills out series of papers that set up payment to foster mother. Makes out clothing order. (When parents refuse to bring clothes to the child, new clothes must be bought.)

2 p.m. Calls hospital to arrange to pick up child and take him to foster home. But the doctor wants more tests so the baby is to be kept in hospital a few more days.

Monday the social worker will have to appear at the preliminary hearing at Juvenile Court. She is the petitioner asking the court to look into the case.

When the baby is placed in foster home, it will be Miss Smith's job to take him back to the hospital for medical followup.

She will also offer social work counseling to the parents. The first appointment will be in her office. If she thinks it safe, she will go to their home for subsequent appointments.

(This social worker is responsible for 32 child abuse cases at this time.)

MDSS goal is to close each case in 30 days referring the family to some other agency (Lafayette Clinic, Family Service, Child Study Clinic).

If the court decides not to return the child to his parents immediately, the child is made a temporary ward of the court and assigned to one of Detroit's child care agencies which will supervise him in a boarding home. All of this is accomplished with due amount of paper work.

With the total tonnage of paper involved in one case of child abuse, it is not hard to understand how the children "get lost" says one experienced social worker.

#### ABUSED CHILDREN: THEIR PARENTS WERE ABUSED KIDS

(By Ruth Carlton)

"Those people! I could kill them myself. "When I think of anyone beating a small child until they break his bones . . ." This explosion, from a gracious, poised,

normally compassionate woman is reflected by most of us.

The subject of battered babies strikes raw nerves and we react in anger.

"But these parents need sympathy as well as the child," plead the social workers.

"We must see abusive parents as troubled people, as greatly in need of help as is the child they have abused," says Robert Daniels, social work supervisor for Catholic Social Services of Wayne County.

"These parents are like children themselves, hostile because their own needs have been unmet and resentful because of the demands made on them as parents."

They themselves grew up in troubled families. "In fact if one point stands out, it is that problem-families beget problem-families," he says. "Somewhere we must break the cycle."

He and John A. Brown, district supervisor for Catholic Social Services of Wayne County, have followed three sets of parents since 1965 when they were referred to the agency for child abuse. Incidentally, none of these families was on public assistance.

In each case the small victim was moved immediately. With the child safe in a temporary foster home, intensive social work counseling was done with the parents.

Neither of these social workers talks in terms of success. But they are convinced these parents profited by social work.

"Now they are better able to fulfill their roles as mothers and fathers, as wage earners, than they were," says Mr. Daniels.

"We have no illusion of having solved all their problems. But because of social work they are able to function much more effectively," Mr. Brown says.

The social worker has to set modest goals in dealing with abuse cases, they say. Only one of these three battered babies has been returned to his parents. The other two have been placed in adoptive homes.

Here are the three cases:

#### CASE NO. 1

Danny Stevens, 14 months old, was removed from his home because of repeated abuse by his mother.

Mrs. Stevens was retarded and emotionally disturbed. She had had a troubled childhood centered around an alcoholic father and a disturbed, rejecting mother.

Her relationship to her mother had been hostile but dependent and the mother had exerted constant control over her life.

Danny had been born just a week after Mrs. Stevens' mother died. These two events were so closely associated in Mrs. Stevens' mind that she rejected her son from birth, could not bear to hold him. She reacted with rage if the baby cried to be fed or diapered.

After the court took Danny out of this home, Mrs. Stevens talked every week with the social worker. She made enough progress that Danny was returned home after 14 months. There has been no further abuse; Mr. Stevens continues to see the social worker once a month now.

#### CASE NO. 2

Mr. Carson was brought to court for abusing his infant son. He told the judge he had been angry when his wife left him baby-sitting. The baby cried, and because he could not stop the crying, he picked up the child and flung him across the room.

Mr. Carson was a depressed dependent person. He was still mourning for his father who had died four years before. His mother had recently married a man of whom Mr. Carson disapproved.

Some way Mr. Carson associated the helplessness of his son with his own helplessness which was compounded now by feeling deserted—deserted by his father's death, deserted by his mother's remarriage, deserted by his wife's leaving their baby with him.

The baby was moved to a foster home. Social work counseling began for Mr. Carson.

Both parents are what the social workers call "limited" . . . more popularly called retarded. The man was willing to give up the child, his wife was not. So the court took permanent court custody of the little boy.

Today Mr. Carson is in the process of getting a divorce.

Mrs. Carson and her daughter have gone to live with her mother.

An adoptive home is lined up for the son who is now four years old. The little boy has some brain damage from the abuse. But the adoptive parents want him even though the doctors do not know how severe the brain damage is.

#### CASE NO. 3

The Jones family came to the attention of the Juvenile Court when Mrs. Jones demanded they take her three-year-old son George. She threatened to kill him if they didn't.

Mrs. Jones also had three little girls. She was an inadequate mother, but this did not include abusing them. She could not tolerate her son George. She beat him severely and put him outside in near zero weather to punish him.

She resented the attention paid George by his father and other adults.

Mrs. Jones was retarded, came from a home where she was neglected, and had been placed in a state training school for delinquents in her early teens.

Mrs. Jones gave up her boy to be adopted. He is now thriving in an adopted home and the Jones family is still intact—mother, father and three daughters.

"These three parents who abused their children all came from problem families," says Mr. Daniels.

"In trying to help them we focused on the parents themselves and not on the act of abuse. We tried to convey to them our concern over their situation and to provide a climate of goodwill in which we could work with them."

Occasionally the social worker made suggestions about child care and the rearrangement of routines.

A housekeeper to be with a mother who had abused her child during the day while the father was at work.

Day care for a two-year-old so the mother could get some relief.

Mr. Daniels sees abuse as a result of a variety of forces operating on the parents: Their psychological needs, limited intellect, social pressures and economic adversities.

"Where there is a problem of child abuse, there are invariably other problems in the family," he says.

Mr. Daniels sees abuse "not as an intentional act of violence on a child or as merely the result of parental rage, but rather as a response to the parent's overwhelming anxieties and to the hostility engendered by them, which somehow the child seems to intensify."

He feels that social work might be more effective if the neighbors and relatives of abusive parents could stop looking upon them as criminals and see them as deeply troubled human beings.

Perhaps then the cycle could be broken . . . that destructive cycle of abused children become abusing parents.

#### BATTERED BABIES: LOTS OF ORGANIZATIONS BUT TRAGICALLY LITTLE SERVICE

(By Ruth Carlton)

Michigan's failure to protect battered babies and rehabilitate their parents is part of the reason State Department of Social Services is now under fire.

A bill has been introduced to remove child neglect (which includes abuse) from the State Department of Social Services (SDSS).

Senate Bill No. 198, introduced Feb. 26 by Senator Lorraine Beebe, of Dearborn, would set up a new state department—Department

of Youth Services—taking both child neglect and delinquency away from the State Department of Social Services.

Judge James H. Lincoln, of Wayne County Juvenile Court, who is one of the supporters of the bill, says: "I do not want to attack personalities. I'm really not interested in who is to blame. But some children's services have to be shifted from SDSS."

"There is no question that the Romney Commission (the Governor's Commission on Youth Problems) report is a hell of an indictment of lack of leadership." (The bill resulted from this report.)

Judge Lincoln referred to his recent request addressed to Bernard Houston, SDSS director, dated April 24:

"I wish to again reiterate the urgent need for five or more additional workers in Wayne County, to be assigned specifically to child abuse cases."

"The Department's (SDSS) policy of dropping cases after 30 days is just simply nonsense. The Department of Social Services is handling the entire neglect load of a number of counties. In Wayne County, their services are either paper thin or nonexistent."

"If the Department of Social Services were to give the same services to Wayne County that now are being furnished to some other counties, it would take no less than 50 workers," the letter said.

Houston's reply to the judge stated he was referring the request to the appropriations committee. "Which means he isn't going to do anything," the judge commented.

"Houston is in an extremely difficult position," the judge continued. "His requests for money from the state legislature are ignored unless some outside group comes up screaming."

"But to get money for a project you have to plan, document, present a five-year plan, and promote it. This SDSS has not done."

"If anything there has been a decrease in services in Wayne County since the merger (the 1966 merger of state, county and city welfare services under SDSS)."

From court to hospital to social workers there is agreement that the battered baby problem can be solved only with adequate casework for the parents. Helping unstable, frustrated, immature parents is also the best prevention known for battered babies.

Increasingly it is suggested the State of Michigan should set up these services rather than depending on the efforts of Catholic Social Services and Children's Aid Society, both private Torch Drive supported agencies.

"The battered baby is only one part of a broader problem of grossly inadequate care and protection of children in many kinds of situations," says Eben W. Martin, family and child welfare consultant of United Community Services and president of the Detroit chapter of National Association of Social Workers.

"A comprehensive, early, child protective and family strengthening service is greatly needed in Michigan. This kind of program is provided in many states by a public agency," Mr. Martin said.

What are protective services?

"Catching a family in trouble before tragedy overtakes them . . . working with them before they harm or kill a child," is one social worker's definition.

Actually Detroit has several fragmented, isolated attempts along this line. Five workers here, six workers there, against unknown thousands of families needing such services.

Here is what Detroit offers these families:

Wayne County Department of Social Services: Five abuse workers who, by plan, would work with the parents for 30 days. (The court calls the 30-day limit "simply nonsense." The social workers say they have no time left for social work if they complete the paper work.)

Wayne County Juvenile Court's Child Study Clinic: No long term service offered. Parents are interviewed before the court

hearing decides whether or not to return their child.

**Children's Aid Society:** The Torch Drive agency responsible for protective services to Protestant families. The department has decreased from nine workers to five in the last five years.

**Catholic Social Services:** Provides casework service "that contributes toward a stable and healthy family life" to Catholic families.

**Protective Service Unit:** Five workers. Set up two and a half years ago with services provided by Catholic Social Services, money by SDSS. Available to any family regardless of religion.

Families are referred by police or schools when children are so blatantly neglected that there is danger to the child.

"We go to their home saying, 'We hear you are having difficulty and we will try to help,'" says Virginia LaFalce, director of the unit.

She plans to introduce a new approach later this month: Group counseling for six to eight mothers.

The First Unitarian Church, 4605 Cass, has agreed to house the project, rent free. Miss LaFalce is looking for volunteer drivers who will pick up the mothers and their children.

She also needs volunteers experienced in nursery school techniques so the session will be a growing experience for children as well as mothers.

SDSS specifies that services be limited to 90 days.

Can parents be changed in 90 days?  
"We try to find the family's most immediate problem related to the child and concentrate on that. In 90 days we know how it's going—whether the family is catching a gleam of hope or whether to refer the case to Juvenile Court," Miss LaFalce says.

"Sometimes in 90 days a parent decides he can't handle it. A man whose wife has died leaving him with young children may ask that they be placed in a foster home temporarily.

"Often we refer the family after our 90 days to other UCS agencies," she says.

Obviously the total combined services offered by these small projects can touch only an infinitesimal fraction of parents of neglected and abused children.

There's no way of knowing their total number but at least three thousand of their children are now wards of the Wayne County Juvenile Court.

The conviction that it is preferable to strengthen the existing family and hopefully return the abused child to it is based on:

The damage to the child when he is uprooted.

The difficulty in finding enough foster homes.

The danger that when a shortage of foster homes exists a child may be put into a home no better than the one he's leaving.

In fact Dr. Paul V. Woolley Jr., pediatrician-in-chief of Children's Hospital of Michigan, reports three cases of battered babies abused by foster parents.

Dr. Woolley was one of the pioneers in recognizing the battered baby syndrome. When he first published in medical journals a dozen years ago, many doctors were explaining the multiple fractures in infants as some mysterious ailment of bone fragility.

Dr. Woolley has just completed a chapter on battered babies for a new medical text in which he gives data on 55 constructive cases of physical abuse admitted to Children's Hospital.

Age:	Number
Under 3 months.....	12
3 to 6 months.....	13
6 to 12 months.....	14
12 to 24 months.....	7
24 to 36 months.....	5
Over 36 months.....	4

Six of the babies died. Four are known to have permanent damage.

In writing of possible solutions, Dr. Woolley says:

"Sometimes material assistance and moral support for those (parents) where frustration and immaturity are evident suffices.

"In others a close and constant tie to a person skilled in interhuman relations has helped. Some benefit from psychiatric approaches. . . ."

As a last resort he lists "long-term removal of the victim through court action."

"Even this is not a cure-all," he writes, adding that three of his 55 cases were battered in foster homes after having been removed from their parents because of abuse or neglect.

"It is self-evident that no amount of legislation can help unless supported by an enlightened concern on the part of the community, the courts and the medical profession," he says.

**BATTERED BABIES: VICTIMS OF THEIR PARENTS OR OF SOCIETY?**

(By Ruth Carlton)

In this series on battered babies charges have been made against the State Department of Social Services (SDSS) headed by Bernard Houston.

A former head of the abuse department for one county Department of Social Services says she resigned because a ridiculous amount of required paper work prevented her from giving social work services.

Both court and police implied criticism of the handling of abuse cases by the Department of Social Services.

The social worker said she filled out as many as 30 forms on one case.

"Nowhere can we find where as many as 30 forms could possibly have been required," Mr. Houston says in a written statement. "We do have a forms problem but it is not within the battered child program itself.

"Only five forms are actually required for the department workers to carry out the responsibility vested in us through Act 98, which is to

- (1) Determine if intentional injury occurred.
- (2) Refer to proper law enforcement.
- (3) Maintain information registry."

However, Mr. Houston then goes on to list circumstances in which "other forms will be necessary" if additional services are required through another agency "whether these are court forms or the forms of another program in this department."

Also two forms originate with the county board of auditors. And extra forms are necessary for Medicaid, he notes.

The News learned from another social worker that 30 forms is a conservative estimate in abuse cases. One must be filled out on every child in the family, not just on the one abused child.

Four children in the family means the same form must be filled out four times.

And this series of four must be repeated each time the abused child moves—say from hospital to foster home, on to a second foster home.

Mr. Houston says some forms had been discontinued before The Detroit News article, and three others have been combined since.

He says the required forms have not blocked the efficiency of his staff in Wayne County citing that out of 306 referrals in 1968, 177 were confirmed as abuse.

Sixteen children were removed permanently from their parents and 66 temporarily.

Answering the criticism of local police and court, as reported in Sunday's News, Mr. Houston wrote:

"To our knowledge there simply is no conflict of philosophy between SDSS and the juvenile court. Neither responsibility nor authority is removed from the hands of police and the court."

To indicate cooperation with the court, Mr. Houston points out 21 of the first 34

abuse cases in April were filed with Wayne County Juvenile Court.

State Department of Social Services has established protective services in 10 counties. Wayne County is not one of them.

Mr. Houston claims, "Extremely high priority has been given the battered child program in Wayne County. In January instructions went to staff to cut caseloads which had been 90 down to 30."

The abused child program was separated from neglect to form a separate unit, and the most qualified staff assigned to it, he says. Also one staff member was assigned as liaison to each large hospital.

Mr. Houston says, "A series of statewide workshops on battered children are being set up with Probate Judges Association, the Supreme Court, the Prosecutors' Association and the Attorney General's office."

He points out that while a 1965 law gave SDSS broad responsibility to investigate battered baby charges and provide services, sufficient money has never been allotted to carry out this responsibility.

Critics of SDSS agree the state legislature has never come through with the necessary money. But some believe this is as much due to lack of leadership and promoting on the part of SDSS as to any niggardly attitude of the legislators.

What does this all add up to?  
Obviously Michigan babies are still being battered around.

Obviously not enough counseling is available to their parents.

Obviously a preventive approach is needed to keep more babies from being abused.

What is the answer?  
Transfer of responsibility to a separate State Department of Youth as proposed in Senate Bill 198?

Preventing unwanted children by more emphasis on planned parenthood and abortion as suggested by Dr. Marilyn Heins, director of pediatrics at Detroit General Hospital?

More funds from the state legislature so State Department of Social Services can do a better job?

Aroused citizens who will demand attention for those too little to run their own protest movement?

As one social worker put it, "It boils down to too little money, too few workers, too few facilities. Only by getting citizens aroused can you ever change the establishment."

**INCREASE SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS**

**HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN**

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress must act this year on substantial social security legislation. Benefits are seriously deficient at the present time, and because of inflation continued delay means that every retired person's social security check, in effect, gets smaller and smaller with each passing month.

I consider it a duty today to cosponsor Representative VANIK's bill which provides for a 15-percent across the board increase in social security benefits; the bill would also raise the minimum monthly payment from \$55 to \$80, and very importantly, it provides for automatic adjustments in benefits when the cost of living rises. According to an estimate of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics in

autumn 1968, for a retired couple to live moderately it cost \$4,100. Yet, the average monthly social security payment to a retired couple in December of that year was about \$165. Unquestionably, benefits must be increased to meet basic needs.

Let us keep before our minds that to our shame almost 6 million Americans over 65 years of age are living in poverty. Even by raising social security benefits by 15 percent only about one-fourth of these poor people will be brought above the poverty line.

President Nixon has asked the Congress for a 7-percent increase in social security benefits, and that increase is supposed to become effective in February of 1970. At current rates of inflation, half of that increase, or more, will have been wiped out between now and February 1970. A substantially higher figure is obviously called for.

When it was reported that the House Committee on Ways and Means would not consider social security legislation this year, I wrote to Representative WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the committee, urging him to somehow make room for a social security bill. We all recognize the importance of the tax reform legislation presently before the committee, and want effective legislation in that area. But a social security bill also deserves high priority. This is not something which affects just a few people; we are talking about the daily existence of a sizable segment of our population—about 25 million people. I strongly urge that the House Committee on Ways and Means find a way to consider a social security bill as soon as their tax deliberations come to an end.

The very delay we are threatened with here shows the necessity of an automatic adjustment provision linked to increases in the cost of living. Inflation moves more quickly than Congress acts. Why do we continue to allow retired persons to go through the painful in-between periods which exist once the cost of living rises significantly, and before the Congress enacts corrective measures to increase benefits?

The social security system must be updated so that older Americans can live their retirement in dignity and a certain deserved leisure without living in poverty today, or worrying that with their fixed income they will be living in poverty tomorrow.

#### BENEFITS FOR OUR ELDERLY CITIZENS

### HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, Congress must take note right now of our wasteful spending in foreign aid and of similar waste in the ineffectually waged war in South Vietnam.

The American people have to have the truth and the many upstanding senior citizens of our country, who have sur-

vived several hardships over the past 50 to 100 years, are deserving of some tranquility and ease of living.

We are in the middle of Senior Citizens' Month, May 1969. And, where do we find ourselves? Without enough money to continue some necessary domestic programs, which I deem first in priorities to be considered by Congress and the administration. This includes programs for the elderly. There are just too many instances I am aware of where our elderly friends receive very little, if anything.

Nevada senior citizens will note that the Nevada Legislature found it could not allocate State money to the tune of \$45,000 to keep six Nevada programs for the elderly in operation. Those programs have ended.

The picture looks just as bleak at the Federal level with a considerable amount of budget cutting underway. Witness the loss, at the moment anyway, of our fiscal year 1970 money for the vitally needed southern Nevada water project. I am still waging my own effective battle to reinstate these funds. Other cuts by the administration Budget Bureau eliminated the Lake Mead Base, a defense installation near Las Vegas. Also, the Clear Creek Job Corps Camp near Carson City, which is being phased out and then there is the closure at the end of June of the Elko Weather Bureau. I have fought to maintain these domestic operations in Nevada.

These cuts and others like them are coming from the Federal level and I say it is all due to the giveaway programs in so-called American foreign aid. I have steadfastly been opposed to our U.S. policy in aiding foreign countries when I know, along with other Members of Congress, that more often than not our financial help and our aid in the form of various goods ends up in the wrong hands—the hands of crooked politicians and the racketeers of the black markets. From these corrupt hands, I have learned, this American aid is turning up as aid to enemy Communist countries. I call our so-called foreign aid program treasonous aid to the enemy.

And then there is the waste of money, and life, in Vietnam. If we are going to do battle in Vietnam with honor—let us do battle and fight to win. Otherwise let us get out now with an orderly withdrawal.

When you correct these two major problems facing this country, we are well on the way to amending our domestic troubles, which have first priority in my opinion and for which I will consistently battle for and to win.

But until the wasteful spending, especially in foreign aid, is stopped, I see no easement on some of our immediate domestic problems and as a result, we must work together hard to achieve needed programs to help make the golden years of so many of our fine citizens' lives more fruitful. I will watch closely for methods where Congress may improve the situation to benefit our elderly citizens and, when the time comes, will take a stand with whom I hope will be the majority in favor of such benefits. In addition, I will vote for increased social security benefits.

#### A MESSAGE FOR NATIONAL MARITIME DAY

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I rise to pay tribute to the American merchant marine on this National Maritime Day. The President has seen fit to issue a proclamation calling on all America to honor our merchant marine industry on this day.

This is entirely fitting, since this year we are observing the 150th anniversary of the voyage of the *SS Savannah*. This voyage was unique in that for the first time an ocean-going vessel had employed steam for propulsion for part of the journey. We can still be proud that that pioneering voyage was accomplished by an American vessel.

In proclaiming this day, the President said:

A strong and profitable merchant fleet is vital to America's economic welfare and defense capability. The American flag on merchant vessels on the high seas and in foreign ports is a symbol of our Nation's dedication to peaceful trade throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, this statement contains the basic points which emphasize and underline our need for a merchant marine industry. These points are: Our economic welfare, our defense capability, and our international trade. There is a fourth point which can be added to these three which is entirely pertinent. This is the contribution that U.S.-flag international carriers can and do make to our balance of payments, or our imbalance, as the case seems to be at present.

Together, these four points would seem to be sufficiently urgent and compelling to trigger a substantial response, especially in view of the gradual decline in our maritime industry. And make no mistake about it, the industry is on the decline. It is not too strong a term to call the situation alarming.

I think that the projected level of our privately owned U.S.-flag dry-cargo fleet of vessels very adequately demonstrates what is happening to our entire merchant marine industry. And this is why so many of us who are aware of the situation are concerned.

On January 1, 1968, there were 663 dry-cargo vessels in the U.S.-flag fleet, which were 25 years of age or less. In just 1 year, this total had dropped by 50 vessels to 613, on January 1, 1969. At the rate we are going, the 1968 total of 663 vessels will have fallen to 244 by January 1972.

This is the direction our merchant marine is going. It is not in the best interests of the United States to stand by and permit this decline to continue.

I am pleased to point out that your Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries did face up to its responsibilities and acted to arrest the decline in our maritime industry. The committee earlier this month reported out a meaningful authorization for the maritime program. For the item of ship construc-

tion assistance, the committee raised the amount requested, which had been only about \$16 million, to what it felt was a more appropriate level of \$145 million.

The level of \$145 million was selected, not as the maximum possible for a vessel revitalization program which we could or should be providing for, but as a floor below which we dare not go.

Subsequently, the House gave its full assent to the action taken by the committee by passing the authorization measure without amendment or even serious debate.

This country has almost endless shorelines, and exposure to oceans, gulf, and deepwater lakes. It creates an enormous demand for goods of all kinds, leading to vast levels of international trade. This was true of the past as well as at present. With these attributes, it is only natural that this country has a tradition of a strong and vigorous merchant marine.

But we could lose this important industry if we continue to permit it to decline. And there is not a great deal of time left in which to decide whether we intend to retain an active merchant marine, or to see it wither on the vine and disappear.

Let us hope the time never comes when National Maritime Day merely calls to memory something that once flourished in our midst and then passed out of existence.

#### A LEGISLATIVE REPORT FOR VOLUNTEER FIREMEN

### HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, many of us in the House have taken a great interest in the problems facing volunteer fire departments and ambulance services. The dedicated men and women who give freely of their time and efforts are performing a most vital service, particularly in the less populated areas.

Mr. Harold Semling has written a very comprehensive article for the May issue of Fire Chief magazine on the legislation pending before the Congress which affects the volunteer firemen. I would like to share with my colleagues his rundown on this legislation:

#### A REPORT FROM WASHINGTON: BILLS AFFECTING THE FIRE SERVICE

Fire chiefs have a considerable stake in legislation now pending in the 91st Congress.

Among the thousands of bills already introduced in the House and Senate are many, which, if passed, could be of substantial value to fire departments. (Over 9,000 bills had been introduced in the House and 1,600 in the Senate by the end of March.)

Since most of these bills will never become law or even be given serious consideration, it is up to the fire chief to work now for his legislative objectives. Simply, this is best done by personal contacts and writing to his Senators and Congressman.

Here is a brief rundown of some major legislation pending in Congress of concern to the fire chief.

Federal benefits would be extended to all firemen killed or totally disabled in the line

of duty, whether or not a specific federal law was involved under a proposal pending in the Senate and House of Representatives.

Congress last year passed a bill to provide compensation in case of injury or death to law enforcement officers in cases involving violation of national law. Under proposals advanced by Sen. Birch Bayh (D. Ind.) and Rep. Andrew Jacobs (D. Ind.) and 20 other Congressmen this coverage would be extended to non-federal cases and firemen (S. 1277 and H.R. 7989).

"This expanded coverage would be justified," according to Senator Bayh, "because the job of . . . fire protection has in many cases become a national responsibility."

"It is truly difficult today to draw hard and fast lines which separate jurisdictional responsibility for public employees who are devoted to protecting the lives and property of all persons without regard to their domicile, place of origin, or final destination," according to Sen. Bayh.

Federal contributions would be supplementary and would be adjusted according to other compensation to which the local fireman was entitled. Under the bill, a widow who is the sole survivor would be eligible for 45% of the monthly wage rate of her deceased husband, Bayh explains. If there are dependent children the rate could go up to 75% of the deceased's wages.

Legislation to make it unlawful to injure, intimidate, or to interfere with any fireman performing his duties during the course of any riot is pending before the House Judiciary Committee (H.R. 7594, introduced by Rep. Thomas S. Kleppe [R. N. Dak.]).

Compensation would be provided for firemen not employed by the United States government who are killed or injured in the performance of duty during a civil disorder under a number of bills introduced in the House of Representatives and referred to the House Judiciary Committee. Many of these bills would also provide for damage or loss of firefighting equipment not covered by insurance. Some of these bills are: H.R. 890 by Rep. Philip E. Ruppe (R. Mich.), H.R. 3105 by Rep. Lawrence J. Hogan (R. Md.), H.R. 4166 by Rep. Henry Helstoski (D. N.J.); H.R. 5218 by Rep. Robert H. Michel (R. Ill.), and H.R. 9128 by Rep. Joseph E. Karth (D. Minn.).

The Federal Property and Administrative Act would be amended so as to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations under legislation proposed in the House of Representatives. Among the legislation's sponsors are Rep. John O. Marsh (D. Va.) (H.R. 1210), Rep. Samuel S. Stratton (D. N.Y.) (H.R. 2132), Rep. Cornelius Gallagher (D. N.J.) (H.R. 1117), and Rep. Henry Helstoski (D. N.J.) (H.R. 2361). Stratton would include municipalities. Rep. Marsh would include volunteer rescue squads. Rep. Helstoski would include Indian groups under federal supervision and rescue organizations at 50 per centum of the estimated market value, as would Rep. Gallagher.

Legislation has been introduced in the House of Representatives to prohibit certain acts involving the use of incendiary devices (H.R. 7468 by James G. Fulton [R. Pa.] and H.R. 8159 by Hamilton Fish [R. N.Y.]). The bills were sent to the House Judiciary Committee.

The National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control would receive \$665,000 to carry out its functions under the Fire Research and Safety Act under legislation (H.R. 7208) introduced by Rep. H. B. Gonzalez (D. Tex.) and referred to the Appropriations Committee.

A dozen Senators are sponsoring a bill (S. 413) by Sen. Joseph M. Montoya (D. N.M.) to provide for cooperative rural fire protection. The legislation would provide for technical assistance, training, and equipping fire control forces to suppress both structural

and wildfires in rural areas which are now under no organized protection or have only limited protection. The bill would be administered by the Agriculture Department. It would, according to Sen. Montoya, be a local effort supported by federal-state cost sharing at a 75-25 percent level. The bill was referred to the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee.

The President would be authorized to proclaim the Second Saturday in May of each year as a "day of recognition" for firefighters under a bill (H.R. 3698) introduced by Congressman Jerome R. Waldie (D. Calif.) and referred to the House Judiciary Committee.

Congressman Charles C. Diggs, Jr. (D. Mich.), has suggested that Congress pass a resolution (H. Con. Res. 171) supporting one uniform, nationwide, fire-reporting telephone number. The proposal was referred to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. There are other similar proposals.

Representative Henry J. Helstoski (D. N.J.) has proposed legislation under which the government would provide temporary assistance where public school buildings are destroyed by fire disaster or natural causes. The bill (H.R. 2360) was referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor.

There have been a number of bills to provide federal assistance for special projects to demonstrate the effectiveness of programs to provide emergency care for heart attack victims by trained persons in specially equipped ambulances. These bills have been referred to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Statutory subsistence allowances, up to \$5 per day, received by firemen would be exempt from gross income for taxing purposes under a bill (H.R. 7911) introduced by Congressman Albert L. Watson (R. S.C.) and referred to the House Ways and Means Committee.

Congressman C. E. Gallagher (D. N.J.) has introduced a bill (H.R. 1121) which would change the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the hospital insurance benefits program for retired firemen and policemen who reach 65 years and who have at least ten years of service. The bill was referred to the Ways and Means Committee.

Ambulance drivers and attendants would be exempt from the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act under a bill (H.R. 5490) introduced by Representative W. E. Brock (R. Tenn.) and referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Fund raising activities of volunteer fire and ambulance companies would be exempt from federal excise taxation under a legislative proposal (H.R. 6987) of Rep. Frank J. Horton (R. N.Y.). The bill, sent to the House Ways and Means Committee, which is presently considering an overall revision of federal taxes, is aimed at providing more money for the volunteer fire departments.

Money is the biggest problem for the volunteer fire departments which now comprise 92 percent of all U.S. fire departments, Horton told the House when he introduced the bill. "Unfortunately, few local fire services have the resources to do the job properly," he said. Adding, "firefighting is no longer a question of jumping off the back step and running down the street to a brush fire. The job is bigger and more dangerous than ever before. Special equipment and special training are needed to fight today's fires. By 1975, we will need 20,000 more fire stations to adequately protect our smaller population centers."

"Local fire and ambulance departments need every penny of the money that they raise to meet the increasing demand for more facilities, equipment, and training centers," according to Horton.

Congressman Joseph P. Viorito (D. Pa.) has proposed (H.R. 3696) that volunteer firemen's organizations be exempt from all

federal income taxes and reports. The bill was referred to the House Ways and Means Committee.

Congressman Ogden R. Reid (R. N.Y.) would have the Internal Revenue Code amended to provide a deduction from gross income for certain nonreimbursable expenses incurred by volunteer firemen. The bill (H.R. 2714), referred to the House Ways and Means Committee, would let volunteer fireman deduct expenses for uniforms, automobile accessories, maintenance and depreciation, gasoline and other items used in connection with his firefighting activities.

Volunteer fire companies would be allowed the same special postage rates on second- and third-class mail that is now available to certain nonprofit organizations under legislation introduced in the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Sen. J. Caleb Boggs, (R. Del.) with 29 cosponsors has re-introduced the legislation (S. 20) in the Senate which was referred to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Rep. William V. Roth (R. Del.) has introduced the bill (H.R. 1343) in the House and it was referred to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Bills similar to Roth's have been introduced by others.

"Other groups already authorized by statute to use such preferential rates include religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans, fraternal, associations of rural electric cooperatives, and one highway or development publication of each State of the Union," Sen. Boggs explains.

The Delaware Senator believes that "this is a group to which volunteer fire companies should belong. There is no more dedicated or unselfish group of men and women in the country than those belonging to volunteer fire companies and their auxiliaries."

"A prime fund raising program with most fire companies is a fund solicitation by mail. Enactment of this bill," according to Sen. Boggs, "would be of immediate specific assistance in this effort." The Internal Revenue exempts volunteer fire companies from taxes and allows as a personnel deduction any contributions to volunteer fire companies. Postal authorities have said from time-to-time they use the Internal Revenue Service's definition of a nonprofit organization as a guide for permitting nonprofit mailings by organizations.

The Senate on three separate occasions, despite objections from the Post Office, has passed such legislation and sent it to the House. In 1966, the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service favorably reported the bill and sent it to the House floor for action. The legislation was never taken up in the closing days of that Congress.

Sen. Boggs expresses the hope that "Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee would take early action on it and that hopefully the Congress would enact it and it could become law."

Legislation proposed by Rep. Thaddeus J. Dulski (D. N.Y.), Chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, would improve conditions of firemen employed by the federal government. Other members of the House have introduced similar bills, all of which are pending before the Post Office Committee.

One bill (H.R. 7364) would improve the basic work week for firefighters employed by the government.

A second bill would liberalize the requirements as to age for the appointment of firefighters in the federal service.

Senator Ernest F. Hollings (D. S.C.) has proposed that federal firefighters be considered as being employed in hazardous occupations. His bill (S. 578) is before the Senate Post Office Committee.

Fire Chiefs have a considerable number of friends in Congress, but positive results will depend on hard work and concentrated action.

**DISTORTION THREATENS FREE PRESS**

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, apparently people the world over are coming to know the Washington Post.

The Russians have expelled their Moscow reporter for distorting the facts as antirevolutionary action—which apparently means that their news line for American consumption somehow got to the Kremlin. The Malaysians banned their Newsweek magazine on the grounds it contained "distortions of facts," and the Thais even refused admittance of one of their reporters to their country, because they feared distortion of the facts in reporting.

Yes, the Washington Post reputation would now seem worldwide—distorters of fact.

Mr. Speaker, I include a news clipping from the Evening Star in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 21, 1969]

**THAILAND CONVINCED "LEFTISTS" WEAKEN U.S. WILL IN ASIA**

BANGKOK.—Thal officials are convinced that what they consider to be leftist criticism in the American press and intellectual community are causing a softening of America's will to fight Communist aggression in Asia.

This conviction was reflected in the decision of the Thal government to refuse to admit a critical American correspondent into the country. But Thai Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman has spoken freely on the subject for the past two or three years.

In press conferences, on speaking tours, in letters to influential American friends and other contacts, the eloquent foreign minister has accused Western "subversives" of preventing the United States from winning the war in Vietnam and endangering America's relations with Thailand.

He has privately named correspondents whom he regards as pro-Communist or "liberal," a word he uses with considerable disdain.

**ADMITTANCE DENIED**

That's abhorrence of Western criticism was epitomized in his government's decision to deny admittance to Stanley Karnow of the Washington Post, who arrived here Sunday night to cover the conference of the Southeast Asian Treaty Organization. Karnow was put on the next flight out of the country.

Officials were annoyed with articles in which Karnow had questioned the value of large-scale American aid to Thailand and had pointed out the Thal government's historic inclination to switch diplomatic allegiances depending on the needs of the moment.

Thal sensitivity to foreign criticism has grown in proportion to the country's increasing commitment to American interests in recent years.

The government did not admit American warplanes were flying from Thailand to bomb parts of North Vietnam until more than two years after the air war had begun.

**BASE VISITS CURBED**

Thal officials still do not let reporters visit the bases except on rare occasions. And they are equally reluctant to let the press cover Thailand's own long-smouldering conflict against guerrillas in the northern and north-eastern provinces.

The aura of secrecy surrounding military activities in Thailand reflects to some degree the feeling among certain officials that the government may have slipped into much too close relationship with the U.S. Thal leaders, although they welcome American aid and have indicated they would like to decrease their country's over-all dependence on the U.S.

**A FORMER NEWSMAN COUNSELS JOURNALISTS**

**HON. ED EDMONDSON**

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most perceptive young Oklahomans I know is James R. Jones, formerly appointments secretary to President Johnson, and now a practicing attorney in Tulsa, Okla.

Mr. Jones has an extensive background in journalism acquired before he turned to law and public service. Against this background, he has written an article, "It's Time To Interview the Journalists," in the current issue of Pace magazine.

The article reflects Mr. Jones' understanding of journalism and the problems of the journalist. It also reflects his opportunity, while serving President Johnson, to become acquainted intimately with the machinery and workings of politics and Government. The article contains criticism of the press, but it is responsible and understanding criticism. It also makes a series of constructive suggestions to the profession of journalism.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this article will be of great interest to the Members of the House, and I would like to insert it in the RECORD at this point:

**IT'S TIME TO INTERVIEW THE JOURNALISTS**

(By James R. Jones)

Journalism and public service are, to me personally, the two greatest callings in life. In both areas you have difficult challenges and unlimited opportunity to serve your fellow man. In both areas your efforts can leave behind a heritage of accomplishment for society which no amount of wealth can purchase. And in both areas the cry for new thought and unprejudiced judgment was never greater.

The main safeguards of our democratic institutions are our First Amendment freedoms of speech and press. These are what basically distinguish this nation from every other people in the world.

With these freedoms the press has gained enormous power—which is as it should be because the press is our most effective deterrent to tyrannical government. But with all this power comes an equally enormous responsibility. The responsibility of courage. The responsibility to tell both sides of the story. The responsibility of accuracy. The responsibility of carefully distinguishing news from editorial opinion.

There are laws and regulations to protect society when a thief enters your home, a doctor carelessly performs surgery, the loan

shark extorts exorbitant interest, or the grocer sells spoiled meat.

But how much more damaging it is when a reporter misquotes or misidentifies an innocent citizen, an editor vilifies a man with an unpopular cause, the publisher preaches hate of minorities, the television commentator degrades an honest public official by reporting with a certain smirk on his face. For these instances of malpractice, society has virtually no remedy.

Despite all these shortcomings, of course, there is another 99 percent of the journalistic profession which is honest, accurate and unbiased.

But there are danger signals. The power of the press rests on its credibility and when this is tarnished, even by a few reporters, not only journalism but our whole society suffers. When the average citizen can't believe what he reads, a free press is in jeopardy.

Last fall 1,200 college journalists gathered in New York City for a conference. A New York Times reporter interviewed some of these young people. This is the lead on that Times article: "Most newspapers are biased. Television is superficial. Most magazines are immature."

This is not the judgment of some congressman who claims he was treated unfairly by a reporter. These are criticisms of young men and women who aspire to join the honored ranks of great reporters and editors.

Earlier this year a national weekly news magazine wrote in an "inside story" that Secretary of State Dean Rusk had strongly opposed any bombing halt. The magazine said it took the Secretary of Defense and a White House Assistant to convince President Johnson that Rusk should be overruled.

The first problem is the article was wrong in its facts. I know that Mr. Rusk did not oppose the bombing halt as indicated in the article. The appalling fact, however, is that this magazine never bothered to call Mr. Rusk to ask his side of the story. That's not professional reporting.

These are the kinds of examples that prompted one of the fine reporters of our time, Howard K. Smith, last year to terminate his nationally syndicated column for an indefinite period. In his final column Mr. Smith explained why. He said he felt that the American press, by creating phony heroes or phony villains, might be contributing to the confusion and frustration now damaging the nation's spirit. He said that some journalists have turned reporting into image making.

Stokely Carmichael is a good case in point. A few years ago, he was unknown. Today he is a household word. Of course, this ordinarily might do no harm, but in this case Mr. Carmichael is a flagrant example of extremism. Therefore he is automatically good copy—or made to be good copy—and this has had a damaging effect on Negro leaders who are not extremists. It would seem that the only Negro some of the media wish to pay attention to is one holding a torch or honing a knife. There are many responsible Negro leaders—in fact, the overwhelming majority. Mr. Smith reported one responsible Negro leader as saying: "If I say no to Stokely, you fellows won't print it in one sentence on the back page. My people think I am doing nothing. But if I go see him, it's on the front page and my people think I am in there pitching."

I do not object to the free publicity given the Carmichaels and the H. Rap Browns. But I do object when it's not balanced reporting. For then it makes it harder for a President and Congress to do what needs to be done and get the funds for programs to meet the problems. It makes life difficult for responsible Negro leaders who aren't getting publicity and acclaim. And worst of all, it frightens a large segment of our society and decimates the ranks of those working for racial progress.

Mr. Smith's last column might remind us all that the Fourth Estate forms one of the

most potent forces in this nation. He wrote that with this power, there must come responsibility, some restraint, some understanding, that the press quite literally can create movements and people and leaders and problems—and can make those stories come true.

My only quarrel with Howard Smith is that he didn't stay within the profession to try to correct the wrongs that exist. How do we right these wrongs?

This question bothered a group of high-level government officials last year. Here are some of their suggestions:

a) Journalism is one of the professions. Yet, it is the only profession that has no entrance examinations or requirements. The press might choose an examining board of distinguished journalists and require entrants to pass examinations showing that they understand the times and their circumstances.

b) This board of journalists should set high standards of professionalism and jealously keep watch to insure that reporters and editors live up to these standards. This should not be a board of censors. However, when injustices occur through inaccurate, unbalanced or false reporting, the board should be quick to correct the errors publicly.

c) Finally, it may be time to change the basic attitude of journalism. Perhaps more attention should be paid to the common, everyday problems that plague society, and to the efforts that succeed and therefore contain lessons we need to learn.

Many men are disturbed by the shortcomings of the few in journalism. But correction and change can only be meaningful when they come from within.

Just as no public official should rest with pride so long as one public servant is dishonest, just as no lawyer can take pride in his bar so long as one fellow barrister inadequately represents a client, so no responsible journalist should rest so long as any irresponsibility exists in his profession.

## SENATE—Friday, May 23, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, from whom cometh every good and perfect gift, we lift our hearts to Thee in thanksgiving for life and health, for love and friendship, for work to do and strength to do it, for this good land and all its people. Come near to those who have special need of Thee—the poor, the infirmed, the unloved. Send out Thy light and truth through all who teach and heal and pray that the weak may be made strong and the strong kept pure and just.

Grant us in our daily duties here the higher wisdom which Thou dost bestow upon those who seek to serve Thee in spirit and in truth.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 20, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1969 in the amount of \$160,000,000, for payment of the first installment of the U.S. share of the 1969-71 increase in the resources of the International Development Association, which, with accompanying papers was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of May 20, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate, on May 21 and 22, 1969, received messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations received on May 21, and 22, 1969, see the end of the proceedings of today, May 23, 1969.)

### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 20, 1969, the following favorable executive reports of nominations were submitted:

On May 21, 1969:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

William T. Pecora, of New Jersey, to be Director of the Geological Survey.

On May 22, 1969:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Francis J. Galbraith, of South Dakota, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Indonesia; Sheldon B. Vance, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

Oliver L. Troxel, Jr., of Colorado, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Zambia;

John Davis Lodge, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to Argentina;

Matthew J. Loomam, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Dahomey;

Francis E. Meloy, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Dominican Republic;

Spencer M. King, of Maine, to be Ambassador to Guyana;

Armin H. Meyer, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to Japan;