

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HUD ANNOUNCES RESEARCH PROJECT DESIGNED TO TAILOR PROGRAMS TO NEEDS OF SMALL TOWNS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the Department of Housing and Urban Development appears to be devoting more of its resources to programs and policies designed to assist our smaller communities in achieving growth and progress.

This effort is directly related to the solution of the problems of our larger cities and metropolitan areas because, as we all know, the lack of economic development and employment opportunities in our small town and rural areas have helped to create the outmigration which has intensified the problems in our cities.

In this connection HUD has just announced a \$150,000 research project designed to determine how HUD programs can be made more effective in our smaller communities.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this matter of rural-urban balance, I place a copy of the press release concerning this research project in the RECORD:

BETTER DELIVERY OF HUD PROGRAMS TO SMALL TOWNS IS OBJECT OF STUDY

How Federal urban programs should be modified to support desirable improvements in community life in small towns is the goal of a \$150,000 research effort announced today by Secretary George Romney of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The research will be carried out by the Jacobs Company, Inc., of Chicago, Ill., a management consultant firm specializing in all aspects of public administration and finance. The firm will study the physical, social, economic and governmental needs of small communities and make recommendations for adapting or developing HUD and other Federal programs to effectively meet such needs.

In announcing the one-year contract, Secretary Romney said that "properly designed programs of assistance, geared specifically to small communities, could result in substantial benefits both to present residents and to those members of our rapidly increasing and shifting population who would be attracted by the presence of economic, physical and social improvements in small-town America."

Secretary Romney noted that there are a variety of unmet needs among communities with populations under 50,000 which have not received adequate attention from other governmental levels.

"Until now," he said, "no systematic study relating the small town in the United States and the means to gain the most effective benefits from HUD and other Federal programs has been undertaken."

The Jacobs Company will employ the systems analysis expertise of the Planning Research Corporation to assure a comprehensive, in-depth analysis of the small community, its problems and its needs, and the ef-

fectiveness and possible improvement in HUD programs.

The end product of this study will include three reports, devoted mainly to (1) an analysis of the basic characteristics, capabilities, and perceived problems of the small communities selected for study; (2) a statement of the problems and needs of the selected small communities as analyzed by the research teams; and (3) an analysis of Federal resources, both current and potential, for meeting the needs and problems of small communities.

The study also will investigate the possibility of developing a broadly based small community profile for use by HUD in further studies of small communities. Recommendations will be made on the feasibility of using a standardized profile form for continuing studies, the types of information which should be included based upon this research effort, and the ways in which existing information can be supplemented through these techniques.

The study will be supervised by HUD's Office of Small Town Services. This office was created to sharpen HUD's focus on less populous communities and to improve the delivery of program information and technical assistance to small town officials. It also has the responsibility for recognizing and analyzing needs of small cities and coordinating Federal, State, local and private efforts to meet those needs.

DEATH OF TOM McATEER, IDAHO STATE SENATOR

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have just lost, and the State of Idaho has lost, a fine and good friend. He was Tom McAteer, a State senator from Bannock County—a railroad man, a sportsman, and a courageous conservationist.

I have wanted, for a long time, to salute his work and his fine Irish integrity. Now—when he is gone—I come to the task and find that our mutual friend, Pierre Pulling, has captured in words what I have long felt about Tom.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this eloquent tribute by Pierre Pulling to this important man, published in the *Intermountain Observer* of June 14, 1969.

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

TOM McATEER

(By Pierre Pulling)

The sudden death of Pocatello's Sen. Thomas McAteer was a jolt. It was not really surprising. Mac had been a strong man, and still seemed to be strong. But he had had a heart condition for some time, and everyone knows about strong men with weak hearts. They go out fast when they go.

There is a faint silver lining under the cloud. Mac was an enthusiastic field sportsman, and he was on a fishing trip at the drop-out. It's the way most of us would choose when we must Cross The Bar. Fur-

ther, though Mac still had much to do, and the ability to do it, a lot of grain had been garnered. I know of little of his successful railroad work. I saw him as a conservationist and a legislator.

We first met as members of the now disbanded Bannock County Sportsmens Association. We both shifted to the South End Idaho Rod & Gun Club, ably organized and still competently led by Bill Reynolds.

Mac was a born-and-bred natural resources booster. He was a natural for State Senator. During his two sessions, he did as much for conservation as anyone could do. I can be plenty critical of politicians. "Horse trading" is inevitable, but can get disagreeable. Mac was a sharp trader. He kept no spavined mounts. Though his Irish wit was charming, his stance was solid as the mountains he protected. And his stature matched his mountains. He made no legislative blunders as I saw them. And I watched!

His friends, his Legislature, and his Idaho will miss Tom McAteer. Repeat, his work was not done, but he accomplished more than most of us can in the time that he had. It was rewarding to work for 20 years with a gentleman of such high caliber. Idaho's renewable natural resources are her most valuable possessions. Mac's influence on them will remain long after he and the rest of us are forgotten. And he will not be forgotten for a long time.

PROFESSIONAL PAY AND CONTINUATION BONUSES FOR JUDGE ADVOCATES IN THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation authorizing professional pay and continuation bonuses for judge advocates in the uniform services.

In doing so, I want to note that retention of military attorneys has been drastically low in the Armed Forces for a number of years and, as a consequence, the services are woefully undermanned in the middle grades, that is, senior captains, majors, and junior lieutenant colonels. If this trend continues—and there is no reason to expect it will not—the Armed Forces will, in the near future, be staffed with the judge advocate departments consisting almost exclusively of very junior officers. To illustrate this, 62 percent of the Army's current judge advocate manning consists of lawyers with less than 3 years of legal experience. I should further point out that the Military Justice Act of 1968, which becomes effective August 1, 1969, requires 744 more experienced lawyers in the services to implement it in accord with the congressional mandate. You will note that I said 744 additional experienced lawyers, those in the grades which I have already pointed out as being woefully undermanned and for which there currently seems to be no near-term possibility of alleviating without additional incentives.

With regard to the bill I am introducing, I invite my colleagues' attention to the remarks in the RECORD by Mr. OLSEN of Montana on May 27, 1969. In them, he graphically outlined the great disparity between the pay of uniformed attorneys to that of their civil service and civilian counterparts. In point fact, a lawyer major's top pay, even including the July 1, 1969, pay raise, ranges up to \$5,000 per year less than his civil service counterpart or a civilian practitioner with like experience.

Attracting and retaining competent lawyers presents a serious problem much like the case of physicians. For, unlike the other skills in which the services may have retention problems, service lawyers are trained at their own expense. In point of fact, the Armed Forces are prohibited by law from training them. And, even after the Armed Forces recruit young lawyers and develop them to the point of full productivity, the services presently have no inducements which will attract them to a military career.

Lawyers, as they mature and gain experience, increase in ability and effectiveness. Actually, most of them reach their most productive years when those in most other skills and professions have passed their peak or nearly reached the age of retirement.

Nor is special pay or continuation bonuses for special skills or professions a novelty. Military physicians and dentists are currently authorized—dependent on their grade and experience—\$100 to \$350 per month plus longevity pay credit and continuation bonuses; veterinarians receive \$100 a month in extra pay; and there are some 484 designated service skills and specialties that are accorded special pay and bonuses. Considering his special educational background and length of training needed to reach maximum effectiveness, military lawyers stand alone as a group for which there is neither inducement to enter the service nor incentive to stay. And, for those services not dependent upon present draft laws, the inability to attract lawyers will become even more aggravated if the present draft laws are changed.

In conclusion, my bill is an effort to alleviate the problem of attracting and retaining judge advocates in the Armed Forces. I am convinced that, unless drastic measures are taken soon to reverse the sharp decline in the retention of career judge advocates, we will have reached a point of no return.

WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS IN VIETNAM

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him relating to the withdrawal of troops in Vietnam and an editorial entitled "One More Gesture," published in the Columbia (S.C.) State.

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

WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS IN VIETNAM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, when President Nixon announced the withdrawal of 25,000 troops from Vietnam, I supported the President's measure. It is a risk, but it again demonstrates America's desire for peace. If North Vietnam does not reciprocate, then further withdrawals should be carefully reconsidered.

It is a calculated risk which is made possible only because of the Nixon Administration's vigorous efforts to step up the training and equipping of the South Vietnamese troops. If the bombing halt and the withdrawal of these troops does not convince Hanoi to negotiate for peace, then the world should be convinced once again that Hanoi does not want peace.

Mr. President, the State newspaper in South Carolina reflects these views in an excellent editorial. The distinguished Editor, Mr. William D. Workman, Jr. states:

"Does Hanoi want peace? Then let the Communists respond to this overture by some show of accommodation. . . . Let us wait for some sign from Hanoi, if that is the President's decision, but let us not wait forever. If Hanoi wants war, then let us see that it is war she gets."

ONE MORE GESTURE

The decision has been made to scale down the U.S. garrison in Vietnam, and hopes for peace have taken wing again. It is the nature of hope, as Alexander Pope observed, to spring eternal. And it is the nature of the enemy in Vietnam, one remembers glumly, to accept whatever concessions are offered and to give nothing in return.

This time, we are assured, it will be different. Already, Paris observers report, the enemy is showing a new willingness to negotiate an end to the war. Just the other day, it is said, Hanoi negotiators approached Washington negotiators and asked for elaboration on some point raised in the Nixon administration's peace proposals. This is widely interpreted as a mark of peaceful intent.

Perhaps it is, and then again perhaps it isn't. In Vietnam, history is on the side of the pessimist. More than once, Hanoi has been advertised as mellowing. More than once, Washington has sought to take advantage of this new reasonableness by making military concessions. And more than once, not to say always, Hanoi has proved to be just as unreasonable as before.

No better evidence of this comes to mind than the events surrounding the so-called bombing halt agreement. Then, too, it was alleged that Hanoi stood ready to participate in a mutual scaling down of the war. American bombers were grounded, and American hopes for peace took off on gossamer wings.

Hanoi had agreed, President Johnson announced, to desist from attacks on South Vietnamese cities and we had agreed to quit bombing cities in the north. In the end, of course, the "agreement" was observed to evaporate. American bombing stopped as promised, but the North Vietnamese soon resumed their shelling.

Critics of America's Vietnam effort never tire of insisting on some show of "good faith" by Washington and Saigon, and they never seem to be discouraged when allied concessions lead nowhere. Now, once again, the allies have agreed to de-escalate the war effort—this time on the ground. Twenty-five thousand GIs soon will be replaced by South Vietnamese troops, and the way is open for even larger American withdrawals in the next few months.

Does Hanoi want peace? Then let the Communists respond to this overture by some show of accommodation. For a start, they might revise their dumb-show performance

in Paris, where they have been content so far to keep the peace talks bogged down in a tiresome dialectic. They might also respond on the battlefield. Military sources in Saigon expect a new enemy offensive, perhaps by the end of the month. If the Communists earnestly desire peace, then let it begin here. One word from Hanoi, and the proposed offensive could be stopped.

By the same token, one word from Washington and the awesome, irresistible military power of the United States could be brought to bear on North Vietnam—not in hesitant half measures, but in an unrestricted onslaught that would reduce the enemy's major cities and ports to rubble and obliterate North Vietnam's capacity to make war. Let us wait for some sign from Hanoi, if that is the President's decision, but let us not wait forever. If Hanoi wants war, then let us see that it is war she gets.

DANGER TO OUR CIVIL RIGHTS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a resolution which was recently adopted by the Council for Civic Unity in San Francisco with regard to the growing movement seeking abolition of the Emergency Detention Act, subtitle II of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

The resolution, with which I am in agreement, points out the grave danger to the civil rights of all Americans that the Emergency Detention Act contains. This act provides that, during periods of "internal security emergency, any person who probably will engage in or probably will conspire with them to engage in acts of espionage" can be incarcerated in detention camps without a trial to establish his guilt or innocence.

Mr. Curt Moody, Council for Civic Unity Director, stated:

The experience of this country's injustice to our citizens of Japanese ancestry during World War II should be enough to make any thoughtful person recognize the dangers of such a law. Justice, if it is to be meted out, must acknowledge the right of an individual to his day in court. The law must deal with the individual, not a group identifiable by skin color or national origin.

I strongly urge my fellow colleagues to support H.R. 11373 and H.R. 1825, bills which have been introduced and would repeal title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF SAN FRANCISCO COUNCIL FOR CIVIC UNITY

Whereas as members of the Board of Directors of the Council for Civic Unity, with knowledge of the experience of Japanese-American Citizens in emergency detention, we recognize the danger of Subtitle II of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Emergency Detention Act), to the civil rights of all Americans, and

Whereas, we as American citizens of all nationalities, regret that sad part of our recent history, and

Whereas the Emergency Detention Act provides that, during periods of "internal security emergency", any person who probably will engage in, or probably will conspire with others to "engage in, acts of espionage" can be incarcerated in detention camps, and

Whereas a person detained under the Emergency Detention Act will not be brought to trial under law, but instead will be judged by a Preliminary Hearing Officer and a Detention Review Board, wherein the detainee must prove his innocence, but the government is not required to disclose evidence or produce witnesses to justify the detention, and

Whereas said procedures violate all constitutional guarantees and protections, of democracy, and are unnecessary, as existing laws and procedures are available and are completely adequate to safeguard internal security, and

Whereas such a law has ominous implications for the racial and ethnic communities because of past history and because of its approach to justice in group rather than individual terms, contrary to the best American traditions, Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Council for Civic Unity should utilize its available resources to oppose this measure and strongly commend the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco for their opposition to Subtitle II of the Internal Security Act of 1950, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all members of the Congress and to the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

BELLE A. MANSFIELD

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago, on June 18, 1869, Belle A. Mansfield, of Mount Pleasant, Iowa, became the first woman to be admitted to the bar in the United States. To honor this centennial year, the National Association of Women Lawyers, in cooperation with other national women's organizations has sponsored significant programs in each of the 50 States. As a woman lawyer, I am especially proud to bring attention to this historic occasion which made possible the many constructive contributions by American women in the field of law over the past century.

Arabella Babb Mansfield, more frequently referred to as Belle A. Mansfield, was the first female American licensed to practice law when the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa on June 18, 1869, granted such admission. Mrs. Mansfield was a graduate of Iowa Wesleyan and studied law with her brother in the law offices of a Mount Pleasant firm.

At the time of Mrs. Mansfield's application for admission to the Iowa bar, a statute provided that only white male persons could be admitted to the practice of law. A court decision was necessary and this was rendered by the Iowa Supreme Court stating that "the affirmative declaration that male persons may be admitted is not implied denial to the right of females." The words "white male" were deleted from the Iowa code on March 8, 1870.

Today, there are approximately 9,000 women lawyers in the United States. They have been admitted to all major law schools and are practicing in every State in the Union.

The commencement theme of Iowa Wesleyan University this June honored

Mrs. Mansfield who served on the faculty of the university. The president of the National Association of Women Lawyers, Miss Ruth Gentry Talley, a Bogalusa attorney, participated in the baccalaureate program at the university. Additional celebrations are to be held in Iowa and other areas throughout the country under the auspices of the NAWL to commemorate this centennial year.

SAUGUS IRON WORKS

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an event of historical importance. On June 21, 1969, the birthplace of the 319-year-old American iron and steel industry—the Saugus Iron Works in Saugus, Mass.—will become the newest national historical site of the national park system. I am especially proud because this landmark is located within my congressional district, and I want to thank the Members of Congress for approving my bill, H.R. 3323, which authorized this designation on April 5, 1968.

Situated on an 8-acre tract on the banks of the Saugus River, 10 miles north of Boston, the ironworks is the restoration of one of the earliest integrated iron producing communities in North America. Completed in 1954 after 6 years of extensive research and reconstruction, the restoration was financed by the American Iron and Steel Institute at a cost of more than \$1.5 million.

The original Saugus Iron Works, built in 1650—130 years before the Revolutionary War—was considered the industrial wonder of its day. Its operations and equipment compared with the best in use in contemporary ironworks of Europe.

High on a bank above the ironworks is the home of the ironmaster. It is the only original building remaining at the site. The house was restored in 1915 by Wallace Nutting, a noted antiquarian.

For several years following the restoration of the ironmaster's house, attempts were made to move it to Greenfield Village at Dearborn, Mich. Local residents fought for its retention, and I was privileged to participate in these efforts to prevent the loss of this truly historic part of the Seventh Congressional District.

The restoration includes a replica of the 300-year-old forge where cast iron "sow" bars from the furnace were reheated and "beaten" into usable wrought iron. The reconstructed giant water wheels provide the power for the mill, the huge forge hammer, and the 17-foot bellows at the forge hearths.

In the museum near the ironmaster's house are relics found during the original excavation of the original ironworks. Here sections of the preserved water wheel constructed three centuries ago still show the craftsmanship of an early millwright. Tools on display were

hammered from iron made at the mill and reveal the skills of the colonial craftsmen.

Although the mill operated only about 20 years, the skills learned at Saugus moved on with the craftsmen to other ironworks being established throughout the Colonies.

Beginning July 1, this national historical site will be open to the public, and I assure you that any visitor to the Saugus Iron Works will come away with a profound sense of its historical importance. I am very proud of this fine example of our American heritage, and I am certain that I share this pride with the people of Saugus and the surrounding communities.

CONGRESS CAN PREVENT DEFENSE WASTE

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, foremost among the public controversies these days is the matter of defense spending. An editorial in the Kansas City Star of June 11, 1969, places the matter in perspective. The Defense Department spends, but the Congress appropriates the money that is subsequently spent. The Congress, because of its unwillingness to reform and improve its procedures must accept a large share of the responsibility for the present condition. The editorial follows:

CONGRESS CAN PREVENT DEFENSE WASTE

The military continues to get its lumps, with the latest whack coming from Congress's joint economic subcommittee on economy in government. That bipartisan group of senators and representatives, headed by Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.), has charged the Defense department with wasting untold billions of dollars on weapons that had to be canceled because they failed to work. The subcommittee put it more formally:

"The federal government has not been adequately controlling military spending. As a result, substantial unnecessary funds have been spent for the acquisition of weapons systems and other military hardware . . . The wasteful, inefficient practices uncovered raised basic questions concerning the Defense department's management of its own affairs . . . The absence of effective cost controls . . . has resulted in a vast subsidy for the defense industry, particularly the larger contractors."

Every word of this statement and of the report from which it is taken, could be absolutely correct. But it does not tell the whole story.

Recently Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.), observed that since the end of World War II, this country's taxpayers "have put up 953 billion dollars for national defense." The taxpayers provided the money, but Congress appropriated it. So the question is: Where does the responsibility of Congress end? When it votes billions for security?

We think not. The various congressional committees have large investigative resources. Yet over the years the committees concerned with military matters have generally accepted the recommendations of the Defense department—or at least those approved by the armed services committees—with little question. Nor has Congress insisted on tight procurement practices in-

cluding a much greater proportion of contracts let by bidding instead of by negotiation.

Only in recent months, buffeted by the disillusionment of the Vietnam war, have members of Congress in general shown much interest in challenging the multibillion-dollar defense programs presented to them. And in the most noted instance—that of the antiballistic missile proposal—the challenging is as much for reasons of political ideology as for concern over the huge amounts of tax dollars involved.

We do not suggest that the Pentagon is blameless in frittering away some of the funds it seeks for the defense program. But we do not see a solution in any attempt by Congress to hold military planners altogether responsible. The lawmakers themselves—not men in uniform or their civilian chieftains—control the pursestrings.

Until Congress accepts and acts upon its responsibility for spending only what is necessary for defense, the conditions described by Senator Proxmire's subcommittee will continue to prevail. No amount of condemnation of the actual spenders can alter the fundamental, all-important fact that it is Congress that votes them the money to spend—much too often without insisting on effective safeguards against mismanagement and waste.

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN WENDELL WYATT BEFORE THE NORTHWEST RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

HON. JOHN R. DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, last week my able colleague in the House from Oregon's First District, the Hon. WENDELL WYATT, addressed the Northwest Rivers and Harbors Congress meeting at Salshan on the Oregon coast. His remarks were well made and should be of interest to every Member who is concerned with the orderly development of our water resources, and so I am placing his speech in the Record.

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN WENDELL WYATT, REPUBLICAN OF OREGON, BEFORE THE NORTHWEST RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, SALSCHAN LODGE, OREG.

No where is there more dramatic evidence of the failure and tragedy of the so-called "guns and butter" policy than in the proposed spending program of the Corps of Army Engineers for the coming fiscal year.

The conduct of the limited Vietnam war under such circumstances has resulted in a deeply discouraging quagmire, the release from which we are battling literally with our lives to achieve.

The business-as-usual attitude during this period on the American domestic scene resulted in repeated huge budget deficits, topped by the deficit of more than \$25 Billion in fiscal 1968. This in turn has been the heart of the wave of inflation which has practically engulfed us. As a result of necessary efforts to attempt to withdraw our economy from the pressures of inflation, the Corps of Engineers under the Nixon Administration has submitted the most austere budget in recent memory. This has been necessary to protect and preserve the value of the dollar.

Inflation is rampant. It is eating steadily away at the resources of those who are least able to afford it, as well, certainly, at the resources of each American. Savings accounts, U.S. bonds, and life insurance have been sys-

tematically reduced just as surely as if the government were annually confiscating a regular percentage.

Any deflationary program is very painful. No one has devised a system of deflation which is painless or popular. But deflate we must if we are to recover control of our domestic economy. And so, important water programs such as that of the Corps must be reduced to the real danger point. Appropriations are cut, programs are stretched out and delayed. Important progress to meet the needs of our people is very seriously impeded.

Then, it is evident, the programs are dealt a further and very serious adverse blow by the spiral of rising costs. Reduction in appropriations, delays in appropriations, and stretching out programs makes them much more costly. Thus necessary procedures to attempt to cure inflation in the end offer substantial fuel to the cycle, thus one feeds the other, on and on.

Let's examine the details of where the Corps program presently rests. Remember, I am now making reference only to projects of the Corps of Engineers. Other agencies dealing with our water resources, including the Bureau of Reclamation, have their own funding problems, which are comparable to those of the Corps.

Looking at the Corps construction requests under the Nixon budget, we find that the total is just barely \$627 Million. The Johnson budget figure represented a cut of \$96 Million below the previous year. The Nixon administration made an additional \$142 million cut. The resulting \$627 million budget request is 27% less than the current fiscal year. This is the Corps' lowest request for construction funding in the past eleven years. General Koisch, in his testimony this spring before the House Public Works Appropriations subcommittee, pointed out that in consideration of the increased construction costs, this year's program actually represents a cut back of 42% from the 1967 level. He correctly adds that if funding continues at this level, we are going to be faced with a most serious situation in water resource development.

Testimony before this committee clearly indicates that one and one half billion dollars, nearly three times that proposed, should be appropriated this year to maintain the Corps' current development schedule.

The need for expansion, rather than reduction, of funds for water resources programs was amply shown by the testimony of over 1,500 witnesses before the Public Works Committee. The witnesses, testifying in regard to this year's appropriation bill, were requesting funds for unbudgeted projects and for increasing amounts on already-budgeted programs and projects. Over 150 Members of Congress were among those witnesses.

Only after a most thorough and exhaustive study and review have these projects been authorized by Congress for funding. This study must include full assurances of the economic justification for undertaking the work.

Each project must have been carefully reviewed by the concerned Federal agencies, and cleared with related agencies. Then they must have been studied by the appropriate legislative committees of the Congress before they receive authorization. Each project must conform to stringent criteria to make sure that the benefits to result from the project justify the expense. Many of these projects also require solid assurance of local cooperation before construction begins, including the commitment of the affected community to possible repayment of funds from benefits derived from the project such as from water supply and irrigation.

This year the Appropriations Committee has felt it is justified in funding new projects only on a very limited basis, due to the tight monetary situation. It has had to take this attitude despite the obvious justification and urgent need for the many projects coming before it for funds.

If additional evidence of urgency is needed, consider these figures. There is present backlog of active authorized civil works projects not yet under construction of the following:

114 Navigation Projects Costing \$4,355,000,000.
281 Flood Control Projects Costing \$4,061,000,000.
17 Multiple Purpose Projects costing \$1,200,000,000.
40 Beach and Erosion control projects costing \$60,500,000.

A total of 452 economically sound Corps-only projects, not yet under construction, totalling . . . nearly \$10,000,000,000.

No one can justly argue that the Northwest has not and is not getting its fair share of the total national sum spent in this area. Even this year about 20% of the total Corps construction budget is for the North Pacific division. Most of this is, of course, being invested in the very large dams.

Our national water development needs are increasing even at a steeper rate than we are decreasing our expenditures.

It is projected that the continental United States alone will have a population of 300 million by 1995 and 400 million by 2020. Most of this fantastic increase will be centered in the large cities and their environs. These large urban centers currently contain about 72 per cent of our population in a land area of 2 to 3 per cent.

The increasing growth of these areas can only bring about more critical water and land use problems. Because our nation's water concentration areas do not conform to the areas of population concentration, in many areas in the near future it will be necessary to store, divert and redistribute available water supplies to make it available in the urban locales. These mounting problems will mean concentrated and cooperative efforts at local, state and Federal levels if growing industry and increased population are to be served.

Despite the tremendous benefits being realized from the Corps flood control projects, the assessment forecasts a rise in annual flood damage from \$1.7 billion in 1966 to \$5.0 billion by 2020, based on the current status of protection works.

Projections show the scope of future needs. In 50 years the tonnage carried on our waterways will increase 6 times what it is today. Pleasure craft for water sports and recreation will increase from today's 8 million to 30 million. This increased density of traffic means major improvements must be made to provide for safe and efficient handling of all this water traffic.

The same holds true for our future needs in the areas of hydro-power, water oriented recreation, and protection from erosion.

We have massive problems in the water resources development field today. But, looking at these projections, it is apparent that these problems are tiny compared to what they will be in the near future. Some of the most immediate needs can be met through projects already approved by Congress. But, in the long run, our greater needs must be anticipated, and plans formulated through an intensive investigation program.

Each year we must delay costs us dearly in terms of production and income. But overall it costs even more. The cost of construction is rising swiftly. According to the Association of General Contractors of America, construction which might have been completed by 1955 had risen 40% in cost by 1965. And the inflation spiral continues to climb. When we are forced by present circumstances to put off those works we could have completed in the 1960's, the financial burden of cost inflation will have tremendously increased by the 1970's. Combined with the loss of benefits from the delay, we will have been doubly penalized for having put off needed works.

One of the most serious barriers to creating informed public awareness of the water re-

source development area is the omni-present, well-financed efforts of various special interest groups who maintain a continuing propaganda campaign in the effort to throw certain phases of this program into a bad light.

The term "pork barrel" has been used by these interests to brand particular projects to which they are opposed and, indeed, the entire resource program. The ability and integrity of the Corps of Engineers and other agencies are impugned. Congress is charged with waste, foolhardy spending, and sometimes even worse.

Suspicion and confusion in the public mind over water resource development can, in many instances, be pinpointed as coming from sensationalist elements in the press. "Pork barrel" grabs reader interest in headlines much more quickly than "Water Resource Development." Implications of Congressional horse trading and favoritism can be used much more readily to attract readership than can a responsible analysis of a particular project. This biased, slanted approach to reporting can only mislead the public and distract it from the true import of the water resources development program. When the government becomes suspect in this critical area, it can only deter us from essential work.

And it is clear above all that, despite this kind of press, our needs and performance in the water resource field will stand the most critical and careful scrutiny, if the analysis is fair, and the comment truthful. For the truth is that no other area of Federal concern is subject to more thorough review, more careful control and more competent and in-depth study than is our water resource development program.

The simple knowledge of this truth, sad to say, is not enough. Knowing the excellent judgment and performance of the Corps of Engineers is not enough. Assurance of a careful and objective review of Corps findings in the Congress is not enough. Knowledge of the checks and balances and the many considerations that go into preparing the budget for these works is not enough.

It is our duty to bring this knowledge into the open . . . to apprise our public of these facts . . . so they may know, as we do, that funds spent on water resource development projects are being spent wisely and in the advancement of essential national goals.

Public exposure to the full and honest facts of water resource needs is the perfect counter to the misleading words of the propagandists. And every opportunity must be taken to make these facts known. For without complete public confidence in the needs behind our programs, there is little hope of bringing them into line with our future national requirements. In the face of an ever-growing need, without public acceptance, we shall gain neither increased speed or expanded scope in water resource development.

In the face of what I consider to be an overwhelming case for maximum attention to proposed Corps projects, we have continual pressures from some to change the interest rates on re-payment.

Senator Proxmire of Wisconsin has, several times, brought this matter up on the Floor of the Senate. His proposal involves a sharp upward adjustment in the interest/discount rate factor used to estimate costs of Federal funding in proposed water resource projects. These estimates are presently developed from the average rate on outstanding long-term Government indebtedness.

As a substitute for this, Senator Proxmire would use the much higher estimated average rate of return obtained by private industry. Such a change would charge an exorbitant interest rate on a potential improvement, artificially raising the estimated cost and apparently making the improvement unjustifiable.

The theory behind Senator Proxmire's

method of computation is that funds used to finance Federal projects are received from the private sector, and would be used for private investment if the projects were not built. Further, it considers the full Federal cost of the funds as a resultant loss in the private sector of our economy. An application of this theory would raise the discount/interest rate for project evaluation from the current level of about 4 and five-eighths (5%) to between 10 and 15%.

According to Senator Proxmire, the use of this 10 to 15% factor would have resulted in benefit/cost ratios of less than 1 to 1 for such projects as the Illinois and Missouri levee system, the cross Florida Barge Canal, the Arkansas River Project and the Kaskaskia River project. Under this system, then, these projects would all have been scrapped, along with the others.

A massive and challenging task in developing its water resources confronts the nation. With vigor, vision, and determination, the job can be done. But in our path are great difficulties. Difficulties of straining to do the maximum under the most possible difficult conditions. We are paying the penalty for past economic mistakes. We must re-direct our priorities to permit the required job to be accomplished.

Only by joining together can we be successful.

NATURALIZED CITIZENS EXPRESS GRATITUDE IN UNUSUAL LETTER TO THEIR SON AT GRADUATION

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in this commencement period, graduates and their families have mixed feelings. For most families, it is a time of great pride in their loved ones. For most graduates, it is a time of recognition of scholastic achievement.

A Buffalo, N.Y., couple, Mr. and Mrs. Vladislav A. Dujovic, 224 Ontario Street, are expressing their pride in a special way. Indeed, they are doing so through the medium of a very unusual tribute to their son, Borislav—Boris—who graduates this weekend from Riverside High School in Buffalo.

The Dujovics, immigrants from Yugoslavia who were naturalized as American citizens in 1963, have prepared a letter to their son.

This is not an ordinary letter, but it is rather a moving recollection of the hardships of the family during the years of oppression in Europe.

These proud parents, devoted to their adopted land, remind their son:

Remember and be proud that your ancestors had always been allied with the United States of America and had fought side by side against all common enemies; they were bravely fighting and falling, thinking always that they would be victorious.

The same struggle against the communists, begun by your ancestors and your grandfather in Yugoslavia, 1941, had continued with the Americans in Korea, and now in Vietnam where they are fighting and falling on the bloody battlefields, well aware of the dangers of communism for all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, this unusual graduation letter from grateful parents to their son

has been printed in a booklet, along with copies of official letters they received upon their naturalization, as well as pictures of their ancestors, some of the pictures having been taken on the battlefields of Europe.

Following is the text of the letter from Vladislav and Anna Dujovic to their son, Borislav, upon his graduation this weekend:

MY DEAR SON BORISLAV:

As you graduate from high school, I would like to express how very happy and overwhelmed with genuine fatherly joy I am, and I heartily congratulate you for having been able to finish your high school studies successfully. Your mother and sister, Vera, are also delighted and sincerely happy; both of them congratulate you also.

Dear Borislav, on this solemn occasion I would like to remind you of some moments and events in the history of our family which might be necessary and valuable for you throughout the course of your life. I firmly believe that any young man should know the origin of his own family and his remote ancestors. In your case, this is a long, glorious story. Our ancestors belong to Montenegro (Crna Gora), now a southern state of Yugoslavia. In 1912 two small countries on the Balkan Peninsula, Serbia and Montenegro fought for their freedom against the Turkish and obtained it. Not only Montenegro and Serbia, but also Greece and Bulgaria joined us to crush and put down the Turks, which after five centuries freed the Balkan Area from Turkish rule. At that time, this Christian unity and alliance had been a glorious triumph of all Christian people living in the Balkan Peninsula. This was known as the Balkan War.

Hardly one year had passed since the people in Serbia and Montenegro were left in peace, when in July 1914, the Austro-Hungarian Empire declared war on Serbia. Immediately Montenegro went to help Serbia. This had been the beginning of the First World War. Besides Austro-Hungary, our enemies had been Germany, Turkey and later Bulgaria. They were known as the Central Powers. Our allies became known as the Great Entente, consisting of France, Czarist Russia, The United States of America, Great Britain and Italy. This crucial war lasted through four years, and in September 1918 the war ended with a victory on our side. During that time the people of Serbia and Montenegro became molded into one national group, known as Serbs. On behalf of King Peter I, the Regent Alexander proclaimed the formation of the Kingdom of all Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes on December 1, 1918. This was the time when our country had begun to be called Yugoslavia.

HITLER-MUSSOLINI PLUNDERING

DEAR BORIS: when Hitler and Mussolini started to ravage and plunder in Europe, as well as the Japanese in the Far-East, most of Europe began falling, one country after another under the forces of Hitler's military machine. Poland, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, Austria, and Czechoslovakia had been victims and prey of the Axis Powers. In the southeast part of Europe, Hungary joined the Axis Powers along with Rumania and Bulgaria. Only Yugoslavia and Greece remained free for a while. Great Britain was fighting hard in the air and warding off the onslaught of the German air force. Yugoslavia was encircled on all sides, except for Greece in the South, by other enemy countries. Hitler gave an ultimatum to the Yugoslavian government, urging our country to join the Axis Powers and also urging us to allow free transportation and the shipments of war materials through our country for Rommel's army fighting in Africa. . . . With sorrow Prince Paul and Premier Dragisa Cvetkovic signed

the pact, on March 25, 1941. The Serbian people as a whole, though they were helpless, could not reconcile with the shameful event. The idea of this act of our government would betray our old friends and Allies. The Yugoslav government was overthrown. On March 27, 1941 a new government, more patriotic than the last, had been formed from the most prominent political leaders in the country. The new Prime Minister was Dusan Simovic, a general. They proclaimed King Peter II as the legal head of Yugoslavia, although he was still a minor. Yugoslavia declared herself an enemy of the Axis Powers, and once again sided with our Allies of World War I.

Surreptitiously without declaration of war, on April 6, 1941, the German bombardiers (stukas) began their hellish pouring of bombs over the capital of Yugoslavia, Belgrade. The heavy bombardment took place very early in the morning at dawn. This was the same case as in the bombardment of Pearl Harbor in the Pacific, by the Japanese on December 7, 1941. Communists had been ordered, from Moscow, to aid the Germans by sabotaging our armies. At that time, Stalin and Hitler were very good friends and allies by the treaty of friendship signed by Ribbentrop and Molotov in Berlin, 1939. Therefore, the Communists from the very beginning were the "Fifth Column" among us; going to the aid of the Germans.

YUGOSLAVIA IS DISMEMBERED

MY DEAR SON: I would like to tell you what happened to our country hence forward. Yugoslavia was mercilessly dismembered by the Axis military forces. The victors divided Yugoslavia among themselves: The Bulgarians occupied the cradle of our Serbian Culture, South Serbia (Macedonia); the Hungarians took Serbian Vojvodina, with the city of Novi Sad, Subotica, Sombor and many other towns; Albanian mobs occupied Kosovo and Methoja along with many countries that were controlled by the Italian fascists. In Croatia, Ante Pavelic, through the aid of the Italian fascists and Nazi Germans formed the Croatian government and an army which became known as the Ustasi. He declared himself an Axis Power and this declaration invited war with our allies. His second act was to kill all Serbs, Jews, and gypsies in Croatia. Over 725,000 people had been killed in the area occupied by the Ustasi. Our ancestral country, Montenegro (Crna Gora), was under the control of the Italian occupation troops. Only the pre-Komovo Serbia was left under the German command in Belgrade, after the crushing of our armies on the border of Yugoslavia.

On April 17, 1941, Yugoslavia was defeated by the Axis Powers. The King and the government of Yugoslavia fled to Cairo, where the Allied forces were stationed. About 133,000 of our Yugoslav military forces were taken immediately as prisoners, and the remainder were scattered in Serbia as well as in Montenegro. Fortunately, Dragoljub Draza Mihailovic, a staff army colonel, was not taken as war-prisoner. On May 8, 1941, Draza Mihailovic managed to come to the mountain Ravna Gora, in western Serbia, with most of his regiment intact. He immediately began reorganizing our armed forces. First, he deployed necessary military action to contact the army officers who did not surrender to the enemy. These underground guerrilla forces known as Chetniks, were in Serbia and Montenegro.

On June 22, 1944, the German troops received orders from Hitler to attack Russia. Then Yugoslav communists, under the leadership of Josip Broz "Tito" went into guerrilla movement in the mountains. This communist guerrilla movement started in the Serbia and Montenegro areas, which was already under the control of the Chetniks. At the time, the communists were almost insignificant, though they started to kill people who were supporting Chetniks.

MIRO DUJOVIC IS STAFF CHIEF

DEAR BORISLAV: In your ancestral country Montenegro, Aleksa J. Dujovic, county secretary; George M. Lasic, staff army major; Milija M. Lasic, professor; Miro V. Dujovic, captain; Branko Radevic, captain; Pavle Djuriscic, captain; and many prominent citizens started to take action against the communist movement. . . . Dragoljub Draza Mihailovic, who had already been promoted as a general, and nominated by our government in London as the chief of all our fighting forces within the borders of Yugoslavia, had nominated staff army Major George M. Lasic as commander of fighting forces in Montenegro. Captain Pavle Djuriscic was nominated as a commander of fighting forces in the valley Lim-Sandzak. Miro V. Dujovic (picture #3), a 1st class Captain of the higher military academy, and Captain Branko Radevic were nominated as chiefs of staff in command of Montenegro. Your grandfather, Aleksa J. Dujovic (picture #1), as the chief of nationalistic propaganda department and adviser in the headquarters for Montenegro, from the beginning, had the strong belief that we ought to form an organization on military grounds to defend all of the people against the communists. He called on all people in Montenegro for support, and convinced them that the Axis Powers will be defeated and that our allies, Great Britain and United States of America will never allow our country to come under communist rule.

During that period, the communist forces, along with their leaders Josip Broz "Tito," Mosa Pijade, Arso and Blazo Jovanovic, Milovan Djilas, and many others who were driven from Serbia by the Chetniks into Montenegro, had massed their forces in and around the city of Kolasin. It was believed that there had been from 5,000 to 7,000 men. Even though they had already killed many innocent people in this part of the country, Aleksa J. Dujovic and George M. Lasic, on December 8, 1941, tried to reach an agreement with communist representatives, composed of Blazo Jovanovic, Mirko Vesovic, Djoko Mirasevic, and others, at a conference at Ptice (residence of the Dujovic families), urging them not to plunge the people in Montenegro into blood, as they were doing. Lasic and Dujovic also proposed that the Chetniks and communists unite together in defeating the Axis Powers, and afterwards deciding the future of Yugoslavia by a free election. This proposal was rejected by the communist representatives. Shortly after the conference, the communist partisans suddenly attacked the Chetniks on January 20, 1942. But being well prepared for action, the Chetniks defeated the communists badly, forcing Josip Broz "Tito," Mosa Pijade, Blazo Jovanovic, Milovan Djilas, and others into refuge in Croatia under the Ustasi rule.

WAR IN OCCUPIED YUGOSLAVIA

Under the leadership and courage of General Dragoljub Draza Mihailovic and other Chetnik leaders, the war was going on in occupied Yugoslavia. Underground Chetnik forces continued to fight in large and small detachments. They attacked the occupiers and their garrisons all over the country. They destroyed their bridges and railroad tracks. In this way they prevented the enemy from transporting war materials to Rommel's armies fighting in Africa. During those days, many Allied military leaders had praised our Chetnik forces as having greatly contributed to the victory. The first had been General Dwight D. Eisenhower, the supreme commander of the Allied fighting forces in North Africa, he said in his laudatory terms "American military fighting forces in Europe and Africa salute their brothers in arms." Then Admiral H. Harwood, commander of the Allied fleet in the Mediterranean Sea; General Glaude Auchinleck, commander of the British army in the Middle East; Marshal A. W. Tedder, commander of the air fleet in the Mediterranean Sea;

General Allen Brook, chief of British staff headquarters; General Charles de Gaulle, head of free France, and General Giraud, commander of French forces in Africa.

In the mountains where the Chetniks had their headquarters with Draza Mihailovic, parachuted in a British military mission consisting of General C. D. Armstrong, Colonel Jasper Rootham and army Major Eric Greenwood. Later an American mission also was parachuted in, consisting of Major Walter P. Mansfield and Colonel Albert B. Seitz. This time on the part of America and Great Britain, the Chetnik groups of fighting forces had been given help in arms, supplies and military foodstuffs, which had been shipped in by parachutes in the free mountains. . . . Nevertheless, Stalin was aware that Josip Broz "Tito" was working for him, and with the advice of Winston Churchill, Tito got ample help. In the territory of Croatia, in the communist headquarters, a British military mission under Brigadier Fitzroy Maclean and later Major Randolph Churchill (son of Winston Churchill) was parachuted in. . . . The Chetniks' fighting forces had been spread over a great territory of Yugoslavia, and they were able to help a great number of allied aviators, who, after bombing enemy installations in Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, as well as in Yugoslavia, were forced down by enemy guns and compelled to parachute from their planes. During the war years there had been saved 676 Allied aviators, who gradually were evacuated to their bases in Italy or elsewhere in the battlefields. Under the leadership of Josip Broz "Tito" the communist partisans did not even make an attempt to help downed American flyers. As an example, this picture shows one of the many groups of American flyers who were saved by the Chetnik forces.

CONFERENCE IN TEHERAN

In Teheran, on November 28, 1943, the Big Three: Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin had a conference. The Prime minister of Great Britain, on advice of his son Randolph Churchill, who was already in the communist headquarters along with Stalin, urged them to give full support to Josip Broz "Tito" and his "comrades." The Big Three decided to drop war supplies to General Draza Mihailovic; the same had been decided at a conference at Yalta and at Potsdam. . . . After Italy surrendered on September, 1943, an Italian division in Montenegro, by the name of Venice, was willing to join the Chetniks and fight together with us against the Germans; but after the Teheran conference they suddenly abandoned our fighting forces, and sided with the communists, even the wounded Chetniks in hospitals were handed to them. Immediately the communists killed all wounded; among the wounded was Miro V. Dujovic (picture No. 3), your close kin. Miro had been sadistically tortured and butchered. Finally they force a knife through his gorge, and dragged him to the left bank of the Lim River, where his body was put in a marsh. This was just the beginning of the slaughter of the clan (brotherhood Dujovic). The Dujovic clan had lost 35 members during the struggle against the fascist and nazis in World War II. Other people from the Vasojevic tribe also suffered, but the Dujovic clan carried one of the greatest burdens of suffering and death as never before in history. The Chief of Staff of Tito's communist forces was Peko Dapcevic; when he came from Croatia into Montenegro, he put on fire the house of your grandfather, Aleksa J. Dujovic, and slaughtered all in the home. In the same sense, during the fightings against the communists, many of your relatives fell in battle among them were young Lieutenant Dragisa T. Dujovic, (picture No. 4), age 25; Radoje D. Dujovic, age 22; Milan M. Dujovic, age 19; Milivoje M. Dujovic, age 41; and Saleta J. Dujovic, age 24. . . . Your grandfather Aleksa J. Dujovic hardly could face the tragedy of his family and of all the

Serbian people, and so he suddenly became very ill. Staff army Major George M. Lasic and most of the top men in the headquarters of Montenegro, Boka and Sanzak were aware that Aleksa was in a critical state of health. So they decided to transfer him to Serbia with his 18 year old son Vladislav (your father), hoping that in Serbia he will get better medical help. But this had been in vain; Aleksa J. Dujovic died in the city of Negotin on June 26, 1944. Two days before he died, Aleksa called a few of his friends and his son together and told them: "I am about to die, and I am glad that I will not survive to see the total destruction of my family and my people, whom we ourselves, with the help of our Allies brought to the brink of destruction." Your grandfather advised his son Vladislav to leave our native country in order to escape the death by the communist villains . . . At the same time, Germany had suffered a defeat in Africa and Italy, and they were retreating from Greece through Yugoslavia. Josip Broz "Tito" and Randolph Churchill fled to the Allied military forces in Italy, and from Italy "Tito" fled to Russia. When "Tito" arrived in Russia he asked Stalin to send General Tolbuhin and his red army from Bulgaria into Yugoslavia to help him overtake the opposition.

CHETNIK FORCES DECIMATED

DEAR BORISLAV: From October 1944 to May 1945 the Chetnik military forces had been decimated by Germans, Croatian Ustasi, and the communists. After concentrating themselves in the Bosnian mountains with Draza Mihalic, they made an effort to meet their allies in Italy and Austria by crossing over wide mountain ranges. On their long journey many died from exposure, starvation, exhaustion and typhus. Few groups succeeded in crossing the Soca River and arriving in Italy untouched. Other groups, totaling about 14,000, reached Austria by crossing the Drava River. They were met peacefully by British forces and placed in a refugee camp by the name of Vetrinje near Celovac. On May 23, 1945, British commander Major Williams Jonsson told the refugee troops to prepare themselves for transfer by train convoys into Italy where other Chetniks and Royal Yugoslav forces were . . . While on the train the Chetnik refugees were stopped in a tunnel bordering Austria and Yugoslavia, where 4,500 communist partisans with machine guns were waiting for them. They were taken in chains and brought in front of a firing squad at Kocevje Forest. This sinister deal, through British Major William Jonsson, was made on the part of our Allies. This slaughter was handled by communist Colonel Slobodan Penzeic. You can compare this massacre of 14,000 Chetniks (at Kocevje Forest, Yugoslavia) with the massacre in Poland, at Katyn Forest of 10,000 Polish officers by Soviet secret police, at the time when Stalin and Hitler were allies.

MY DEAR SON: You should remember that at Kocevje Forest, members of the Dujovic clan had also been slaughtered. Among the ones slaughtered were Mihalo D. Dujovic, age 28; Punisa D. Dujovic, age 23; George B. Dujovic, age 29; Ljubo B. Dujovic, age 24; Luka M. Dujovic, age 34; Vidak M. Dujovic, age 26; Dusan R. Dujovic, age 17; Djoko V. Dujovic, age 29; Djoko S. Dujovic, age 40; Dimitrije D. Dujovic, age 18; Batric I. Dujovic, age 26; Miladin I. Dujovic, age 17; Lakić I. Dujovic, age 25; Bozidar R. Dujovic, age 20; Djuro D. Dujovic, age 45; Batric M. Dujovic, age 40. Milos J. Dujovic (picture No. 2, brother of your grandfather Aleksa), while crossing through the mountains toward Austria, was captured by German and Croatian Ustasi. Some sources say that Milos was taken to Jasenovac and executed. The last innocent victim of the Dujovic clan had been your father's sister, 20 year old Emilija A. Dujovic (picture No. 6), the daughter of your grandfather Aleksa. She had been imprisoned by the communists in 1946 without

any charge or guilt. This took place right after Josip Broz "Tito" had taken complete control of Yugoslavia. She was tortured severely and died soon after her martyrdom. Before she died her last prayer had been: "O Almighty God, did my brother Vladislav succeed in escaping and did he succeed in saving his own life?"

STRIVING TO AID OTHERS, TOO

The falling of our Serbian brothers everywhere was the price we had to pay to prevent from being overtaken by the communists. At the same time, our people were striving to help other nations having freedom, as well as ourselves, from falling under the paws of two monsters of our time—Mussolini and Hitler.

Dragoljub Draza Mihalic deciding not to flee from the country hid himself in the mountains. He was captured by communists in 1946 and tried. He was found guilty and executed by communists on July 17, 1946. The injustice made by communists in power (1946) toward our supreme commander in occupied Yugoslavia will rest in history as a classic example of the political mistakes of the Second World War. The president of the United States of America, Harry S. Truman, had recognized the contributions of the Serbian people. He recognized the victory of all of the fighting forces under General Dragoljub Mihalic when he most humanely decorated this Yugoslav war hero and leader with the highest medal of order and honor.

The text of the Presidential citation reads as follows:

"General Dragoljub Mihalic distinguished himself in an outstanding manner as Commander-in-Chief of the Yugoslavian Army Forces and later as Minister of War by organizing and leading important resistance forces against the enemy which occupied Yugoslavia, from December 1941 to December 1944. Through the undaunted efforts of his troops, many United States airmen were rescued and returned safely to friendly control. General Mihalic and his forces, although lacking adequate supplies, and fighting under extreme hardships, contributed materially to the Allied cause, and were instrumental in obtaining a final Allied Victory. March 29, 1948 (Signed) Harry S. Truman."

And from England: "I honour the memory of Draza Mihalic as the first leader of national resistance to the Nazis within occupied Europe. By his courage he set an example which contributed to the ultimate defeat of Germany; and he set it in the darkest and most difficult times. His execution after the war was an act of gross and shameful injustice. Oxford, England, April 17, 1966. (Signed) H. R. TREVOR-ROPER."

FATHER WAS LONE SURVIVOR

The only person (among the men) of the Dujovic clan, over 17 years of age, who succeeded to save his life from communist villains was your father, Vladislav (son of your grandfather Aleksa). On advice given to me by Aleksa two days before he died, I proceeded to flee for Greece through territory being held by the Russian troops, Josip Broz "Tito", and Greek partisans led by would-be General Markos. In Salonika there had been British military forces. I arrived there on January 14, 1945. From Salonika the British transported me to Italy, where I lived several years in the camps of the displaced persons. There, in 1950, I met Anna Vukic (your mother) who also was from Yugoslavia, and I married her. So, my dear son Borislav, you had been born in Italy. At that time, 1951, there was in Italy a Norwegian commission which was connected with the immigration of displaced persons. And all of the Dujovic family left for Norway after securing a visa. We arrived in Norway in September and we settled in Kristiansand, S, where later your sister Vera was born. In July, 1955, your mother and father got in touch with the American Embassy in Oslo, and we

declared to them that we wished to emigrate to the United States of America. The American Embassy kindly met our wishes, and they allowed us to emigrate to the United States. All of our family came to America in October 1956, and settled in the City of Buffalo, New York. In October, 1962, all of the Dujovic family became American citizens. On this solemn occasion the Governor of the State of New York, Nelson A. Rockefeller; Walter J. Mahoney; Senator Jacob K. Javits and Senator Kenneth B. Keating had expressed the traditional hospitality and their congratulations to the Dujovic family for becoming American citizens.

AS YOU GRADUATE TODAY—

Today, my dear son Boris, while you are finishing your high school studies with your fellow students, present will be only your parents and your sister Vera, without your many relatives and many dear ones. Your parents are very happy and congratulate you for your success, but they are also sorrowful because they can not share their happiness with many of our relatives who would be present if they were not dead. But this should not discourage you in the least because you are an American citizen. You should remember and be proud that your ancestors had always been Allied with the United States of America and had fought side by side against all common enemies; they were bravely fighting and falling, thinking always that they would be victorious. The same struggle against the communists, began by your ancestors and your grandfather in Yugoslavia, 1941, had continued with the Americans in Korea, and now in Vietnam where they are fighting and falling on the bloody battlefields, well aware of the dangers of communism for all mankind. Now all free men are aware that communism is not a myth, but an evident well known threat and activity of criminals, founded on lies, deception, smuggling, fear, terror, tears and blood among millions of innocent people in Russia, China, and elsewhere. Today, all men who desire and love freedom and peace will fight for the preservation of these rights. Willingly or unwillingly, communism will come to a confrontation. It is generally known at this time that the white and yellow communism have nuclear energy to produce better weapons in fighting, and it will not be easy to fight them to their defeat, but at the end they will be destroyed. The Almighty God and justice will prevail and we will win. When you arrive in our native country with American fellows as victorious men, we ask you, dear Boris, to visit the grave of your grandfather and many other of your relatives to tell them these words: "No, you are not defeated, you have won." Congratulations on your graduation.

With deep parental love and happiness.

Yours,

VLADISLAV and ANNA DUJOVIC.

BROADCASTING 25 YEARS

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 25th year of broadcasting by one of America's leading commentators. Joseph McCaffrey has been reporting on the in's and out's and the up's and down's of the Washington scene with accuracy, rare insight, human compassion, and a fairness that is unequalled. I have had the distinct pleasure of being one of his regular listeners for many years and have had the double pleasure of appearing on one of his programs.

Accurate reporting of the myriad activities of the Congress of the United States with its 535 individualists, each one contending for time, space, and attention, is a demanding and incredibly delicate job. Joe McCaffrey has performed a distinct service to the Nation in choosing between the events and personalities for his nightly commentary. In the best tradition of broadcast journalism, he has served the public well and the Congress is in his debt for such reporting. I, along with many other Members of both bodies, wish Joe McCaffrey a happy anniversary in broadcasting and Godspeed in his continuing service to the Nation.

POWELL RULING SEEN AS DEFIANT GESTURE BY RETIRING CHIEF JUSTICE EARL WARREN

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Banner in a recent editorial discusses some pertinent and interesting points relating to the recent U.S. Supreme Court ruling in the matter of Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL.

Certainly this case raises some historical questions in the matter of the relationship between the judicial and legislative branches.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this matter, I place the editorial in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

SLAP AT CONGRESS AND SUCCESSOR—POWELL RULING IS WARREN'S FINAL DEFIANT GESTURE

"Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members. . . ."

"Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its members for disorderly behavior, and with the concurrence of two-thirds expel a member."

So says the Constitution of the United States—

Article 1, Section 5. Notwithstanding which, the Supreme Court yesterday ruled that the House of Representatives improperly excluded Rep. Adam Clayton Powell (D-N.Y.) from the 90th Congress in March 1967. In the court's view stated: "Since he (Powell) was duly elected by the voters of the 18th Congressional District and was not ineligible to serve under any provision of the Constitution, the House was without power to exclude him from its membership."

It is more than a shade difficult to reconcile the assignment of power asserted by the Constitution and the judicial ruling of non-power in the same circumstances and the same hands at the same time.

The top tribunal overrode two lower court decisions to arrive at its own. Federal District Judge George L. Hurt on April 7, 1967, dismissed Powell's lawsuit to reverse exclusion, on the grounds that the court lacked jurisdiction in the matter. Applying the doctrine of separation of powers, he said that if the court ordered any House member, officer, or employe, to "do or not to do an act related to the organization of membership" of the House, the court would be "crashing through a political thicket into political quicksand." He added that he did not know of any other

case where the question of separation of powers (between the legislature and the federal judiciary) was posed "with such stark clarity."

Subsequently, the U.S. Court of Appeals ruled unanimously that Powell could not challenge his ouster in the federal courts.

The presiding member of that three-judge panel was Warren E. Burger, shortly to be seated as Chief Justice of the United States.

In refusing to intervene, then-Judge Burger did not dispute the matter of jurisdiction. He was motivated by his respect for Congress' right to make its own rules, and by the practicality of the case—asserted as a matter of constant concern. Speculating about a confrontation (on the separation of powers question) he later asked rhetorically: "What if we had ordered the House to seat Powell, and the House had refused? Could we have sent the Army up Capitol Hill to enforce it?"

That is among the questions unanswered. It also relates to the basic question for whose avoidance of a disconcerting area of conflict the Founding Fathers spelled out the guiding principle of a separation of powers.

The Supreme Court's (7 to 1) opinion—Justice Potter Stewart dissenting—was written and announced by Earl Warren. This was his last defiant gesture as he prepares to shed the robes of Chief Justice; to thumb his nose not only at Congress, but at the decision, as cited above, of the man who will succeed him in that top judicial capacity.

The question now is, if the legislative branch in its respective two houses does not have the powers delegated to it by the Constitution, regarding its own department rules and ethical standards, just what powers does it possess?

At least 534 members out of 535 in the 91st Congress must be pondering that question today.

MERCHANT MARINE AND SEA-POWER FOR PEACE

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of the strong bill in behalf of the modernization and revitalization of American shipping and our American maritime fleet was a great step forward and I hope it will be followed up by every additional action this House and the Congress can take to strengthen our merchant marine fleet, and bring it up to competitive levels that will enable us to regain leadership in this field that we are fast losing to the Soviet Union.

I was pleased to note the optimistic note sounded recently by Mr. Ralph E. Casey, a Massachusetts native, valued friend, and esteemed vice president of the American Institute of Merchant Shipping, in a speech that he delivered and some remarks that he made at the maritime day dinner in Boston.

During the course of his remarks, Mr. Casey stated that our ships are becoming larger and more productive, and that soon some ships will replace the carrying capacity of three or four, and in some cases, as much as 10, conventional cargo vessels.

Mr. Casey is of the opinion that a properly financed and managed construction subsidy system could result in a shipbuilding boom which in truth would be a boon for this country, since

it would result in increased employment in the shipbuilding industry and other industries.

Mr. Casey disclosed that 19 shipping companies are prepared to build 82 vessels costing nearly \$1.2 billion, and when this program is carried out we will be well on our way to cutting down the lead in new merchant ships currently enjoyed by the Soviet Union and in maintaining our proper place at the top of world shipping.

This program would not only rehabilitate and revive our shipping and shipbuilding industry, but it would spark a great deal of additional business for American ships, hence for American businesses of all kinds that would be able to rely upon American shipping to carry their goods to all parts of the world.

Let us have the strongest, most modern, and best merchant marine fleet in the world. It will give us needed sea power.

EXPLOSION AT DU PONT

HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I conducted an on-the-site inspection of the Carney's Point plant of the Du Pont Co. in New Jersey, which was swept by explosions on June 4.

Contact also was made with New Jersey State and Federal officials who are charged with investigating such tragedies and their investigations have not disclosed any explanation for the explosions.

The Bureau of Engineering and Safety of the New Jersey Department of Labor and Industry reports:

Thorough investigation indicates that the fire and explosion did not result from violations of the Explosives Act or the regulations promulgated by the Bureau under the Act.

It thus appears that the Du Pont Co., which has an outstanding safety record in its operations, took every essential precaution to prevent the tragedy.

I am satisfied that the company did everything possible to prevent such an occurrence and hereby present a detailed report furnished me by Du Pont officials:

REPORT BY DU PONT

Investigations or on-the-site inquiries by Federal and New Jersey State authorities, with full cooperation of Du Pont representatives—who are conducting their own investigation—have not disclosed any explanation for the explosions which wrecked a portion of Du Pont's Carney's Point, N.J., plant on Wednesday, June 4, 1969. The explosions resulted in the death of seven company employees and injury to 60 others. All but three of the injuries were minor, and the three were not considered serious. All but one returned to work without loss of time.

An as yet undetermined number of persons in nearby communities, including nearly a score of children in area schools, received what were apparently minor injuries mostly from broken glass and flying debris. This was caused by shock waves in the wake

of the explosions, similar to a sonic boom. Effects of the blast were felt and caused some glass and vibration damage as far away as Wilmington, Del., about 3 miles away across the Delaware River.

The explosions occurred at 1:43 p.m. on the afternoon of June 4, when some 100 tons of in-process smokeless powder exploded. Two or three major blasts involved three 30-foot by 60-foot houses, each containing 50,000 to 75,000 pounds of smokeless powder awaiting final processing. The three buildings were obliterated, and a fourth facility on the 160-acre processing area was severely damaged. However, its contents did not ignite or explode.

Seven of 35 employees normally working in the powder area apparently were killed instantly. They were: Joseph A. Harrell, 44, a manufacturing area operator; and William L. Boyce, 26; Harry D. Green, 25; Elmer T. Hill, 44; Barry W. Moore, 23; Joseph Quinn, 30; and Lawrence P. Robillard, 25; all chemical operators in the powder department. All were New Jersey residents.

As far as Du Pont knows, it was in complete compliance with the law regulating the handling of smokeless powder. The plant is inspected regularly by both state and Federal authorities and always has received favorable reports.

The blast caused extensive damage to several other buildings on the 841-acre plant, including a nearby blending tower where the explosion was first thought to have originated. Manufacturing ceased throughout the plant following the explosion, and a previously conceived and off-rehearsed disaster plan was put into effect immediately. This disaster plan had last had a full-scale rehearsal on May 23, 1969, which was credited for the swiftness with which the plant personnel responded in the June 4 emergency.

The first step after insuring the further safety of the plant was identification of the missing and the beginning of a search for these seven employees. Three bodies were recovered almost immediately, a fourth was not found until Thursday morning, and a fifth body was found on Friday. Because of the severity of blast damage in the immediate area, two bodies were not recovered despite intensive search. All seven were declared dead by Salem County Medical Examiner, Dr. Jonathan Hummel, at noon on Monday, and the search for the two missing people was halted. Investigation has shown that on the afternoon of the explosion there were two separate crews in the powder house area. One crew consisted of five workers. It was at one of the destroyed powder buildings. The other two-man crew was in the vicinity of another of the destroyed buildings.

Within minutes of learning the identity of the seven missing people, pre-arranged two-man teams departed for their homes to inform their families. These teams kept in constant touch with the families for an extensive period following the accident, keeping them informed of developments and aiding in all possible ways in funeral arrangements and other attendant family problems associated with a death in the family.

State Police, emergency ambulance and fire services from surrounding communities were at the plant and in the disaster area within minutes after the blast. Coast Guard and Navy helicopters also were on the scene in a matter of minutes.

An investigation by the Bureau of Labor and Industry of the State of New Jersey was launched almost immediately and a five-man team spent several days on the plant and in the surrounding community searching out all possible evidence.

A representative of the Department of Defense and one from Picatinny Arsenal in New Jersey, also conducted investigations.

More than 50 representatives of press, radio, and TV were let on the plant and thoroughly briefed about two hours after the explosion after assurances had been made

for their safety. From that point on, Du Pont cooperated fully in making all facts available to the press as soon as they became known.

The company began accepting and recording calls on damage claims from residents and businesses in the surrounding communities almost immediately following the blast, and within four days had set up separate offices in Wilmington and Penns Grove, N.J., to speed the processing of all such claims.

As far as Du Pont workers are concerned, comparison of Du Pont's safety performance as measured against that of other companies by the National Safety Council shows it to be a national industrial leader in safe work. Based on the frequency rate of lost-time injuries (including fatalities) per million man-hours worked, on which the council bases its statistics, Du Pont frequency rate of injuries averages 10 times better than that for the chemical industry as a whole and 18 times better than that for all industry. In recognition of this, the council has awarded Du Pont its highest award, the Award of Honor, 25 times, which is more than any other company has received.

COMPARISON—INJURY FREQUENCY RATES

Year	Du Pont	Chemical industry	All industry
1956	0.43	3.38	6.38
1957	.35	3.55	6.27
1958	.33	3.56	6.17
1959	.36	3.32	6.47
1960	.41	3.71	6.04
1961	.39	3.26	5.99
1962	.31	3.31	6.19
1963	.28	3.32	6.12
1964	.27	3.13	6.45
1965	.48	3.36	6.53
1966	.26	3.78	6.91
1967	.39	3.55	7.22
1968	.36	3.74	7.35

¹ Estimated.

AFRO-AMERICAN STUDIES—A RED FRONT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Bryn Mawr, the once fashionable finishing school for young ladies, has added to its faculty Herbert Aptheker, a leader of the Communist Party, as a visiting lecturer in the history department.

Reportedly, Aptheker, a leading Communist theoretician, and director of the Institute for Marxist Studies in New York City, will teach Afro-American history.

The elevation of Aptheker to a college professorship is disturbing in itself, but becomes revolting to consider his being employed as an expert in Afro-American history. Aptheker is a white, who has devoted most of his life to the Communist exploitation of black people. What qualifications could a Communist Party official possibly have to be an expert—either in African or American history? Or for that matter even an educator—his daughter, Bettina Aptheker, being a leader in the campus wars at the University of California and an admitted Communist youth leader.

The Aptheker affair can but suggest that the entire Afro-American studies movement has been inspired and promoted not to educate Negroes, but as an

entree into schools to advance international communism in the United States.

Where black studies have been tolerated, the college administrators have encountered difficulty in securing experienced or qualified teachers—the reason perhaps being that there is no such subject.

We can surmise that where instructors have been obtained, they possess the similar expertise of Comrade Aptheker. That the entire program is but a ruse in order to get on campus as faculty, to then mix among the students where age and position becomes invaluable to promote grievances, encourage turmoil, and promote extremist courses.

Bryn Mawr and every other school that has buckled under to ideological education should reexamine their black studies movement as to the disservice they subject their students to, as well as to how they are damaging the reputation of their institution.

Bryn Mawr may have offered Aptheker's hiring to avoid conflict, but they may find his retention rewarded by confrontation.

Needed is for the alumni and parents of our college youth to start demanding some voice and participation in campus affairs.

Mr. Speaker, a recent AP release on Bryn Mawr, and a dinner program showing his association with Gus Hall, and a bibliography from the Dictionary of American Scholars, an excerpt from HCUA hearings and a newspaper clipping, follow my remarks:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 17, 1969]

APTHEKER TO TEACH AT BRYN MAWR

BRYN MAWR, Pa.—Herbert Aptheker, a leader of the American Communist Party, is moving to Philadelphia's Main Line in the fall to teach a course in Afro-American history at fashionable Bryn Mawr College, the college confirmed yesterday.

A spokesman for the predominantly women's institution said Aptheker, 54, has been named a visiting lecturer in the history department.

Aptheker, regarded as among the Communist's leading theoreticians, currently is director of the American Institute for Marxist Studies in New York. He has been a member of the Communist Party for three decades and was a member of its National Committee until it was dissolved in the early 1960s because of what he called "legal complications."

[From the Dictionary of American Scholars]

Aptheker, Dr. Herbert, b. New York, N.Y., July 31, 15; m. 42; c. 1. American History. Ph.D.(hist), Columbia Univ, 43; hon. Dr. Phil, Univ. Halle, 66. Guggenheim fel, 46-47; Ed, Polit. Affairs, 53-; Dir, Am. Inst. Marxist Stud, 64- Dir, New York Sch. Marxist Stud, 60- U.S.A., 42-46, Maj. AHA; Asn. Stud. Negro Life & Hist. (award, 39); Orgn. Am. Hist. Contemporary American thought. Publ; American Negro slave revolts, Columbia Univ. 43 & Int. Publ, 63; ed, Documentary history of the Negro people in the United States, Citadel, Vol. I, 62 & Vol. II, 64; auth, American foreign policy and the cold war, New Century, 62; ed, Marxism and democracy, 65 Marxism and alienation, 66 auth, Nat Turner's slave rebellion, 66 & ed, Marxism and Christianity, 68, Humanities; auth, The nature of democracy, freedom and revolution, 67 & ed, Autobiography of W.E.B. Du Bois, 68, Int. Publ. Add: 32 Ludlam Pl, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11225.

EXCERPT FROM HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES—90TH CONGRESS, JUNE 27 AND 28, 1968

SUBVERSIVE INFLUENCES IN RIOTS, LOOTING, AND BURNING—PART 6

MR. MONTGOMERY [reads]. "Bettina Aptheker, 19, daughter of top Communist Party theoretician Herbert Aptheker."

She has since disclosed the fact that she has been a member of the Communist Party all her adult life. She makes no bones about being an avowed Communist.

[From the Washington Daily News, June 19, 1969]

FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE PROF LINKED TO PANTHERS

A District police captain yesterday told the Senate Permanent Investigations subcommittee that Jimmy Paul Garrett, whom he identified as director of the Black Studies program at Federal City College, was one of seven members of the Black Panther Party who purchased 75 handguns between Oct. 21, 1967 and April 3, 1968 at Shims Army Store in Reno, Nev.

Capt. John E. Drass, who said he had been on loan to the subcommittee from the police department to investigate the Black Panther Party, said that "several of these weapons were recovered in shoot-outs with law enforcement officials."

So far no plans have been announced by the subcommittee to call Mr. Garrett, and he has made no request to appear. He could not be reached for comment.

A college spokesman, Fred Scott, said officials have "no idea how valid the information is" and an investigation is under way. The FBI refused to comment.

[From Human Events, Apr. 16, 1966]

MANY "RESPECTABLE" LIBERALS LEND NAMES TO APTHEKER SALUTE

On the page opposite, *Human Events* presents an intriguing list of over 220 names. They are sponsors of a testimonial dinner honoring Herbert Aptheker, Communist theoretician extraordinaire. Many of those listed are out-and-out Communists, but others are persons who have denied any Communist leanings. Many are leaders of left-wing causes in the United States who have been accorded great respect by the nation's news media and America's lawmakers.

Indeed, those putting on the program honoring Aptheker have tried to cloak the occasion in "bourgeois" respectability. Scheduled for Thursday evening, April 28, the dinner is to be held in the plush Sutton Ballroom of the New York Hilton. Engraved invitations have been sent out and those attending must RSVP.

The chairman of the program is Prof. Howard L. Parson, head of the philosophy department at the University of Bridgeport. Prof. Staughton Lynd of Yale University is featured as a speaker. (Prof. Lynd's respectability has just been raised a notch by the State Department, which has reissued him a passport in spite of the fact he violated passport regulations when he traveled to Hanoi to publicly denounce American resistance to communism in Viet Nam.)

Will Geer, who only recently was invited to participate in a poetry program at the Library of Congress in Washington, is listed as one of two "participating artists." America's Communist party chieftain, Gus Hall, who continually makes wild attacks against the U.S. government, is also a featured speaker, but he is referred to with dignity as "Mr. Gus Hall."

Among some other prominent persons paying obeisance to Herbert Aptheker are: C. Clark Kissinger, national secretary of Students for a Democratic Society; Prof. Eugene

Genovese, the controversial Rutgers professor who publicly welcomed a Viet Cong victory; Robert W. Kenny, honorary chairman of the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Viet Nam. (Sen. Wayne Morse [D.-Ore.] has continued to quote the "findings" of this committee to buttress his arguments that the United States should pull out of Viet Nam and, on December 20, NBC narrator Frank McGee called this group headed by Kenny "a large committee of responsible lawyers.")

Also, Prof. Frederick L. Schuman, whose books on International Politics have been standard classroom texts, appears as a sponsor; Jessica Mitford, author of *The American Way of Death*; the Rev. A. J. Muste, veteran pacifist and a central figure in the Fellowship of Reconciliation; Dr. Willard Uphaus, another self-styled pacifist; the Rev. Stephen Fritchman, a leading leftist in California; Prof. Anatol Rapoport, a key supporter of the teach-in movements.

None of these persons who has lent his name to a dinner honoring Herbert Aptheker can claim ignorance of his background. He is an admitted Communist who has been crisscrossing the continent preaching Marxism to college students.

According to testimony he has given to Congress and the U.S. government, he has been an active member of the CP since 1939. He has been teaching at schools conducted by the Communist party since 1940 when he was an instructor at the School for Democracy. This school was established by Communist teachers ousted from the public school system in New York City.

He was a member of the faculty of the Communist Jefferson School of Social Science from 1944 through 1956. Here's what the *Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications*, put out by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, says about this "school": "... The basic proposition of Marxism-Leninism taught and advocated by the school... is that our present form of 'capitalist society,' represented by the government of the United States, must be destroyed through a proletarian revolution and replaced by socialism under the dictatorship of the proletariat; that such revolution requires the use of force and violence; and that the leading force in such revolution... is the Communist party."

Aptheker, whose daughter Bettina is also an admitted Communist, has played a central role in defending Communists who have been convicted of teaching and advocating overthrow of our government by force and violence. Today, Aptheker continues his "teaching" role and is head of the American Institute for Marxist Studies.

It is this unusual fellow whom so many Americans wish to honor. One wonders (not too optimistically, it must be admitted) if the *New York Times* and other liberal newspapers, who are seized by apoplectic fits every time they discover a "right-winger," will seek to expose the extremists who honor Dr. Aptheker.

APTHEKER DINNER PROGRAM

You are cordially invited to join in tribute to Herbert Aptheker on the occasion of his fiftieth birthday, publication of his twentieth book and the second anniversary of The American Institute for Marxist Studies. Thursday evening, April 28, 1968, Sutton Ballroom, The New York Hilton, Avenue of the Americas, 53rd to 54th Street, New York City. Dinner promptly at 7 p.m. Cocktails at 6. Cover \$12.50. R.S.V.P.

PROGRAM

Chairman: PROFESSOR HOWARD L. PARSONS, Head, Philosophy Department, University of Bridgeport.

PROFESSOR EUGENE D. GENOVESE, History

Department, Rutgers University Steering Committee, Socialist Scholars Conference; MRS. MODJESKA M. SIMKINS, Civil Rights Leader, Columbia, South Carolina; MR. GUS HALL, Communist Party, U.S.A.; PROFESSOR DIRK J. STRUIK, Mathematics Department (Emeritus), M.I.T.; MR. CARL MARZANI, Writer and Publisher; PROFESSOR STAUGHTON LYND, History Department, Yale University; MISS BETTINA APTHEKER, Student Leader, University of California; DR. HERBERT APTHEKER, MR. WILL GEER, MR. AT WOOD, and Participating Artists.

Herbert Aptheker Testimonial Dinner Committee, 20 East 30th Street, New York, N.Y. 10016, MU 9-4530.

Initiating Sponsors: Prof. Robert S. Cohen, Chairman; Mr. Ossie Davis, Prof. Staughton Lynd.

Arrangements Committee: Peter K. Hawley, Chairman; Harry Epstein, M.D., Treasurer; Louise Thompson, Secretary.

SPONSORS

Murray Abowitz, M.D., Cal.; John J. Abt, Esq., N.Y.; The Rev. George A. Ackerly, Conn.; Dr. Irving Adler, Vt.; Mr. Charles R. Allen, Jr., N.Y.; Mr. James S. Allen, N.Y.; Mr. M. S. Arnoni, N.J.; Mr. James Aronson, N.Y.; Mr. Keith Baird, N.Y.; The Rev. William T. Baird, Ill.; The Rev. Lee H. Ball, N.Y.

Prof. Loren Baritz, N.Y.; Dr. and Mrs. Edward K. Barsky, N.Y.; Dr. Roger Bartra, Mexico; Mrs. Charlotte Bass, Cal.; Dr. Christian Bay, Cal.; Mrs. Minna Bayer, N.Y.; Mr. Lee Baxandall, N.Y.; Prof. James E. Becker, N.Y.; Mr. Maurice Becker, N.Y.; Prof. Edward D. Beechert, Jr., Hawaii.

The Hon. Elmer A. Benson, Minn.; Mr. Hans Blumenfeld, Canada; The Rev. Charles W. Bonner, N.Y.; Leonard B. Boudin, Esq., N.Y.; Mr. Richard O. Boyer, N.Y.; Mr. and Mrs. Carl Braden, Ky.; The Rev. G. Murray Branch, Ga.; Dr. Dorothy Brewster, N.Y.; Prof. John M. Cammett, N.J.; Mr. James E. Campbell, N.Y.

Prof. and Mrs. Edwin Cerney, Ga.; The Rev. Mark A. Chamberlain, Ore.; Mrs. Alice Childress, N.Y.; Harry Chovnick, M.D., Ohio; Mr. John Henrik Clarke, N.Y.; Dr. J. Raymond Cope, Cal.; Mr. Martin J. Corbin, N.Y.; Mr. Thomas Cornell, N.Y.; Prof. Francis P. Costello, Pa.; Irving J. Crain, M.D., N.Y.

Mrs. Alice Burghardt Crawford, N.Y.; Prof. Ephraim Cross, N.Y.; Mrs. Vita Cuning, N.Y.; Mr. Howard Da Silva; Prof. Charles C. Davis, Ohio; Dr. Guillermo De Covia, Mexico; The Hon. Hugh De Lacy, Cal.

Prof. Celia S. Deschin, N.Y.; Prof. Vernon K. Dibble, N.Y.; Earl B. Dickerson, Esq., Ill.; Frank J. Donner, Esq., N.Y.; Prof. William T. Doyle, Cal.; Prof. Martin Duberman, N.Y.; Mrs. Shirley Graham Du Bois, Ghana; Prof. Barrows Dunham, Pa.; Dr. Robert W. Dunn, N.Y.; Prof. O. B. Edwards, Ala.

Prof. Arnold Eisen, N.Y.; Mr. Philip Evergood, Conn.; Mrs. Lincoln Fairley, Cal.; Stanley Faulkner, Esq., N.Y.; Mr. Joseph Felshin, N.Y.; Mr. Sidney Finkelstein, N.Y.; Mr. Moe Fishman, N.Y.; Dr. Philip S. Foner, N.Y.; Mrs. Ruth C. France, Ind.; Prof. Mitchell Franklin, La.

The Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman, Cal.; Mrs. Ruth Gage-Colby, N.Y.; Mr. Will Geer, N.Y.; Mr. Maxwell Geismar, N.Y.; Mr. Hugo Gellert, N.J.; Prof. Eugene D. Genovese, N.J.; Prof. Charles H. George, Ill.; Mr. Simon W. Gerson, N.Y.; Prof. M. Gittleman, N.Y.; Mr. Sidney J. Gluck, N.Y.

Mr. Michael Gold, Cal.; Rabbi Robert E. Goldberg, Conn.; Mr. Ben Golden, N.Y.; Mr. Edwin B. Goodell, Jr., Mass.; Carlton B. Goodlett, M.D., Cal.; Prof. Roland F. Gray, Canada; Mr. William Gropper, N.Y.; Prof. Harry Grundfest, N.Y.; Mr. Robert Gwathmey, N.Y.; Mr. and Mrs. Carl Haessler, Mich.

Mr. Gus Hall, N.Y.; Vincent Hallinan, Esq., Cal.; Dr. Louis Harap, N.Y.; Prof. Bill J. Har-

rell, N.Y.; Dr. Edmond S. Harris, Wash., D.C.; Mr. Robert Heifetz, N.Y.; Mrs. Beatrice Hellman, N.Y.; Prof. David S. Herreshoff, Mich.; The Rev. Charles A. Hill, Mich.; Prof. Eugene C. Holmes, Wash., D.C.

Len W. Holt, Esq., Wash., D.C.; Mr. Charles P. Howard, N.Y.; Mrs. Bertha W. Howe, Fla.; Dr. Nathan Hurvitz, Cal.; Dr. W. Alphaeus Hunton, Ghana; Prof. Dell H. Hymes, Pa.; Mr. James E. Jackson, N.Y.; Prof. Sidney L. Jackson, Ohio; Prof. Michael R. Johnson, Kan.; Dr. Oakley C. Johnson, N.Y.

Mr. Albert E. Kahn, Cal.; Prof. Sidney Kaplan, Mass.; Prof. Jeffrey Kaplow, N.Y.; Dr. and Mrs. A. A. Katz, N.Y.; Mrs. Mary M. Kaufman, N.Y.; Prof. J. Spencer Kennard, Jr., N.J.; The Hon. Robert W. Kenny, Cal.; Mr. Rockwell Kent, N.Y.; David B. Kimmelman, M.D., N.Y.

Mr. C. Clark Kissinger, Ill.; Dr. Hildegard Kneeland, Cal.; Prof. Gustav Kuerti, Ohio; Prof. Howard D. Langford, M.D.; Prof. Charles P. Larrowe, Mich.; Mr. John Howard Lawson, Cal.; Prof. Eugene H. Lehman, Jr., Cal.; Prof. Gaylord C. LeRoy, Pa.; Miss Meridel Le Sueur, Minn.; Prof. Jack Lindeman, Pa.

The Rev. Donald G. Lothrop, Mass.; Prof. Oliver S. Loud, Ohio; Bishop Edgar A. Love, Md.; Mr. Walter Lowenfels, N.Y.; Dr. Hyman Lumer, N.Y.; Miss Florence H. Luscomb, Mass.; Prof. Bernard Mandel, Ohio; Ben Margolis, Esq., Cal.; Prof. John M. Marsalka, Conn.; Mr. Carl Marzani, N.Y.

The Rev. William Howard Melish, N.Y.; Prof. Louis Menashe, N.Y.; Prof. Robert Merideth, Ohio; Mr. Warren Miller, N.Y.; Mr. Leonard E. Mins, N.Y.; Miss Jessica Mitford, Cal.; Judge Stanley Moffatt, Cal.; Mr. Richard B. Moore, N.Y.; The Rev. Richard Morford, N.Y.; Prof. J. P. Morray, Chile.

Prof. John R. Morris, Okla.; Mrs. Elsa Peters Morse, Cal.; Mr. George B. Murphy, Jr., Wash., D.C.; The Rev. A. J. Muste, N.Y.; Dr. Otto Nathan, N.Y.; Mr. Truman Nelson, N.Y.; Samuel A. Neuberger, Esq., N.Y.; Prof. Karl H. Niebyl, N.J.; Mr. Joseph North, N.Y.; Mr. Paul Novick, N.Y.

The Hon. Stanley Nowak, Mich.; Prof. James O'Connor, Mo.; Prof. Otto H. Olsen, Md.; Mr. J. H. O'Dell, N.Y.; Prof. Howard L. Parsons, Conn.; Mr. Frederick C. Patten, Cal.; Mr. William L. Patterson, N.Y.; Mrs. G. O. Pershing, Conn.; Emily M. Pierson, M.D., Conn.; Mr. John Pittman, Cal.

Prof. Norman Pollack, Mich.; Victor Rabinowitz, Esq., N.Y.; Mrs. Mary Rackliffe, Mass.; Prof. Anatol Rapoport, Mich.; Mr. Anton Regrier, N.Y.; Prof. Richard W. Reichard, Iowa; David Rein, Esq., Wash., D.C.; Mrs. Frances Reswick, N.Y.; Miss Bertha C. Reynolds, Mass.; Prof. Jack L. Roach, Conn.

Prof. Joseph K. Roberts, Mich.; Mr. Sidney Roger, Cal.; Dr. Annette T. Rubinstein, N.Y.; Prof. Norman Rudich, Conn.; Prof. Robert J. Rutman, Pa.; Mr. Morris U. Schappes, N.Y.; Mrs. Pauline G. Schindler, Cal.; Prof. Frederick L. Schuman, Cal.; Arthur Schutzer, Esq., N.Y.; Prof. Michael Scriven, Ind.

Miss Edith Segal, N.Y.; Dr. Howard Selsam, N.Y.; Prof. Herbert Shapiro, Ga.; Mr. Theodore Shapiro, N.Y.; Abbott Simon, Esq., N.Y.; Dr. David F. Simonson, III.; Mr. Edwin S. Smith, N.Y.; Miss Jessica Smith, N.Y.; Prof. Allen Solganick, Md.; Prof. John Somerville, N.Y.

Mr. B. L. Spitzer, N.Y.; Prof. Pete Steffens, Cal.; Prof. H. C. Steinmetz, Canada; Mrs. Emma Gelders Sterne, Cal.; Hope B. Stevens, Esq., N.Y.; Prof. Dirk J. Struik, Mass.; Maurice Sugar, Esq., Mich.; Mrs. Yuri Suhl, N.Y.; Mr. Anthony Toney, N.Y.; Mrs. Pauline Taylor, Ohio.

Dr. Willard Uphaus, Conn.; Prof. Stephen Vause, N.H.; Bishop W. J. Walls; Dr. Harry F. Ward, N.J.; The Rev. Eliot White, Mass.; Mr. Frank J. Whitley, Cal.; Mr. and Mrs. Henry Willcox, Conn.; Mr. Henry Winston, N.Y.; Mr. Carl Winter, N.Y.; Nathan Witt, Esq., N.Y.; Miss Sarah E. Wright, N.Y.; Prof.

Maurice Zeitlin, Chile; Mr. Morris Zeitlin, N.Y.; Prof. Howard Zinn, Mass.

OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the tax burden on the wealthy is theoretical. On the ordinary workingman it is real. Tax loopholes let the wealthy shrug most of this burden onto people in the middle and low income groups. Your constituents and mine may be paying more income tax than some millionaires.

And one of the grossest of these inequities is the 27½ percent oil depletion allowance. One of the most respected leaders of opinion in the Baltimore community, Mr. Gwinn Owens, has suggested that if this depletion allowance is not repealed, it should be balanced by giving the ordinary workingman "a life depletion allowance based on the same formula." At this point I insert a copy of his penetrating remarks, which were made in a WJZ-TV, Baltimore, commentary, in the RECORD:

COMMENTARY ON OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE
(By Gwinn Owens, WJZ-TV, Baltimore)

Do you know that there are oil tycoons in this country who earn literally millions of dollars a year and pay only a small change for income tax? This, it seems to me, ought to fry the dander of a steel worker or a school teacher who earns a few measly thousand and then has to kick back a large slice of this to the Internal Revenue Service. This situation has been gagging the pit of my stomach for years. Then this week I was soothed by a new idea: a tax plan that would be as fair to common ordinary working people as it is to common ordinary oil billionaires. I hope someone in a position of power is listening, or perhaps my Congressman has inadvertently tuned in.

First off, I must explain that the oil baron's avoidance of nasty old income taxes is all quite legal and sanctified by Congress. The tax escape hatch is something called the Oil Depletion Allowance. This provides that though a man may make a mint out of the gusher in his backyard, he doesn't have to pay taxes on all of it. Kindly old Uncle Sam recognizes that someday that bonanza will run dry. Consequently Congress, fighting poverty as always, reduces the oil man's taxes in order to hedge against the day when he is left with nothing but dry wells, memories and blue chips.

There is one flaw in the depletion theory. True, the well will someday run dry. But, symbolically, doesn't everyone's well run dry? You may eke out your living now as a taxi driver, a hardware salesman or a college professor. Someday, however, your well of strength, skill or brains will give out, and you will have no means of earning even next week's groceries. I see absolutely no difference between the wage-earner's well of life running dry and the oil man's well of petroleum running dry. The reason oil magnates get preferential treatment from Congress is simple: They have a lobby and the wage earner doesn't.

Consequently I suggest, in a modest lobbying effort of my own, that plain working people be given a life-depletion allowance based on the same formula as the Oil Deple-

tion Allowance. Let the oil men keep their special privilege, but fair is fair. A life-depletion allowance would guard against the day when our well of vitality has yielded its last barrel of work.

JOB CORPS CENTER CLOSINGS

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1969

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, on June 11, 1969, Mr. Marquis Childs, the distinguished columnist and Washington correspondent for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, wrote the following column after visiting the Women's Job Corps Center in Clinton, Iowa. The Clinton center is one of the centers which President Nixon has ordered to be closed.

In my judgment, Mr. Childs' observations which appeared in the Washington Post are thoughtful and timely, and I would commend them to the attention of my colleagues. The text of the column follows:

CLOSING OF JOB CORPS CENTERS MAY BE A FALSE ECONOMY
(By Marquis Childs)

CLINTON, IOWA.—It looks as spic and span as the campus of a small Midwestern college. So far as order and neatness go, the Clinton Job Corps Center has it over most campuses in these times of protest and disruption.

The center, one of seven out of 17 for women trainees being closed down, has only two more months to go. Then the experiment housed in what was once a veterans' facility will be dismantled. After three years of operation, the learning out of this brief experiment will go into dusty files with the Nixon Administration taking a new tack in job training.

Economy is the principal reason for closing down 59 out of the total of 109 centers. The cost was high and the attack on the Job Corps program was mostly on that score. The General Learning Corporation (General Electric and Time, Inc.) operating the Clinton center is paid \$5125 for each girl for a course of 11 months. Travel and a cash allowance bring the total to \$8000.

Parents struggling to find the money after taxes to send their young to college were indignant. Why, for that much we could put our boy through four years at a good university—that was the theme in many letters of protest.

But this fails to take into account the goal of the Job Corps centers. That was to take young men and women from the bottom of the heap—rejects, those who had been denied all the advantages of the affluent society—and rehabilitate them. It was meant not merely training in skills to get a job but health, deportment, self-confidence, some knowledge of the world beyond the impoverished backwaters in which they had led a half-life.

Many of the girls had not seen a doctor or a dentist for 10 years or more. Some were so close to illiteracy that they were unable to pick their own name out of a list. They came from Muleshoe, Tex., Hickory Flat, Tenn., Big Shoe, Mont. One Indian girl's only address was the back seat of a junk car.

In these backwaters they would have been semi-literate drudges at best or at worst public charges whether in jail or in overcrowded hospital wards and whatever is today the

equivalent of the poor house. The Indian girl is supervising 23 girls in a computer operation at a good salary. Of the 4000 who have gone through the course 75 to 80 per cent have been placed in jobs or they have qualified for the military or have gone back to school.

When the news came that the Clinton center would be closed the girls, ranging in age from 16 to 21, launched a two-day telethon on the center's closed circuit television system. The goal was to raise money to put over a protest. Stop smoking, was one of the appeals, give your cigarette money to help pay for telegrams. They sent wires to everyone they could think of who might have influence, from President Nixon to Pope Paul.

The Clinton community joined in. The president of the Chamber of Commerce went to Washington to plead for the center. While there was grumbling in this prosperous town with its expanding industrial development when the center was established, on the whole the reception has been good.

With 80 per cent of the trainees Negroes, most of them from the Deep South, it was an experiment to set them down in a community in which the resident Negro population is negligible. The complaint is that their boy friends, coming from nearby industrial centers, were raucous and badly behaved. Municipal Judge David Halbach has said that violations by the trainees and their friends of Iowa's strict alcohol beverage laws has been lower on the average than for the community itself.

Economy aside, an argument for cutting back the Job Corps centers and perhaps eventually phasing them out was to provide the job training in or near cities where work is available once the training has been completed. The revised program will be carried out largely by the National Alliance of Business Men. The budget for next year provides an increase from \$200 million to \$420 million for this purpose. The trainees will not be brought long distances so that transportation costs will be negligible.

A large question is still unanswered with this shift of emphasis. What about the rehabilitation of the boy or girl dumped at the bottom of the heap? The Job Corps centers have provided an environment as well as training on a seven-day a week basis with the goal of making up in a year for the deprivations of a lifetime.

Whether the rejects can survive on their own in an urban training center is highly doubtful, in the view of those who have been close to the experiment. The very fact of closing down the centers after only three years is another blow of rejection. And for those who have lived on the border of bare existence one more blow is too many.

"YOU OWE US"—COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN AT UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI AT ST. LOUIS

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague from Missouri, the Honorable BILL D. BURLISON, graciously placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several days ago an editorial from one of the newspapers in his district, the Kennett, Mo., Daily Dunklin Democrat, commenting approvingly on some statements of mine in an address last week

at commencement exercises of the University of Missouri at St. Louis. As a result of that insertion in the RECORD, numerous Members of the House have expressed interest in reading the text of my commencement address, and I am, therefore, taking this means of making it available for their perusal.

While I was deeply grateful to the university for awarding me an honorary doctor of laws degree, I approached the assignment of commencement speaker with some trepidation. It was probably the most difficult speech to prepare of any I have given in a long time. What does one tell a college graduating class in this unfathomable year of 1969? All of our traditional values are under bitter attack on every campus; all of the "truths" we accepted as valid a few years ago are questioned and disputed.

Nevertheless, after accepting the flattering invitation—an invitation presumably based on the assumption that you have some wisdom or insight or special experience or advice or perhaps even some good recipes to impart to the graduates—you cannot just stand up and say you do not know what to say that would mean anything to the young men and women earning bachelor's and advanced degrees.

According to the editorial about my speech which Congressman BURLISON placed in the RECORD, I "told it like it is." My only hope is that what I had to say about the obligations to the rest of us, of the 699 fortunate men and women receiving degrees that day, made a portion of the sense to them that my remarks seemed to make to many of the parents and over-30 friends of the graduates, when I outlined what I thought were some of the things these young people owe us for, and how they can go about repaying us.

The University of Missouri at St. Louis, one of the four campuses of the University of Missouri system, is a young institution, founded in 1963, but quickly established as a dynamic educational force in our community. Its chancellor since 1965 has been Dr. James L. Bugg, Jr. Virtually 99 percent of its student body comes from the Greater St. Louis metropolitan area, and most of the students are working part time or full time to meet college expenses. The graduates have truly earned their educations and it was an earnest and inspiring and serious-minded group to talk to.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I submit the text of my commencement address last week, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

I am deeply grateful to the University of Missouri for two great honors accorded me today. One of those honors, of course, is the award of an honorary degree which means far more to me than most of you can possibly imagine, for I did not have the opportunity as a young woman to earn an academic degree in the customary manner. There was no University of Missouri at St. Louis, and not much chance of a \$35 a month telephone company clerk—that's \$420 a year—being able to finance an education, which girls weren't supposed to have much need for anyway in those days.

But I always felt the need—and the desire—and I have always regretted not having had the opportunity the men and women of this graduating class have enjoyed, to achieve a college education. The degrees you will receive today may or may not make all of you rich or famous, or assure the capture of all of the prizes you seek in the pursuit of happiness. But I don't think any of you fortunate young people earning degrees at this commencement will ever have the occasion to regret the years you have spent on this campus, or the multitudinous bits and pieces of seemingly unrelated facts and information you have learned here. And, although you will probably remember little of what is said here today, I am sure you will always remember with deep satisfaction what this day has meant to you.

And that is why I say I have received two great honors today. In addition to my degree, the second honor is the privilege of participating in this never-to-be-forgotten moment in your lives, as you take giant steps forward, in status and in stature, in a society in which personal success and career satisfaction are rapidly becoming inseparably entwined with educational achievement.

Therefore, to have the opportunity to share in this day, as your families are doing, and as I am privileged to do, gives the day as much meaning to us as it does to you. For each of us of an older generation recognizes that you who are graduating know far more about the world in which you live than it was possible for any of us to know at your age. That is not to say that you know enough. No one ever does. But we count on you to build on the foundation of knowledge that you have acquired here, and to use that knowledge, so that your children, a generation hence, will be better prepared to cope with the challenges of a future society certain to be different from that we know today, just as today's is far different from the world as it existed when your parents were as old as you are today.

Until a very few years ago—say, when the members of this Class of 1969 were freshmen—the traditional role of the commencement speaker was to welcome the members of a graduating class of a University into the Establishment, urge them to work hard during their forthcoming apprenticeships in the professions, and to be patient; that is, not to entertain brash expectations of taking over the top executive positions in business, industry, government, or any other field during the first few weeks or months or years of their new careers.

So much has happened so dramatically in these last few years the advice which might have been valid three years ago no longer seems relevant today. At some universities, in fact, the most appropriate comment a commencement speaker conceivably could make would be to thank the students for permitting commencement exercises to be held at all. On other campuses—and this is one—the students would deserve a grateful vote of confidence in their maturity for not having burned down the library and the administration building and for not having locked the dean in the boiler room.

Because of what has happened in so many colleges across the land, a sadness and a sense of shock and of failure pervade the academic community almost everywhere, and a sense of outrage pervades the public at large over the excesses which have occurred in some of our greatest institutions of learning. Repercussions are being felt daily in the Congress, where angry demands are being heard for a massive crackdown on all manifestations of collegiate defiance of authority and of law.

This, of course, is not "dissent." Dissent is precious to American freedom. But I think back only 2 years to a beautiful June day at

another college in Missouri where I heard a distinguished American woman, the Honorable Patricia Roberts Harris, a legal scholar who had been serving our country with great effectiveness as our Ambassador to Luxembourg, make an eloquent commencement speech on the importance of dissent. Dissent, she said, must be protected and encouraged in all segments of our society, and particularly in our college communities.

A few months ago, however, while Mrs. Harris was serving as dean of a university law school, she was driven to resign her position in disillusion because of the excesses of some of her students in translating dissent into revolt, culminating in a student strike, and the complete shutdown of all classes.

Remembering that commencement speaker's subsequent rather harrowing experience with dissent turned into open warfare, I am not going to follow her lead as a commencement speaker and devote this final lecture of your undergraduate days to the subject of your right of dissent. Rather, I am going to risk stirring up some dissent here myself by talking about some of your obligations to the rest of us, instead of about your rights. You know enough about your rights already, I am sure. But what about us? What are our rights where you are concerned?

To put your obligations into just a few words, it is simply this:

You owe us.

All of you have been privileged to receive the incalculable benefits of a college education—which, from a purely monetary standpoint alone will mean many thousands of additional dollars in your lifetime earnings. That's not exactly what you owe us for—you'll pay taxes on those earnings and the government and the economy will get back many times over the public investment in your education.

What you owe us—what you owe to your families and to all of their "over-30" contemporaries, and to numerous politicians to whom you might sometimes ascribe the blame for most of our national ills—is the full use of all of your brains and energies, directed toward correcting those social ills you are so familiar with and oppose so deeply.

And you are not only invited, but are strongly urged, to exercise any resentments you hold against the so-called Establishment by using all of the channels of citizen expression to make it change in the directions you want it to go.

If I were to express a wish for your future happiness, it would be that you retain for the rest of your lives the feeling of *dissatisfaction* I know that most of you hold today over the lack of perfection in our social structure and in our political machinery. You cannot come to this point of a university degree without realizing that our society is in deep trouble of a rather unique kind.

Most of our problems—and this is true—most of the problems in our society today are the direct outgrowth of solutions of previous, and usually far more serious, problems. Think about that.

Just think back to the year in which most of the members of this Class of 1969 were born—1947—and think how different this country has become in your comparatively short lifetimes.

On the emotional issue of racism, discrimination, lack of full equality, just think back to the kind of completely segregated society which existed 22 years ago, at the time of the eye-opening report of President Truman's Civil Rights Commission. This historic report established the foundation on which all successful civil rights causes of the past generation have been fought and won.

The most segregated institution in our country 22 years ago was the armed services—now the most fully integrated. Housing was

truly ghettoized not merely by price, but by force of law. Schools in much of the Nation were separate by race—by law. The jobs many of the students of this University are preparing to fill with dignity and pride and distinction were, in many instances, completely closed to the parents of many of the members of this student body.

Now the law of this land, instead of fostering and promoting and requiring discrimination by race, creed, color or sex, expressly prohibits these things. Twenty-two years out of history is an infinitesimal span of time—but the accomplishments of those 22 years in human progress in this country have been fantastically great. Your elders are still dizzy from the pace of the events which you may see now as only timid short steps to a long goal. The shock waves from the momentum of these events leave most adults overwhelmed and gasping. Some, of course, have been completely dismayed. They will never adjust.

But most Americans can adjust and are adjusting to new concepts of human relationships, and are paying the taxes—the very high taxes—to try to overcome in a few years the accumulated deficiencies of educational systems and housing policies and job training opportunities which go back, not generations, but centuries.

Four years ago, when most of you were graduating from high school, the Federal Government was just beginning its multi-billion-dollar program of Federal aid to education. And now every school district in the land, and every college, are heavily dependent for their educational survival on those funds. Four years. And the politicians who brought it about did not do so by the waving of any wand, or by simply making a logical explanation of why it was needed. It was a long battle. Between the time of the passage of the first general aid to education bill in either House of Congress—by the Senate in 1949—and the enactment of such a law, 16 years had elapsed—most of your lifetimes.

You owe us for what was done—for having had the courage to fight for your education. And you must pay us what you owe us. You must pay us back by working now for what you know must be done to help others.

For, like it or not—like the idea or not—you are indeed now part of the Establishment. You are, or soon will be, the teachers, the engineers, the doctors, the accountants, the writers, the thinkers, the politicians, the bureaucrats, the social workers, the biologists, the do-ers, of which the Establishment consists. You may fret at your frustrations in trying to move mountains and change men's hearts; but you can chip and scrape at both objectives and truly make a dent. We did!

Humanity—all of your fellow citizens and the world of which you are a part—desperately needs your skills, your knowledge, and your abilities, in order to help us do things better than they have been and are being done.

Patient or impatient with the improvements which have been made in American society in your lifetimes, you now have the precious opportunity to exert an influence upon events and upon attitudes in this country.

You have proved your competence and your adaptability to hard tasks and to great challenges. Your presence here today as successful candidates for college degrees attests to your qualifications as well-educated young men and women.

You have many choices: You can slide comfortably, if you wish, into well-paying positions in which you can concentrate only on the objective of climbing the professional ladder to success by not "making waves"—that is, you can play the safe and cozy organization game; or—you can prod and push and

inspire your contemporaries, as well as your elders, into reluctant changes in their own comfortable pursuits.

Some of you, I imagine, will take the easy road of least resistance—the path of the yes-man; others, I am sure, will seek the notoriety which comes from finding fault with every policy and concept which you encounter on the job or in the community, whether or not you have constructive ideas for improvements. Either path brings certain types of rewards, whether in monetary terms, or in the vanity values of personal publicity. What I would prefer to see most of you do, however, is to couple your recognition of the deficiencies in our society with a determination to try to find solutions which will work in the correction of those deficiencies. It is not an easy assignment.

In Washington, on each day that either House of Congress is in session, strident speeches are made in the House or Senate denouncing everything which is wrong in American life or in the world at large. Simultaneously, bills go into the hopper intended to bring about instant Utopia. Solutions are so easy, of course, when they are only intended to sound plausible. But will they "wash"? Will they work? Are they feasible? Are they Constitutional? At whose expense would they have to be achieved? Could they be administered? Could they be paid for?

Be critical—be dissatisfied with the deficiencies in our society—insist upon change for the purpose of bringing about improvement—criticize that which is wrong—hold to your ideals—but, also try to put the need for change in historical perspective; learn enough about why our problems exist and where they came from in order to be able to touch the right pushbuttons which will turn on the power-generating forces needed to accomplish changes and improvements. You can bring changes only as you persuade, not browbeat, your fellow citizens to accept and pay for those changes. Americans will never pay tribute to bad manners and arrogant demands.

While some commencement speakers worry over the future of America because of so much dissatisfaction and disaffection on our campuses, I think a companion worry has to be that, like so many college generations which preceded you, you may soon rut down into life's amenities and the satisfactions of your own careers and forget what you are now so angry about.

From a material standpoint, you all have it made—or will have it made in a reasonably short period of time in your chosen professions. The jobs are waiting, and the pay—to those of us who once earned \$35 a month—is simply incredible. You will do all right financially, high taxes and all.

But just remember, that you owe us for your opportunities—owe us not your gratitude (although your families might find a little of that nice to hear) and not your uncritical acceptance or endorsement of everything we have done (because we have made many mistakes, as every generation has done) but you owe us the application of your good minds to the problems we have not as yet solved. And, as those problems are solved, the solutions themselves will create new problems which will tax your best brains.

What the people of Missouri and of the United States paid for in the creation of this University was the hope that your knowledge would now enable you to do for others far more than has been done for you. Don't ridicule our sentimentality, because in a few years, when your children are getting their degrees, you'll know how your families feel today—a warm and proud and happy feeling that they have given to this country an educated son or daughter who is equipped to do good. Don't let them down!

FUN ALONG THE COLORADO

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, the centennial celebration of Maj. John Wesley Powell's epic exploratory trip down the Green and Colorado Rivers was launched at Green River, Wyo. There was a good deal of fanfare and there will be more to come.

Major Powell was visionary as well as practical. He had the wisdom to apply knowledge to reality and make predictions which have held up over the course of time.

Indeed, he was the first man to assess the impact reclamation would have on the fierce rivers of the inland plateau area.

But even he would probably have not guessed the impact that reclamation has had on the rivers down which he made his great journey.

At this point I include an article entitled "Fun Along the Colorado," from Reclamation Era, which enumerates some of the differences between his trip and what a traveler would experience today:

FUN ALONG THE COLORADO

If he could return today, 100 years after his epic river and canyon explorations, Major John Wesley Powell would not be too surprised at finding dams and reservoirs on the Colorado River system which he knew so well.

A perceptive man, Powell knew that American technology would make far-reaching accomplishments. For instance, he envisioned tapping the West's rivers for such benefits as irrigation and community use. And he was known to predict that hydropower generation would someday be one of the primary purposes of dams.

Nor would Powell be disappointed that the Colorado River and its tributary, the Green River, have not been wholly "preserved" in the condition he found them. He realized, probably better than any other man of his day, the critical value of water resources to the West's development. And he was constantly a zealous advocate of practical water purposes, whenever his story might enlighten someone.

Probably the Major would be astonished, however, by the way Americans have widely accepted new pastimes at water resource areas. This does not include fishing, which has been appreciated for centuries, nor boating, which seemingly held some promise in his day for increasing variety.

But Powell scarcely could have envisioned a boom in such ideas as people being rapidly pulled across water on two small pieces of wood—water skiing; or adding both skis and a kite for soaring a few minutes in the sky.

Both of Powell's boating trips, one in 1869 and the other in 1871-72, were made in heavy rowboats, each weighing over 1,000 pounds. When dangerous rapids were met, the preferred technique was to unload all gear and then to let down the boats with long ropes. Usually, one line was tied to the bow and another to the stern, with at least two men handling the lines.

BOAT LOSS

Occasionally a boat was pulled from their grasp by the swift current, and sometimes holes were knocked in the hulls by rocks, but the crew managed to improvise patches and to keep the boats afloat throughout the trip. In Lodore Canyon one of the explorer's boats

was out of control before its occupants could make a landing, and it was broken apart by colliding with a midstream boulder.

Today's Flaming Gorge and Glen Canyon Dams, provide plenty of swift-flowing river for those who wish exciting river trips. Much lighter-weight craft, either of wood or rubber, is used today in place of the awkward boats of the Powell trip. Where rapids threaten, boaters can utilize the updated knowledge and experience, or they can usually run the rapids—in a carefully prescribed manner—rather than make a portage or line their boats. Danger still lurks in the violent rapids, but a river runner with exact knowledge and considerable experience can make it look easy.

Powell started his trips during May, knowing that the Green River would be high from spring runoff. The large flow carried him and his men over many hidden boulders, but it probably also contributed to the accident in Lodore Canyon when the river's swiftness threw the boat out of control.

By August, when Powell was in Grand Canyon he was riding on low flow, and the voyagers were continually plagued by high riverbed and exposed rocks.

FLOWS EVENED

The advantage today is that Flaming Gorge and Glen Canyon Dams have evened the flows, cutting down the tempestuous floods of spring and releasing water gradually throughout the year, or when needed. Boating is thus possible for a long season.

In another aspect—the mobility of the American public in getting to lakes for recreation purposes—Powell would be amazed. A lake located more than 5 miles out of town was almost too far away for a quick fishing trip in his day—unless, perhaps, it happened to be linked to town by railroad.

Because of their remote locations, Reclamation reservoirs built in the early part of this century were rarely considered for recreational use. But with the age of transporting boats behind the automobile, people began looking to these reservoirs for their "treasure house" of potential in fishing, boating, swimming, and sightseeing.

At Flaming Gorge Lake, named for the first canyon which Powell and his men boated into, swimming has become part of the routine of even such knowledgeable wildlife as deer, when they have a hankering to be on the other side of the lake. On seeing the animals swimming across, visitors take pleasure in a good deed by reporting the swimming deer for officials of the Utah and Wyoming State Game departments.

Most visitors to the Flaming Gorge recreation area were first thought to be from the nearest metropolitan area, Salt Lake City. But an analysis showed that more than half of the total are from distant States.

AND FISHING

Fishing is an interesting sport around Reclamation's Flaming Gorge Dam. Not only is fishing considerable in the reservoir, but when the gates on the dam were closed in 1962, ideal trout fishing took place in the sparkling trailwaters below the dam. The stream was converted from a muddy waterway to a clear, cold relatively stable river. The spectacular stream winds for 30 miles through picturesque forest lands, or isolated recreation areas in Daggett County, before entering Colorado and Dinosaur National Monument.

Last December a fish specialist said the Daggett County reach of the Green River deserves to be called "Utah's Blue Ribbon trout stream." And because trout growth and aquatic food production have continued to increase here, it would likely continue to have a favorable future for trout ranging up to around 6 pounds for 5-year olds.

Further along the route of Powell's voyage,

a huge, beautiful reservoir was named, a few years ago, for the intrepid explorer. At this reservoir, Lake Powell, the administering agency, National Park Service, reports a 1968 jump of about 50 percent more visitors than the previous year. The 1968 total was 883,400 at this isolated lake backed up by Reclamation's Glen Canyon Dam. And because there are no nearby cities, more of these people drove from such distant points as Los Angeles, Phoenix, Denver, and Salt Lake City.

The superb scenery at Lake Powell is unsurpassed for variety. Facilities for all kinds of water-based recreation, including fishing, are in operation year-round. Particularly excellent this year is trout fishing just below the dam, rivaling that downstream from Flaming Gorge.

LAKE MEAD VISITORS

Chalking up the highest visitor figure of all Colorado River Basin reservoirs is Lake Mead, located near Las Vegas on U.S. Highway 95. Last year 4 million sun-seekers, fishermen and boaters showed up at this lake behind Reclamation's Hoover Dam.

Lake Mead also is associated with Major Powell because it was at the mouth of the Virgin River (now an arm of Lake Mead) that Powell terminated his 1869 voyage.

When Lake Mead is high, water backs into the gorge to Separation Canyon, where three men of the voyage climbed out of the canyon rather than face what they believed would be certain death in other violent rapids below. These three, the two Howland brothers and William Dunn, unfortunately were killed by Shivwits Indians after reaching the canyon rim.

Powell and his crew were exceptionally daring to do what they did. To explore this awesome river area had been considered an impossible feat before they undertook it, and indeed the task turned out to be almost unendurable.

Even when undertaken today—whether for sport thrills or further study—boating the Green and Colorado Rivers still is an ominous challenge. And because of the need for proper knowledge and equipment, it is accomplished by only a few.

For Powell, it was an endeavor of scientific worth. And for him it would be a service to national problems, which few other men understood or tried to measure.

Continuing his hard pioneering work, and tackling tremendous obstacles he strongly spurred on the reclamation era for the Nation. So that today, Reclamation specialists with added knowledge have been able to forge ahead with constructing dams and related water facilities in many Western areas.

GAINS TOTALED

The 67-year old Federal Reclamation program has brought irrigation service to 10 million acres of land in the West, 8 million acres of which were irrigated in 1967. Total gross value of crops produced by farmers on these lands is \$27 billion.

Also, 600 billion kilowatt hours of hydropower have been generated. Since 1950, \$674 million in property damage, plus unnumbered people's lives, have been saved by structures controlling flooding rivers.

Guards against water pollution, enhancement of fish and wildlife areas, and preserving the scenic environment also are Reclamation project benefits.

Major Powell envisioned such assets as those. However, the water resource development which would amaze Explorer Powell most has come about in just the last few years—the outdoor recreation boom, and the tricks devised by fun-seekers for thrills at lakes and reservoirs.

For its part, Reclamation has constructed over 200 lakes which accommodate such activity, and serve many other useful purposes.

REPRESENTATIVE BURKE ANNOUNCES 1969 POLL RESULTS

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in announcing the tabulation of my annual questionnaire poll this week, the results indicate that the majority of my constituents favor repeal of the 10 percent surtax; increased military pressure on North Vietnam as a means to end the war; restoration of the national lottery draft system; and a constitutional amendment which would provide for the election of the President and Vice President by a simple majority of the people.

These results definitely indicate that the people residing in my congressional district are opposed to further tax increases and want less government spending. They are deeply concerned about the problems of inflation and feel they are now overtaxed.

As for Vietnam, the majority of the respondents indicated they would like the war to end but they do not want peace at any price. Instead the majority indicated they favor increased military pressure on North Vietnam to bring a conclusion to the war. Nevertheless, 26.6 percent in the district indicated that they would get out of the war regardless of a subsequent Communist takeover.

More than 218,000 questionnaires were mailed to the residents in Broward and north Dade Counties and I was

pleased and gratified to see that more than 40,000 citizens responded. It is indicative to me that our citizenry is concerned and interested in their government.

The results of the questions were computed by percent and includes tabulations for the entire district as well as by distinct section. The questions and results follow:

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS, 1969

Questions	Entire district		Central Broward		South Broward		North Dade	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Do you favor the renewal of the 10 percent surtax when it expires on June 30.....	17.0	83.0	15.7	84.3	18.7	81.3	16.8	83.2
2. Would you favor the 10 percent surtax if part of the revenue would be returned to local and State governments.....	30.0	70.0	29.2	70.8	34.7	65.3	26.5	73.5
3. If a satisfactory peace in Vietnam cannot be secured in the near future, would you favor 1—								
a. Withdrawal of U.S. forces, even if this means Communist takeover.....	26.6	73.4	24.9	75.1	24.9	75.1	30.4	69.6
b. Adhere to holding operations by joint United States-South Vietnam forces.....	20.5	79.5	20.6	79.4	22.3	77.7	18.5	81.5
c. Increase military pressure on North Vietnam.....	52.9	47.1	54.5	45.5	52.8	47.2	51.1	48.9
4. Should the power of the President to commit American troops to combat without specific approval of Congress be curbed.....	66.0	34.0	67.9	32.1	67.5	32.5	62.3	37.7
5. With respect to raising an army to defend the Nation, do you favor 1—								
a. Continuing the draft in its present form.....	31.5	68.5	32.9	67.1	30.6	69.4	30.7	69.3
b. Replacing the draft system with an all volunteer army.....	24.2	75.8	21.1	78.9	22.2	77.8	30.0	70.0
c. Restoring the national draft lottery system established in World War II.....	44.3	55.7	46.0	54.0	47.2	52.8	39.3	60.7
6. Should the United States adopt a 12-mile offshore territorial limit against those nations which impose more than a 3-mile territorial limit.....	93.9	6.1	94.4	5.6	94.3	5.7	91.1	8.9
7. Do you favor a law by the Federal Government to prevent strikes by public employees.....	72.0	28.0	77.8	22.2	68.5	31.5	68.6	31.4
8. Should presidential candidates be selected by national primaries, instead of party conventions.....	84.1	15.9	83.2	16.8	85.9	14.1	83.2	16.8
9. Do you feel the electoral college should be abolished and the President and Vice President be elected solely by the simple majority vote of the people.....	87.8	12.2	86.7	13.3	87.3	12.7	89.7	10.3
10. Do you believe the Federal Government should guarantee an annual income to heads of families, whether or not they are working.....	6.1	93.9	4.1	95.9	7.7	92.3	6.8	93.2
11. Do you favor limiting the number and type of questions to be asked in taking the 1970 census.....	75.2	24.8	82.4	17.6	71.6	28.4	70.1	29.9

¹ Figures shown represent percentage of answers favoring each option shown.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS—1969

[In percent]

Questions	North Dade						South Broward						Central Broward					
	Republican		Independent		Democrat		Republican		Independent		Democrat		Republican		Independent		Democrat	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Do you favor the renewal of the 10-percent surtax when it expires on June 30.....	15.1	84.9	10.7	89.3	29.8	70.2	20.8	79.2	17.5	82.5	16.7	83.3	16.2	83.8	14.9	85.1	15.2	84.7
2. Would you favor the 10-percent surtax if part of the revenue would be returned to local and State governments.....	23.8	76.2	27.4	72.6	27.7	72.3	42.4	57.6	28.3	71.7	28.4	71.6	29.7	70.3	24.3	75.7	33.8	66.2
3. If a satisfactory peace in Vietnam cannot be secured in the near future, would you favor 1—																		
(a) Withdrawal of U.S. forces, even if this means Communist takeover.....	29.6	70.4	30.7	69.3	30.9	69.1	25.2	74.8	24.8	75.2	24.6	75.4	25.0	75.0	25.5	74.5	24.0	76.0
(b) Adhere to holding operations by joint United States-South Vietnam forces.....	19.4	80.6	16.4	83.6	19.6	80.4	20.8	79.2	19.3	80.7	27.4	72.6	19.8	80.2	18.8	81.2	24.7	75.3
(c) Increase military pressure on North Vietnam.....	51.0	49.0	52.9	47.1	49.5	50.5	54.0	46.0	55.9	44.1	55.9	48.0	52.0	55.7	44.3	55.7	51.3	48.7
4. Should the power of the President to commit American troops to combat without specific approval of Congress be curbed.....	58.7	41.3	62.6	37.4	64.9	35.1	69.2	30.8	66.9	33.1	65.2	34.8	66.6	33.4	72.6	27.4	65.5	34.5
5. With respect to raising an army to defend the Nation, do you favor 1—																		
(a) Continuing the draft in its present form.....	31.0	69.0	27.5	72.5	33.5	66.5	29.1	70.9	27.3	72.7	36.3	63.7	35.1	64.9	31.3	68.7	29.2	70.8
(b) Replacing the draft system with an all-volunteer army.....	29.8	70.2	31.8	68.2	28.4	71.6	20.6	79.4	20.9	79.1	26.3	73.7	20.3	79.7	18.2	81.8	27.1	72.9
(c) Restoring the national draft lottery system established in World War II.....	39.2	60.8	40.7	59.3	38.1	61.9	50.3	49.7	51.8	48.2	51.8	37.4	62.6	44.6	55.4	50.5	49.5	50.5
6. Should the United States adopt a 12-mile offshore territorial limit against those nations which impose more than a 3-mile territorial limit.....	95.9	4.1	93.7	6.3	80.2	19.8	95.4	4.6	95.6	4.4	91.1	8.9	95.3	4.7	96.1	3.9	94.6	5.4
7. Do you favor a law by the Federal Government to prevent strikes by public employees.....	84.4	15.6	60.2	39.8	63.2	36.8	76.0	24.0	69.2	30.8	55.4	44.6	86.8	13.2	69.1	30.9	65.0	35.0
8. Should presidential candidates be selected by national primaries, instead of party conventions.....	83.0	17.0	88.7	11.3	74.1	25.9	83.0	17.0	89.1	10.9	87.5	12.5	79.4	20.6	86.0	14.0	89.9	10.1
9. Do you feel the electoral college should be abolished and the President and Vice President be elected solely by the simple majority vote of the people.....	88.2	11.8	87.8	12.2	92.6	7.4	84.2	15.8	91.0	9.0	88.7	11.3	86.5	13.5	86.0	14.0	88.3	11.7
10. Do you believe the Federal Government should guarantee an annual income to heads of families, whether or not they are working.....	3.0	97.0	9.8	90.2	7.0	93.0	2.7	97.3	11.7	88.3	11.9	88.1	5.2	94.8	2.3	97.7	3.4	96.6
11. Do you favor limiting the number and type of questions to be asked in taking the 1970 census.....	75.8	24.2	74.9	25.1	61.4	38.6	73.0	27.0	73.9	26.1	66.9	33.1	84.4	15.6	84.2	15.8	75.5	24.5

¹ Figures shown represent percentage of answers favoring each option shown.

REPRESSION IN VIETNAM

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, we see every day in Vietnam how difficult it is to stop a war. War becomes a pattern, with smaller patterns within it. Military commanders fight for isolated hilltops, out of habit of fighting. The Saigon regime suppresses its opponents because that kind of political repression has become a pattern within the war. Even the killing becomes a pattern of so many dead this week, so many last week.

The war will end when we can break these patterns and recall our goals. We want a Vietnam which can rule itself in a manner its citizens think most likely to affect their safety and happiness. We want in Vietnam a government responsive to all elements of its national community and not a government we either impose or tolerate which is disruptive of such representation and responsibility.

It is clearer today than ever before that the present government in Saigon is without the support of its own people. That government exists and persists as a malodorous remnant of our earlier policy—now happily repudiated—of seeking a military victory. It is kept in power solely by American support. That support becomes the justification and the means by which political and religious freedom is ravaged, by which students, opposition leaders, and journalists are jailed, and by which extensive corruption is made possible.

Support for such a government demeans the sacrifices made by thousands of American war casualties, it demeans the serious and well-intentioned efforts by the American people to understand and help the Vietnamese people.

Ending American support for the Thieu-Ky government will certainly cause that government's early fall. This is the best indication that that government lacks any real basis of support among the Vietnamese. The sooner we make the hard decision to abandon these leaders whom we installed in an earlier, less enlightened period of American policy, the sooner we can end, with dignity and honor, our tragic involvement in the affairs of the Vietnamese people.

As long as we continue supporting the present government in Saigon, we will hamper the discussions among Vietnamese from which must develop the political institutions they need to govern themselves when our withdrawal is complete.

The most recent example of repressing political discussion in Vietnam came this week when the summoning by police of four leaders of an opposition organization, the Progressive National Committee, headed by Tran Ngoc Lieng. This committee was only formed on June 4 and its principal offense seems to have been its initial public statement favoring "a government of reconciliation" that would be composed of "nationalist elements acceptable to both sides."

This reasonable hope, which is so moderate that it might have been uttered

by President Nixon himself, apparently irritated President Thieu, among others in the Saigon government.

President Thieu's attitude toward such political developments can be seen in a statement he made at the press conference held in Saigon after his meeting with President Nixon:

From now on, those who spread rumors that there will be a coalition government in this country, whoever they be, whether in the executive or the legislature, will be severely punished on charges of collusion with the enemy and demoralizing the army and the people. I will punish them in the name of the Constitution.

This statement is the best reason for removing President Thieu and, if necessary, changing the Constitution so that normal political processes can return to Vietnam.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GI BILL

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, June 22d is a memorable date for almost 27 million Americans who have served in the Armed Forces of this country. Twenty-five years ago, on June 22, 1944, the first Servicemen's Readjustment Act, or GI bill, was signed into law. This landmark legislation was passed by the Congress without a single dissenting vote in the closing days of World War II.

On that date every man and woman who had served honorably in the uniform of the United States became eligible for assistance in a number of programs designed to help veterans in their readjustment to civilian life. The GI bill, however, could only provide the opportunity. As always, the individual still had to succeed in his schoolwork or vocational training; he was required to pay back his home, farm, or business loan.

The GI bill of World War II set a precedent. It made all Americans realize that for the sacrifices a fighting man must make for his country, we, too, had an obligation that must be met. The Nation realized that displacement from the normal social and economic environment of civilian life for a period of time by those who entered service had placed them at a disadvantage in our competitive society.

While no government, or people, could give back those years or repay the hardships experienced in wartime some means of equity could be provided. This was the objective of the GI bill.

Benefits were extended to Korean veterans and then to those serving during the Vietnam conflict. Over a million Vietnam-era veterans have already participated in education and training programs.

The GI bill has been an unqualified success, the entire Nation has benefited immensely. More than 380,000 new teachers, 84,000 new doctors, 30,000 new dentists, and 15,000 new nurses financed some or all of their education under the GI bill. In addition, over 3 million work-

ers in trade and industry received GI bill training.

Home, farm, and business loans have stimulated economic development. Increased taxes from the higher wages and salaries earned by better-educated veterans have returned the Government's investment many times over.

On this silver anniversary of the first GI bill we should again acknowledge the tremendous debt our country owes to its war veterans.

The GI bills, past and present, should be viewed in their true light, as investments in human beings, our veterans, an investment that pays handsome dividends to all America.

THE BRAVE NEVER DIE

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, with the Vietnam war still with us our efforts for peace in other parts of the world often seem insignificant. But unfortunately, as we all know, other wars exist where men fight and die for freedom though we may hear less about them than Vietnam. When the efforts for peace have failed and we have been driven to war, we have been fortunate in maintaining our freedom. Not all nations, unhappily, maintain that freedom that once was theirs.

This past Memorial Day brought veterans of many different wars and Americans of many different origins together. An excellent tribute made by a Cuban-American, Manuel J. Reyes, Latin American News director of WTVJ-television, was presented to the veterans of the Spanish-American War in Miami, Fla. I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the moving speech Mr. Reyes made in behalf of all Americans who have fought and continue to fight for freedom for the people in all nations:

The Brave never die!

This is why, death will never defeat the Veterans of the Spanish-American War! Those gallant men who in the year 1898, in the prime of their youth, renounced to all of life's wealth and as volunteers (the first volunteers of the United States' Army), went overseas to defend freedom.

Strong men who with their fighting, placed the United States in a category of first world power and as a country of hope for the poor and the oppressed.

Like I have done year after year, since I came into exile, I am here with you again, on this Memorial Day, to honor those who fell in 1898, fighting for the freedom and dignity of the human being.

Cuba was one of the countries where you and your fellow-soldiers went on that noble task.

This is why, today, as a Cuban and I am and will be until the day I die, even if I die at the last corner of the world, but as a Cuban, I want to unite my prayers to yours, with the greatest respect and admiration, as true brothers. I want to unite my prayers to yours on behalf of a country and a people who were not born to be slaves, on behalf of the Cuban people in the martyred island and in exile.

Because, if my people were not silenced by terror and tyranny imposed over them, I

know that if my people could talk, they would be here today, praying for those who fell at San Juan Hill in Oriente Province, so that Cuba could be free.

And it is because our brotherhood is sealed with the blood of those who, on your part or ours, joined in a common fighting action to free Cuba.

There was no other alternative at that time.

And today, faced with a similar situation, which has already prolonged itself for over ten years, the alternatives have disappeared little by little.

There is but one way left for the noble Cuban people in their fight to overthrow the tyranny: A way which you, united to the Cuban Freedom Fighters, bravely took in 1898. A way thru which there is no return and leads to a Spartan climax: Freedom or Ashes.

You helped to free Cuba during the past century. But today Cuba is living the worst tyranny of all its history.

The tragedy of the Cuban people is so great; the suffering of the Cuban mothers is so great; and despair of its best men is so great. . . . and at the same time, the courage of that same people is so great, that the only way left is freedom, or let Cuba as a whole be burnt to ashes thru the will of its people. So that from the ashes of Communism, a new Cuba, free, sovereign, independent and democratic, will arise.

And today, by joining my prayers to yours, two people who were born to be brothers, by praying to God for the eternal rest of those who gave their lives in the Philippines, in Puerto Rico and in Cuba; let's tell them that their sacrifice was not in vain. Let's tell them to rest peacefully in their graves . . . because their heirs, making their glorious history come alive again, have joined to proclaim at this cemetery, before their graves, a cry that will be heard in Cuba, a cry which will shake the island from one end to the other; a cry which will raise the people against the tyrant: Freedom or Ashes!

STAFF REPORT OF U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post this morning, there appeared an article by John P. MacKenzie inferring that the Attorney General was recommending against the extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Since the Attorney General has not yet testified on the subject and is not quoted in the article, the inferences, and conclusions drawn from it are subject to serious question.

The need for extension of the act is clear and should not be confused or jeopardized by other legislation proposing changes or improvements in voting procedures on a nationwide basis. The tremendous progress made since the 1965 enactment of the act makes this clear, but it does not mean that the problems and practices necessitating its passage have vanished. This is testified to amply by a recent staff report by two attorneys of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Mr. George Bradley and Mr. Richard Seymour, brought to my attention by a letter from Mr. Howard Glickstein, Acting Director of the Commission.

I include herewith the letter and staff report at this point in the RECORD:

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS,
Washington, D.C., June 16, 1969.

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TAFT: I am sending you a copy of a Commission Staff Report on Irregularities in the May 13 Municipal Elections in Mississippi which we have filed with Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Committee on the Judiciary. The facts presented and the issues raised in this report relate to the proposed extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Although a number of black candidates were successful, most notably Charles Evers who was elected mayor of Fayetteville, Mississippi, the report documents many instances of discriminatory practices which the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was enacted to eliminate. Another central finding of the report is that not one black candidate in counties where Federal Observers were present believed the election would have been run in a honest manner were it not for the presence of these observers provided for in the Voting Rights Act. In counties where Federal observers were not present, there was a division of opinion as to whether there had been an honest election.

I believe the report will be useful in demonstrating that the original objectives of the Voting Rights Act to enforce the 15th Amendment in those States were historically the right to vote had been denied on account of race and color still have not been achieved.

If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact my office.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD A. GLICKSTEIN,
Acting Director.

MAY 13, 1969, MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS IN MISSISSIPPI
(U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Staff Report)

Primary elections were held on May 13, 1969 by numerous Mississippi municipalities to choose candidates for the June 3, 1969 general election. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights sent two attorneys to the state for a week to observe the elections and speak with many of the black candidates who sought political office and their supporters.

On May 13, 1969 Commission staff attorneys observed the conduct of the election in Fayette, Jefferson County; Woodville, Wilkinson County; Gloster, Amite County; Lexington, Durant, Goodman, and Pickens, Holmes County; and Belzoni, Humphreys County. Commission staff visited the polling places throughout the day and kept in contact with black candidates and their supporters in these cities. The rest of the week they spoke with black candidates and their supporters in other Mississippi towns. In all they spoke with black candidates or their campaign workers in 20 towns scattered among a total of 15 counties.

Most of the black candidates interviewed, regardless of whether they won or lost and regardless of whether they believed the election had been fair, believed that there would not have been as fair an election had it not been for the presence of the Federal Observers and the presence of numerous lawyers and others serving as poll watchers. Although there were criticisms of the manner in which the Federal Observers carried out their duties, not one black candidate in a county where Federal Observers were present believed the election would have been run in an honest manner were it not for the presence of these observers. In counties where Federal Observers were not present, there was a division of opinion as to whether there had been an honest election.

For convenience in reporting, the prob-

lems uncovered have been divided into four general areas:

1. Registration to vote.
2. Qualification as a candidate.
3. The conduct of the election.
4. The role of Federal Observers.

REGISTRATION TO VOTE

In many of the towns visited by the Commission staff, it was reported that black persons no longer have fears of adverse consequences if they register to vote. This was not true everywhere, however. In Woodville, for example, a black candidate stated that people were still afraid to register to vote in Wilkinson County. As an example of the fear that still exists in the Woodville area, he noted that when three college students from Michigan State University who served as poll watchers for black candidates during the election had to leave the town very late at night, local black residents insisted that they be escorted to McComb by the Deacons of Defense. In Itta Bena there were reports of threats to bomb a black candidate's headquarters the night before the election. A guard was placed around the headquarters by local black persons the entire night. It was also noted in Woodville that several candidates who had held jobs either with the school system or the county had recently lost their jobs as a result of seeking elective office or because they were actively involved with the NAACP. Their contracts were not renewed after their involvement had become common knowledge.

A black candidate in Moorhead, in Sunflower County, stated that some black persons were afraid to register to vote for fear that white persons would take economic reprisals against them. A similar reluctance to register was reported in rural areas of Quitman County by a black candidate for office in Marks.

Problems in registering to vote for the city elections were widespread. Difficulties were reported in Summit, Pike County; Bolton and Edwards, Hinds County; Clarksdale, Coahoma County; Durant, Lexington and Goodman, Holmes County and Leland, Washington County.

A black candidate for office in Summit stated that black persons desiring to vote had difficulty in finding the Summit city clerk in order to register with him. Under Mississippi law, a voter must register with the county registrar and with the city clerk in order to vote in municipal elections. Section 3211 of the Mississippi Code provides that the registrar "shall register the electors of his county at any time" and section 3374-61 makes this provision applicable to municipal clerks, who act as registrars for municipal elections. Until the deadline for registering for the primary election had passed, the city clerk in Summit, who has another full-time job, was only available for registration between 3 p.m. and 7 p.m. on Tuesdays and Wednesdays. In the future, however, the clerk in Summit has reportedly agreed to register voters at any time, except on Sundays. Pike, the county in which Summit is located, has not been designated for Federal Examiners. It was reported that the town clerk in Edwards is in his office only from 9 a.m. to 11 a.m. Monday through Friday. Thus, it is very difficult for people who work during the day to register in the city.

In several of the towns noted above, county clerks did not inform the newly registered voter that it was necessary for him to register in the city as well. Thus, large numbers of black persons were unable to vote in municipal elections because they had not registered in the city, even though they had registered at the county courthouse.

In one town where no primary was held, but where black candidates were running as independents, two black voters alleged that the city clerk was present when they registered with the county clerk, and that he told them he would take care of the city registration for them. He did not, however, and their ballots were challenged. One black

voter was told by the same city clerk, when she saw him in 1966 after having been listed by the Federal Examiner, that she already was on the city books. Her name, however, was not on the list and thus her ballot was challenged.

In another town, witnesses reported that the county clerk harassed black persons who attempted to register with her. In July 1968, a local civil rights volunteer took a crippled black woman and four other black persons (two to register, and two to help the crippled woman) to the clerk's office. The clerk refused to allow the crippled woman to sit while she was registering, instead forcing her to walk from table to table for different parts of the registration process. This took about 15 minutes, the clerk asserting that, after all, the woman would have to stand while voting. On two occasions—July 1968 and February 1969—this clerk allegedly sent a deputy out to buy spray deodorizer while black persons were being registered.

Another widespread problem was that a large number of names listed by the Federal Examiners were not placed on the city rolls. As a consequence many persons who had been listed by the Federal Examiners had their ballots challenged, while others, anticipating challenge, did not cast ballots at all. Such problems were reported in Woodville, Wilkinson County; Vicksburg, Warren County; Edwards and Bolton, Hinds County; Clarksdale and Jonestown, Coahoma County; Itta Bena, Leflore County; Marks, Quitman County; and Lexington, Durant and Goodman, Holmes County. In some of these cases the Federal Examiners failed to transmit the names of persons listed by them to the appropriate city officials.

In March, local campaign workers discovered that the names of 150 black persons in Itta Bena who had registered with the Federal Examiner were not on the city lists. This was brought to the attention of the Civil Service Commission office in Jackson. That office allegedly was able to get 108 of the names placed on the city books for the elections, but apparently determined or assumed that the 42 others lived outside Itta Bena. At the May 13 primary, an additional 12 black persons were allegedly turned away because they were not on the city lists, although they too had been listed by the Federal Examiner.

In one town, persons listed by the Federal Examiner, but whose names were not on the registration books, were permitted to cast challenged votes. When a ballot is challenged, the Democratic Executive Committee decides whether to count it. The chairman of the Democratic Executive Committee in that town is alleged to have said, in reference to challenges by poll watchers for black candidates: "Let them challenge all they want because the challenge comes through me and I will handle them the way I want."

When the Federal Examiner arrived in Holmes County in March, he apparently made no effort to publicize his presence. Commission staff talked to many local black persons—candidates and campaign managers as well as voters—who did not know he was in Lexington until his presence was discovered by accident on his last day there. Predictably, he did not list anyone during his visit to Lexington.

Lack of such publicity was a widespread problem throughout Mississippi. Little or no advance publicity was given in any of the counties. While some civil rights leaders were apparently informed of the presence of Federal Examiners, in most cases nothing else was done. As could be expected, few persons were listed by the examiners. A list showing the counties in Mississippi where examiners were sent and the number of persons listed is attached.

QUALIFICATION AS A CANDIDATE

In several towns primaries were not held even though black candidates had sought to

run and thought they had qualified. The absence of a Democratic Party Executive Committee in those communities required candidates to use a different procedure for qualifying and the black candidates were not informed of this procedure.

In Friars Point, for example, where the Justice Department subsequently on May 17 filed a suit, black candidates sought to qualify for the primary by filing their papers with the County Democratic Party Executive Committee. The local newspapers allegedly reported that the black candidates had qualified for the primary. Shortly before the primary, however, it was announced that the black candidates had not qualified for the primary, because they allegedly had not complied with certain statutory requirements. Despite the fact that they had allegedly filed their papers several weeks before the deadline for qualifying either in the Democratic primary or as independents, they were not notified that they had not qualified until after these deadlines had passed. The Justice Department suit charged that "without general notice to the public, [the defendants] altered the procedure for qualifying." This was done without obtaining the approval of the Attorney General as required by Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

In Centerville several black persons attempted to qualify to run in the May 13 primary for city positions. They filed the required notice with the city clerk in Centerville and with the Secretary of the Democratic Committee in Woodville. They were told by the clerk at the town hall in Centerville that the town did not have a primary election. They were not told, however, that there was a procedure for obtaining a primary election. To run in a municipal primary in a town without a Municipal Executive Committee it is necessary to petition the Chairman of the County Executive Committee to call a special meeting of registered voters. At this meeting a temporary Executive Committee is elected. This Committee runs the primary election. They learned from civil rights lawyers in Jackson, however, that even though they were unable to run in the Democratic primary they could qualify as independents if they obtained signatures from 75 registered voters. Three candidates were able to get the necessary signatures, even though they learned of this possibility the day before the filing deadline. Thus they were able to get on the ballot for the June general election. In North Carrollton, in Carroll County, and Pickens, in Holmes County, black candidates attempting to qualify as Democrats were told there was no primary and therefore had to qualify as independents. As in Centerville they were not told there was a procedure by which a primary could be held.

A black candidate in one town in Hinds County, however, was unable to qualify for election because she was unaware of the proper procedures to follow. She allegedly filed her papers to run for office with the town clerk before the filing deadline. Someone, however, told her that she had to take the papers to the Mayor. She returned to the town clerk, obtained her papers from him and took them to the Mayor who informed her that he had nothing to do with the election. She then went back to the clerk's office, but he had left. She returned the next day and gave the papers to the clerk, but was told that she was one day past the deadline and, therefore, the clerk refused to put her on the ballot.

In Woodville, black voters were totally excluded from a second unofficial "white primary." All the black candidates for the Democratic primary were defeated. However, black and white persons had qualified as independent candidates for mayor and alderman. Thus, there was a possibility that the white vote would be split since there were two white candidates and one black candi-

date for mayor and eight white and one black candidates for the five alderman positions. To avoid this, the county White Citizens Council sent a letter to all white voters asking them which white candidates they believed should withdraw from the race.

They apparently were at least partially successful, as it was reported that one of the white candidates for mayor had withdrawn his name. A copy of the letter is attached to this report. In contrast to the tone of the letter, a campaign poster is attached illustrating the slogan used by several black candidates in the area: "Don't vote for a black man. Or a white man. Just a good man. . . . Doesn't that sound good?"

In Canton, some black candidates qualified to run in the Democratic primary; others running as independents will appear on the ballot in the June 3 general election. The city, however, allegedly redistricted the municipal boundaries eliminating a large number of black persons and adding a number of white residents. The city did not, as required by the Voting Rights Act of 1965, submit these changes to the Attorney General or the District Court in Washington, D.C. for approval. A suit was brought in Federal court and on May 10, 1969 the holding of a primary and general election was enjoined.

THE CONDUCT OF THE ELECTION

On the day of the primary, election irregularities occurred in a large number of communities in which black candidates ran.

Among the most frequent irregularities were restrictions upon the activities of poll watchers for black candidates. Title 14, section 3128 of the Mississippi Code states:

Each candidate shall have the right, either in person or by a representative to be named by him, to be present at the polling place, and the managers shall provide him or his representative with a suitable position from which he or his representative may be able to carefully inspect the manner in which the election is held."

Despite this provision, election officials in Marks allegedly required poll watchers representing the black candidates to sit 20 feet from the election tables. From that distance, they could not see enough of what was happening to do more than tally the ballots voted. In Jonestown, the election officials at first challenged the right of the student volunteer poll watchers to be there. After reportedly telephoning an outside source, the officials allowed these poll watchers to remain, but seated them so far back of the polling place, at the insistence of the manager, that they could not see the names on the books and thus could not carry out all of the normal functions of poll watchers. In Leland, where no Federal Observers were present, the election officials also allegedly required poll watchers for the black candidates to stand so far away from the tables that they were unable to check the qualifications of voters. And, although section 3164 of the Code specifically provides that candidates and their representatives have the right to observe and inspect the counting of the ballots, the poll watchers in Clarksdale were not allowed near the machines or tally tables during the tally of votes. They protested, but were not allowed closer.

Although many municipalities across the State had black election officials working at the polling places, only a few had more than a token number of black persons, and the black persons working in the polling places were under the supervision of the white election managers. In Woodville, Clarksdale, and other cities, white election managers were reluctant to render assistance to illiterates, although the courts have held that the Voting Rights Act of 1965 requires that this assistance be given, and that illiterates be informed of its availability. *United States v. Louisiana*, 265 F. Supp. 703 (1966), *aff'd per curiam*, 386 U.S. 270 (1967). In Vicksburg,

a black election official was told that she could not help illiterates who asked for her assistance in voting. She was told that the election manager would appoint someone to assist illiterates needing assistance. He invariably appointed one of the operators of the voting machines, all of whom were white, despite the voters' requests that a black election official assist them.

In Lexington, a black election official is reported to have told a student poll watcher that the election officials had been instructed not to give or offer help to voters until the voter needing assistance asked them. In polling places throughout the State, illiterate voters frequently seemed unaware that assistance was available, but quickly asked for it when poll watchers for the black candidates informed them of its availability. Instructions such as those allegedly given in Lexington deprive such voters of the means of voting as they wish.

Sec. 3272 of the Mississippi Code provides that voters who are blind or disabled "shall have the assistance of one of the managers or other person of his own selection" in the marking of his ballot. In one instance in Vicksburg, however, a poll watcher reported that a blind woman was denied assistance by the "person of her choosing"—her black sister. A white official insisted on casting her ballot for her.

In Itta Bena, white election officials assisting illiterates reportedly tried to influence the illiterates not to vote for the black candidates. It was also reported in Vicksburg, where no Federal Observers were present, that black voters who did not request assistance often had white election officials entering their booth under the pretense of giving assistance.

In Itta Bena, an armed white deputy sheriff, apparently there to maintain order, sat between the two tables being used for the election, allegedly harrasing black persons. As a result, some left without voting. The election officials made no effort to moderate his conduct. Also in that city, a white election official allegedly demanded that four black women give her their marked ballots, rather than place them in the box. The women now fear that their ballots were never counted.

In Vicksburg, one of the polling places for a largely-black area was reportedly changed without publicity. When black persons showed up at their regular polling place to vote, the election officials stated that there had been a change, but refused to aid the voters in finding their proper voting place. As a consequence, many of these persons did not vote. In Greenwood, one black voter was not allowed to vote until she had "hounded" the election officials for several minutes, although her name was on the voting lists.

In Clarksdale, four black persons attempted to vote, but were turned away because their names were already marked as having voted. One of the student volunteers felt that some of these instances were explained by there being more than one person with the same name registered but the name appeared on the lists only once. At first, the election officials refused to permit the casting of a challenged ballot; later, they relented. A white voter in this situation was allegedly allowed to vote by machine upon his oral statement that he had not already voted. The officials ignored the challenge of the student volunteers. After that, a black voter in the same situation was also permitted to vote by machine.

A slightly different variation occurred in Vicksburg. A number of voters of a predominantly black ward, and presumably also some in predominately white wards, were unable to find their names on any books; their names had apparently been dropped for some reason. When a poll watcher at this

ward requested that these persons be permitted to cast challenged ballots he reportedly was told that this was not the custom in Vicksburg, apparently because the city used machines. It was not till 1:30 p.m., six and a half hours after the polls had opened, that paper ballots were furnished for those persons whose right to vote had been challenged, notwithstanding sec. 3170 of the Mississippi Code which clearly establishes the procedure for the challenging of ballots.

In Lexington, local officials of the municipal Democratic Executive Committee allegedly purged the names of 83 black persons and 67 white persons from the poll books shortly before the election. An overwhelming majority of black voters in Holmes County had registered by being listed by the Federal Examiner. Although the local officials refused to give a list of those purged to representatives of the black candidates, it is likely that most of the blacks purged from the poll books had been listed by the Federal Examiner. Sections 7 and 9 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 establish an exclusive procedure, including provision for a prompt hearing, by which allegedly unqualified voters listed by a Federal Examiner may be removed from a list. Even if intended in good faith, the alleged purge of the names of black voters from the poll books violated the procedural safeguards provided by the Voting Rights Act.

To challenge unqualified voters effectively, a candidate normally needs to be able to inspect the poll books some time in advance of the election, searching for names of persons still on them who are not currently qualified to vote. Sec. 3211 of the Mississippi Code requires that the "registrar shall keep his books open at his office," and sec. 3374-61 renders this provision applicable to municipal clerks. In one town in Holmes County, a black representative of the local black candidates stated that he had on three occasions attempted to see the voter registration books maintained by the city clerk in the clerk's office at a local bank. On each of these occasions, access to the books was allegedly denied, on the ground that business was too pressing. When white volunteers came to look at the books the day before the election, however, the clerk produced them at once.

In Edwards, Mississippi the chairman and a few of the other members of the Municipal Democratic Executive Committee met without informing the black members of the committee. At this meeting they appointed a number of Negroes closely aligned with the white power structure in the city to serve as election officials and to aid illiterate persons in voting.

The Commission staff was unable to document an earlier report from Vicksburg that election officials had told hundreds of black voters that it was unnecessary to vote for two candidates, that they could cast a single ballot for the black candidates. This would have been contrary to the full slate requirement, and such ballots would not be counted.

THE ROLE OF FEDERAL OBSERVERS

Notwithstanding the general agreement among the black candidates interviewed, that the May 13 primary would have been far more unfair if the Federal Observers and volunteer student and lawyer poll watchers had not been present, there were serious problems arising from the manner in which some of the Federal Observers conducted themselves and from the policies under which they operated.

In Clarksdale, for instance, the Federal Observers frequently did not observe the assistance being given to illiterate black voters. In Goodman, they stationed themselves in a location from which it was impossible to see several of the voting booths, and consequently did not know when black voters

in that part of the polling place needed assistance or when it was being given to them. Seats from which they could have observed all of the events in the polling place were available. In Woodville, the volunteer poll watchers on several occasions suggested to black voters needing assistance that Federal Observers were present, and asked if the voters wanted an observer present while they received assistance in casting their vote. At least one observer, when told by a poll watcher that a voter desired him to observe, stated "If the voter wants me, tell him to come over and get me."

In that town, a volunteer poll watcher—an out-of-state attorney—charged that the Federal Observers did not bother writing up a report of an incident in which a black woman was handed a ballot, walked over toward the booth, but appeared uncertain about what she should do. As she approached the table an election official reportedly took the unmarked ballot out of her hand and placed it in the box. Despite vocal protests by poll watchers about this matter, the observers apparently felt the issue was too frivolous to report. During the counting of the ballots, a Commission staff attorney noticed that the Federal Observers, at first, were making a brief notation as to the reason each time there was a ballot on which votes were not counted. Later in the evening, however, he noticed that they appeared to have lost their interest, and failed to do this on several occasions.

Black candidates and poll watchers at the Woodville election were extremely critical of the role of the Federal Observers. One student from Michigan State University, a poll watcher for one of the black candidates, charged that the Federal Observers challenged their right to observe the election. After the poll watchers showed them the Mississippi statute which did not prohibit out-of-state people from acting as poll watchers, the Federal Observers challenged their right to stand near the table where the ballots and ballot box were kept. In both instances the local election officials upheld the right of the poll watchers.

The Commission in its 1968 *Political Participation* report criticized the Department of Justice policy of "keeping the Federal presence as inconspicuous as possible" when observers were sent into polling places. It recommended that the Attorney General "should announce publicly in advance of the election that Federal Observers will be present and should assure that the observers are identified as Federal officials."

This recommendation has never been implemented, and the Department kept secret, until the last minute, the cities and polling places in which Federal Observers would be present for the May 13 election. The reasons stated by the Commission for its stand in 1968, however, remain true today:

"The subdivisions where the assignment of observers is warranted are those in which there is a likelihood of discrimination at the polls. It is important for Negro voters in these subdivisions to know that observers will be present to deter local election officials from subjecting Negroes who attempt to vote to discrimination and the harassment, indignity, and humiliation which accompany it."

The Commission's recommendation that the observers be identified as Federal officials has, similarly, not been implemented. Across the State during the May 13 election, Federal Observers failed to identify themselves by word or by any kind of sign or official insignia. In its 1968 report, the Commission stated that "identification of the observers [would] serve to confirm to Negro voters that they will be afforded comparable treatment with other citizens at the polls." Without identification of the observers and advance notice of their presence, black voters feel no

such assurance. In one community visited by a Commission staff attorney, a black candidate did not know, two days after the election, whether a Federal Observer had been present. In Itta Bena, poll watchers for the black candidates knew that Federal Observers were present, but did not know which of the white persons standing about they were.

In its 1968 report, the Commission recommended that the Attorney General should "instruct Federal Observers that they have a duty to point out to local election officials irregularities affecting Negro voters. . . ." One of the reasons for this recommendation was that under the Department of Justice policy that observers should take "only such steps as may be necessary to fulfill the observational function", and that the irregularities they observe should be reported first to the captain of the observer team, and then to a Department of Justice attorney, who will take it up with election officials, [m]uch or all of the election day may elapse . . . before the matter is settled."

In the May 13 primary, the Federal Observers acted only as passive recorders of events, refusing at all times to speak to the election officials about even the most blatant discrimination against black voters. A Commission staff attorney in Woodville was informed by a lawyer from the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice that it was Department policy that the Federal Observers were to speak with no one.

This meant that no Federal agent monitoring the election would speak to local officials about even the most obvious irregularities until the Justice Department attorney assigned to that county or pair of counties returned to the particular polling place. In Itta Bena, this process allegedly took three hours from the first time an irregularity was brought to the attention of the Federal Observers by local poll watchers—at which time the observers admitted that the black voter turned away was fully qualified to vote—to the time when the Justice Department attorney arrived. In that time, a total of 26 voters in that situation had been turned away. Local candidates and their poll watchers were given no information telling them how to get in touch with Department representatives more quickly.

Neither the observers nor the local election officials informed voters that they could have assistance in voting and that Federal Observers could watch the assistance being given. Only if a voter asked for such assistance or if he was unable to write his name was he told that such assistance was available. Since many illiterates are able to write their names but not able to read and understand the ballot, this limited provision of information left many black voters, needing assistance, ignorant of the possibility that assistance could be given and that Federal Observers could watch it as it was being given.

Although the stated policy was that the observers should talk with no one, a Commission staff attorney saw the observers in Woodville engage in animated conversation with the white election officials on numerous occasions. They did not seem to speak with poll watchers, black candidates or any local black people, however. Two observers there also refused to speak to the Commission staff attorney when he asked one for the number of persons who had voted and the other—the one who had allegedly challenged the right of the poll watchers for the black candidates to be there—for his name.

Some of the local black persons understandably felt that the observers were in sympathy with the white community. At one point in the afternoon, several poll watchers and at least one black candidate asked the

Commission staff attorney if he could not get the Federal Observers out of the balloting place. On reflection later, however, these same persons agreed that there would have been widescale fraud but for the mere fact of the observers' presence.

SUMMARY

The election of some black persons to municipal office in Mississippi is evidence that some changes have occurred in Mississippi since the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Even with these victories, however, virtually all cities and towns in Mississippi will still be governed by all-white local governments.

Interviews with observations by staff attorneys suggest that this is in part due to the following:

1. Many black persons in Mississippi still fear economic or other reprisals if they register to vote or openly support black candidates.

2. Officials in some cases have made registration difficult for black persons by narrowly limiting hours for registration, by failing adequately to inform applicants of procedures required to vote in municipal elections, and in some cases by actually misinforming them as to these requirements.

3. Black persons continue to be excluded from serving as election officials in most areas of the State surveyed.

4. Officials sometimes failed to assist or misinformed black candidates seeking to obtain places on the ballot, and some were unable to run in the primary as a result.

5. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 establishes procedures to be followed before local officials change election requirements or procedures or remove from the poll books persons listed by the Federal Examiners. In many instances throughout Mississippi, local officials took such actions without observing the Act or any of the procedural safeguards provided by the election laws of the State of Mississippi.

6. The Federal Government neglected to take adequate steps to inform citizens of the presence of Federal Examiners and thus examiners listed relatively few voters in recent months.

7. Some Federal Examiners failed to transmit the names of persons listed by them to city voting officials, and as a result many black voters throughout the State had their ballots challenged or were turned away from the polls.

8. Although most black candidates believed that the mere presence of Federal Observers improved the honesty of election procedures, a number of election irregularities occurred even where Federal Observers were present.

9. The effectiveness of Federal Observers was limited by their failure to make their presence known to voters and by their failure to intervene at once when irregularities were observed.

U.S. GOVERNMENT MEMORANDUM, APRIL 3, 1969

To: Files.
From: David H. Hunter.
Subject: Mississippi voter registration.

Federal Examiners were in Mississippi to list persons to vote on four Saturdays in March. This was the only listing in Mississippi by Federal Examiners in 1969 prior to the holding of the municipal elections. A hyphen is used to indicate that no Federal Examiner was in the county on that date. The results are as follows:

County	Mar. 8	Mar. 15	Mar. 22	Mar. 29	Total
Amite.....	0	0	5	-----	5
Benton.....	0	0	0	-----	0
Carroll.....	0	1	1	-----	2

County	Mar. 8	Mar. 15	Mar. 22	Mar. 29	Total
Clay.....	0	0	0	-----	0
Coahoma.....	0	0	0	-----	0
De Soto.....	0	0	0	-----	0
Forrest.....	0	0	0	-----	0
Franklin.....	0	0	17	10	27
Hinds.....	0	35	43	80	158
Holmes.....	0	0	0	-----	0
Humphreys.....	11	14	1	-----	26
Jasper.....	2	1	-----	-----	3
Jefferson.....	8	0	-----	-----	8
Jefferson.....	0	0	-----	-----	1
Davis.....	2	2	-----	-----	4
Jones.....	22	58	78	108	266
Lefflore.....	0	19	68	68	155
Madison.....	0	3	0	-----	3
Marshall.....	2	1	-----	-----	3
Neshoba.....	0	2	-----	-----	2
Newton.....	0	42	30	-----	72
Noxubee.....	37	15	13	-----	65
Rankin.....	0	0	-----	-----	0
Sharkey.....	9	18	10	-----	37
Simpson.....	2	0	25	25	52
Walthall.....	13	5	22	-----	40
Warren.....	12	8	16	-----	36
Wilkinson.....	16	11	1	-----	28
Winston.....	0	8	5	-----	13
Total.....	24	228	365	389	1,006

MAY 20, 1969.

DEAR FELLOW CITIZEN OF WOODVILLE: Your local Citizens Council is gravely concerned about the political prospects in the Woodville Municipal General Election which will be held on June 3rd, and we feel sure that you, as a public spirited white citizen, are equally concerned.

First, may we emphasize the fact that we have no axes to grind nor political fortunes to favor or oppose as to individuals, but are taking this action purely and simply to endeavor to insure that white officials are elected on June 3rd.

As you doubtless know, the present prospects in the Mayor's race present two white candidates and one negro candidate. In the Alderman race, there are eight white candidates and one negro. In both instances, the negroes are thus virtually assured of election.

We feel that forgetting personal ambitions or desires, some of the white candidates should withdraw so that there will be only one white candidate for each office. It is our understanding that some of the candidates are agreeable to this, provided it can be ascertained which ones the majority of the white voters favor.

In an attempt to determine the wishes of the white voters of Woodville, we are therefore, conducting a "straw vote" election which we feel will be of tremendous assistance in working out a compromise—provided you, the voters, co-operate by taking part.

We are enclosing herewith an unofficial ballot which we ask that you mark in private, seal in the enclosed envelope, and return immediately by mail. You will note from the enclosure that there is no way your ballot can be identified, and your vote will thus be secret. As soon as possible, since the deadline for printing the Official Ballot is very near, we will open these envelopes and tabulate the vote—in the presence of all candidates or their representatives. From the resulting tally, we hope to be able to effect a compromise settlement of this grave issue which faces us all.

Please do not delay. Time is of the essence. Please mark and return the enclosed ballot today.

May we thank you in advance for your cooperation, and again assure you that our only motive in undertaking this project is public service in what we feel is the best interests of the Town of Woodville.

Sincerely,
WILKINSON COUNTY CITIZEN COUNCIL.

STRAW BALLOTS¹

FOR MAYOR, TOWN OF WOODVILLE
(Vote for One)

W. H. Catchings.....()
Marvin N. Lewis.....()

FOR ALDERMAN, TOWN OF WOODVILLE
(Vote for Four)

J. M. (Mac) Best.....()
Thomas M. Bryan.....()
Pat Cavin.....()
Cage Chisholm.....()
H. B. Curry.....()
Anthony David.....()
James (Jabbo) Herrington.....()
Brandon Inman.....()

¹ This is not an Official Ballot, but merely an attempt by the Citizens Council to ascertain the candidates preferred by the majority of the white voters of Woodville. See letter attached.

SUCCESSFUL FIRST SEA TRIALS OF
U.S.S. "SEAHORSE"

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

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

AT SEA, NORTH ATLANTIC,
June 16, 1969.

The Honorable JAMES G. FULTON,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FULTON: We are returning from the first sea trials of the USS *Seahorse* (SSN669), our 43rd attack type nuclear submarine. The ship completed all tests, including full power operation, both surface and submerged. The *Seahorse*, third United States ship and the second United States submarine to bear this name, was built by the Electric Boat Company, Groton, Connecticut.

The first *Seahorse* was a one-gun schooner purchased in 1812 for service on Lake Borgne near New Orleans. In 1815 she contributed to Andrew Jackson's victory in the Battle of New Orleans by repelling attacks of armed British launches and by helping to delay the advance of the British until the arrival of reinforcements to Jackson. She was run ashore and burned to prevent her falling into enemy hands.

The second USS *Seahorse* (SS304) was commissioned 31 March 1943. In World War II, she made eight war patrols and sank 20 Japanese ships for a total of 72,529 tons. She won nine battle stars as well as the Presidential Unit Citation. She was decommissioned 2 March 1946, stricken from the Navy Register in 1967, and sold for scrapping.

The new *Seahorse* is equipped with the latest navigation and electronics systems, and a computer-controlled weapons system which enable her to detect and attack targets at various distances. These characteristics, combined with her ability to operate at high speeds for long periods of time and the environmental independence provided by nuclear propulsion, make her a powerful weapon against surface ships and submarines alike.

In addition to the 43 attack type nuclear submarines, we also have 41 Polaris submarines, making a total of 84 nuclear submarines in operation. When all nuclear submarines presently authorized by Congress are completed, the United States will have an

operating nuclear submarine fleet of 65 attack and 41 Polaris submarines, and a small submarine capable of exploring the ocean bottom.

Respectively,

H. G. RICKOVER.

JUDICIAL ETHICS BUT NOT UNDER
EARL WARREN

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Washington Star carries a significant story relating to the ethics or indifference thereto of the present members of the Supreme Court—interestingly enough the story does not seem to be intended for the wire services and the rest of the country.

For 15 years the trusting American people have been thoroughly brainwashed with the false idea that the Supreme Court is next to God in infallibility, and sometimes, as in the school prayer decision, a little bit superior to the Diety. For 15 years the American people have had the totally perverted doctrine drilled into them that decisions of the Supreme Court are "the law of the land." For 15 years the Warren Court has been promoted as the finest thing since 1776.

But now, Mr. Speaker, the slips are showing. Justice Fortas, who almost became Warren's worthy successor, resigned in disgrace. Other Justices are shown to be business partners—some-time with judges of the lower courts whose decisions they review. Justice Douglas demeans the Court daily with his erratic and irresponsible conduct.

Given the opportunity to adopt its own rules of ethical conduct, a majority of the Court refused to do so. Like many of the other very strange decisions made behind the closed doors of these Justices, the real reason for their failure will probably never be known. Ostensibly, the majority felt that with an incoming Chief Justice, the views of the outgoing Earl Warren and the incoming Warren Earl Burger might not be the same on the question of judicial ethics. They were diametrically opposed on the question presented in POWELL against McCORMACK, as you know.

Considering the ethics of the justices of the Warren Court, we can hope that they will improve under the new Chief Justice—the question may not be too hot for him to handle.

A clipping from the Evening Star for June 18 follows:

HIGH COURT DEFERS ETHICS CODE ISSUE

Supreme Court justices will take no formal action to give up outside income until at least the fall, Chief Justice Earl Warren has disclosed.

Warren issued a brief statement yesterday saying the justices had talked over the issue of off-the-bench activities Friday.

Indicating the court was split on the question, he said "a majority of the justices agreed" to put off the issue until the next court term, beginning in October.

WON'T FILE REPORTS

What this means in practice is that, for now, the justices will not formally bind themselves to give up all income for outside services or to file any reports on their finances—obligations which lower federal judges were put under by the U.S. Judicial Conference a week ago.

However, each justice remains free to act personally on the question. Justice Thurgood Marshall, the newest member of the court, has done just that. His office announced yesterday that Marshall would "abide by" what the Judicial Conference demanded of lower court judges.

Repeating the idea that he, as a justice, is "not bound by" the conference's action, Marshall said he had decided to go along—with one exception. His annual financial statement, he said, will be filed with his fellow justices, not with the administrative office of U.S. courts.

The administrative office is the house-keeping agency for the federal judiciary. It will keep on file the financial statements which lower court judges will begin filing May 15.

SIMILAR ACTION URGED

Warren's brief statement yesterday made clear that he wanted the high court members to follow the example of the Judicial Conference, the policymaking body for the federal judiciary. He said he had "suggested the propriety of the justices taking similar action."

This apparently carried out a promise Warren had made to the members of the Judicial Conference last week. He apparently helped promote conference action by leaving the impression he would work for similar self-denials by the justices.

It seemed clear that Warren had wanted his colleagues to act before his retirement. However, he will leave office Monday without the court having taken a stand, as a body, on nonjudicial activities and compensation.

Warren said "some of the justices" had urged Friday that, since the end of the current term was nearing and since there will be two new members of the court in the fall, "no action in the matter should be taken before that time."

The chief justice will be succeeded Monday by Federal Judge Warren E. Burger. The other new justice on the court next fall will be the person President Nixon selects to replace Abe Fortas, who resigned amid a controversy over his off-the-bench conduct.

The statement by Warren did not say how the justices had voted on the postponement issue and why some justices did not agree. A court spokesman said there would be no comment beyond Warren's statement.

While Marshall is the only justice to declare his willingness to abide by the express restrictions on outside income and financial reporting, Justice William J. Brennan Jr. has voluntarily given up all his outside activities, his office reported last week. He did so as a "personal decision," it was reported.

It is generally assumed that any attempt to impose restrictions on the justices would be resisted by at least two court members, Hugo L. Black and William O. Douglas.

Black has said he opposes any court "rule" on the matter, and he and Douglas said in a joint opinion three years ago that federal judges are accountable only to the Senate in impeachment proceedings.

Douglas' outside activities have been the subject of continuing congressional criticism. In response to part of that criticism, Douglas recently resigned his \$12,000-a-year post as president of the Albert Parvin Foundation. He remains as board chairman of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, which pays him at the rate of \$500 a day while on center business.

SUPREME COURT DECISION

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, serious questions of the relationship of the three "separate" branches of our Federal Government are raised by the Supreme Court decision in the ADAM CLAYTON POWELL case. This holds promise of becoming another one of the Warren Courts' "infamous" decisions.

One of the cornerstones upon which our democracy was built was the principle of "separation of powers" of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of Government. This principle is thrown to the winds in the decision by the Court.

From the beginning of our Nation, it has been a settled proposition that each House of Congress should be its own judge of the qualifications of its Members. Historically, this has not been limited to the named constitutional prerequisites or qualifications such as age, residence, and citizenship.

I must say that I am shocked by this interpretation, severely limiting the power of Congress, though certainly not surprised at it.

I am not even surprised at the language used by Justice Douglas in his separate concurring opinion when he refers to the case as one with "racist overtones." Could it be that this jurist would dismiss the fact that the final vote in the House on March 1, 1967, excluded Representative POWELL by 307 to 116? This liberal Court is dedicated to working its will upon society in our Nation through judicial interpretation, but I do not believe the Congress will sit idly by at this further invasion into the legislative field. In fact, if I read the mood of the other Members correctly, this could very well give the necessary impetus to various restrictions on the Federal judicial system.

For example, there is legislation now pending which would require reconfirmation of Federal judges at periodic intervals such as every 6 years. I favor this proposal and also one which would make retirement mandatory at age 70.

I have joined with a distinguished Member of the House, Congressman JAMIE WHITTEN, of Mississippi, in an effort to establish a permanent standing committee on the Constitution in the House of Representatives.

Nowhere in the Constitution, nor elsewhere, is the Supreme Court given the sole right to interpret the Constitution; but for years now its members have assumed that right, and so far have gotten away with it. Many of our problems have arisen because both the executive and a majority of the legislative body have stood by and let the Court assume the role of sole interpreter of the Constitution and thereby, in effect, rewrite it. Now a majority of the people seem to believe the Court has and is entitled to exercise such power. As Members of Congress, we all swear to uphold the Constitution; not as interpreted by Chief

Justice Warren, Justice Douglas, or other Supreme Court Justices, but as it is written.

If we will consider the matter for a moment, we can easily see that if the three equal and coordinate branches of Government—legislative, executive, and judicial—the order in which they are listed in the Constitution—are to, in fact, be equal and coordinate, the Judiciary must not be permitted to continue to convince the public that it is the sole interpreter of the Constitution. All three branches are created by the Constitution, but if one is to determine the rights and powers of the other two as provided in the document—Constitution—creating them, and if the other two—in this case, the legislative and executive branches—accept such action as binding, it can only result in subservience to the Supreme Court and other Federal courts.

**CONGRESSMAN GILBERT PROTESTS
CLOSING BROOKLYN NAVAL APPLIED SCIENCE LAB**

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I and other members of the New York delegation met to hear a Navy representative explain the reasons for the reduction in operations at the Naval Applied Laboratory in Brooklyn.

We listened very carefully, Mr. Speaker, and I must say in all candor that he did not make a very convincing case that the change was in the national interest. I continue to object to this decision and regard it as not only purposeless but wasteful. I would hope that the Navy will still show the wisdom to reverse this course.

The Naval Applied Science Lab was modernized just 2 years ago at the cost of a quarter million dollars. The Navy does not claim that it has superior facilities anywhere. At Brooklyn, the Navy has had opportunity to call on academic specialists from the country's best universities, a practice the Navy admits it will not be able to duplicate elsewhere. The move may cost the Navy as much as \$30 million in abandoned facilities. The Navy has been, in fact, most vague about any advantages that would accrue to it by shifting the work done at this laboratory to some other location.

Most important, Mr. Speaker, the move will disrupt the lives of many New Yorkers. Some 350 will lose their jobs. Another 350 will be forced to relocate to cities that are not only unfamiliar to them, but which fail to provide equivalent service in schools, housing, and other vital needs. The personnel at the laboratory object strenuously to the transfers and I am sure that the Navy, by its decision, will lose valuable trained men.

I would also like to point out that a substantial contingent of minority group breadwinners have worked at the lab-

oratory, as professional and skilled members of the staff. They cannot hope to receive equivalent working and living conditions elsewhere. For them, this decision is both unjustified and cruel.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the Navy should be allowed to make irresponsible decisions of this sort and I favor mobilizing the influence of this body to halt the move.

THE DUQUESNE TAMBURITZANS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, during my pre-law studies at Duquesne University, I was fortunate to witness the forming of a young group of performing students known as the Duquesne University Tamburitzans which specialize in a wide variety of folk dancing and singing. Since that time their fame has spread far and wide and in recent years they have achieved international acclaim.

I have just received from the Department of State a message from the American Embassy in Warsaw, Poland, and the American Embassy in Bucharest, Romania, proclaiming the success of their tour which is sponsored by the Department of State's cultural presentations program.

Through the years the Duquesne Tamburitzans have traveled abroad and have been most successful as good will ambassadors and have been instrumental in cementing relations with foreign countries. Judging from the recent reports they have done it again.

I submit for the RECORD and invite the attention of my colleagues to the message received from the American embassies from abroad:

In a whirlwind visit of only one and one half days the Duquesne University Tamburitzans intrigued and charmed their Warsaw audience with a wide variety of American folk dancing and singing. Their performance on Monday night at the sold out Dramatyczny Theater was a complete success. The songs and especially the colorful dances they performed, such as the Western Hoe Down, their wonderfully Kicky Charleston, as well as their striking cheerleaders' number all brought about prolonged applause. The tap dance duo, the Broadway medley, the authentic Indian dances and the square dance were all first rate and received with long applause. But the "rock" finale brought down the house with rhythmic clapping for encores.

The costuming, the skill and vivacity of the youthful performers and the realization that this was an amateur group prompted favorable comment from many with one of Warsaw's major theater directors saying that this "was a fresh show, full of talent."

As well as performing in Warsaw the Tamburitzans visited the famous Mazowsze dancers at their training area located 25 kilometers from Warsaw. The Mazowsze put on almost a complete performance for them and the two groups had an opportunity to sing some songs together. There was lunch provided for them and as the bus pulled out of the drive the Mazowsze troupe sang a departing serenade.

The group left for an extended tour of the Soviet Union early Tuesday morning.

AMERICAN EMBASSY BUCHAREST

After a near-catastrophic beginning when the opening show had to be cancelled because their equipment failed to arrive on time, Duquesne University's Tamburitzaans took the Bucharest public by storm Friday.

The young performers from Pittsburgh put on two shows yesterday in the Sala Palatului, Bucharest's largest and most prestigious hall, with barely 20 minutes between shows to mop their brows and recover their breaths. The late afternoon show was scheduled for the more than 3,000 tickets holders who had to leave in disappointment when Thursday's opening performance was cancelled. The regular evening show yesterday also was seen—and applauded stormily—by more than 3,000 persons, with people by the scores standing in the aisles for more than two hours.

The opening sequence of Texas dances, with their sprightly music, colorful costumes and fast-moving choreography captured the audience from the very beginning and it was evident that the Duquesne students maintained rapport with it from then on. By the large, the fast numbers attracted the greatest applause. It also was apparent that the Bucharest public was more familiar with—and appreciative of—some of the more recent aspects of American popular culture than its folkloric roots. Thus, the Charleston, the selections from Broadway shows, the tap dancing by Barbara Harris and Mary Woolsey and especially the mod of the sixties won the greatest recognition. But what really brought the house down was the virtuoso violin performance of Romanian folk tunes by David Kolar, played as an encore. The audience broke into delighted applause on recognizing the tune after the first few bars and continued to chuckle and exclaim throughout the long complicated passages. The public also appeared particularly impressed by the beauty, richness and variety of the costumes. As lavishly-garbed numbers followed each other, there were repeated exclamations of "beautiful!" There the trim red-white-and-blue costumes of the Duquesne cheerleaders seemed to find particular favor.

On Saturday morning the group taped a television show and Saturday evening the Tammies are to be guests of the University of Bucharest's student culture house. They will give part of their show, and their hosts will reciprocate. With a performance by the Romanian doina folkloric ensemble. On Sunday the group leaves for performances in Poland and the Soviet Union.

MR. AND MRS. RIDDER PLEDGE TO LONG BEACH HOSPITAL

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a man who has long been a friend of mine and who has once again demonstrated his strong sense of public responsibility. As publisher of the Long Beach Independent-Press Telegram, Mr. Herman Ridder has for years worked to keep the citizens of Long Beach well informed. Recently, he and Mrs. Ridder have benefited their community in another way. They have pledged to establish a half million dollar trust for the expansion program of St. Mary's Hospital. Mr. Ridder said of his gift:

It has long been the desire of Mrs. Ridder and myself to provide the people of Long Beach with the finest hospital facilities possible.

To achieve this goal the Ridders are contributing to the construction of a 10-story structure which will house some 230 patients.

Mr. and Mrs. Ridder can well be proud of the service they have done for Long Beach; and Long Beach is fortunate to have citizens like them.

THE NATIONAL PASTIME

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, as a person who has followed baseball with some affection since 1945, I can regretfully understand why a good many Americans, particularly the young, are becoming disenchanted with an operation that was once affectionately known as "the national pastime." I refer to baseball as "an operation" because it is becoming increasingly evident that the powers that be in baseball are rapidly turning a popular sport into a business operation based solely on the ability to turn a profit.

That baseball is no longer America's national pastime is indicated by a recent Louis Harris survey which shows that only 28 percent of the American public now considers baseball its favorite sport—a decline of 28 percent in the space of just 1 year.

Perhaps even more significant is Mr. Harris' statement that "baseball is weak in the under-30 age group."

What has caused this startling drop in baseball's popularity? Of course, it is true that other sports have been attracting more and more fans. And, in recent years, Americans have been using their additional leisure time to become active participants in such sports as golf and bowling. But, it is apparent that much of the public disaffection for baseball can be traced directly to the insensitivity of baseball's hierarchy to the public interest.

The moguls, as they are often called on the sports pages, have completely disenchanted millions of fans in Wisconsin and throughout the country by bouncing franchises around the country like ping pong balls. During the past year, the period during which baseball suddenly plummeted in fan appeal, the men who run the operation took another step backward. I refer to the cynical firing of American League umpires Al Salerno and Bill Valentine. These men in blue were given the pink slip, allegedly because they were incompetent. But there is overwhelming suspicion that Salerno and Valentine were sacked because they tried to organize their colleagues into a collective bargaining unit—a right which belongs to any and every American.

A number of inconsistencies substantiate the conclusion that the umpires were released by American League President Joe Cronin because their labor organizing activities violated the decadent business ethic of the baseball establishment. The firings came just 3 days after Valentine and Salerno launched a

drive to set up an American League Umpires Association patterned after an organization established by National League umpires back in 1963. Cronin called the umpires incompetent; yet he allowed Salerno to perform on the field for 7 years and Valentine for 6. Cronin lent further incredulity to his charge of incompetence by offering Salerno a post as a scout for minor league umpires.

It would seem clear that Cronin made his decision to release the umpires purely on business grounds—albeit grounds which the majority of responsible businessmen would abhor. If the men who run baseball are going to run it solely as a business operation they should be treated as are other businessmen and subjected to the laws which affect other businesses. This includes antitrust laws.

I am joining with 16 other Congressmen and Senators in attempting to achieve justice for Mr. Salerno and Mr. Valentine, by supporting their case before the National Labor Relations Board. I also support Representative CLEMENT ZABLOCKI in his call for congressional review of the present antitrust exemption currently enjoyed by the baseball businessmen. If the baseball establishment remains unwilling to recognize its public responsibilities, Congress must be willing to recognize its own.

STOP FEDERAL WASTE

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, the great challenge for Congress today is to stop inflation. The most effective action will come through a balanced budget.

The Dallas Morning News prepared an interesting editorial which makes an excellent suggestion. Today the average businessman is paying about 10 percent for commercial bank loans. Yet the Federal Government is loaning the rural electric people money at 2 percent.

It would seem more logical if rural electric companies would go out into the open market to finance their own paper with the loan being guaranteed by the Federal Government.

Here is this interesting editorial written in the Dallas Morning News on June 17, 1969:

Lending money at 2 percent interest, although that money had to be borrowed at more than 6 percent, doesn't make sense. But that's what the federal government is doing.

The U.S. Treasury now is paying an interest rate of a little over 6 percent on money it borrows. But that same money is being loaned to rural electric cooperatives in 35-year loans at an interest rate of only 2 percent yearly.

Congress started this practice back in the 1930s, when agriculture was badly depressed and greatly in need of electrical utilities. At that time, the 2 percent charged electric cooperatives was about in line with what the U.S. government was paying for borrowed money.

Now the rural picture has greatly changed. More than 98 percent of all farms have

electric service. Rural Electrification Administration borrowers have accumulated a net worth of about \$1.4 billion, 26.8 percent of their total assets. Much of the REA electrical power is being sold to nonresidential consumers.

Yet, Congress is being asked to authorize \$345 million in REA electric loans at 2 percent interest for the fiscal year which begins next July 1.

Taxpayers should insist that this subsidy be ended. Many of those whose taxes underwrite these loans have invested in investor-financed electric utilities with which coops complete; these individuals are being hurt two ways.

There is no excuse today for continuation of loans at interest rates established in the 1930s. Here is an opportunity for the federal government to save money and make rural electric cooperatives end unjustified dependence upon the U.S. Treasury.

CONGRESSMAN DON EDWARDS REMARKS ON LUMBER PRICES

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the housing crisis continues unabated throughout the United States, but with particular urgency in my congressional district in California.

One of the major problems is that of ever-increasing lumber prices. The steady increase in the price of lumber has increased the price of homebuilding to the builder and buyer by thousands of dollars. In fact low- and middle-income buyers are being priced out of the market.

David Young, president of the Building Industry Association of California, has outlined some of the problems of lumber prices in an article in the May 1969, issue of the Builders Journal. I include his excellent article in the RECORD:

MY TRIP TO JAPAN TO STUDY THE LUMBER SITUATION

(By David Young)

I made a trip during the past two weeks and used the lumber situation as an excuse. I had no time, really, to prepare a formal talk even though I prepared 14 pages of notes, so if you will bear with me I will skip over these notes as quickly as I can and just hit the highlights.

Our party consisted of seven large mill owners from Washington, Oregon and Northern California. None of their mills produce less than 50 to 70 million feet of lumber a year. The assistant Executive Director of the Western Forest Industry Association, Wayne Gaskins and Dr. Tom Hamilton, a research analyst for the Forest Division, were along as well as several wives.

During the two weeks we were gone we had one day that we didn't have a full schedule—and I mean a full schedule from 8:00 A.M. until 9:00 or 10:00 P.M.—and that was this past Sunday.

We first went to Maui for three days where the lumbermen had their normal convention. At this meeting, Joe McCracken, Executive Vice President, gave a report on the World Conference on timber held in Belgium. He said the entire lumber situation might be expressed in one word, "tight." There is just not enough lumber for the world. 90% of lumber, is raised in three countries, 50% in Russia, and between the United States and Canada there is 40%. The most disturbing factor in the balance of the lumber situation is the rise of Japan's demands. And this

demand is not going to change much. Until this year, European demands had slightly decreased each year; however, last year they took a tremendous jump. The largest producer in Europe is Sweden which is going to double its supply this year but it will not come near to meeting the demand. European price has risen 5% in the last 18 months for the first time in four or five years. Their demands will increase this year approximately 2 billion board feet, or more.

ALLOWABLE CUT

The allowable cut in the United States is about 11½ billion board feet on public lands. This does not take into consideration the private lands. The largest holder of which is Weyerhaeuser. Crown Zellerbach and many others have varying amounts of timber land which they own and there is no governmental control on who they sell to or how much they cut or how they are managed. This is not the case in Japan, where all timber lands are rigidly controlled. On our public lands we will cut 11½ billion feet this year. In Idaho, Oregon, Washington and the Western timber areas, we will cut 8½ billion feet not counting Alaska. You can see where the big majority of our lumber comes from.

It is planned in the next 5 years to increase the allowable cut approximately one billion board feet per year. This is under the sustained yield law which means that we have a 100 year cycle which we will hold to unless it is changed. This has been the case for many years but we are working to change that now. It is felt by U.S. Forestry that it takes 100 years to grow a tree suitable for harvest—the independent operators, such as Weyerhaeuser and Crown-Zellerbach (they are the two largest) work on a 60 year cycle. They have found improved methods of growing a tree, fertilizing, etc., and we are hoping to get the Forestry Division, who is becoming more and more amendable to the idea, to cut back maybe not the 60 year cycle but an 80 year cycle. If this were to be done we could increase the allowable cut by double in the next four or five years in order to catch up. Most forestry experts feel that it would not be out of line. Of course, at the present time in the West, we are cutting more than is growing, but we do have a tremendous amount of virgin forest that has never been touched. This virgin forest has not increased in size, it is not improving in any way so it might as well be cut and new trees put in their place.

BOSTON SURVEY

We had a report from the Boston Research, whom the government had employed to study a way in which logs should be sold to Japan. As you might know, our government has worked very hard to sell anything to Japan that it can because of the unfavorable balance of trade. We were impressed with this fact when we were taken to the Embassy and briefed on the situation in Japan as it now exists. Last year we had a trade deficit of approximately 700 million dollars. This year the trade deficit is one billion dollars. You must understand that when we talk to the government about embargoes, etc., there are many other things that enter into it. Throughout the entire world we are working on a deficit trade balance, and Japan is one of the greatest and this is one of the big problems in any log control program. The Boston survey revealed some strong statistics. Japan each year since the war has increased its gross national product. The least year it had since the war was 12%—the last three years it has been 20% per year compounded. It is felt that with 12 to 20 years their gross national product per capita will equal ours.

JAPANESE HOUSING

In traveling around Japan it is hard to believe some of the living conditions you see. 20% of the families in Japan live in one room. Average is 3.6 people. 50% of the homes

in Japan have no inside plumbing. The new homes that are being built in Japan vary in size, from 360 ft. to a large home of 640 ft. Most of these people would give anything to have a 500 square foot house. You must understand their method of financing is entirely different from ours. They have no FHA program, no VA program. To buy a \$20,000 house, 600 ft., a working man must come up with a third of that in cash. He has no government program to furnish him this cash money, and no bank will take the majority of the loan. As a rule he works it out between three or four banks. It was a revelation to me, I thought they would have a program similar to our FHA/VA.

Overall industry in Japan has grown 60% in the last three years. A plywood mill we visited well demonstrated how this has been done. The owner of that mill was a man who had a small business but he had shown his ability to operate that business well. He now runs a 5 million dollar plywood mill and he is known as the owner and the president. He owns the majority other than the government and three banks. Yet his total investment in that 5 million dollar mill is 60 thousand dollars. The three banks and the government backed him to that extent as lenders. This is one reason the industry has improved 60% in three years.

The individual in Japan is now saving approximately 18% of his income even though their wages are not comparable to ours. The average daily worker on a construction project or in a mill, or plywood plant, earns between 7 and 8 dollars a day. The women earn between 5 and 6 dollars a day and 50% of the workers in the lumber and plywood mills are women.

There has been very little individual housing built. Most of it has all been built by the companies or by a contract outside of Tokyo where 3400 individual housing units are under construction. The lots are 30 by 40 feet and the land cost \$2.00 per square foot. This is a 2½ hour bus ride from Tokyo or one hour and 15 minutes by fast train. These houses contain anywhere from 500 to 700 square feet. The lots are entirely surrounded by a retaining wall of stone. The houses sell from \$11,000 the cheapest houses we saw, to \$30,000. Price depends on the lot location because people who have to walk a mile to the train pay much less for the same house as the people who are near the train. Most of these people, work in Tokyo so it means at least a hour and 15 minute ride.

Last year in Japan they had 1,500,000 housing starts. As you know, that is the same number of starts we had. This year they expect to get 1,800,000. You know how much lumber they used last year in the way of logs and see what they are planning to do this year. They will get their 1,800,000.

I spent one day with a prefabricator—the largest prefabricator in Tokyo—owned by the Fugli banks group. They work in large combines and everyone seems to be owned by somebody else, as we are getting to in this country. This company will build 50,000 units in the next two years. Other large groups are going into housing, and are doing their research at this time. They feel that they must go to prefabrication, and much research is being done to find something to take the place of lumber. They feel that housing is going to be quite lucrative in the future as a manufactured item.

LOG SITUATION

Even though they are looking for a substitute for lumber it is felt that for the next five years their lumber demands will increase. I am sure you saw in the paper where Japan will take take 15% less logs next year than they took this past year. This is a partial result of a meeting with the foremost lumber men in the business. The Chairman of the Board Akira Gunji of Mitsui Lumber, is Mr. Lumber as far as Japan is concerned.

He said that next year they are going to use 15% less. He also said that within the next two weeks they would release 150 million feet they have in logs in Washington and Oregon. He said the only reason they haven't released them yet they are trying to work out some way so that they won't get adverse publicity. They bought these logs at about \$110.00 per thousand and if they put them out for bid now they will bring \$170.00 per thousand. You can understand his problem. He said, they won't make money out of them because they have already contracted for ships to haul these logs to Japan. At the present time there are approximately 26 ships running between Washington, Oregon, Northern California and Japan.

One of the men in our group sells logs to Japan—yet his mill produces about 215 million feet of framing lumber which is sent to Southern California each year. Three days before he made this trip he bought 70 million feet from the State of Washington. These areas within the State are not controlled by our national allowable cut. When he got to Japan they knew he had bought this 70 million feet and he was approached many times on our trip. They tried to get him to sign any kind of a contract where he would sell these 70 million he had bought. He refused on all points and the last offer he had before we left Osaka, was to go back and buy all he could and they would take any quantity at a guaranteed 15% net profit and sign a contract in that form no matter what was paid for the logs. Also he felt that they would go at least \$50.00 more than they had ever gone before for logs. That could mean that in turn we would pay \$50.00 more for lumber than we had ever paid before.

You know and I know that lumber has dropped approximately \$8.00 a thousand but it is not going to drop much further. If you have lumber to buy you had better buy it now. In Osaka they have made land of about 390 acres, on the harbor and all mills are being moved to this location. Mills are being built as fast as they can build them with the most modern equipment they can find. Our mill owners from the north said that the new mills there are just as modern as ours and the Japanese get from 20 to 30% more lumber from a log than we do. They take the time to get the lumber from logs and we should do this also.

CONSTRUCTION METHODS

Concerning their construction in the field—joists are 1-1/2" by 1-1/2" with 1/2" sheeting. Their span is 4 feet. The floor gives as you walk across it. Their rafters are 1-1/2" x 2". On these rafters they put beautiful tile roofs. Every Japanese house has a tile roof. Their exposed 4 x 4's must be straight and clear and there are about 3 per house. They demand that the lumber they use for housing have a good appearance where exposed. At least one room in the house should have a cedar ceiling and it is called P.O. cedar—that is Port Orford Cedar, even though it is their natural growth cedar. The Port Orford Cedar comes the closest to being what their natural growth lumber is. I saw one piece at a lumber auction—that was quite interesting. This one piece was 10" by 16" by 14' long. Actually figured by the board foot this went for \$3,000 per M feet. This, of course, was exceptional because they don't get pieces like this very often. This was a piece of Port Orford Cedar. Yet, the man in the yard told us that they told the people that it was natural growth lumber of their own land because that doubles the price.

The lumber bought for the individual house is never over four or five pieces at a time and then at a lumber auction. Every piece of lumber over the size of a 2 x 4 has its individual length, cross-section, grade and how many good sides written on its face. Each package that is bid will have approximately four pieces and a ribbon tied around it and a tag put on. The ribbon describes the contents.

At the lumber auction you are given a cap with a number on it for identification. Each little bundle of lumber has the buyers name put on it. Of course, if you had a tract to build you would buy it in a different manner. Most of the tract builders own their own mills.

They cut the lumber down until they get pieces that are about a centimeter by a centimeter or 1/2 by 1/2 inch. This is used for lath. They plaster most of their houses today with a combination of mud and cement. Not too much structural strength but it is protected by a coat of good plaster on the outside. Many such houses have been there for hundreds of years. Most all of the beams of any size in the house have two sides of bark on them. A slab is removed from each side and the beam itself is the full tree. They shim where necessary under the joist.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

On the return trip I had detailed discussions with my traveling companions. I would say that two-thirds of them want an embargo on lumber. They are in the same boat we are. Buying logs from the national forest, they are having a bad time now. In fact plywood has dropped so much here in the last two weeks that half of the plants have closed. The day before yesterday, one of the fellows called his mill and they had shut down because 1/2" sheeting plywood had dropped to \$88.00. They were losing \$12.00 per thousand.

Along that line, I might say of the mills in Japan, none of them are going to close temporarily because should they do so they are through for good. We could not understand this at first until we found out that when a boy gets out of high school and goes to work for a mill he has almost pledged himself for the rest of his life. He looks to that mill owner as a sort of father who is going to take care of him for life, and, the mill owner takes that responsibility. If he closes, the owner loses face—he will go broke before he will close. That's one reason. The other reason is that they borrow to buy the logs. When they make the lumber they borrow on it to pay for the logs. The bank will loan them the money on the lumber to pay for the logs because they don't want the mill to fail either. Right now—every mill there has a surplus stock of finished lumber, and they don't have too many logs. When they told us before we went that there was a surplus of logs it was not a true fact.

In Osaka, 30% of the lumber being cut is U.S. logs, but they don't have any surplus, they are working on a day to day basis and they have the ships there dropping them as they haul them up to the mill. The logs are dropped in the middle of the harbor and they are then taken over by a rafting company, who rafts these logs, and tows them into the storage ponds. In the new section of the harbor at Osaka they have thousands of acres of storage ponds. These were not built with concrete walls around them as decoration, they are going to put logs in them. Every mill owner there would rather cut U.S. logs than any other logs they can get.

CONCLUSIONS

We came to the following general conclusions after talking to each of the people in the party.

1. We won't run out of lumber this year in the United States. You will remember that before I left I had been told that in 60 to 90 days we would run out of lumber. We won't run out of lumber this year. . . . Most of the mills have logs enough to last until they can get logs out in July and August from the high country. The price will not go lower—this is the concensus of the people I talked with the day before yesterday. It is down now about \$8.00 but it is not going to go lower. And it will not peak out higher than it was last month.

2. Japanese operators will take every log—they are offered and they are in a position to pay up to \$50 more than they have paid. We feel that the release of their 150 million feet of stock in the Northwest at this time, is more or less a smoke screen—to get us off guard. The log consumption in Japan will grow for the next 5 years, although they are working just as hard, if not harder than we are, to find a substitute for lumber.

3. The allowable cut will be increased this year and it will be increased each year for the next five years. It is going to take an appropriation of some size to get into the areas where the allowable cut can be taken out and we feel that this will be done.

4. The final conclusion by all including the mill owners themselves, was there isn't enough lumber in the world to satisfy the needs. At every opportunity you had better find a substitute for lumber and we had better cut back on our waste. We can take lessons from Japan in the way they cut their logs. We went up into the logging operations where they are working cutting these 8" trees. They grow trees there like we grow corn in this country. When they go in at the end of 40 years they clear the site. They then go in and plant seedlings and start all over again. At the end of ten years they go in and thin it out and take everything that is not bigger than it should be at ten years and leave the other trees. We saw piles of logs this big around in the lumber mills and they get a 4 x 4 with a little slab on each side. That is everything they get out except for a little pulpwood. They save every bit. They even put the bark aside for fuel. After they cut the trees and leave the limbs the women move in behind them and take everything over a 1/4" in size and cut it up in bundles of a certain length. You can find them in any food store in Japan for about 40c American money. They cook a week on that bundle of limbs.

I haven't hit everything—I could go on for an hour or two—it was a very pleasant trip—I learned a lot but I don't think I came back with any real feeling of encouragement. I don't think the lumber situation can get any worse than it was three weeks ago. The Japanese feel they can go \$50 more for logs and that means we will pay \$50 more but they are a little afraid to do so, because they are very much afraid of possible legislation—the Morse Amendment did nothing—but it did act as a warning. They are scared now because of this Morse Amendment, because of our being there, and other investigations that have been made so they are going to be very careful about who they buy lumber from. I don't think they are going to push us down too tight. I hope that is a bright spot in the whole thing.

WHAT GOOD GOVERNMENT MEANS TO ME

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to four fine young people from Battle Creek, Mich., who were judged the winners of a communitywide contest held in conjunction with Government Day—Michigan Week ceremonies in that city.

These students, accompanied by Mr. and Mrs. Floyd Oglesby, were rewarded by a 2-day trip to our Nation's Capital last week and I had the privilege of hosting them during part of their stay.

In this day when we have heard and

witnessed so many "child-like" acts by irresponsible individuals endeavoring to destroy our institutions of government and learning, it is gratifying to know that sixth, seventh, and eighth grade students like Rietta Whitman, Colleen O'Brien, Bob Martin, and John Attarian, learn at an early age the real meaning of citizenship. Each of these prize-winning essays entitled "What Good Government Means to Me," contains a thought-provoking and important message, and I would like to share them with my colleagues at this time:

WHAT GOOD GOVERNMENT MEANS TO ME
(By Rietta Whitman, sixth grade, Post Elementary School)

Every American citizen should appreciate and take pride in our government. For although it may not please everyone, you will have to admit it does a pretty good job in these troubled times.

Unlike Communist-ruled countries, it gives us the right to vote as we please and to print what we think in public. Our government is made up of a democracy in which no man is overrun by another and every person is equal.

In such places as Russia, Viet Nam, or Biafra many have little, if anything, to do with their government. For these and other countries are conflicted by war and have little to say about what is to happen to their life.

I can't help thinking many of these things might be prevented if they were to have a stable government such as ours.

Russia is one of many countries in which the people have nothing to say about what their government does. Ours is a government of the people, for we have the power and ability to change something our country might do.

My government means many things to me but most of all it means freedom. The freedom of just living and having no boundaries put upon our lives. Also the security of knowing that as bad as things might get, the government will try its best to have food and work for everyone for generations to come.

Our nation has been the home of immigrants and ones in need for hundreds of years. It has stayed as one while other countries have been upset and split apart by the destruction of war. Even through it all I think it has become stronger, as different countries and races have joined together in the combining of world peace. But even from the beginning, our government has had one of the biggest parts in making our nation what it is today.

WHAT GOOD GOVERNMENT MEANS TO ME
(By Colleen O'Brien, sixth grade, Fremont Elementary School)

Good government means a beautiful world to live in. It means to spend money where it needs to be spent; to clean up slum areas so people have a better place to live; to wipe out poverty; for all men to be created equal; to have beautiful lakes, parks, and cities. It means good education for all people; jobs so there won't be poverty; to stop riots and make it safe to walk down the streets at night; to spend more money on helping people who are starving; to spend more money on curing diseases of this growing world.

Good government means to stop wars; to have peace on the earth; for every person to be free; to react to the growing needs and problems of this growing population. It means to promote all ideas; to spend more money on hospitals and homes for people who can't take care of themselves. It means to find some other way to deposit waste and garbage instead of throwing it into beautiful lakes, streams, and rivers; to set away more land for National Parks so people will have somewhere to go. Good government means this to me.

WHAT GOOD GOVERNMENT MEANS TO ME
(By Robert Martin, eighth grade, Southwestern Junior High School)

People all over the world have dreams. The kind of dreams they have to believe in if they expect them to come true. A good government is like that. You must believe in it with all of your heart if it is ever to exist.

The good government is the one where the people all work together to make that government, because and only because they believe in what they are doing. You cannot have a good government, when all the people are fighting among themselves, all tearing at each other's throat to gain power.

Our country has had some fine leaders in its past. If we could combine the dedication, loyalty, wisdom and bravery of all these men and place it within the hearts of the people of our fine country, our government would be immortal.

Maybe things are meant to be as they are, I don't know; but I don't see how any being can survive without the inalienable rights granted to him by his Creator. The good government is the one in which the people are not afraid to fight for their rights and what they believe in.

To me, good government means being able to speak freely within reason, and stand up for what we believe is right to be able to walk on any street in town without the fear of being robbed or assaulted. The good government is when the people have an unlimited amount of faith in the local, state, and Federal law officers. As I said before, this kind of government cannot exist when the people are divided, and constantly criticizing law officers, politicians, and public officials. A man cannot concentrate on his work or do a good job, when he is continuously being ridiculed. A good government can bring you many rewards only when you fight for them, and it lasts only as long as you allow it to.

WHAT GOOD GOVERNMENT MEANS TO ME
(By John Attarian, seventh grade, Northwestern Junior High School)

To me, good government means fair and equal taxes for everyone, fair enforcement of the law, upholding every citizen's rights, and the protection of our society from those individuals who mistake license for liberty.

Also, fair and equal taxation would mean the taxation of all classes of society by the same percentage of income—with allowance for handicapped and otherwise incapacitated or disabled citizens. These taxes would also be collected from the churches and labor unions, for their members are citizens as well as members of their organizations and should fulfill the expectation of their government as citizens and share the responsibilities of citizens since they share the benefits.

Further, fair enforcement of the law would mean treating all classes of our society and all races with equality. Under good government, no class of society and no race—Caucasian or Negroid, to take the two most conflicting races—would be privileged or hold special rights. Under good government, no social class or race would be able to go unpunished for a crime that another class of society or race would be punished for. A treatment of all classes of society and all races with absolute equality would prevent one race or class from getting envious or arrogant because of inequality under the law and thereby help keep domestic peace.

Also, the upholding of every citizen's rights means no restriction of his religious convictions and no interference with his desires of employment. Good government also assures a citizen of his rights to freedom of speech and trial by jury. It also does not take advantage of a citizen, to accomplish its own means.

Finally, the protection of our society from those who mistake license for liberty means

not allowing riots to take place and those who participate in them to get away with the crimes they have committed. The same applies to lynchings, gang fights, and the like. In short, good government would allow the citizen to walk down a street in peace, free of the threat of an attack or murder.

In summary, good government means taxation of all classes of society by the same percentage of income, treating all races and classes of society with equality, and protecting and upholding the rights of the individual citizen.

**POLITICAL PERSECUTION
IN SAIGON**

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, on June 17, 1969, at page 16259, my colleague from New York (Mr. REID) inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report prepared by a study team recently returned from a trip to South Vietnam. That study team was composed of a number of prominent Americans including JOHN CONYERS, Congressman from the State of Michigan and my colleague on the Judiciary Committee. The report dealt with "limitations on political and religious freedom; the detention, interrogation, imprisonment, and treatment of prisoners; and legal standards and procedures," in South Vietnam. It also documented that extensive religious repression and political persecution exists, and that the citizens of South Vietnam—the very citizens we claim to be protecting in that war-torn nation—are the victims of the most arbitrary kind of military "justice." I commend the members of the study team for their thorough and thoughtful report. It provides even more food for thought to those who believe that it is worth fighting longer and losing more American lives to preserve in power a military clique which never would have come to power in the first place but for our intervention in South Vietnam.

Although no further documentation of the existence of political persecution in South Vietnam is really required, yesterday's New York Times carried a story which adds still further damning evidence against the actions of the Thieu government. The four individuals now in trouble with the Thieu government were among those talked to by the American study group. I insert the article at this point in the RECORD with the reminder to my colleagues that this is the government which we have expended so much blood and treasure to maintain in power. It is a sad thought.

The article referred to follows:

**FOUR OF OPPOSITION GROUP IN SAIGON ARE
SUMMONED TO POLICE INQUIRY**

(By Terence Smith)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, June 17.—At least four members of a liberal opposition group that recently called for the formation of a "government of reconciliation" were ordered tonight to report for questioning by the National Police.

Summonses were delivered this evening by police officers to four members of the newly organized Progressive Nationalist Committee, a left-of-center group of students, intellec-

tuals and members of the professions. They were ordered to appear before the chief of the special police at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The summonses appeared to be the first step in a widely expected Government campaign against liberal political groups and persons.

In the last few days there have been reports from South Vietnamese sources that the Government was planning to take steps against groups that have been publicly calling for a softer negotiating position in the Paris peace talks.

President Nguyen Van Thieu warned of such a crackdown in a news conference last week on his return from Midway Island where he conferred with President Nixon.

I WILL PUNISH THEM

"From now on," the President said, pounding his fists for emphasis, "those who spread rumors that there will be a coalition government in this country, whoever they be, whether in the executive or the legislature, will be severely punished on charges of collusion with the enemy and demoralizing the army and the people. I will punish them in the name of the Constitution."

At the same time, President Thieu warned that action would be taken against any newspapers that distorted the news in a manner that would demoralize the nation. On Saturday, the leading English-language paper, The Saigon Daily News, was closed on such a charge. It was the 32d paper shut down by the Government for political reasons in the last year.

According to reliable South Vietnamese sources, the Government is planning to subdue the more militant elements of its opposition by issuing warnings to some politicians, and by arresting others suspected of maintaining contacts with Communists. More newspaper closings are expected.

The Progressive Nationalist Committee is headed by Tran Ngoc Lieng, the lawyer who defended Truong Dinh Dzu, a former presidential candidate now in prison for advocating a coalition government with the National Liberation Front or Vietcong.

The committee first appeared on June 4, just four days before President Thieu was to confer with President Nixon. In a public statement, it called for the formation of a government of reconciliation that would be composed of "nationalist elements acceptable to both sides."

The purpose of the reconciliatory government according to the statement, would be to "prepare and organize elections to determine the political future of South Vietnam."

THIEU REPORTED UPSET

The statement was reported to have irritated Mr. Thieu, who was said to have felt that it was an effort to undercut his position on the eve of the Midway meeting.

At his news conference following the meeting, Mr. Thieu was asked if he planned to take any action against Mr. Lieng or members of his committee. He declined to answer the question with the explanation that he had not read the committee's statement, but he promised that he would look into the matter.

The summonses issued tonight were delivered to two deputy chairmen of the committee and to two members. Mr. Lieng did not receive one.

At his home tonight, Mr. Lieng said in an interview: "If the Government means to repress the genuinely nationalist organizations by this technique, the Communist will reap the benefits. The whole nationalist movement will suffer as a result."

Mr. Lieng said he would be surprised if he did not eventually get a summons. "They called me in once before, in February," he said. "That was when we had just begun to put the organization together. They questioned me for several hours and then released me."

Mr. Lieng said that his committee was not in favor of the formation of a coalition government as such. "The members of the reconciliatory government would not be Communists," he said. "They would be true nationalists acceptable to both sides."

The secretary general of the committee, Chau Tam Luan, a militant young professor, objected bitterly to the Government's action tonight. "The object of these summonses is to suppress opposition," he said, "to make people afraid to join us. This is a way of warning people, letting them know that if they join us they can expect a call from the police."

TITLE IX—A NEW DIMENSION IN FOREIGN AID—III

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, when Congress initiates new programs, we often find roadblocks within an agency preventing the new program from getting a smooth start. This may be one trouble facing the congressional mandate for greater participation at the local level in foreign aid projects. At least John Schott, who has worked within AID, feels there are obstacles within the agency. His comments are important to us:

OBSTACLES WITHIN THE AGENCY

Whether this be the proper definition of Title IX, or whether a more modest or narrow interpretation of the statute is chosen, a number of institutional obstacles face the conscientious A.I.D. official who may wish to implement this mandate. Not the least of these are the internal restraints imposed by the current organization and staffing pattern of the Agency. From the standpoint of personnel requirements, the outlook for Title IX's implementation can appear bleak indeed. Despite the numerous reorganizations of foreign aid agencies—all of which were in part designed to shorn these agencies of antiquated skills and obsolete ideas—there lingers on in A.I.D. a large contingent of people unresponsive to the new approach to development encouraged by Title IX. For some of these, Title IX constitutes an implied criticism (if not threat) to project activities with which they have long been involved. To others, Title IX is perceived as additional Congressional encouragement of the narrow-gauged project activities to which they have devoted their life—the promotion of cooperatives, community development, public safety programs, "free" labor union development. For them, A.I.D. should simply multiply and intensify these efforts as its response to Title IX.

This narrow view of Title IX is ironically buttressed by many of the more sophisticated program officers and senior officials embued—so far as A.I.D.'s development activities are concerned—with a macro-economic approach toward development. After the effort of the early sixties to depoliticize the aid-giving process and to substitute hard nosed and politically "neutral" macro-economic criteria for the Agency's previous ad-hocism and security-consciousness, it was hard not to see Title IX as a regressive step. To many of these officials, the development activities of the Agency could be divided between those initiated as developmentally significant by A.I.D. programmers, and those smaller, special-interest project activities undertaken at the insistence of Congress. Title IX was considered another such out-

side, special interest group initiative—hopefully no more than a passing fad—which could be satisfied by relabeling (or perhaps multiplying) a few appropriate "grass-roots" activities already undertaken by the Agency. By so doing, no significant diversion of Agency resources would be necessary and no "start up" or "phase down" costs would be incurred by this annoying but transient, Title IX exercise.

To counter these and other hostile attitudes within the Agency toward Title IX requires the nagging persistence of interested Members of Congress. It also requires awareness at the most senior levels of A.I.D. that Title IX is important and that its objectives should conscientiously be pursued. But even with this, a government agency—constrained by civil service regulations and organizational inflexibilities—requires several years to re-train existing personnel and to recruit and absorb new personnel with the requisite imagination and expertise to administer so complicated and delicate a mandate as Title IX. This obstacle is proving difficult to surmount.¹

ANOTHER SHOE FACTORY CLOSES—300 MORE OUT OF WORK

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I received a telegram from the commissioner of the New Hampshire Department of Employment Security, Benjamin C. Adams, informing me of the closing of yet another shoe factory in New Hampshire.

On Monday of this week, the Jodi Shoe Co., in Derry, N.H., notified its 300 workers that the factory would be closed until further notice. The reason: inability to compete with the flood of low-cost, foreign shoe imports. Mr. Adams' telegram also said that many other shoe companies are on shaky grounds, and are considering closing or substantially reducing their operations.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the situation of the American shoe industry is continuing to deteriorate. Mr. Adams' concern is by no means ill-founded. The shoe industry is caught between a rising flood of low-cost, foreign shoe imports on one side, and the refusal of the Federal Government to recognize and alleviate the situation on the other.

Last week, I inserted in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Adams which explained

¹ Several modest steps have been taken by A.I.D. in recognition of this personnel problem. Four regional seminars on Title IX are being held this fiscal year for senior A.I.D. (and a few State Department) officials, a six-week conference on Title IX was sponsored in the summer of 1968 under contract with the Center for International Studies of M.I.T. which was in part designed as a training exercise for twenty A.I.D. officials, several midcareer officers may attend a special course of instruction on Title IX-related matters at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy next year, and some unfocused thought has been given to changing civil service and other personnel restrictions so that people knowledgeable in these new fields can be recruited into the Agency.

the situation in greater depth. For those of my colleagues who missed it then, his letter can be found on page 15449 of the June 11 RECORD.

Hundreds of thousands of American jobs are at stake here, and I urge the Congress and the administration to act now to stop the long slide of this important industry. For unless we do, Mr. Speaker, there is no question that shoe factories will continue to close their operations, and the industry will slowly but surely grind to a halt.

MORE THAN LAW AND ORDER

HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the recent mayoral elections in Los Angeles and Minneapolis and Tuesday's primary in New York have been closely linked by political analysts to the issue of "law and order."

Perhaps this was the case in the first two instances. Certainly, what happened in New York is not simply linked to this one issue, as the Wall Street Journal points out today in an excellent editorial.

Our cities are in trouble, and no city is in greater trouble than New York.

I commend this down-to-earth review of our urban problems to every Member of this body, and include the editorial from the Wall Street Journal of June 19, 1969, in the RECORD at this point:

MORE THAN LAW AND ORDER

The nationwide trend to the right, boosted by conservative victories in both the Democratic and Republican primaries in New York City this week, is more complex than it might appear. How healthy it is depends, we think, on which of its components are under discussion.

The New York upset follows mayoral election of "law and order" men in Los Angeles and Minneapolis. Interestingly enough, Mr. Yorty in Los Angeles and now Mr. Procaccino in New York are Democrats (Mr. Stenvig in Minneapolis is an independent.) Mr. Marchi, the Republican winner in New York, is the candidate of the state's Conservative Party he harped much less on law and order than did Mr. Procaccino, for whom the "safe city" issue was practically the sum of his campaign.

Now law and order is certainly a valid issue, which reflects the deep discontent of people all over the country with rising crime and disorder. The way some of the politicians go at it, though, leaves the impression that they think a police crackdown is all that is necessary to solve the problems of the cities.

Their rhetoric smacks more than a little of repressiveness, even police-statism, and we don't think the nation needs that. Indeed, we are not sure we want to see the conservative, or anti-liberal, cause, or whatever you want to call it, represented by men like the Messrs. Yorty, Stenvig and Procaccino. In contrast, both the mainstream Republicans and the New York Conservatives (their political paths seem to converge more and more) talk with a high degree of responsibility.

Beyond the law and order question as such, there is unquestionably a profound disaffection throughout the country with

the whole long-dominant liberal establishment. Much of it the liberals have brought on themselves, but at least some of it has been beyond their, or anyone's control.

Consider the case of Mayor Lindsay, who was the candidate of both the Republican and Liberal Parties this week and who remains in the November race as the Liberal candidate. Conditions in New York have deteriorated under his four-year reign, and evidently certain of his attempted bureaucratic innovations have not proved particularly workable.

Yet Mr. Lindsay inherited a city that, like many other urban centers, was already a mess, the victim of years of neglect by political hacks. It was already overcrowded, plagued by vehicular and pedestrian congestion, air, noise and water pollution, greedy unions, an in-migration of unskilled poor people; the usual list. It is a little hard to imagine that any mayor could have done a great deal to stem the deterioration in the short space of four years.

The liberals' direct responsibility for the rot is nonetheless very considerable. As exponents of the prevailing political philosophy in Washington and numerous other governmental units for the past generation, they assumed attitudes and pursued policies that resulted in a lot of harm.

In New York, for one example, they would not hear of a residency requirement for welfare eligibility; that offended the sentimental view of the nature of man on which liberalism rests. But they were unprepared for the explosive aspects of the predictable inflow of the poor and unskilled and the spiraling welfare rolls.

In certain ways the liberals worsened the plight of the slum-dwellers. Their welfare system itself is demeaning, anti-incentive. In the name of public housing they tore down tenements and put up barracks-like apartments; the frequent upshot was that the poor did not get better housing but were dispossessed of what they had. The liberals' attacks on other urban problems were similarly inept.

Viewed as something far broader than a law and order issue, then, the developing anti-liberal trend has hopeful elements. The new people, whether they call themselves conservatives, Republicans—or in fact, liberals, many of whom are now disenchanting with the old ways—reject the paramountcy of government as chief problem-solver. With the installation of the Nixon Administration in Washington, this is becoming the mood from top down.

It is not just rejection, however, but a much more positive phenomenon. If the energies and initiatives of private institutions and private individuals can be unloosed after decades of being blanketed by government, then even the nation's admittedly grievous problems may begin to yield. Such, at any rate, we believe to be the salutary potential in the so-called turn to the right.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice to those who pay tribute to a great American.

General Eisenhower was one of our Nation's most patriotic and dedicated leaders of all time. His great contributions, both as a soldier and as a statesman, toward peace in the world will con-

tinue to inspire others to work for that cherished objective.

He was a tremendously human and understanding individual, whose sincerity and warmth of spirit will live on in the memory of everyone who was privileged to know him. I am especially grateful for the personal kindness and counsel he extended to me, both while he was in the military service and in the White House.

While the world shares the sadness of his passing, I know that former President Eisenhower's beloved family finds comfort in the knowledge that he was so widely admired, respected, and loved.

THE BERKELEY DISTURBANCE

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the police brutality charge, voiced by the tax-paid professors in California's higher education system, should be directed against the militants rather than the police.

The following factual and detailed account of the recent Berkeley disturbance was presented by Gov. Ronald Reagan in a talk to the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco on June 13, 1969. The accumulations of lethal projectiles on rooftops and other strategic spots prove this was no spontaneous uprising, but a carefully planned and executed operation—planned and directed by nonstudents of the university, many of whom have been associated with "filthy speech" movements and riots throughout the country—which should have gained the strong condemnation of every loyal citizen, and especially the university faculty, rather than their approval.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Governor Reagan for his speech, and urge that everyone read it. I include it herewith:

EXCERPTS OF SPEECH BY GOV. RONALD REAGAN

Many speakers of world renown have recognized the Commonwealth Club as one of the nation's preeminent sounding boards. You are a distinguished forum. Any speaker invited to address you gives great consideration to choice of subject, and certainly I have no intention of being an exception.

My problem, however, is how to choose between a number of tempting topics, a number of state issues all vital and all more or less controversial, such as California's crying need for true tax reform, which, incidentally, would give me a chance to explain why it should not be based on compulsory withholding of income tax.

There is one subject, however, which stands out as probably the most vexing and frustrating, not only to government, but to the people of California: the "people's park" controversy across the bay in Berkeley.

The volume of words already spoken and written on this subject have not resolved a number of confusing aspects. Many questions remain unanswered.

Is the University properly cast in the role of greedy land baron, ousting the poor homesteader? Did the University arbitrarily and unreasonably interfere with a citizens' volunteer effort at beautification of an unused vacant lot? Did the forces of law and order

precipitate violence and engage in massive but unnecessary "overkill?" Were there no efforts on the part of the University to negotiate, conciliate or reconcile differences between the people and the University? Even more basic, was this just another episode in the nationwide wave of violence swirling about our campuses, and if so, do we just continue reacting, restoring law and order after the fires start and the rocks begin to fly? Of greatest importance: Is the nationwide campus ferment a single thing, a widespread youthful dissatisfaction with things as they are which occasionally trigger some of the more emotional into violence? Or are there two separate and distinct groups each with its own cause? Is there a silent majority, non-violent but with legitimate grievances and is there a separate rebellious minority promoting a real revolutionary cause, a group that seeks by deception to enlist on occasion the aid of that majority group?

I would like to attempt in this forum to put the "people's park" controversy into perspective, and at the same time try to find answers to some of the above questions.

In discussing the episode of the "people's park," two facets will have to be avoided. One, the case of James Rector who died of shotgun wounds. At this moment, the precise circumstances regarding his death have yet to be established officially by a coroner's inquest. For that reason, I feel it would be improper for me to comment. The other has to do with the numerous charges of non-demonstrators suffering injuries and arrest, and the allegations of mistreatment in the detention facilities at Santa Rita.

Certainly, the possibility of all of this must be recognized. There is no question but that part of the mob on that first day of violence intended only to be vocal and were caught in the crossfire as they tried to escape. Since all of this is under investigation again, comments here would be improper.

It can be said, however, that if any citizens' rights were violated, if officials were guilty of misconduct, then justice must be done and the guilty must be punished.

The cause of the controversy is a city block, roughly 450 to 250 feet, purchased by the University two years ago for \$1.3 million as an eventual site for residence halls and research facilities. In the interim, it was to provide playing fields and recreation facilities very much needed on the Berkeley campus, since previous areas devoted to this purpose have been used for construction of new campus buildings.

The land has lain idle for more than a year, during which time no one thought of using it as a park. On April 4, it came up on the University's priority list approved for immediate development. On April 18, that classic example of four letter word journalism, the "Berkeley Barb" issued a call for its readers to gather on the coming Sunday, April 20, equipped with tools and shovels to convert for their own use the University property into a "cultural, political freak-out and rap center for the Western World."

It was made very plain: They were aware of the University's plans for immediate use of the property. We must depend on leaflets, the Barb and the official campus paper, The Daily Californian, for word as to their intentions, but they were pretty explicit.

The Barb said: "We will police our own park and not allow its occupation by imperial power." A handbill read: "We take a solemn oath to wage a war of retaliation against the University if it begins to move against the park. If the University attempts to seize \$1.3 million worth of land, now claimed by the people, we will destroy \$5 million worth of University property." Another handbill bluntly warned that even sending surveyors or posting "no trespassing" signs would be the signal for instant retaliation.

As a matter of fact, when the University did get around to posting "no trespassing" signs (51 of them), they were instantly torn down and burned.

The Daily Californian published an article by 27-year-old non-student, Arthur Goldberg—a name familiar in the free speech and filthy speech movement a few years ago. He praised the riots at Howard University and the University of Wisconsin and complained that not a thing was happening at Berkeley. His article then went into a tirade against Chancellor Heyns in connection with the University's plans for development, winding up with this arrogant and insulting demand: "Who the hell does the chancellor think he is? It is our park."

Ultimatums of this kind were the only answer the University received to its repeated efforts to enter into dialogue with these people. The chancellor had appointed staff members to make overtures, probably because a number of legitimate citizens and some students had joined in the work on the vacant lot under the impression that it was a volunteer community project to pretty up an unused vacant lot.

The real leaders, of course, were Goldberg and a number of others whose records include participation in the Oakland Induction Center riot, the seizure of Moses Hall, the Chicago riots and last summer's bloody riot in Berkeley when many of the same people demanded that Telegraph Avenue be closed off and turned over to them as a park—perhaps "playpen" is a more appropriate word. The names are all on the police blotter: Mike Delacour, Stuart Edward Albert, Paul Glusman, William Miller, and Frank Bardacke—to name a few—none of them are students of the University.

The chancellor repeated several times his willingness to discuss the design of the development and its possible use by the adjacent community. But at no time did the squatters designate an individual or committee with whom he could communicate. The University's position was untenable.

Not enough has been said about the very real problem of legal liability. As owner of the property, the University was liable in the event of injuries in the use of the property, or if it became a public nuisance. The importance of this can be judged by the recent announcement that the City of Berkeley itself is in danger of losing its own liability insurance because of the recurring disturbances in the streets and around the campus. The property, incidentally, had already become something of a public nuisance. Police had been responding to frequent complaints of nightly rallies, mass singing, shouted obscenities, bonfires throughout the night, and the gathering of unsavory characters which so frightened some housewives they wouldn't even walk down the street on neighborhood errands. And now it has been learned that part of the lush greenery planted to make the lot a so-called sylvan glade turned out to be marijuana.

One hundred and thirty-two residents of the neighborhood have petitioned the University to end the use of the park by the squatters, and to go ahead with the University plans. In addition to the complaints already mentioned was one that the property was being used as a garbage dump and toilet. Again as a measure of the liability risk is the record of arrests that had already taken place at the site.

One involved a 21-year-old man, picked up for indecent exposure after the police found him sitting in the park, completely nude, in full view of park occupants and by-passers. There were arrests for narcotic violations, armed robbery and a number of juvenile cases, some for drunkenness—including a 14-year-old, loitering and sleeping in the park, and four cases involving

juvenile runaways—one from as far away as Wisconsin.

We all continue to use the term park but the issue never had been one of whether there should be a park or even whether a park was needed. There are no shortages of parks in Berkeley, and by the end of the summer, the City will have completed a new park only two blocks from the disputed site. By their own statements, the leaders of this property take-over have made it plain their only purpose was political. They were challenging the right of private ownership of land in this country. They referred to the University's deed as a piece of paper that does not give the University the right to make use of this land.

All of the events I've mentioned—the attempts at communication, the ultimatums by the dissident group—took place in the short period from April 20 to the second week in May. D-Day came on May 15. Before dawn, at 4:45 a.m., campus police led about 65 law enforcement officers to the site. There had been a number of claims that the group would occupy the site physically, and forcefully prevent the University from going ahead with its own plans. About 75 individuals were found sleeping in the park and were warned they were trespassing. Only three refused to leave and had to be arrested on that charge. The building of the fence began at 6:20 a.m. and optimism reigned—there was no opposition. It began to appear that the police on hand were an unnecessary precaution but no one can deny the University would have been less than responsible had it not notified law enforcement of its intentions in view of the repeated threats of violent resistance.

Now what about the police themselves? What did they have in mind when confronted with this call for their services? Were they deliberately provocative, looking for trouble, trigger-happy? Hardly! In the past 11 months four major riots have erupted in Berkeley. All of them involve militants from the south campus area of Berkeley, a neighborhood that has become the most serious crime problem in that city. In these 11 months there have been eight major bombings or attempted bombings, nearly 1100 drug arrests, 750 in the south campus area alone. They have confiscated nearly 1000 sticks of dynamite, more than 200 pistols, rifles, shotguns and other weapons, dozens of Molotov cocktails and materials for making more. There have been dozens of arson attempts resulting in more than \$800,000 damage including the fire that gutted Wheeler Auditorium. One policeman has been ambushed and shot; a dozen others have been fired upon. In last summer's Telegraph Avenue riot, two California Highway Patrolmen were the deliberate victims of fire bombings. Molotov cocktails were thrown at their feet. Engulfed in flames, they suffered serious burns requiring lengthy hospitalization. One of them has just recently been released from the hospital and is now able to do a little part-time work in the Highway Patrol office.

One of the attempted bombings involved a Berkeley police car in the official police parking lot. A homemade bomb employing a plastic base explosive was powerful enough that had it gone off it would have blown up not only the car and driver, but several adjacent buildings. In another bungled attempt—dynamite exploded but fortunately failed to rupture two large vats of highly flammable substance. Had this attempt been successful, Berkeley firemen are of the opinion that all of west Berkeley might have gone up in a holocaust.

All of this had to be taken into account as they were called into the street again.

By noon a total of 150 officers had been assigned to the area, 75 held in reserve, 75 on duty at the park site.

Meantime, back on the campus, a noon

meeting had been scheduled for Sproul Plaza to hear a lecture on Israel and the Mideast crisis. This is a not unusual tactic. Permission is obtained through a student organization for a meeting which then abandons the original purpose. The crowd in the Plaza numbered more than 2,000 and some of them were obviously anticipating more than a routine discussion of an international crisis. A group of medics dressed in white uniforms, wearing Red Cross symbols, mingled in the crowd.

This has been normal procedure when a riot is planned or probable. There were nine speakers at the rally but no one mentioned Israel. The ninth speaker was Dan Siegal, UC student body president-elect. To use a trite phrase, it could be said that he appeared before an already-inflamed audience. Before he finished, they were screaming, raising clenched fists above their heads. Siegal has been charged with inciting to riot.

He wound up his speech saying, "Don't let those pigs beat (then a few unprintable words) out of you. Don't let yourselves get arrested on felonies." But he climaxed his speech shouting, "Let's go down and take over the park!" His admonition regarding felonies was not heeded, or perhaps it was just for the record.

The crowd was moving on a line of approximately 75 Berkeley police and California Highway Patrolmen. Someone kicked in the glass door of a bank on the way down; the window of an automobile was smashed. Rocks, bottles and other missiles were flying. Sheriff's deputies fell into line behind the marchers. From past experience, they knew that when the missiles started, those doing the throwing usually did it from the rear ranks. But not today—this was a mob.

Rocks, sticks, bricks and prepared jagged pieces of pipe and steel—some 18 inches long—rained down, thrown in end-over-end fashion into the police ranks from rooftops. The force with which they were thrown can be judged by one that smashed through the door of a police car. Cherry bombs exploded in the street, some with BB shot glued on to act as shrapnel. Officers went down under the barrage and were overrun.

This was no spontaneous eruption. The rooftops had been stockpiled with rocks and other missiles. There were similar stockpiles in nearby alleys. Heavy steel reinforcing bars—construction steel—had been cut into short, throwable lengths.

Sheriff deputies resorted to teargas, but the barrage from the rooftops and streets continued. The small contingent of police and patrolmen had been broken up into little groups and completely surrounded. A thrown knife struck a highway patrolman in the chest and penetrated to the bone. One had his helmet shattered by a chunk of broken concrete, others were hit in the face. Many suffered injuries that made it impossible for them to get up, let alone walk or defend themselves.

Out on the fringe of the battlefield, a police car was overturned and set on fire. Those who did it discovered a Berkeley police reserve officer, a member of this volunteer group for 20 years, who had been assigned to traffic duty. They surrounded him, throwing rocks at close range. Backed against a building, he went down and was literally being stoned to death in the ancient biblical manner. Lying on the ground, he drew his revolver. He did not fire it. At sight of the weapon, the mob fell back momentarily and persons inside the locked building opened the door enough to drag him inside.

The field commander of the Alameda County sheriff's office made the decision the riot was out of control. Deputies armed with shotguns were ordered into action. When they arrived, they literally had to step over the bodies of injured officers who couldn't be helped or moved because the few left

standing were under severe assault, and literally fighting for their lives.

Now, to all those who are so quick to charge police brutality or over-reaction, let me call your attention to something that hasn't been mentioned. All of these officers, including those beaten to the ground, were armed with the regulation .38 revolver. None of them used those weapons or even drew from their holsters. And yet they have stated that only the arrival of the deputies and their use of the shotguns prevented the outright killing of isolated police and patrolmen.

As the afternoon went on, gas-dispersing vehicles spread teargas in an effort to disperse the crowd. One of these was put out of action by the mob. They even captured and looted a mail truck. Ambulances moved in and out of the area retrieving the injured. Militants overturned more vehicles and turned in false fire alarms and then stoned the firemen when they responded to the calls.

At the start of the noon rally, a total of 150 officers were on duty. By the end of the day, the total had reached 791, and this force was insufficient to guarantee the safety of Berkeley. The city manager, chief of police, mayor and sheriff joined in a request that National Guard forces be assigned to prevent further violence and disorder. The sheriff said he could no longer guarantee the safety of the city.

Three battalions of the 49th Infantry Brigade with supporting units were ordered to Berkeley and I signed emergency proclamations banning outdoor public assemblies and prohibiting loitering on the streets.

A total of 48 persons had been arrested on charges ranging from assaulting an officer to assault with a dangerous weapon, failure to disperse and refusing to leave University property. On the basis of casualties alone, it would seem the street people were out in front. Ninety-nine officers had been injured—18 requiring hospital treatment. The total for the street people was 43.

And yet, faculty groups in Berkeley and on distant campuses have publicly denounced the police and the use of the Guard. Others have challenged what they term "overkill" and taking their cue from these supposedly reasonable people, students have demonstrated in protest against the use of police and Guardsmen on campus.

No one can take pleasure from seeing bayonets in an American community or on a college campus. But the arrival of the Guard with bayonets brought almost total de-escalation of hand-to-hand fighting and violence. There were a few skirmishes—false bomb reports, maneuvers by the Guard and police units to disperse marching gangs of militants.

For four days, the Guard successfully kept the crowds moving and dispersed. Then, on May 20, a large crowd made a stand in Sproul Plaza. Repeated warnings failed to move them. The Guardsmen were being assaulted from the upper floors of one of the buildings. Chairs were being thrown down on their heads. The balcony of the associated student building was stockpiled with rocks and chunks of broken concrete.

All the warnings failed, and there was every indication that a direct assault was imminent. The field commander made a battlefield decision and called for a helicopter to make a teargas drop. The mob was told this had been done. Some left, but most remained.

There is no question that innocent people suffered the distress that goes with teargas. But there is also no question that horrendous tales exaggerated this episode beyond any resemblance to the true facts.

There also can be no question that the alternative to the gas—hand-to-hand combat between the mob and the Guardsmen—could have produced real tragedy.

By May 24, arrests had totalled 768, and

496 were non-students. Forty percent of those arrested were not even residents of Berkeley. Finally, on June 2, the University and local officials agreed order had been restored and the Guard could be withdrawn. They had put in 17 days at a cost to the taxpayers of \$760,000. There is no way to assess the cost in damage, in injuries, and in loss of business to the community.

The issue is not closed. A "people's park" negotiating committee has finally surfaced to declare there will be no real peace in Berkeley until the fence comes down. If we are to judge by past history, when it suits their purpose an incident will be found or created as an excuse for intimidation through mass marches, demonstrations, and coercive tactics always with the potential for violence.

They have issued a 13-point manifesto. Some of those points are very significant and revealing.

"Young people leaving their parents will be welcome with full status as members of our community.

"We will turn the schools into training grounds for liberation.

"We will shatter the myth that U.C. is a sacred institution with a special right to exist.

"Through rent strikes, direct seizures of property and other resistance campaigns, the large landlords, banks and developers who are gouging will be driven out.

"Space will be opened up and living communes and revolutionary families will be encouraged.

"We will demand a direct contribution from business, including Berkeley's biggest business—the University, to the community until a nationwide assault on big business is successful.

"The people of Berkeley must arm themselves and learn the basic skills and tactics of self defense and street fighting.

"We shall attempt to bring the real criminals to trial; where this is impossible, we shall implement revolutionary justice.

"We will create a soulful socialism in Berkeley.

"We will unite with other movements throughout the world to destroy the racist-capitalist-imperialist system.

"We will create an International Liberation School in Berkeley as a training center for revolutionaries.

"We will protect and expand our drug culture."

I opened my remarks with some questions.

The decision is up to you as to whether the University arbitrarily and unreasonably interfered with an innocent, bucolic beautification project. And if it was the University that arrogantly refused to meet or conciliate.

I'll leave it to you to decide if the forces of law and order precipitated the violence.

Should the University—having invested \$1.3 million of the people's money for a purpose approved by the University administration, its own Capital Outlay Review Board and the Board of Regents—turn this investment over to some newly-created corporation organized to put the property in the hands of those who sought to take it by force? Or should the University get on with the business of providing facilities for the education of our young people?

And that brings me to the final question. Is there a revolutionary movement involving a tiny minority of faculty and students finding concealment and shelter in the disappointment and resentment of an entire college generation that finds itself being fed into a knowledge factory with no regard to their individuality, aspirations or their dreams?

The answer is an obvious yes and the challenge to us is to establish contact with these frustrated young people and join in finding

answers before they fall to the mob by default.

At this moment in California, the danger of this happening is very real. And why not?

When Chancellor Heyns was meeting with law enforcement officials and joining in their requests for police and National Guard protection, other chancellors in our system were endorsing protests and hunger strikes. Faculty groups were passing resolutions deploring police tactics without so much as making a phone call to learn the facts.

I am firmly convinced these represent a minority, but they are activists. The majority of faculty are scholars too busy with their own research and writing to engage in such extra-curricular activities. Are they also too busy to teach?

Young men and women go to college to find themselves as individuals. They see the names of distinguished scholars in the catalogue and sign for courses with the belief they will learn and grow and be stimulated by contact with these men. But all too often they are herded into classes taught by teaching assistants hardly older than themselves. The feeling comes that they are nameless, faceless, numbers on an assembly line—green cap at one end and cap, gown and automated diploma at the other. They want someone to know they are there—they aren't even missed and recorded as absent when they aren't there.

The symptoms of rising rebellion have been evident for some time. They no longer bother to vote in student elections. So that other tiny group with its revolutionary purpose elects the student body officers and editors who proceed to speak in the name of the University.

This generation—better informed, more aware—deserves much more.

First, those who administer and teach must make it plain they will not be coerced by threats of force. They must spell out in advance those kinds of misconduct they will not tolerate and that there will be no negotiation with any who threaten violence. But this is only for that revolutionary minority—the University can dispose of the threat they represent in a week if they will take a stand.

The greater problem has to do with those others and it begins with establishing communication. Their legitimate grievances must be understood and solutions must be forthcoming. "Publish or perish" as a University policy must be secondary to teaching. Research, a vital and essential part of the process, must not be the standard by which the University rates itself. Its function is to teach and its record must be established on the quality of graduates it offers to the world—not on the collecting of scholarly names in its catalogue.

The few subversives on our campuses will be a problem much easier to handle if the members of that so-called great silent majority have inner convictions, beliefs and confidence in our society and in us as adults.

LANHAM, MD., GI KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp5c. Kenneth L. Bartley, a fine young man from Maryland, was recently killed in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage and honor his memory by in-

cluding the following article in the RECORD:

LANHAM GI KILLED IN VIET VILLAGE—SPECIALIST KENNETH BARTLEY AIDED MONTAGNARDS

Army Spec. 5 Kenneth L. Bartley, of Lanham, Md., who helped organize a band of Montagnards in the Central Highlands of Vietnam, was killed June 12 while defending their village, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Specialist Bartley was a member of a Special Forces unit of the 4th Infantry Division, stationed a few miles south of Pleiku.

HELPED CONSOLIDATE HAMLETS

Specialist Bartley, who was 6 feet, 4 inches tall, was moved by the plight of the diminutive Montagnard mountain people who took great delight in the things he did for them, his father, Edward L. Bartley, said yesterday.

Mr. Bartley helped consolidate three Montagnard hamlets into a single village, while accompanied by his 4-foot 6-inch translator, whom he affectionately called "Shortie," the soldier's father said.

The 21-year-old Prince Georges county soldier had books sent from home to help his translator friend learn Spanish and German. The Montagnard already spoke three foreign languages.

"My son wanted to help those people. He was moved by their total poverty, and couldn't understand how they existed," his father said.

LOVED THE PEOPLE

His compassion for the Montagnard's developed to the point that he decided to extend his service an extra six months. "I guess you might say he loved the people," Mr. Bartley said of his son, who had already served nine months in Vietnam.

A 1966 graduate of Bladensburg Senior High School, Mr. Bartley attended Prince Georges Community College before enlisting in the Army in March of last year.

Specialist Bartley hoped to become a radio disk jockey. He was a friend of several radio personalities in Annapolis and Salisbury.

Besides his father, he is survived by his mother, the former E. Huldah Hibbs; a brother, Donald E. Bartley, at home; great-paternal grandmother, Mrs. Gertie Crowther, of Washington; his paternal grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Lancelot W. Bartley, of Washington, and his maternal grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. C. B. Hibbs, of Sterling Park, Va.

ASTORIA'S BETSY ROSS

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, in my hometown we have a lovely patriotic lady, Mrs. Chester "Jo" Love, who is fast becoming known as Astoria's Betsy Ross. She has been sewing replicas of various American flags, specializing in the American flag as it existed during the days of the Lewis and Clark expedition. Last November her Lewis and Clark flag flew over the National Capitol while she was attending a national Elks Emblem Club convention as an Oregon delegate. This fine lady has written an essay on Americanism. For the benefit of my colleagues and posterity, I submit it herewith for their consideration:

AMERICANISM

(By Josephine M. Love)

After having lived thru World War I, the Great Depression, World War II, Korea, the Cold War, and now Viet Nam, I find it rather difficult to define what Americanism truly is. How can decades of triumph, poverty, fear, and hope be expressed in a few minutes? Americanism cannot be pinpointed to one set of definitions, because everyone of us here today has seen different forms of Americanism during our lives . . . just as those who came before us and those who will come after us. It can only be said that it is an intangible word, a feeling that cannot be expressed. But that is what our whole foundation of living has been based on, intangible ideas, freedom, democracy . . . spirit of honor . . . spirit of truth . . . spirit of youth. Americanism, a word so intangible, yet so great that hundreds of thousands of simple people like you and me who will never be glorified, have suffered and died and lived for it. It is the spirit that pushed Lewis and Clark 2,000 miles thru uncharted wilderness to discover another ocean. It is the same spirit that led our grandmothers westward over barren, dusty prairies, bearing children, driving cattle, and fighting off Indians. All of us here today are mixtures of different kinds of Americanism, our ancestries, our lifetime experiences are all varied, yet we all know what Americanism is. It isn't merely going thru the motion of saluting the Flag or standing for the National Anthem . . . it is something inside of your self . . . and like my love, it grows with experience and age . . . so that it withstands temptation, poverty and fear . . . leaving only wisdom and hope.

J. EDGAR HOOVER AWARE OF SDS THREAT TO EDUCATION

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, J. Edgar Hoover is well aware of the sinister, diabolical, and subversive threat of campus anarchists to the cause of education in the United States.

I commend the following article in the June issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin by the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover to the attention of my colleagues and to all the people of our country:

J. EDGAR HOOVER AWARE OF SDS THREAT TO EDUCATION

As the current academic year draws to a close, it should be readily apparent that the students in the New Left revolutionary movement are not on college campuses to seek education. Rather, this conglomerate of malcontents is engineering a drive to destroy our educational system.

More and more, the New Left is being controlled by the followers of Karl Marx through the Old Left organizations of the Communist Party, USA (pro-Moscow), the Progressive Labor Party (pro-Peking), and the Socialist Workers Party (Trotskyites). Not since the New Left came into being has the influence of Marxism-Leninism been so strong.

The Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), largest of the New Left groups, is rapidly gaining a definite Marxist-Leninist coloration. At the SDS National Council meeting in Austin, Tex., in March, one of the organization's top leaders was quoted as

stating, "Our primary task is to build a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary movement."

While the New Left movement may or may not make the dean's list this year, it rates an A plus in revolutionary exploits. The SDS and its adherents have rocked campuses from coast to coast with violence, riots, and sabotage. At the SDS National Convention last summer a workshop on violence and explosives was held. Literature explaining how explosive devices can be manufactured and used against Selective Service installations, ROTC buildings, and university facilities has been distributed. The results are a disgrace to a society which owes its very existence to democratic processes under the rule of law.

Many of the criminal acts of the New Left were, and are, committed as expressions of rights under the first amendment. Corruption of the first amendment would be a better term for such antics. Certainly, free speech and dissent are not synonymous with despotic obstruction and force. The wild and insatiable demands of the New Left for unlawful power and its blind determination to silence and destroy all who stand in its way are tyrannical acts of the first order.

Under the first amendment, a person may hire a hall and speak on any subject to as many people as he can persuade to listen. However, he has no right to disrupt classes and assemblies and prevent other persons from hearing a speaker of their choice. Neither the New Left nor any other group shall be allowed to plunder, riot, and terrorize our educational institutions and impose its will upon a majority of students who do not share its views. Crime under the ivy-covered arches of a college campus is no more excusable than crime in our city streets.

SDS leaders know that if a revolution is to be brought about, they must inject more discipline and organization into the movement; the antidisziplin, freewheeling, individualistic, anarchistic mood of the New Left must be controlled and molded into a strong, centralized, Marxist-Leninist revolutionary force. The Old Left groups, of course, are working hard to capture at least a part of the movement.

The pro-Peking Progressive Labor Party (PLP) already has a strong beachhead inside the national SDS. On some key issues, the PLP comes close to having enough strength to swing votes in national meetings. While considerable factionalism now exists within SDS ranks on "how to bring about a revolution," the pro-Peking, the pro-Moscow, and the Trotskyites all agree on one major point—students alone cannot bring about a revolution. One well-known communist youth leader wrote, "We must view the worker-student alliance as a mutual necessity and do everything in our power to insure its growth and endurance." The PLP and the Trotskyites also supported similar linkage of the students and "workers."

Not all SDS members accept the Old Left organizations. Many feel that SDS can promote a viable revolutionary youth program without stringent controls and free of parental tutelage from a foreign or internal Marxist party. Whether this is possible or not remains to be seen, and the answer may be decided at the SDS National Convention this summer, where this issue will be bitterly and hotly contested.

Meanwhile, a basic fact looms. Never before in this country has there been such a strong revolutionary Marxist movement of young people which is so eager to destroy established authority. Furthermore, the New Left movement has made it emphatically clear that mere change and revision are not its objectives. Armed with a long list of "non-negotiable" demands, its immediate goal is the complete overthrow and control of our

educational system. We all know what its ultimate goal is.

Concessions and appeasements will not satisfy those bent on anarchy and nihilism. America should take note before it is too late.

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER, *Director.*

EXPERTS SAY PRO-ABM STUDY ALTOGETHER UNCONVINCING

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, at the back of the editorial section of yesterday's Washington Post is a full page ad concerning the proposed Safeguard ABM system.

According to the ad—which was placed in the paper by the American Security Council—a special subcommittee recommends that—

An American ABM system is the soundest insurance for peace—and against war—that the United States can buy in 1969 for its security and protection in the 1970's.

The recommendation is contained in a study, "The ABM and the Changed Strategic Military Balance: U.S.S.R. vs. U.S.A.," recently published by the Council.

Last month, I received a letter from Mr. John M. Fisher, the president of the American Security Council, asking my comments on his group's study, and I would like to place a copy of that letter in the RECORD at this point:

AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1969.

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I have enclosed for your information an advance copy of a special study on "The ABM and the Changed Strategic Military Balance: U.S.S.R. vs. U.S.A."

The 31-man study committee was co-chaired by Dr. Willard F. Libby, Nobel Prize winner; Dr. William J. Thaler, who developed the over-the-horizon radar; and General Nathan F. Twining, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The other members of the committee are equally qualified in other areas of expertise pertinent to this complex subject.

We hope that the committee's factual analysis will be useful to you.

I would appreciate your comments on this study so that I might share them with the study committee members who worked so long and hard, without recompense, to complete this project.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. FISHER,
President.

Mr. Speaker, I have always paid attention to all aspects—pro and con—of the ABM debate, and I proceeded to read through the American Security Council's "factual analysis." In doing so, I found that the report's authors generally resorted to gross distortions and confusingly misleading logic to present a case for ABM deployment.

However, I felt that before I undertook to answer Mr. Fisher's request for my comments, some additional—and more technical—critique was called for. So, I sent a copy of the report to the attention of two physics professors at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology who had been working and studying various aspects of ABM.

Dr. Vigdor L. Teplitz is an assistant professor of physics at M.I.T. From 1962 to 1964, he was associated with the radiation laboratory at the University of California at Berkeley; the next 2 years he spent with CERN, the European nuclear research program; since 1966, he has been on the staff at M.I.T.

Dr. Steven Weinberg is a professor of physics at M.I.T. He also is a consultant for the Institute for Defense Analyses and for the Brookhaven National Laboratory. Dr. Weinberg is a contributor to the recent book, "ABM: An Evaluation of the Decision To Deploy an Antibalistic Missile System," which was edited by Abram Chayes and Jerome G. Wiesner.

Over the past weeks, Drs. Teplitz and Weinberg prepared a detailed analysis of the American Security Council study, and last week, they sent me the following letter, in which they concluded that the study is "altogether unconvincing" and that I should "not use it as a guide in my thinking on the Safeguard ABM system." I now place a copy of their letter in the RECORD:

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF
TECHNOLOGY, DEPARTMENT OF
PHYSICS,

Cambridge, Mass., June 12, 1969.

Congressman GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: At your suggestion we have read "The ABM and the Changed Strategic Military Balance U.S.A. vs. U.S.S.R." by Dr. Willard F. Libby, Dr. William J. Thaler, General Nathan F. Twining and others. We find it altogether unconvincing and suggest that you not use it as a guide in your thinking on the Safeguard ABM system.

Most of the text is devoted to an impassioned argument that the Soviet Union continues to work toward world domination and is devoting all available resources to that end. The conclusion drawn by the authors is that the United States must have a greater military effort than that of the Soviet Union. There is no attempt to consider the question of a "sufficient" military effort. The author's fear of the Soviet Union reaches something of a crescendo on page 44 in describing the goals of the Soviet military space program: "... 3) to gain control of space. There have been numerous references in Soviet speeches and official documents to indicate such an objective." (Our emphasis). A rather bold, but unlikely program. An argument used by the authors to fan the reader's fear of Soviet defensive capabilities (on p. 45) is: "It is also noteworthy that the U.S.S.R. has obtained valuable combat experience from the coordinated use of missiles and AA guns in North Vietnam." The space discussion is not balanced by any reference to the U.S. Air Force's \$600 million per year space program. And no weight is given to any experience our B52 forces may have gained in overcoming defenses, in their Southeast Asia operations. The general tone of the large polemical part

of the pamphlet is such that if the symbols U.S. and U.S.S.R. were interchanged the result would make about the same amount of sense and would be dismissed as typical propaganda.

In general, there is no serious argument that the Safeguard system is the proper response to the Soviet threat nor any serious discussion of its capabilities and limitations. Some of the specific weaknesses and inaccuracies of a more technical, rather than political, nature in the work are:

(1) Figure 3, comparing U.S. and Soviet ICBM strengths, compares numbers of missiles, not numbers of re-entry vehicles (possibly indicating a certain distrust of our Department of Defense which has decided to increase the latter and not the former). No discussion is given of the differences among missiles. There is, for example, no recognition of the similarity between the SS9 which the Soviets are deploying and the Titan which we are phasing out in favor of more "efficient" weapons.

(2) Figure 5, and the text on page 37, in comparing relative strengths of the two powers in submarine launched missiles include diesel powered Soviet missiles along with nuclear ones. The former need frequent surfacing to recharge batteries and are hence much more vulnerable and less useful weapons. Their projections of Soviet strength, here and elsewhere, always assume that the Soviet Union will maintain in operation, at great expense, older less effective weapons as they deploy newer ones. This seems a foolishly optimistic prediction although it results in misleading and frightening graphs.

(3) Figure 6 is again misleading, adding together both Soviet missiles aimed at Europe and missiles aimed at the United States, to compare with American ones aimed at the Soviet Union.

(4) Figure 7, labeled Soviet Defensive Missile Developments, in a pamphlet on the ABM, would lead the reader to believe there are eight Soviet ABM systems. There are not; there is only the embryonic Galosh system. The others are anti-aircraft systems.

(5) Page 34: The SS9 was not unknown to the Defense Department, according to the testimony of Alain Enthoven before the Senate Armed Services Committee last year.

(6) Page 34: After discussing the size of the SS9 warhead but not its accuracy, the authors go on to say, "Because of its size and accuracy the SS9 is regarded as a weapon designed to knock out American Minuteman ICBMs." This is not at all clear; two possible reasons for the size of the SS9 are (i) for use against large cities, and (ii) to explode at high altitudes above the range of the Sprints in the Sentinel system, with enough energy to cause destruction to urban structures on the ground. One would expect ABM proponents to seriously study this second possibility in arguing for Safeguard. The authors do not mention it.

(7) Page 51, again it is "clear" to the authors, with no discussions of the targeting accuracy of the SS9, that it is a counter force weapon.

(8) Page 51, the authors accuse the United States of ceding "the offensive space weapon arena" to the U.S.S.R. This ceding presumably refers to Soviet development of FOBS (Fractional orbiting ballistic missile system) which is an inaccurate weapon, not suitable for counter force use, but which may have some utility as a penetration aid against an ABM system. The authors, in general, do not seem to be able to conceive of, or at least to approve of, not building any weapons system it is physically possible to construct, no matter how small, or counter-productive, its contribution to our security.

In the small part of the work which con-

centrates on ABM systems there is a section on the need for a Missile Defense, no section on whether Safeguard fills that need, and an attempt to rebut some of the arguments against Safeguard.

(9) Page 55, the authors state flatly that Safeguard is a "point" defense. If this were true, Safeguard would have no long range Spartans and the Perimeter Acquisition Radar would be different or missing. This is not a matter of semantics; it is a matter, at best, of billions of dollars to be spent on new hard point elements of the Safeguard program and further billions responding to the Soviet response.

(10) On page 55, the authors also repeat the argument that Safeguard is for research and development. Research and Development is best done on Kwajalein or at White Sands where tests can be made. The only advantage in R & D of the present plans are for such marginal studies as on the effects of cold weather.

(11) On page 56, the authors equate not building Safeguard with "gambling on the assumption that defense technology will not eventually overcome offensive weapons systems." It does not bring us any closer to the far off goal of an effective ABM system to build an admittedly ineffective one.

(12) On page 56, the authors ask about the Soviets "Will they cease their own ABM efforts?" The Soviets have stopped ABM construction. After building the Galosh system with less than 100 missiles in it, they concluded it was a mistake and stopped. The authors are intent on us making a mistake with a 1000 missile system.

There are a plethora of other weaknesses in the authors' presentation. Many are connected with the great emphasis on political analysis and argument, itself open to much debate, and the relatively small attention paid to the technical question at hand. The fact that we have not addressed our remarks in details to their political analysis does not, of course, indicate that we find it sensible.

Please let us know if we can be of further assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

VIGOR L. TEPLITZ,
Assistant Professor of Physics.
STEVEN WEINBERG,
Professor of Physics.

Mr. Speaker, as both the MIT physics professors and I discovered, the American Security Council tends to utilize scare tactics rather than cold facts as a rationale for ABM. The Councils ad continues in that direction. The ad states that "a lack of national resolve" is the only thing stopping us from building ABM and that the "Russians will have us either by violence or by blackmailing us with the threat of violence, if we allow them to increase their nuclear superiority."

I believe that tactics such as those used by the American Security Council take the legitimate debate over ABM and turn it into a shambles. There is no simple way to resolve the ABM question; each side has many valid points backing up their respective positions. But, no one—on either side—is helped by the level of argument employed by the Council in its report and in its ad.

I am sending a copy of Drs. Teplitz and Weinberg's letter to Mr. Fisher with the hope that he indeed will take seriously these comments on his group's study. I would hope that all Members of Congress who have seen the Council's

ad, or read the Council's study, will now consider the accuracy of the statements posed for the Council.

For those Members who have not seen the ad, I place it into the Record at this point:

BUT WHAT IF WE DO NOT BUILD THE SAFEGUARD ABM?

The answer is lodged in facts that may not show up as often as they should on newspaper front pages and in TV news broadcasts! It is concerned with the serious step-up in Russian missile production . . . with a world in which the Communists have taken the lead in nuclear weapons . . . and with the single non-Communist, non-military threat that may prove to be the cause of our downfall.

Make no mistake. At this very moment the Soviet Union already is well ahead of the U.S. in overall strategic missile strength. The most urgent matter before the Congress and the American people today is deciding what to do about it.

The American Security Council urges that all of the facts be given careful consideration . . . and believes that a carefully reasoned evaluation of those facts leads to a single, irresistible conclusion: America needs to begin building a Safeguard ABM missile defense system at once.

COMPARISON OF STRATEGIC MILITARY TRENDS

Although the American gross national product is almost twice that of the Soviet Union, the USSR has for years been spending up to 3 times more than we have in strategic military forces. The current trend warns us that the Russians will have spent up to \$100 billion more than us on strategic weapons between now and 1975.

At this moment the total of Soviet strategic missiles is estimated at 2,750 compared with our own 1,710 (including ICBMs, intermediate and medium range missiles and sub-launched missiles). We're not building any more missiles. They are!

But that's not the whole story. By 1975 the Soviets will, at the present rate, have deployed close to 500 mammoth SS-9 nuclear rockets with 20 to 25 megaton warheads. Each missile will be about 25 times more powerful than our own present Minuteman missiles—each will be about 1,000 more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb.

The Soviet Union has a missile defense. We do not!

THE SOVIET UNION'S MOTIVES

It no longer is necessary to "suppose" that the Russians are aiming for strategic military superiority. We now know that their objective is clear strategic superiority because they have already passed the balance point and are still building at a rate that suggests an all-out war economy. In both word and deed, the Russians have shown that they regard the world struggle as a fight to the finish—a fight that the Soviets intend to win at any cost. Not a single political or military authority has been able to offer any reasonable explanation for the current Russian buildup of staggering destructive power, except in terms of deliberate, coldly calculated aggressive intentions . . . like the Soviet intentions and what followed in Czechoslovakia . . . Cuba . . . Vietnam . . . the Berlin Wall . . . Hungary . . . Poland!

The facts about this threat to our security have been carefully studied by a special Committee of distinguished Americans appointed by the American Security Council. Members of the Committee are outstanding experts in their respective fields. They include two Nobel prize winning scientists; the developer of the H-bomb; the developer

of over-the-horizon radar; a former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; the general who headed the development of our own ICBM forces; the present head of the A.E.C.'s weapons division at Los Alamos; a former commander of the Strategic Air Command; a former chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission; a former commander of the Polaris Submarine fleet and 20 other such authorities whose combined credentials clearly establish them as the most qualified independent group ever to study this complex problem. None of them are "armchair strategists." They know what they are talking about. We believe their collective voice should be heard by every American!

THE ASC COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

The Committee has presented its findings and conclusions in the form of a highly readable 72-page book which, summed up, tells us this:

"An American ABM system is the soundest insurance for peace—and AGAINST war—that the United States can buy in 1969 for its security and protection in the 1970's."

The Committee urges that a dependable Safeguard ABM system can and MUST be built at once. Their report observes, "far from being an offensive weapon, the ABM is, in reality, insurance against war. It may well be, in fact, the single most important step the United States can take toward a real and lasting peace at this moment in history."

... and they further emphasize that *ABM has become a symbol of our determination to keep America strong. All major defense decisions in the next decade will probably be affected by the acceptance or rejection of ABM on Capitol Hill in the next few weeks!*

Can anything stop us from building a workable Safeguard ABM System? Just one thing: A lack of national resolve. It is ironic that—not technology... not "hardware"... not money... but our failure to pull together for a strong America might be the single factor responsible for our downfall.

As a matter of plain common sense, the Russians will have us either by violence or by blackmailing us with the threat of violence, if we allow them to increase their nuclear superiority. *History does not reassure us with a single instance of an aggressor nation that restrained itself, once that nation believed it could start a war and win!*

WHAT YOU CAN DO—RIGHT NOW

The Committee's 72-page book on the ABM and the Russian missile threat is written simply, in non-technical language. It will provide every concerned American with the facts he needs to decide about the Safeguard ABM system. You—and your children—should have and read this book.

You can order a copy simply by mailing the form below.

But you should do more. Tell your congressman how you feel about Safeguard. Call, wire, write, but be sure to make your voice heard! (If you do not know the names and addresses of your Senators or Representatives, call your local newspaper. They will be glad to give you this information.)

GIVE SAFEGUARD YOUR FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Equally important, you can help protect yourself, your family and your country by sending the largest contribution you can, together with the form below, so that we can use this money to purchase more advertising space, and to otherwise get the facts about Safeguard and the missile gap—to every corner of America.

The American Security Council was able to fund the basic study but needs broad citizen support for its "Operation Safeguard"

educational program. Thousands of citizens have already helped pay for ads like this. But thousands more concerned Americans *must help*. Please mail the form below—with your check—today.

[Form referred to above not reproduced in the RECORD.]

WHAT IS THE AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL?

The American Security Council is a non-profit research and educational association dealing solely with national security problems.

The ASC is bi-partisan and seeks the best qualified experts whether they be Republican or Democrat, liberal, moderate or conservative. This broad spectrum of participation is reinforced by the cooperation of 358 colleges and universities and 189 membership organizations representing millions of Americans in a separate series of studies called Peace and Freedom Through Cold War Victory.

By selecting experts on the basis of qualifications rather than political leanings, every ASC study has been accurate in its basic predictions. For example, the two preceding ASC studies on the changing strategic military balance accurately predicted the present adverse strategic military balance. These were prepared at the request of the House Armed Services Committee and published by that committee in 1967 and 1968.

These studies are possible only because experts on ASC committees understand the need and donate their services. Please help back these dedicated Americans.

SPECIAL ABM SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL

Cochairmen

Dr. Willard F. Libby, Director, Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics, UCLA.

Dr. William J. Thaler, Chairman, Physics Department, Georgetown University.

Gen. Nathan F. Twining, USAF (Ret.), Former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Members

Gen. Paul D. Adams, USA (Ret.), Former Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Strike Command.

Dr. Harold M. Agnew, University of California—Los Alamos Scientific Lab.

Dr. James D. Atkinson, Professor of Government, Georgetown University.

G. Duncan Bauman, Publisher, St. Louis Globe Democrat.

Peter Bruce Clark, President and Publisher, The Detroit News.

Adm. Robert L. Dennison, USN (Ret.), Former Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic.

Hon. Elbridge Durbrow, Retired Career Ambassador.

Adm. H. D. Felt, USN (Ret.) Former Commander-in-Chief, Pacific.

Robert W. Galvin, Chairman of the Board Motorola, Inc.

Vice Adm. Elton W. Grenfell, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Atlantic Submarine Fleet.

Dr. Montgomery Johnson, Chief Scientist, Philco-Ford Corp.

Vice Adm. Fitzhugh Lee, USN (Ret.), Former Commandant, National War College.

Vice Adm. R. E. Libby, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Naval Operations.

Dr. Nicholas Nyaradi, Director, School of International Studies, Bradley University.

Dr. Stefan T. Possony, Director of International Studies, Hoover Institute—Stanford University.

Gen. Thomas S. Power, USAF (Ret.), Former Commander, Strategic Air Command.

Brig. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, USAF (Ret.), B. A. Schriever Associates, Inc.

Ira G. Ross, President, American Ordnance Assn.

Vice Adm. W. A. Schoech, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Naval Material.

Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, USAF (Ret.), Former Commanding General Air Force Systems Command.

Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, USN (Ret.), Former Chairman U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

Dr. Kenneth Street, Jr., Professor of Chemistry, University of California (Berkeley).

Dr. A. D. Suttle, Research Scientist.

Dr. Edward Teller, Nuclear Scientist.

Rear Adm. Chester C. Ward, USN (Ret.), Former Judge Advocate General, USN.

Dr. Kenneth Watson, Professor of Physics, University of California (Berkeley).

Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, USA (Ret.), Chief U.S. Strategist, World War II.

Dr. Eugene P. Wigner, Physicist, Princeton University.

PROGRESSIVE PENOLOGY—THE PRISON JUNGLE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, one of the marvels of the present day is oft given as the reform handling of our convicts and those incarcerated in detention facilities. Indeed, the emphasis is on rehabilitation in an effort to return the offender to the midstream of society as a useful citizen.

To this end, we have all but abolished in our prison system such archaic things as forced labor, solitary confinement, rigid discipline, and other forms of control which might be said to detract from the dignity of the prisoner as a human being.

The plain facts of life are that there are people who wind up in prison because they could not control themselves in a free society, and to control them for the protection of other members of the community, we must lock them up. There are others who are confined for either punishment or for rehabilitation. They are not identical, even if they are equal under the law.

In our refusal to recognize these truths, we have made the prison environment so permissive that it has become a veritable jungle. The inmates have literally taken over the institution.

One of the numerous instances of this foolishness made the papers here in Washington, although most receive no publicity. Four university students, sentenced to jail for criminal contempt of court after a college riot, pleaded for segregation from other less sophisticated but more experienced prisoners, and were safely locked away in two-man cells isolated from the lower class inmates.

Perhaps the highly theoretical penal reformers will one day learn from the many acts of homosexual violence and other strong-arm attacks by the jungle lords against their weaker prey. These experts may even become so enlightened as to suggest that if prisoners are handled under strict discipline, taught some-

thing about earning a living, and given hard work to occupy their time and usefully employ their energies, they might actually return to society moderately reconstructed. At least they will not have once again demonstrated that even in prison they are tougher than society. And it is possible that their milder fellow inmates will be discharged as rehabilitated, rather than terrified, tormented, and sexually molested creatures.

A current news clipping as well as one 2 months ago follow:

[From the Washington Daily News, June 19, 1969]

FEAR SEX ABUSE—FOUR GW STUDENTS GET SPECIAL CELLS

Officials considered sending four George Washington University students sentenced for criminal contempt to the Occoquan workhouse but decided not to after an inmate there claimed Monday he was the victim of a sexual attack.

Mr. Robert Montilla, assistant director of the D.C. Corrections Department, said yesterday District Court Judge Gerhard A. Gesell, who sentenced the four white men to serve two to five days of three month sentences in jail, had inquired about which facility they could be sent to, to insure their safety.

"He was worried about these young men being sexually assaulted," Mr. Montilla said. "He wondered where they could be sent where there was the greatest assurance they'd get through their time without being molested."

Some time Monday at Occoquan, which houses mostly misdemeanor convicts, an inmate who later alleged that he had been pressured from other prisoners to perform a sexual act climbed a water tower to escape from them, Mr. Montilla said.

"He was up there a couple of hours. We felt the best course was to wait him out, and he came down."

"We believe there was no sexual attack," he stressed.

But the incident was discussed with the judge in deciding ultimately where to place the four students, he said.

"For the short amount of time (they were to serve behind bars) it seemed to me the safest place would be in the D.C. jail," Mr. Montilla said. The four began serving the sentences at 7 a.m. Tuesday in two two-men cells at the jail, isolated from other prisoners.

"They wouldn't be in contact with other inmates," Mr. Montilla reasoned. There is less security at Occoquan, but what happened Monday "is a relatively isolated thing" there, he said. "Occoquan is not an unsafe place."

The facility, near the Lorton Reformatory complex, has about 170 inmates currently.

The D.C. Jail currently has 1,038 prisoners, with about two-thirds in single or double cells and one-third in dormitory housing.

Recent congressional hearings have disclosed that molestation of new prisoners, particularly whites, those who appear young frail and "not hip" to prison ways, is widespread at D.C. institutions.

Mr. Montilla said most sexual attacks tend to happen on buses carrying prisoners to the facilities, in the dorms, and places where close supervision is difficult.

The four students pleaded guilty to defying Judge Gesell's order to evacuate Rice Hall on the GW campus May 9 and were given three month sentences, of which all but a few days were suspended.

William Richardson, 19, of Glendale, Ariz., and Leonard P. Ganessi, 22, of 2517 K-st. n.w., were to be released at 7 a.m. today. James Goodhill, 22, of 2112 F-st. n.w., and

Robert M. Young, 20, of Clifton, N.J., are to be released Saturday morning.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 23, 1969]

**EIGHT HELD IN SEX ATTACK ON YOUTH
(By William N. Curry)**

Eight D.C. jail inmates yesterday were charged with sexually assaulting a 16-year-old youth being held by U.S. marshals in the U.S. District Court holding cell last Friday.

The youth had been placed in the lock-up although the U.S. Code says that juveniles kept in jail must be "held in custody in a room or other place apart from adults if facilities for such segregation are available."

C. A. (Al) Butler, the chief deputy marshal for the District, said the cellblock has separate facilities and he normally uses them for juveniles. "A breakdown in communication" led to the youth's being placed with adults, he said.

The U.S. marshal transporting the youth from Florida to New York City did not tell local marshals the youth was under 18, Butler said. The youth did not look like a juvenile and Butler said there were no papers traveling with him.

A Justice Department spokesman said a form giving the youth's age as 17 accompanied him. He was born April 26, 1952, according to court papers.

Butler said, "There has been a tightening up of normal procedures to hopefully prevent a recurrence." The Justice Department spokesman said the chief U.S. marshal for the United States was investigating the incident.

The youth had been placed in the holding cell Friday afternoon. After rebuffing one sexual advance the youth, who is white, was homosexually raped by 10 to 12 black adults, police said.

When he was getting on a bus for the D.C. jail, where he was to have spent the night, the youth told marshals of the attack, Butler said.

Medical tests substantiated his claim, and yesterday Stephen M. Schuster Jr., the investigating assistant U.S. attorney, filed sodomy charges against the eight.

General Sessions Court Judge Justin L. Edgerton ordered the men, already in jail, held without bond.

Those charged were: Delano R. Tarlton, 18, of 154 3d st. n.w.; Charles Canty, 23, of 278 15th st. se.; Kenneth Thomas Jr., 24, of 4269 Foote st. ne.; Michael E. Jones, 20, of 640 Rock Creek Church rd; Tyrone Parker, 21, of 1122 21st st. ne.; Larry Curtis, 21, of 5068 8th st. ne.; Tyrone Flowers, 20, of 418 D st. ne.; and Henry Smith Jr., 18, of 1343 F st. ne.

THE GOD GAP

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the demagogues of reform and change who babble from habit to criticize our country and culture often seek to explain away their inadequacies with such vocal gymnastics as "generation gap" or "credibility gap."

The problem in our country today is not an age gap, nor is it a believability gap, but rather it is a complete departure from the basic fundamental truth of the creation and role of man.

It is a God gap.

A letter from Tom Bondhus of Big Lake, Minn.; a letter from Patricia Young of Vancouver, Canada; and a letter from the Methodist laymen of North Hollywood, Calif., follow these remarks:

CHURCH OF THE MORNING STAR,

Big Lake, Minn., June 14, 1969.

JOHN RARICK

Falls Church, Va.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In reference to your list of issues facing America.

Could they all be caused by a loss of self respect and conscience of our people?

Would it be fair to say that men without self respect or conscience would be more prone to be cowardly?

Would a dictator have less difficulty in badgering cowards than brave men?

We have a plague in this country because our President has ignored both the first and 13th amendment of our constitution and the 13th verse in God's law of freedom. Our Draft Director has written that: God first took man's freedom. I quote General Hershey's book "Outline of Historical Background of Selective Service and Chronology" Chapter "Biblical Antecedents" I'll quote part; "And if one is to trace the ancestry of Selective Service he must go far beyond the history of early America, back to Biblical days. The first chapter of Numbers records in the first and second verses:" (1) And the Lord spake unto Moses in the wilderness of Sinai, in the tabernacle of the congregation, on the first day of the second month, in the second year after they were come out of the land of Egypt, saying, (2) Take ye the sum of all the congregation of the children of Israel, after their families, by the house of their fathers, with the number of their names, every male by their polls." After copying them he continues: "And the forty-sixth verse of the same chapter records that 603,550 men were subsequently "inducted" to go forth to war in Israel after being "registered" and "classified." That is as far as Hershey went. The term the Bible uses for draft is "Numbering" and that is why the book is called Numbers. Hershey seemed unaware of this and uninterested in the conclusion of the "Draft" God ordered to determine its successfulness as a military venture. In the 13th Chapter of Moses tells what God had in mind when He ordered Moses to call this draft, and 13 chapters still later we learn of their fate.

The conclusion was not what a good General would be expected to follow, because Moses didn't get a single man to fight out of that first draft and later those men all died.

They say you can tell about a person with the word association game. When Hershey quoted Numbers 1:2 "with the number of their names, every male by their polls;" He must have been thinking of the children of America as horses left out in the pasture over the winter, as he referred to them once. Then "their polls" might mean something to hitch a horse to. Had he been a freedom thinking American he might have thought of polls as a place to cast a ballot of vote, as yes or no.

The polls are referring to God's draft law; Exodus 30:12 "When thou takest the sum of the children of Israel after their number, then shall they give every man a ransom for his soul unto the Lord, when thou numberest them; that there be no plague among them, when thou numberest them."

13. This they shall give, every one that passeth among them that are numbered, half a shekel after the shekel of the sanctuary: (a shekel is twenty ge-rahs) an half shekel shall be the offering of the Lord." In Ex. 38:26 You will notice they all paid this ransom. We know this is the same draft because they are identified by the number that Hershey mentioned, their age, etc. If

they all paid the ransom to get out of fighting, there would be nobody to fight, as there wasn't. Numbers 14:2 records God didn't get a man, and boy was he mad, just read on. However God isn't stupid. God knows, it is better not to fight than to fight with a bunch of cowards, so God just waited until they all died and 38 years later God tried the draft again. This time God had an army of not less than 1/3 of 1% smaller than the first call and they were brave men. Why? is the question. The answer is: The men drafted first, had been out of Egypt only 13 months and felt safe under the forced service system or the bondage they had been trained to accept. Forced service turns a man's conscience into cowardliness, because when he is forced to serve by a threat of jail, he is twice a coward; once because he is afraid to fight as they were, and if God had forced them to fight they would be cowards the second time because they were afraid of what God would do to them if they didn't fight. With cowards one can only lose wars. God knows that if given the ransom; (a chance to pay a token to be excused) a man can not pay it if he believes the cause to be good; without admitting to himself that he is a coward. The men that did pay, in God's first draft were cowards and were used to admitting it to themselves, so they were able to pay it. That is why God waited until they all were dead and their sons were trained to be free men and think like free men.

The basic principle of the tyrant or dictator to control the people is; Turn them into cowards by destroying their conscience and self respect and they will not resist.

God's Law on the other hand; is based on the idea that a free man's vanity can be converted to bravery.

Even God could not force a man to be brave.

If conscience and self respect are removed from our people, isn't your list of problems an expected result?

Yours truly,

TOM BONDHUS.

VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA,
CANADA.

THE GOD-GAP

The trouble with the world today is not the Generation Gap, the Credibility Gap or the Missile Gap, but the God Gap.

Man has become so pre-occupied with: doing his own "thing" that he has replaced spiritual values with the dogma of scientific humanism.

In reaching for the stars, man has forgotten the wonder of the universe.

In splitting the atom, we have taken unto ourselves credit for creating the atom.

Like the people of ancient Babel, we would build a Tower to the Heavens and sit upon His throne.

The cult of humanism is reflected in the "I-oriented" songs we sing, and which proclaim: "I Want You, I Need You, I love You."

On the other hand, when things don't go our way, we sing: "Stop The World I Want To Get Off" or "Make The World Go Away!"

This emphasis of man's "rights" to the exclusion of his "responsibilities" is nothing new. Perhaps the sin of Adam and Eve was born of their belief that it was their "right" to eat whatever fruit they pleased. Could be that they fancied themselves with squatters "rights" to The Garden of Eden!

Similarly, I see the "theory" of evolution as part and parcel of the scientific humanism which attempted to separate man from God. Like the child that pouts: "You're not my father" in a futile attempt to defy a parents authority, so man, in denying the existence of a Creator would defy His authority.

Yet to deny the order of the universe is

as futile as commanding the rain to return to the sky or the sun to change places with the moon!

For man can no more command the sea and sky than he can conquer the inevitability of life and death.

In closing the God Gap then, we must first acknowledge the manifestation of divine order.

Only from this acknowledgment can we move on to appreciation enthusiasm, conviction, dedication, inspiration and ultimately the agape love which embraces all of humanity and which heals the wounds of racism, prejudice and selfishness.

Without an understanding of this progression, love can only remain a superficial, self-centered cult of sex-saturated humanism.

PATRICIA YOUNG.

MISSION OF THE CHURCH ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

No organization has ranked church members as thoroughly as the NCC (National Council of Churches). Perhaps the main reason it has upset so many church members in so many denominations is that it purports to "speak for 40 million members," none of whom had a choice in becoming a member.

Although the NCC claims to exist "more fully to manifest oneness in Jesus Christ as divine Lord and Savior . . ." (Preamble of NCC Constitution), its actions belie these noble words. Emphasis is predominately political and, unfortunately, of the left wing variety.

In fact, so politically oriented is the NCC, that it is claimed to be operating illegally under federal law.

The NCC enjoys exemption from federal taxation because of its official commitment that it "shall not engage in influencing legislation or engage in lobbying," yet it has one of the most ruthless and powerful lobbying groups in Washington, and its efforts are nearly always in support of socialistic legislation.

If you are contributing to The Methodist Church (now The United Methodist Church), you are contributing to the NCC, because the Methodist Church is a contributing member of the NCC. If there is any doubt in your mind, just refer to the Methodist Discipline, Part VII, chapter XVI, paragraph 1595, and you will find that it states: "The Methodist Church is a charter member of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America. It has borne its proportionate share of financial support, . . ."

Financially, the NCC depends on member denominations for more than one-half of its budget. In 1965, member donations amounted to \$7,114,478! Make no mistake about it—the NCC is big business. Since inception, the NCC has taken in more than \$212,000,000! One wonders how much of this money has been spent on the following political activities supported by the NCC:

World Order Study Conferences which called for recognition of Red China.

Conferences and resolutions calling for the United States to disarm, withdraw from Vietnam and negotiate with the Communists.

General Board actions and testimony before Congressional Committees calling for the elimination of prayer and Bible reading from the Public Schools.

Urging more Foreign Aid and more Anti-Poverty Funds.

Issuing propaganda in favor of the United Nations and World Government.

Issuing propaganda against internal security committees and investigative procedures.

Attacks on the Profit Motive of Capitalism.

Telling the Congress of the United States that the U.S. should encourage efforts to bring armaments under international control.

Urging the extension of trade and travel with Red China, Eastern European Communist satellite countries, and the Soviet Union.

Protesting against the loyalty oath in the National Defense Act and Education Act.

Declaring that United States citizens should be prepared to subordinate their sovereignty to that of the United Nations.

Urging elimination of State and Local residence requirements for public assistance.

Sponsoring youth assemblies which blaspheme the sacred, such as in the play "For Heaven's Sake."

Paying for trips to the Soviet Union where NCC delegates are wine and dined by Soviet Secret Police agents.

Setting up a Commission of 25 members to organize racial demonstrations, make commitments, organize boycotts, and lobby in Congress for civil rights legislation.

Issuing reports stating that "resistance to civil authority is a valid course for Christians to take" when that Christian decides that a particular law is "unjust" and should be "disobeyed."

Hiring busses to carry lobbyists to Washington so that they could pressure their Congressmen as to how to vote on certain legislation.

Authorizing their representatives to appear before the National Convention platform committees of the Republican and Democratic parties to tell them what planks they should adopt.

How do these projects square with the NCC's claim that it exists "more fully to manifest oneness in Jesus Christ as divine Lord and Savior . . .?"

The fact is, they don't. Actually, the NCC's principal function is that of a Protestant Political Propaganda Hierarchy.

Just what can individual church members do to get rid of the NCC? Perhaps the most effective action would be to deprive it of its most vital need—money.

If church members who disagree with the actions of the NCC would simply withhold financial support to their Churches, this would dramatically reduce the flow of funds to the NCC. The NCC, in turn, would be obliged to curtail its activities.

We suggest that you become more fully informed about the NCC, and then decide for yourself whether you should continue supporting this organization through contributions to your Church.

Send for this release. (Letter No. 87) addressing it to the address below. You should give this to Christian friends and pastors who should have this information:

METHODIST LAYMEN OF NORTH HOLLYWOOD,
NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.

PEOPLE WHO SERVE FOOD HAVE
TO EAT TOO, ALSO

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the Capitol Hill food workers have formed an association for the purpose of achieving some semblance of justice in their wages and working conditions.

True to the unenlightened labor policies of the last century from which most of his policies spring, the Capitol Architect, through his agent, has threatened the job of a leader of the employees association on trumped up charges.

The plain fact is that while the Capitol

16710

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 19, 1969

Architect squanders millions of the tax-payers dollars on wasteful projects, he has denied to these food workers not only

what the very lowest standards call a living wage, but also the slight increase he himself promised them last November.

Mr. Speaker, people who serve food to Senators who "have to eat too" have to eat too, also.