

chusetts, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. VANIK, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. KYROS, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 12473. A bill to permit State agreements for coverage under the hospital insurance program for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 12474. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to prohibit the granting of authority to broadcast pay television programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 12475. A bill to revise and clarify the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DULSKI (for himself and Mr. CORBETT):

H.R. 12476. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for additional positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 12477. A bill to promote public health and welfare by expanding, improving, and better coordinating the family planning services and population research activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 12478. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the granting of authority by the Federal Communications Commission for the broadcast of pay television programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAZEN:

H.R. 12479. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the coastline of certain States as being, for the purposes of that act, the coastline as it existed at the time of entrance into the Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLOREY:

H.R. 12480. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Frederick Douglass home as a part of the park system in the National Capitol, and for other purposes," approved September 5, 1962; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 12481. A bill to adjust agricultural production, to provide a transitional pro-

gram for farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 12482. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights in and under lands in Dunn County, Wis.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12483. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States, its territories, and possessions, to include privately owned property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 12484. A bill to establish certain rights of professional employees in public schools operating under the laws of any of the several States or any territory or possession of the United States, to prohibit practices which are inimical to the welfare of such public schools, and to provide for the orderly and peaceful resolution of disputes concerning terms and conditions of professional service and other matters of mutual concern; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 12485. A bill to provide improved judicial machinery for the selection of juries, to further promote equal employment opportunities of American workers, to authorize appropriations for the Civil Rights Commission, to extend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 with respect to the discriminatory use of tests and devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 12486. A bill to exempt a member of the Armed Forces from service in a combat zone when such member is the only son of a family, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12487. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the assignment of a member of an armed force to combat area duty if certain relatives of such member died or became totally disabled while serving in the Armed Forces in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 12488. A bill to restrict the mailing of credit cards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12489. A bill to reform and modernize the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 12490. A bill to establish fee programs for entrance to and use of areas administered for outdoor recreation and related purposes by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 12491. A bill to supplement the anti-trust laws of the United States by providing for fair competitive practices in the termination of franchise agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12492. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to permit the duty-free entry of certain personal effects of servicemen assigned to combat areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 12493. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to permit a State, under its agreement with the Atomic Energy Commission for the control of radiation hazards, to impose standards (including standards regulating the discharge of radioactive waste materials from nuclear facilities) which are more restrictive than the corresponding standards imposed by the Commission; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.J. Res. 799. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of Gen. Douglas MacArthur; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 12494. A bill for the relief of Francesco and Orsola Miceli and minor son, Vito Miceli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 12495. A bill for the relief of Annibale Cuozzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 12496. A bill for the relief of Polberto Obias Baranuelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 12497. A bill for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act and in the interest of Mrs. Kathleen Alice Heinze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

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

157. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Roger Sherman Bandy, Decatur, Ill., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

158. Also petition of Geraldine M. Vickers, Lawndale, Calif., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### AMERICA'S HERITAGE OF FREEDOM

#### HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, a constituent from the First Congressional District of Arkansas recently sat down to record his ideas on "America's Heritage of Freedom." The resulting article on the price and responsibilities of freedom is worth the serious consideration of all of us as we approach the 193d birthday of our Nation.

The article, written by Mr. Rudy

Thomas of Caraway, Ark., was printed in the local newspaper in Caraway. I commend it to the attention of each of my colleagues and include it in the RECORD at this point:

#### AMERICA'S HERITAGE OF FREEDOM

(By Rudy Thomas)

Another Glorious Fourth of July is just around the corner. It is a day remembered and celebrated as the birthday of our nation. Come next July 4th our nation will be 193 years old. This may sound as if ours is a very old nation, but quite the contrary, it is still a relatively young nation.

As we pause from our daily routine of life to once again celebrate our national birthday let us examine in all candor some of the basic elements that have made our America

the greatest nation in the world today. Freedom as men know it under American government is indeed new. It has come to us only after men struggled for centuries to exercise their rights to be free, to throw off the fetters of tradition. Throughout most of the world's history men have lived their daily lives under rigid rules.

From birth to death primitive people obeyed tribal custom and taboos. As civilization arose, despot kings held the power of life and death over their subjects. In the middle ages merchants gained some business rights, but the poor peasant remained in bondage to his feudal lord. The turning point in these deplorable social conditions seems to have been steered by the hand of God. The spread of Christianity began to undermine the ancient idea that men were

merely servants of the state. Christianity preached "the importance and dignity of the individual", that a man had reason and a conscience and so the right to live his own life. Then the bold discovery of our continent opened new chances to break bonds. Our precious forefathers in due time quit the Old World for a fresh new world where they could nurture the seeds of freedom. To do this they had to conquer a wilderness, fight some six years of Revolution, and build their own nation on a raw continent. That is what they did earn freedom, to earn the chance to think and act for themselves and enjoy the fruits of their own labor and risks. The history of the Colonial and Revolutionary days show how dearly they paid for it. Our American forefathers knew how hard freedom was to earn. They were not going to take it lightly. To safeguard it they created a new kind of government. They wrote the constitution of the United States with the Bill of Rights—the first government in history to serve, not the state, but the people. Now that they were free they knew they could work out their own destiny. Their tools were courage, work and risk—the tools of free men.

This then is basically our American precious heritage of freedom. If it be just, if it be righteous, if it be Godly, let us all in America think on these things as we approach another glorious 4th and give due thanks to men of each generation who have been willing to pay the price to sustain such a noble heritage.

Now just a word about the future in our land of the free and the home of the brave. If we are to have and to hold our national honor we of this generation must assume serious responsibilities based upon high and noble character. Freedom is a hard-won prize. We have to work to keep it. Let a people become indifferent or greedy and that people is in danger of losing freedom. Freedom demands responsibility. It demands courage and hard work. It demands knowledge, thinking. It does not promise equal gains for all. It does however, promise equal rights, equal risks. Individual freedom is ours only as long as we earn it. The work starts in our own actions and behavior. We can keep freedom by respecting the rights of others—family, neighbors, community, and minority groups in race, religion and politics.

In conclusion, let us challenge the youth of our land to position your life, based on courage and character to hold these elements of freedom ever so high where it can be said by all generations of Americans to follow—you have passed to us the torch of freedom inherited from the glorious men of yesteryear.

Now that you have read these facts concerning our heritage of freedom please go out to your favorite picnic come July 4th and help celebrate one of the greatest days ever known to man.

#### SURTAX IN DANGER

### HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, as a strong supporter of tax reform, I am quite naturally deeply disappointed with the income tax surcharge bill which is scheduled to come to the floor of the House for a vote on Monday.

Last year we were told that if we approved the 10-percent income tax surcharge as proposed by then President

Johnson, we would get tax reform. Some of us, including myself, refused to merely listen to promises and demanded performance. We did not get it and refused to support the tax proposal. A year later we are again being asked to vote favorably on the income tax surcharge and again we are hearing promises about tax reform.

Mr. Speaker, the time for tax reform is now. If we are to pass a tax bill at all, it should be coupled with meaningful tax reform, particularly the tax-giveaway, 27½-percent oil depletion allowance.

To those who are hinting that we will get tax reform in return for passage of the income tax surcharge proposal on Monday, I ask you to commit yourselves now—before the tax vote on Monday—on the following question: "Are you prepared to vote in favor of the elimination or at least a drastic reduction of the 27½-percent oil and gas depletion allowance?"

Those who cannot answer with a loud yes, should not be asking anyone else to vote in favor of the income tax surcharge on Monday.

Possibly those of us who have fought for tax reform have been taken for granted too long. Possibly there are those who feel that we can be bought off by the insignificant proposal contained in the tax bill which covers the working poor. I assure them that they are wrong.

This morning's New York Times contains a very interesting editorial in relation to the current controversy over tax reform. I hasten to add that the New York Times supports the tax proposal as a way of throwing water on the fires of inflation. Nevertheless, its remarks about tax reform should be of great interest to everyone concerned with tax reform.

At this point in the RECORD, I place the Times editorial:

#### SURTAX IN DANGER

Prospects for extension of the 10 per cent income tax surcharge all by itself are not very bright.

The Democratic leadership in the House, fearful that their party would be tarred with the brush of "fiscal irresponsibility" have now scheduled a Monday vote on the Administration's bill, a measure conspicuous for its failure to embody substantive reforms. But if despite strong liberal opposition the bill is approved, an even taller hurdle will be encountered in the Senate, where the Majority Policy Committee has adopted a resolution rightly insisting "that meaningful tax reform should be passed simultaneously" with the surtax. Thus, as a consequence of the Administration's unwise decision to abandon tax reform, the surtax itself is in serious danger which means that business uncertainty and the likelihood of disturbances in the financial markets will be greatly increased.

The Nixon Administration and the Democratic House leadership made a serious miscalculation when they thought that the proponents of genuine tax reform could be appeased by an ineffectual provision to lighten the tax burden on the working poor. They failed to reckon with a new fact of political life.

Americans, with a splendid record for voluntary compliance in matters of taxation, bitterly resent the notorious loopholes in the revenue code that permit the wealthy to avoid taxes altogether or to pay far less than is warranted by their incomes. That resentment will subside only when there is genuine progress in reducing the 27.5 per cent oil de-

pletion allowance, nailing down such escape hatches as make it possible to avoid all capital gains taxes on bequeathed assets, and eliminating the tax exemption on bond issues of state and local governments.

In the absence of reduction in expenditures, which would be a more effective means of dampening inflation, the surtax is needed to avoid a budgetary deficit and return to an inflationary monetary policy. But the Administration should by now be reconciled to the fact that it cannot get the surtax extension without pressing for genuine tax reforms.

If the Administration bill is defeated on Monday, the House can follow the Senate precedent and temporarily extend the tax. If it passes, another battle will begin in the Senate. The blot created by the gaping tax loopholes can no longer be easily expunged from the conscience of the Congress.

#### INTELLECTUAL EXHIBITIONISM IN EDUCATION IS DEPLORED

### HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, as one of 22 Congressmen who visited college campuses last month to learn the causes of student unrest, I am most concerned with the course our universities take in preparing students to assume leadership in years to come.

I understand student desire to hear all points of view. I agree with student concern for better communication with college administrations, more voice in relevant curriculum and campus affairs, community problems such as housing, and national problems such as economic injustice.

Some colleges, however, are busily misinterpreting the valid student concerns into the terms demanded by a small minority of highly trained revolutionaries.

In my congressional district, Bryn Mawr College recently disclosed that it has retained as a visiting lecturer Dr. Herbert Aptheker, admitted Communist and Communist Party functionary, described as the leading theoretician of the Communist Party in this country.

When I learned of the appointment, I expressed my disagreement with the necessity and the wisdom of appointing a doctrinaire lecturer. The final decision as to whether or not Bryn Mawr should, in fact, retain Dr. Aptheker rests with the trustees, administration, students and faculty, and, perhaps, the alumnae who contribute and parents who pay tuition to send their daughters there.

I am weary of the cries of academic freedom as a cloak to cover any act that draws criticism. I am particularly disturbed at what appears to be a growing intellectual exhibitionism that institutions must outdo their peers in catering to demands for Marxism to the neglect of a system that has produced more things for more people than any society mankind has ever known.

It is a question of balance.

Just as I would protest a plethora of campus lecturers expounding authoritarian, racist, or Fascist theory, I as vehemently protest the parade of Marxist and revolutionary teachers onto our

campuses to "instruct" the students. I can hear the anguished screams from the academic community if colleges were to hire Democrats to espouse the theories of the Democratic Party and Republicans to promote the theories of the Republican Party.

This question of balance is critical. On many of our college campuses young men are being denied the opportunity to take ROTC even as an elective course in an attempt to cater to the demands of some students.

Yet, in direct contradiction to the elimination of ROTC, the institution will put "culture" courses into the curriculum and hire new instructors. This lack of balance can, in the long run, only hurt the education of a majority of students—black and white—who must learn also on the college campuses that life in an orderly society does not permit only your indulgences, but allows others equal opportunity.

I insert for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this editorial of June 19, 1969, from the Main Line Chronicle, published in Ardmore, Pa., which says some things that have to be said:

#### EDUCATION OR INDOCTRINATION?

Bryn Mawr College is a free-loading guest in the community. It pays no taxes but shares our municipal services. If the college administration assumes that the community will accept academic arrogance as academic freedom, it had better be set straight.

It has become increasingly noticeable of late that the college has lowered its standards and is going in more for indoctrination than higher education. You see it in the product.

None of the faculty will admit he is a Communist—which is, by the way, a libelous word, unless party membership can be documented. But too many members of the faculty are Marxist in effect and, as we have often said, equals to the same or equal things are equal to each other.

We have had to live with this, and there is nothing the Township can do but to accept the fact that we are playing host to an institution that is corrupting the minds of young people and working with the enemies of our government.

The administration now feels bold enough to appoint one of the leading Communist Party activists to its lecturing staff. This is an affront to the community, and to the alumnae of Bryn Mawr College as well.

The real significance of the appointment is what this means to the Red Party. Dr. Herbert Aptheker, the appointee, expressed it in the following words: "It is thrilling, with wide national significance for the Communist Party." And noting that the request for his appointment was made by black and white militants, he added: "It also reflects something of what the student movement is all about, which many people have failed to understand."

The meaning we are to take from this is that the "student movement" is aiming for a Communist takeover. Non-Communists have been saying that all along.

Dr. Aptheker's life has been devoted to the spread of Communism by indoctrination of students. He is a member of the party's National Committee and a director of the American Institute for Marxist Studies.

He successfully indoctrinated his own daughter, who, with Mario Savio, started all the trouble at Berkeley.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has a whole dossier on the man, going back more than 30 years.

His call to Bryn Mawr must not be taken lightly. It has given his whole party a lift,

and its members are saying that it now puts them on a level of acceptance with the Republican and Democratic parties.

Residents of the community should let the college administration know what they think of this affront, this show of contempt for decent American opinion.

Resentment should be shown, first of all, by the alumnae, either by voice or—what is more expressive—by holding back on gifts.

Alumnae tell us that when they are solicited for gifts and when they mention with dismay the pink hue the college has acquired, they are told: "Oh, yes, but this can be changed by continued loyalty." Oh, yes? The appointment of Dr. Aptheker proves that the administration values what transient black commies want above what the public thinks of the college.

They may go in for "intellectualism" at Bryn Mawr, but they don't show much intelligence.

### POWELL MAY "JUST TRY TO BE REASONABLE" WITH THE HOUSE

#### HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the historic decision rendered June 16 by the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL is a subject of broad interest to Members of Congress and the general public. In addition to the resolution, House Resolution 443, which I introduced June 19, 1969, proposing to restore the pay, allowances, and seniority now declared unconstitutional taken away from him during the 90th Congress—1967-68—a delineation of his further legal options is also worthy of sober and objective reflection. It was thoughtful of the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ROGERS) to submit the majority opinion rendered by Chief Justice Warren, additional views by Justice Douglas, and the dissent by Justice Stewart in the RECORD, June 25, pages 17326 to 17342. I would like to add the following which is an excellent article by William Greider, staff writer for the Washington Post, outlining Congressman POWELL's current legal position:

#### POWELL MAY "JUST TRY TO BE REASONABLE" WITH THE HOUSE (By William Greider)

According to those who counseled with him in Bimini in his hour of triumph, Rep. Adam Clayton Powell genuinely seeks accommodation with his old brethren in the House of Representatives, the men who tossed him out. He would like to settle matters, not entirely on his own terms, but in a way that would avoid a nasty confrontation between the House and the Federal courts.

This present mood is subject to change without notice, of course. It is certainly out of character with the flamboyant man everyone remembers, whose defiance led to his exile from Congress. But that is how he is said to feel as of now.

Judging from the current sentiments among his colleagues, it seems unlikely that the House will be willing to settle the dispute quietly with a little something for Adam like back pay or seniority.

Aside from the political benefits of attacking him, there is a special feeling toward the Harlem Congressman, even among some of the liberals who supported him. It is a

personal animosity which they do not direct at other committee chairmen who have taken their secretaries on trips around the world or put their wives on the payroll at the taxpayers' expense.

They regard him as an unreformed scoundrel. More important, he has been an indiscreet scoundrel, continually calling the public's attention to congressional practices they all know exist. The other day, a Texas Congressman introduced a resolution to begin a counter-claim to recover the money Powell allegedly misappropriated in his days as chairman of the Education and Labor Committee. That would seem just to the public and it might seem just to Powell if the same standard were applied to all chairmen.

The Supreme Court decision which declared the House exclusion of Powell unconstitutional has put him in a position where at last he has a little leverage in the matter. He can offer the House something which most members undoubtedly want—a chance to avoid an embarrassing showdown between the Federal court and its co-equal, the Congress. No one can predict precisely how this confrontation of powers might unfold, but nearly everyone agrees that it would not enhance either institution.

For Powell the situation poses a delicious irony—the possibility that the House might be placed in the position of defying a court order. Even if Powell never collected a penny in back pay that would be a poetic turn-about. For the central element in the indictment against him was his defiance of a contempt order in a New York State court. As one of his supporters said, "It's just like they all say—it's a simple problem of law and order."

A lot must happen before the case gets that far. In his low-keyed press conference in Bimini Powell said he would meet first with the House leadership and the implication was that he would explore the possibilities of avoiding the clash.

Here is the legal situation from the challenger's position: Powell could seek a declaration from the District Court that the original House resolution on March 1, 1967, which excluded him was void. By amending his suit, he could easily apply the Supreme Court's reasoning to argue that a second House resolution, adopted Jan. 3 of this year, was also unconstitutional because it allowed him to be seated with conditions. The court held that the House doesn't have the power to keep a member from being sworn in if he meets the three constitutional qualifications—if he's a citizen, a resident and old enough. (That doesn't prevent the House from punishing him or expelling him afterward.) Powell's lawyers could argue that the House was again adding to the constitutional qualifications this year when it required a \$25,000 fine and a loss of any seniority status as conditions for Powell's readmission.

If Powell won a court declaration that both of these resolutions were illegal, it would do two things for him. First, he could then argue for a court order (directed at the House staff officers, not its elected members) to recover \$55,000 in lost pay, not to mention the \$25,000 fine which they have been deducting from his paychecks. More important to Powell, he could then argue among his colleagues that his House seniority of 24 years was, in effect, restored.

Though many have forgotten this fine point, the original action taken against him by the House Democrats in January of 1967 did not strip him of his seniority. It merely ordered him removed as chairman of the Education and Labor Committee. That action was intended to head off the more drastic punishment of ouster which the House eventually took. If Powell's current status is determined by the January, 1967, punishment (which everyone agrees is beyond the reach of the courts), he could claim that he is not at the bottom of the seniority ladder—but

merely an ex-chairman with 24 years of seniority.

In terms of settling amicably, Powell's lawyers could win a declaration from the District Court of the Congressman's rights—but then drop the matter without seeking the court order to enforce a remedy for the damages—the order which would force the showdown.

It would then be a matter for the Democratic caucus and its Committee on Committees to resolve. Powell himself has said that he has no illusions about regaining the chairmanship, but he hasn't given up hope that his seniority could be restored. That would make him No. 2 on the committee and presumably chairman of a subcommittee.

It would also have the effect of pushing every other Democrat on the committee down a notch—including liberals who have spoken in his defense. Simple arithmetic suggests that their opposition—plus the Southerners and Powell's other natural enemies—would be enough to prevent any restoration movement in the Democratic caucus. All of his legal arguments will be academic if his fellow Democrats insist he is still a freshman.

These are the considerations which the House leaders will have to deal with if they wish to avoid a clash with a court order. Conceivably, we will be treated to the spectacle of an Adam Clayton Powell just trying to be reasonable, baby, while his congressional colleagues will be the ones insisting they are above the law.

## INDEPENDENCE DAY OF MADAGASCAR

### HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to President Philibert Tsiranena, of Madagascar, and Madagascar's Acting Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Reneg Ralison, on the occasion of the ninth anniversary of Madagascar's independence.

Nine years ago today the island of Madagascar joined the family of nations as the independent Malagasy Republic. On this ninth anniversary of their independence, I would like to pay tribute to the leaders, Government, and 6 million people of the Malagasy Republic for the peace, harmony, and stability they have created in pursuit of their nation's motto "Liberty, Country, Progress."

Known as the "big red island" in recognition of its natural beauty, Madagascar is the fourth largest island in the world. Madagascar forms a cultural bridge between the African and Asian worlds as its people are of Indonesian-Malay, Arab, and African heritage. Though the 6 million people of Madagascar are members of 18 different tribes, a cultural cohesiveness—not yet attained by many African nations—exists as a result of a common language, Malagasy.

The economy of the Malagasy Republic is in the early stages of development. Problems of underpopulation and lack of capital forestall rapid industrialization. However, the economy enjoys a certain degree of self-sufficiency. Ninety percent of the people are engaged in agriculture

and 90 percent of Madagascar's exports are agricultural products. The island's principal crops are rice, tapioca, coffee, vanilla, cloves, and tobacco.

The Malagasy Republic has been a staunch friend of the Western World and an old friend of the United States—relations between the United States and Madagascar date back more than 100 years. At present a NASA satellite tracking station very vital to the American space program is located on Madagascar. The United States is also the Malagasy Republic's second largest customer as it buys about 10 percent of the island's exports.

At a time when racial strife and international conflict is the norm, it is a pleasure to note that in a state such as the Malagasy Republic the worlds of Africa and Asia can come together and create a nation which peacefully pursues the goal of "Liberty, Country, Progress."

## CITIZENS' CRUSADE FOR CLEAN WATER

### HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, a coalition of some three dozen private conservation organizations, labor unions, consumer groups, professional societies, and associations of local governmental officials has launched the "Citizens Crusade for Clean Waters" in a massive effort to alert the American public to the need for controlling water pollution. I was privileged to participate in the first organizational meeting of the crusade.

Initially, the crusade is directed at getting in fiscal 1970 an appropriation of \$1 billion, as authorized, for Federal grants to local governments for helping in the appropriation of municipal waste treatment plants. On June 6, 25 of the private groups sent a joint wire to President Nixon, asking that he request the full \$1 billion for waste treatment plant construction grants. Since that time, the number of organizations in the coalition has risen to 38, with two more taking independent action in a similar vein.

The crusade was kicked off on June 9 with a press conference at the National Press Club. Joseph W. Penfold, conservation director of the Izaak Walton League of America and chairman of the Natural Resources Council of America, which initiated the crusade, presided over the meeting and explained the organization of the coalition.

Louis S. Clapper, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation and a member of the Federal Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, then explained the background of need for waste treatment works. A copy of the remarks of Mr. Penfold and Mr. Clapper follows:

REMARKS BY LOUIS S. CLAPPER, NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION, BEFORE PRESS CONFERENCE CALLED BY THE "CITIZENS' CRUSADE FOR CLEAN WATER"

People interested in clean water and concerned about contamination of the environ-

ment were distressed at a report issued earlier this year by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration on the cost of abatement and control.

This report indicates that, if costs continue to rise, the total bill is expected to amount to \$26 to \$29 billion in the next five years. Broken down, this is \$8 billion for municipal works, \$6.2 to \$4.6 billion for industrial waste treatment, with another \$1.8 billion for industrial cooling, and from \$5.3 to \$5.7 billion for municipal and industrial operating and maintenance costs.

There is a growing money gap between what the Congress has authorized and what is appropriated for Federal grants to local governments for the construction of waste treatment plants. For fiscal 1968, only \$203 million of the \$450 million authorized was appropriated. For fiscal 1969, the authorization was for \$700 million, yet only \$214 million was appropriated. Finally, this coalition was formed with the Nixon Administration joining the Johnson Administration in recommending only \$214 million, or less than a quarter of the authorized \$1 billion for fiscal 1970.

We view the Federal grants as being tremendously important. Unless the Federal Government helps, it is a poor position to require high standards of water quality from the States and local governments. And, unless the governments handle municipal pollution, they are in a poor position to point a finger at polluting industries. And, so the whole water pollution control program is in jeopardy.

We are confident that the people want clean water and are willing to pay for it—if given the chance.

A survey conducted by the Gallup Organization, Inc., for the National Wildlife Federation earlier this year revealed these statistics:

About half (51%) of all persons interviewed expressed the opinion that they are "deeply concerned" about the effect of air pollution, water pollution, soil erosion, and destruction of wildlife in our natural surroundings. An additional one-third (35%) are "somewhat concerned."

Nearly three-fourths of those interviewed were willing to pay something in additional taxes to improve our national surroundings.

Three of every four persons favor setting aside more public land for conservation purposes such as national parks, wildlife refuges, bird sanctuaries, etc.

The public is almost evenly divided on whether or not it will, at some time, be necessary to limit the human population if present living standards are to be maintained.

Summarizing this survey, we conclude that the American public appreciates quality in the environment, deplors what is happening to it, and stands ready to support corrective measures, even to the extent of paying for it—as they will, one way or another, in the end.

The Conservation Foundation, as a matter of fact, has compiled data which shows that voters have expressed themselves in this manner. Since 1964, the voters of nine states have had the opportunity to vote in statewide elections on water pollution control bond issues. Seven of the nine state bond proposals were approved and even the other two attracted majority voter support. Of 17,625,254 citizens who participated, 11,725,444 voted "yes", an average "yes" vote of 66 per cent.

I should like to report to you that the Federal Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, of which I am a member, has recommended that the Federal Government meet its obligations. The following was adopted in the December, 1968, meeting of the Board:

The Board recommends that continued efforts be made by the Secretary to ensure that the Federal Government lives up to the commitment made to the States under the municipal grants program administered by the

Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. A failure to press for adequate appropriations can be construed by the States as

evidence that the Administration and the Congress were not sincere in their concern for the problem of water pollution control.

TABLE 1.—RESULTS OF STATE ELECTIONS ON BOND ISSUES FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL, 1964-1969<sup>1</sup>

Election date	State	Amount (in millions)	Vote	Pass/fail	Percent "yes" vote <sup>2</sup>
Nov. 3, 1964	Maine	\$25	(Yes 222,242 No 81,469)	Passed	73.2
Nov. 2, 1965	New York	1,000	(Yes 3,373,700 No 718,398)	do	82.4
May 16, 1967	Pennsylvania <sup>3</sup>	250	(Yes 1,163,779 No 677,808)	do	63.2
June 29, 1967	Rhode Island	12	(Yes 16,461 No 12,439)	do	56.9
Nov. 5, 1968	Illinois <sup>4</sup>	400	(Yes 1,656,600 No 1,216,847)	Failed	57.6
Do	Michigan	335	(Yes 1,906,385 No 796,079)	Passed	70.5
Do	Ohio <sup>5</sup>	100	(Yes 1,732,512 No 1,550,759)	do	52.7
Do	Washington	25	(Yes 845,372 No 276,161)	do	75.4
Apr. 1, 1969	Wisconsin <sup>6</sup>	144	(Yes 808,393 No 569,850)	do	58.9
Total		2,291	Yes 11,725,444		66.5
Less Illinois		-400	No 5,899,810		
Total passed		1,891		17,625,254	

<sup>1</sup> State water pollution control agencies, State election agencies, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration are sources for the information summarized here. The table may not be complete; although each of the 50 States has been contacted, all have not yet responded to our inquiry. All reported bond issue election defeats, as well as approvals, are summarized here.

<sup>2</sup> The percent "yes" vote is the percentage of "yes" to total "yes" and "no" votes.  
<sup>3</sup> Pennsylvania's 1967 bond issue totaled \$500,000,000. Of this, \$250,000,000 was for water pollution control (\$100,000,000 for construction of sewage treatment plants, and \$150,000,000 for acid mine drainage pollution control). In addition, \$225,000,000 was for "elimination of land and water scars created by past coal mining practices" and closure of abandoned mines, and \$25,000,000 for air pollution control.

<sup>4</sup> Illinois' 1968 proposal totaled \$1,000,000,000, which was designated for open space-outdoor recreation land acquisition and air pollution control, as well as for water pollution control. Although no fixed amount was officially earmarked for water pollution control, there was general agreement that \$400,000,000 would go for this purpose. Despite a majority of "yes" votes, the proposal was not approved due to an Illinois law which requires a "simple majority of votes cast for all State legislature candidates" to pass.

<sup>5</sup> Ohio's 1968 proposal totaled \$120,000,000, which was divided into 2 parts: \$100,000,000 for sewage and water treatment, and \$20,000,000 for water management.

<sup>6</sup> Wisconsin's proposal totaled \$200,000,000 and included \$56,000,000 for open space-recreation land acquisition. This was an advisory referendum only; the legislature is to make the final decision.

Notes: In 1966 the Massachusetts Legislature authorized a \$150,000,000 bond issue for an accelerated water pollution control program. Massachusetts has no law which requires either State or local bond issues to be referred to the voters for approval. In 1967 the Connecticut Legislature approved a \$150,000,000 bond issue for water pollution control. The legislature took final action on this proposal; there was no referendum by the voters.

TABLE 2.—UPCOMING STATE ELECTIONS ON BOND ISSUES FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Election date	State	Amount (millions)	Vote	Pass/fail	Percent "yes" vote
November 1969	New Jersey <sup>1</sup>	\$190.6			
Do	do <sup>2</sup>	222.0			
May 1970	Oregon <sup>3</sup>	50.0			
November 1970	Maine <sup>4</sup>	50.0			

<sup>1</sup> In January 1969 the New Jersey Legislature placed on the November 1969 State ballot a referendum on a proposed \$190,600,000 bond issue for "expanding public sewage facilities to eliminate pollution of surface waters."

<sup>2</sup> In April 1969 the New Jersey Legislature placed on the November 1969 State ballot a 2d referendum on a proposed \$222,000,000 bond issue for "controlling and eliminating pollution of tidal and surface waters."

<sup>3</sup> In April 1969 the Oregon Legislature voted to refer to the voters at the May 1970 primary election a proposed change in the State constitution to authorize the State to issue bonds to finance grants and loans to local governments for sewage works construction. Under the proposal the amount of bonds issued cannot exceed 1 percent of the value of all real property and the amount outstanding at any one time cannot exceed \$50,000,000.

<sup>4</sup> In March 1969 the Maine Legislature placed on the November 1970 State ballot a referendum on a proposed \$50,000,000 bond issue for construction of pollution abatement facilities.

JUNE 6, 1969.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,  
President, the White House,  
Washington, D.C.:

Conservation, labor, and many other citizen-civic organizations representing millions of interested and concerned persons firmly believe water pollution is one of the most important domestic problems, involving serious health hazards and waste of beneficial uses of water.

State-approved applications for matching grant funds totaling \$2¼ billion from States and local governments are now on file with the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

The proposed Federal budget for fiscal 1970 requests only \$214 million to assist local governments in the construction of sewage treatment plants under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Our groups believe that your administration should seek for fiscal 1970 an appropriation of \$1 billion for Federal grants to local governments to help them in the construction of these desperate-

ly-needed waste treatment plants. We consider it imperative that the \$1 billion authorized be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969.

## CITIZENS CRUSADE FOR CLEAN WATER.

## MEMBERS

American Association of University Women.  
AFL-CIO.  
American Fisheries Society.  
American Institute of Architects.  
Association of Interpretive Naturalists.  
Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.  
Consumers Federation of America.  
Izaak Walton League of America.  
National Association of Counties.  
National Audubon Society.  
National Fisheries Institute.  
National Rifle Association.  
National Wildlife Federation.  
Sport Fishing Institute.  
The American Forestry Association.  
The American Institute of Planners.  
The Conservation Foundation.

The League of Women Voters of the United States.

The National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts.

The Wilderness Society.

The Wildlife Society.

United Auto Workers.

United States Conference of City Health Officers.

United Steelworkers of America.

Wildlife Management Institute.

## VOTERS AND WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

(By Joseph W. Penfold)

Most Americans not only want clean water but are willing to pay for it.

This is indicated by a summary of results of recent statewide elections on bond issues for water pollution control. The summary was released today by the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water, a coalition of some 30 organizations concerned about the lagging national water cleanup program.

"The record of the last five years shows that when voters are asked directly in state bond referendums whether they want clean water and are willing to tax themselves to help pay for it, two out of three say 'yes,'" Joseph W. Penfold, coordinator of the Clean Water Crusade, said.

The summary reports that:

Since 1964 the voters of nine states have had an opportunity to vote in statewide elections on proposed water pollution control bond issues.

Eight of the nine proposals were approved and the ninth also was supported by most of those who voted on it.

Of the total of 17,625,254 citizens who voted on the nine proposals, 11,725,444 voted "yes"—an average "yes" vote of 66 per cent.

(Most states have not held elections in this field; their legislatures make the final decisions to issue bonds or to finance pollution control through regular appropriations.)

The state elections involved were in Maine in 1964, New York in 1965, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island in 1967, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio and Washington, all in 1968, and Wisconsin in 1969.

(Of the nine proposals, all were officially approved except the one in Illinois. Although supported by 57 per cent of those who voted on it, the Illinois proposal failed because of a requirement of Illinois law that such proposals must be approved by a "majority of votes cast for all state legislature candidates" in the same election.)

In commenting on the election summary, Penfold emphasized that "these state bond financing proposals were predicated on the assumption that the Federal government would keep its commitment, as declared by the Congress in the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966, to match the state money."

"If we are to turn the tide and begin to clean up our polluted rivers, streams and lakes, it is necessary for the Federal government to keep this commitment that the states and local communities have been relying on by putting the Federal money on the line in the form of grants at the level authorized by Congress," he said.

The Clean Water Crusade group is asking President Nixon and the Congress to provide \$1 billion—the amount authorized by Congress—in matching grants for community sewage treatment plant construction during the 12 months beginning July 1. The Nixon Administration has asked the Congress for less than a quarter of that amount—\$214 million.

Penfold said "the inadequacy of \$214 million for this program at this time is put into perspective by the size of the backlog of grant applications from local and state governments already received by the Interior Department's Water Pollution Control Administration: \$2¼ billion."

The official Federal-state estimate of state

clean-up costs over the next five years is more than \$10 billion.

Penfold noted that in many instances water pollution control bonding proposals passed comfortably at the same time that voters were rejecting bond proposals for other purposes. "In the November 1968 general elections, as *Engineering News-Record* magazine has reported, voters across the country continued to approve most pollution control bond issues even though they rejected 49 per cent of all bond proposals," he said.

Penfold is conservation director of the Izaak Walton League of America. Other organizations cooperating in the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water include the League of Women Voters of the United States, the American Institute of Architects, Consumer Federation of America, National Association of Counties, National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors, U.S. Conference of City Health Officers, National Audubon Society, AFL-CIO, United Auto Workers, National Wildlife Federation, Sierra Club, and American Fisheries Society.

The summary of state election results was prepared by the Conservation Foundation at the request of the Clean Water Crusade. Sources for the election results reported in the summary are state pollution control and election officials, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

#### CAMPUS UNREST

### HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, 22 concerned Members of the House of Representatives, who also happen to be Republicans, recently issued a 37-page report on the subject of criticisms of life in the United States by young people, particularly college students. This attitude often is euphemistically referred to as "campus unrest." But often it has been plainly destructive and has quite properly created widespread concern among the American people. While acknowledging the legitimacy of criticism, almost all Americans believe that the road of violence as a way to cure injustice is historically demonstrable as in reality a detour to political reaction. Grotesque remedies offered by some in this Congress and in the country sustain this observation.

In my view the report of my 22 colleagues is a useful and thoughtful one that draws its strength from the fact that it is based upon visits to several dozen institutions of higher learning—not upon guesses, preconceptions, and newspaper photographs. The report, among its other strengths, points out that radical students strive to prevent successful reform by moderates. But the report does not gloss over the fact that there exists a large, and perhaps growing, body of students who are extremely disgruntled and dissatisfied with both the inadequacies of their institutions of higher learning and society in general. Importantly, in this regard, the report points out that the "crucial factor in the widening gap between students and others is the student's perception of reality. This must be understood by all those who seek solutions. This requires of us comprehension and of the student, understanding."

This report, in its entirety, is worth

reading. There are passages that are open to dispute but for the most part the report is helpful and those who took their time and made this effort are to be commended.

#### YOUTH'S CONTRIBUTION TO SOCIETY

### HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, while everyone has been complaining about hippies and the SDS, a great majority of today's youth is making substantial contributions to society. My observations show that our youth want to help remold our "establishment" into a viable apparatus that is more in tune with the needs existing today rather than to destroy the fabric of our democratic way of life. I have personally known many of our youth who have taken on responsibilities far beyond their years, and I commend them for meeting the challenges that are put before them.

I share the sentiments of a very fine writer who wrote the following editorial which appeared in the *Fargo, N. Dak., Forum*:

#### DON'T WRITE THEM OFF

(By Lloyd W. Sveen)

Adults suffered a terrible shock last week [April 13-20]. They discovered they had written off teenagers and college students too soon.

"Students Fight Dakota Flooding" screamed the big black headline across the top of page 1 of the *San Diego Evening Tribune*. You could almost feel the amazement of California readers at the thought of schools closing because students were out sandbagging a river instead of a college president.

This is understandable in a state where student revolt was born at Berkeley in 1964, but the same stunned surprise was reflected here. A typical comment was that of Minnesota Gov. Harold LeVander: "The youth are said to be anti-establishment but when the chips are down they come through."

Why should we be so surprised that kids are eager to meet challenges? Maybe because we've taken away all the challenges that used to be normal in the process of growing up?

We're a smart generation which survived the spiked malt, Betty Coed, and Joe College age to establish a technological era where miracles are so common it is difficult to get excited about plans to land a man on the moon. We're so smart we've made it almost impossible for a child to develop into a man or a woman without wrenching experiences.

We preach about the virtue of work to our kids, but we have invented just about everything that can eliminate work.

We tell of the hardships we underwent during the depression while we hand them their own credit cards.

We teach them that the great heroes of history were individualists who dared to stand alone, but we lay down rules on length of hair and skirts so all will look alike.

We build schools to teach our kids to think and to reason, to weigh and consider; but when they arrive at a judgment that differs from ours we call them rebellious.

We call them hippies when they wander from place to place in search of happiness but we applaud and envy the millionaire jet set which does the same thing.

We tell them that delaying a present pleas-

ure brings a far greater reward in the future but we can't wait to buy another luxury so we charge it.

We who once gloried in the lurid movies of the '30s before the Legion of Decency cracked down now are righteously indignant at the new wave of nudity and double entendre.

We tell kids to be patient with us because problems can't be solved overnight—but we give them instant bottles when they're babies, instant food when they're growing up, we take instant pictures of them at high school graduation, and give them instant entrance to a college.

And now when Mother Nature gives them an instant challenge we don't know what to do about it. We are so happily surprised that the electronic talk shows are full of suggestions about thanking the kids—give them a big party, set up scholarships, give them more opportunity for recreation.

We're in danger of flubbing it again. Why not just say, "Thanks. You did a good job," and then start to figure out a way to give them more ways to work off their energy and use their talents.

#### A LETTER OF PROTEST FROM A STUDENT WITH REGARD TO THE CUT IN TEACHER'S SALARIES

### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a letter which I recently received from one of my constituents, a student at Surrattsville Senior High School, Prince Georges County, Md. It is, I believe, eloquent testimony to the concern which the youth of today have, not only about their own future, but for the problems which face our society. The student, Mr. Steve Kane, has asked that I discuss with my colleagues the problem involving cuts in teachers' salaries. I am most happy to comply with his request by calling Mr. Kane's letter to their attention:

CLINTON, MD.

DEAR MR. HOGAN: I am a student at Surrattsville Senior High and I am writing in to ask you if you could speak to some of the other representatives about the salary cut of our teachers. Our teachers here really work hard to put things across to us and with the large classes, I and many other students feel that the salary cut of our teachers for next year is very unjust. Would you please see if you can do something about this for our hard working teachers?

Thank you.

STEVE KANE.

Mr. Speaker, I feel a sense of frustration because in the face of all of the money which the Federal Government expends each year on various programs and the billions of dollars spent across our Nation in matters far less important than education, we as a nation, have been unable or unwilling to see that our teachers receive the kind of compensation which they so richly deserve.

I confess that I have no immediate answer to the problem and so I call upon you to join with me in making a better effort to see that the teachers of our Nation are at least as well paid as others rendering comparable service to our society.

## YUGOSLAVIA GETS FDA GRANT

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, last week HEW announced a \$120,000 grant to a university in Yugoslavia to study spastic people.

This week, the FDA announces a grant of \$200,000 and a second one for \$130,000 for research in Yugoslavia. The purpose of the grant is announced for the study of any relationship between use of birth control pills and cancer of the cervix. An estimated 10,000 Yugoslav women are to be involved in the 6-year study.

Of course, it is understandable that with the high standard of living in the United States we could not expect to employ 10,000 women for 6 years for \$200,000, but it does seem ridiculous—even if only counterpart funds—that our country must help subsidize the Communist economy of Yugoslavia.

It is possible that some in our Government are aware that the Red Yugoslav leaders have embraced the Vietcong government in South Vietnam in the killing of American boys, and see in this research project a chance to control the future population of Yugoslavia.

And all of this while the American taxpayers are being asked to continue the surtax because of excessive, frivolous, uncontrolled governmental spending.

In include a pertinent news release:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,  
June 26, 1969]

**YUGOSLAVIA WILL STUDY PILL FOR FDA**  
(By Morton Mintz)

The Food and Drug Administration is contracting with Yugoslavia for two major studies on the safety of oral contraceptives—the first FDA research projects in an Eastern European country.

The larger study is intended to shed light on whether there is a relation between use of the Pill and cancer of the cervix.

A second objective is to gather data on the almost unexamined question whether the Pill in any way imperils the offspring of women who have used it. The study also will investigate whether use of the Pill effects fertility—an issue about which there are differing medical reports.

In an interview yesterday, Dr. John J. Schrogie, director of the Division of Research and Liaison in the FDA's Bureau of Medicine, said that the 6-year study will begin within several weeks and will involve about 10,000 Yugoslav women—about half of them controls who will use non-chemical or no contraception.

The cost is estimated at \$200,000—much less than it would be in the United States, the FDA official said. The bill will be met with counterpart funds that are available to repay the United States for foreign aid, but that can be spent only in Yugoslavia.

The study awaits final approval which is expected, shortly from FDA Commissioner Herbert L. Ley Jr. and C. C. Johnson Jr., head of the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Association.

Already approved is a second study that will cost \$130,000 in counterpart funds and will last four years. This investigation will concern a suspected relation between use of the Pill and, in some users, diabetes.

Population research is an approved use for counterpart funds under Public Law 480. The issue of a possible link between the

Pill and cervical cancer flared into controversy last September, when it became known that a major—and still unpublished—study done in New York City had shown a higher rate of precancerous changes in the cervical tissue of women on the Pill than in controls using a diaphragm.

The FDA's Advisory Committee said last Nov. 1 that the data "do not confirm or refute a causal relation. . . ." The agency's hope is that the Yugoslav study—and another being planned in this country—will yield definitive answers.

## THE PRESS ETHICS COMMITTEE

**HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, elements of the news media have been most insistent that there be an ethics committee established for the House, the other body, and for the Supreme Court. The clear implication has been there is dire need for such a committee because of a handful of incidents of misconduct, at least as far as Congress is concerned.

Yet, the national and international news media has no such ethics guardian of its own. However, a group of journalists and writers, concerned over the one-sided and slanting reporting, is attempting to at least throw some light on the sickening and disgusting attempts to brainwash us.

These distinguished journalists and writers have formed a press ethics committee, and in the RECORD of May 26 I commended them for it. Yet, even before this committee could issue its first statement the subjective peddlers hastened to attack it, seeking to destroy it and leave it stillborn.

They did not accomplish this, however, and the press ethics committee has distributed its initial statement—one that hopefully will encourage the two-sided, objective coverage of the news so badly needed if the public is to have a sound basis for decisions.

I urge my colleagues to read this first statement of the press ethics committee carefully. I do not know what prominence it was given around the country, but I do say it deserves the full attention of every American at this crucial moment in our history. The statement follows:

## THE PRESS ETHICS COMMITTEE

The Press Ethics Committee issued the following statement today:

News reporting against the ABM defense missile system for the U.S.A. has been so one-sided that the right of 200 million Americans to be defended has been largely ignored.

Typical of the extreme media attacks against minimal U.S. defense from the new Soviet 25 megaton war-heads is the following from the Washington Post of April 15, 1969:

"It is still far too small to knock out more than one (U.S.) ICBM site.

"It is instead a large war-head designed to destroy large 'soft' targets—such as cities—in other words a second strike weapon, and that is all."

On the Huntley-Brinkley TV-show, where the proposed anti-missile defense has been

attacked very frequently, the ABM system was even assailed in the newscast on President Eisenhower's death. TV quiz programs and TV shows are loaded with ABM opponents. One of the favorite gadgets in what seems to be leading toward a TV "blitz" against defensive missiles is to emphasize their cost and follow this immediately with the need for funds for domestic poverty programs.

This cacophony has reached such a pitch that in Foreign Affairs magazine D. A. Brennan has spoken of lopsided reporting which causes lopsided thinking. Columnist William S. White has not criticized the Press but has charged that the anti-ABM lobby is operating "one of the most richly financed propaganda campaigns in recent history."

News reporting on the new "Safeguard" missiles has almost entirely by-passed the simple fact that—at the very worst—they are better than no defense missiles at all.

The Press Ethics Committee, on the basis of a volume of press reports and TV-casts, warns the public that its safety seems endangered by the increasingly one-sided and virulent reporting against a missile defense from the new Soviet aggressive rockets.

We urge each American to be alert to this dangerous propaganda barrage and to ponder any favorable, as well as adverse, reports respecting the proposed anti-Soviet rocket defense system.

Americans should keep in mind that—on the basis of full information—the present Republican President and his predecessor, a Democratic President, have both recommended a missile defense against new offensive missiles in the hands of Communist regimes.

## MEMORIAL DAY, 1969

**HON. LESTER L. WOLFF**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, last month we celebrated with the usual pagentry and holiday atmosphere Memorial Day, 1969. It is truly unfortunate that despite its name Memorial Day has lost its true meaning for millions of Americans and instead has become the unofficial beginning of summer. In a rush to the beaches and golf courses too many Americans forget why it is that there is a day away from work. It is not a day to celebrate, it is a day to mourn.

This point was brought home to me when, immediately after Memorial Day, I spoke with a constituent, Mrs. Andrew McCarthy, of Sea Cliff, N.Y., whose son had just been killed in Vietnam.

Mrs. McCarthy is a proud American. She was terribly sad, as only a mother in her situation could be. She was not angry at her country.

But Mrs. McCarthy was understandably distraught by our failure to observe Memorial Day for what it is—a day to remember our men of this and previous wars who have died in combat. She asked me, "Can we not have a real Memorial Day?"

Mr. Speaker, we should have a true and serious Memorial Day. Not a holiday weekend, but day in memory of tens of thousands we have lost in the history of our Nation. I would hope that in the future that Mrs. McCarthy could have her very small and very human request—a real Memorial Day.

## POSTAL LABOR RELATIONS

**HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the Postal Operations Subcommittee has concluded its hearings on the subject of labor relations in the postal service. During this past month and a half Members of this House have been aware of the delegations of postal unions from home who have made their presentations on the subject of labor relations by law in the postal service. Four days of hearings were held in response to this interest in which testimony was taken from all postal unions, the administration, and a large number of experts in the public employee relations field.

The hearing record will be kept open for a short time in order to accommodate Members of Congress and others who would like to go on record in this matter.

## PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S LABOR RELATIONS PROGRAM

At the present time, labor relations problems in the Federal Government are governed by a program started by President Kennedy during his administration under an Executive order, which is an in-house Government regulation based on the authority of the President as the manager of the Federal Government. At the time President Kennedy signed Executive Order 10988, the present labor program, it was a great progressive step in the public employee field, an Executive order was the device used as authority for the program because many Federal managers were afraid that legislation would be passed by the Congress which would severely restrict their authority.

The effect of President Kennedy's Executive order was very worthwhile. The organization of Government employee unions expanded so that today there are more Federal union members outside the postal service than in postal unions. In the early 1960's the vast majority of Federal Government union members were in postal unions.

## THE IMPASSE PROBLEM

President Kennedy's program though has outlived its usefulness because of the breakdown in employee contract negotiations. Federal personnel managers are able to decide what issues they will negotiate with unions about and what interpretation is to be placed on contracts once they are signed. The only appeal from these decisions is to the department head of the agency involved, whose orders personnel managers are following in the first place. In short, management sits as judge in its own case.

Postal unions during their 1968 negotiating sessions had this kind of experience with postal management. Post Office Department negotiators declared thousands of contract items nonnegotiable as management prerogatives, including many items that were in previous contracts. They did this because they felt that local department negotiators in previous negotiations had given up too

much of management's authority. Negotiations reached an impasse in the spring and continued until the fall, when Postmaster General Watson declared that as far as he was concerned all items were negotiable. This decision of his may have prevented a postal strike, since contract negotiations had completely broken. This situation cannot be allowed to happen again. What is more, the ironic thing about the negotiations is this. Once a contract is signed it is not enforceable in the courts like any other contract. Today no neutral party can judge a dispute over contract terms between management and labor in the Federal Government. The courts have declared that an Executive order is nothing more than the personal policy of the President, it can be changed between breakfast and lunch and back again by dinner. It is no different than any other instruction a President issues, and the courts will not sit in judgment on the way the President runs the Government. Therefore, the only appeal from an adverse interpretation of the contracts worked out by the Post Office Department and postal unions is the Post Office Department itself. It sits in judgment in its own case. Therefore, in any new Federal program there must be access on the part of labor to the courts and arbitration for less important individual matters.

## A NIXON EXECUTIVE ORDER?

Federal personnel managers realized that extensive changes had to be made in Executive Order 10988 if legislation was to be forestalled. Congress had been alerted to the breakdown in contract negotiations. The Wirtz committee made up of important Cabinet officers and assisted by their staffs, heard witnesses, took testimony and reported to President Johnson by mid-1968. Nothing was done with the report. Chairman Hampton of the Civil Service Commission convened a new committee to examine the possibilities of a new Executive order on Federal labor relations soon after the Nixon administration took office. Chairman Hampton's group has been meeting ever since. Newspaper columnists at the beginning of our hearings had stated that a new Nixon administration Executive order was expected by May 1, when the Civil Service Commission testified on April 25, their witness stated that a new Executive order would be issued within 60 days. A White House letter to the subcommittee dated in mid-May backed up this estimate. June 25 has come and gone and there is no Executive order, nor will there be for some time. There have been charges made by some Government union officials that this program is being studied to death.

I do not agree with that charge. The delay in issuing a new Executive order is brought about by the awareness on the part of those studying the problem that a new Executive order will not be helpful. The problem today is the enforcing of public employee contracts. A strike against the Government is a criminal act. There is no way to enforce these contracts in the courts because Executive orders have no more legal standing and are no more binding than a letter from the President. There is only one

answer and that is legislation by the Congress. The long delays in action on an Executive order is I believe an admission that an Executive order at this stage of Government unionism will not give access to the courts where serious contract questions should be settled—*Manhattan Bronx Postal Union v. Gronowski*, 350 F. 2d 451, and *National Association of Internal Revenue Employees v. Dillon*, 356 F. 2d 811.

## WHAT HAS CONGRESS DONE?

The Subcommittee on Postal Operations began its hearings on this problem and took up the consideration of the bills dealing with labor relations in the postal service. The consideration of bills was limited to the postal service because the postal service is the only Federal industrial operation with long standing and almost complete union representation. In addition, working conditions in the Post Office Department are terrible, and labor relations in the postal service have reached a critical point. What is more, the Postmaster General and his staff seem to realize more than other Government officials that something must be done and soon. They have suggested in their corporation plan the most far-reaching labor relations program ever suggested in Government circles, with direct reliance on the National Labor Relations Board. This is important because Federal personnel managers have always resisted using National Labor Relations Board cases as precedents, let alone using the services of the Board itself.

The bills taken up for study by my subcommittee were in general agreement on the need for access to the Federal courts, on the need for arbitration of disputes, on the need for mediation assistance from the Federal Mediation Service, on the need for the establishment of a Postal Labor Relations Board to sit on judgment in contract disputes. This is a large area of agreement. Both the Post Office Department and postal labor unions are in agreement on these items.

The bills supported by postal unions differ on the question of what types of postal unions should be represented before a postal disputes panel and share in the benefits of any new program. Some bills, for instance, exclude all but AFL-CIO craft unions from their provisions. This would be a death sentence for the industrial postal unions such as the National Postal Union and the National Alliance of Postal and Federal Employees. The National Alliance, for instance, has large numbers of minority group employees as members. Their problems are different from those of other employees. Yet these special problems would be ignored by their unions in some sections of the country because they are a smaller part of the work force than other groups.

The bills supported by the Post Office Department are unique in that they provide for collective bargaining on all issues including wages. These bills substitute the right to a form of arbitration through a Postal Labor Relations Panel instead of the right to strike, which would remain under Federal law a crime. In addition, the National Labor Relations Act would be binding in all matters not spe-

cifically set out in the bill. The setting of wage rates is sought by the Post Office Department so that they can exchange promises of wage increases in return for concessions on labor's part on working conditions and other matters. What concessions the Post Office Department seeks from postal unions remains to be seen. What is more, since a postal corporation would be self-sustaining, wage rates would be tied directly to postal rates and postal unions would find themselves directly pitted against the interests of large mail users. The administration bills do have great merit in that they recognize the need for binding contracts, arbitration, a Postal Labor Relations Board, and the application of as much labor law from the private sector as possible in a Government setting through the application of the National Labor Relations Act—title 29, United States Code.

H.R. 7916, a bill introduced by Congressman DULSKI, has much to recommend it. It provides for a complete postal labor relations program by including within its protection both craft and industrial unions, and both local and national unions. It does not include postal supervisors, but H.R. 4, introduced by Congressman DULSKI, which is the postal reform bill, does protect the postal supervisors union.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

The subcommittee was able to obtain a wide range of agreement between all of the parties, including the Post Office Department. There is agreement that there must be legislation, that there must be access to the courts, a Postal Labor Relations Board which will decide contract cases, and arbitration procedures.

I believe that if we direct our attention to the main problem we have to face, which is the breakdown in contract negotiations, and provide the means for parties to settle as many problems as possible in negotiations between themselves in contract negotiations, we will have done the job that is necessary. For instance, grievances should be defined by contract and violations of contract provisions in regard to individuals should be settled by procedures set up by contract. Grievances, for instance, should be settled quickly on as low a level as possible, so that they do not pile up by the thousands at the Department level, with no decision one way or the other for long periods of time.

Applying the National Labor Relations Act to all matters involving postal employees where their situation is similar to workers in private industry would be helpful. If we avoid at the same time onerous regulation of Government unions by the National Labor Relations Act where it has not been proven necessary for Government unions. National Labor Relations Board cases could be useful in determining the fairness of election procedures, unfair labor practices, jurisdictional disputes and appropriate unit cases. The use of the National Labor Relations Act could if necessary be limited to specific matters and I know the committee would be open to suggestions on this point.

#### CONCLUSION

The postal labor jurisdictional disputes arising from the introduction of different bills has obscured the need for postal labor relations by law. The jurisdictional disputes raised by witnesses before the subcommittee have obscured the real body of agreement between all the parties, and the national president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, Mr. James Rademacher, pointed this out in his testimony.

The members of my subcommittee will meet at some future date to discuss the wide area of agreement among all of the parties so that we can discuss a new bill. A report on the subject of postal labor relations will be issued. There is a great opportunity to accomplish something of value here that we can all be proud of as Members of Congress. I would welcome additional written statements from Members of Congress and others. Our hearing record will be open for a short time.

DON JOHNSON NEW VA  
ADMINISTRATOR

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday Donald E. Johnson was sworn in as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

As you know, Don is an Iowan, from West Branch, the hometown of the late President Herbert Hoover.

At the ceremony Monday, the Veterans' Administrator spoke eloquently about the role of the Veterans' Administration and his determination that the challenge it faces would be met.

We in Iowa are proud of Don Johnson. We are confident of his ability; assured by his determination. We know that under his leadership the challenge will be met.

Mr. Speaker, I place Don Johnson's remarks of Monday in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS BY HON. DONALD E. JOHNSON  
JUNE 23, 1969

If some of you suspect there is a slight Iowa flavor today, you are entirely correct. We in Iowa are proud of our heritage and while we are compassionate people and people dedicated to the welfare of mankind everywhere, there are occasions when we do stick together and are, in fact, quite clanish. This ceremony today is certainly a time of celebration, but I find that celebration to be tempered by President Nixon's words of June 5 at the time he made the announcement of my appointment, and I quote:

"There is no agency that has greater impact on more Americans than the Veterans Administration. The veteran population from World War I, World War II, Korea, and now Viet-Nam, runs into the millions, and the Veterans Administration has the primary responsibility for dealing with the needs of all veterans."

As I heard those words that day and as I have re-read them on several occasions, I have been sobered by the responsibility that is now mine and so while we will celebrate today and commemorate this day, at the

same time we will recognize the responsibility that lies ahead.

But I look forward to the challenge that is ours and that we are going to meet because I find the Veterans Administration to be a unique government agency. It is unique because it is the agency that does what the electorate wants it to do. The electorate recognizes an obligation to those servicemen—to those men and women—who answered the call of their country and who have served, suffered and sacrificed. I find, too, that the VA is unique because of a special partnership that exists between the Legislative and the Executive Branches of Government. It's the one agency in which there is close liaison at all times. We work together—and this we pledge—that this agency and those committees in particular on the Hill which have charge of veterans affairs will continue to work together. I think that it should be said that the House Veterans Affairs Committee in particular, with which we have more of our dealings, has for many years been led by a strong exponent of veterans rights, the Honorable Olin E. Teague of Texas.

The VA is also unique in another way. It is a Federal agency that maintains close liaison with the veterans' organizations and this, too, we pledge to continue and expand.

And lastly, the Veterans Administration is unique because it is an agency staffed by compassionate, dedicated and hard-working public servants. I have found this to be true in my past dealings with the agency and also during the past two weeks when I have been rather unofficially on the job. I look forward to joining the 170,000 VA employees.

I think, too, that this is a fitting day for this ceremony because this week marks the 25th anniversary of the first G.I. Bill of Rights. Since the President's announcement on June 5 of a special committee to look at the problems of the Viet-Nam veteran and the G.I. Bill of Rights, many words have been spoken and written on the adequacy of the present G.I. Bill. I am pleased, of course, about the assignment given me by the President to chair that committee and both as Administrator of the VA, and as chairman of that committee, I look forward to the assignment.

It is not my wish to pre-judge the work of that committee, but I want to tell you here that raw statistics do not always tell the story. In these days of a different sort of situation than we had in 1946 and 1947—with a gradual demobilization, with a high employment rate, and with many men completing their educational work before they are inducted into the services, there are, indeed, differences and we do, indeed, need to take a look at the problems that exist. But I can tell you that we will—this committee—find the answers to those problems.

In the interim, I want to pay tribute to the Veterans Administration for carrying out its mission. One of the things that we are specifically charged with in the formation of that committee is to reach out to the educationally disadvantaged. The VA "out-reached" program to the educationally disadvantaged has been a success. VA achieved a 79% effectiveness in the big city target areas. One of the problems that exists is how we are to reach the men in the rural areas of America. This VA found to be difficult and even with the help of the veterans organizations we have only been able to reach 14% of them.

And so I think it is implicit in what I am saying, and I speak now to the veterans organizations represented here, that because your strength often lies in rural America, we need your help more than ever, and we cannot afford to wait for the outcome of this committee report. We need to have renewed efforts on your part and also the VA to reach these people we're seeking in rural America.

And so I would pledge to you that this

committee will find the answers. And I ask at this time for assistance from the Congress, from the White House, from the veterans organizations and from educators.

This new team looks forward to the assignments ahead. The President is determined that we recognize new problems in this different time frame in which we find ourselves. I ask for your advice and counsel. As Judge Whitney Guillard indicated to you, the family Bible was open to what I think is one of the most beautiful Jewish prayers—it asks for wisdom to govern. I trust that wisdom will be given to us.

Finally, I know all of you join with me as I express the fervent prayer that efforts now underway under the direction of President Nixon will bring about the earliest possible termination of the present hostilities in Viet-Nam through a just and honorable peace.

As we look to the future, I know that I express the hope of all Americans as I pray that the day may come when there will be no Veterans Administration because there are no more wars, and that mankind the world over will have learned to live peacefully side-by-side in an enduring climate of mutual respect and compassion and trust.

Thank you for honoring me with your presence here today.

#### A NATIONAL COLLEGE FRATERNITY TAKES FIRM STAND ON CAMPUS DISORDERS

**HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, disruption and violence on our college campuses is a matter on which a great deal of attention has been focused, and a matter which concerns us all.

Recently Sigma Tau Gamma Fraternity, which has chapters on 75 campuses—several of which are in my congressional district—issued a most refreshing position paper on "freedom and order" which I feel is of interest to my colleagues.

I would like to share their recent statement with you, and also point out that this statement has been supported by more than 3,000 undergraduate members of Sigma Tau Gamma Fraternity:

STATEMENT OF SIGMA TAU GAMMA FRATERNITY  
ST. LOUIS, Mo.—Sigma Tau Gamma, a national college fraternity with chapters on 75 campuses, has taken a firm stand on campus disorders in a statement release from its headquarters in St. Louis.

In a position statement on "freedom and order" adopted by college chapters and endorsed by a large majority of its more than 3,000 student members, the fraternity reaffirmed its commitment to the "maintenance of an academic environment conducive to learning and scholarly development."

Citing the intrinsic rights of free inquiry, the fraternity insisted that they must be exercised "in a manner which does not diminish, abridge, or destroy the rights of others."

"We cannot condone the disruptive influences and activities which contemptuously deny to others their freedom to pursue truth in an atmosphere which permits reflection, debate and study."

Dr. Ronald W. Roskens, president of the international organization, noted the inconsistency of students who insist upon being

heard often deny the same privilege to others through vulgar and abusive clamor.

"It is paradoxical to me that certain members of the most educationally privileged generation in history would advocate destruction of the educative process which nourished their minds and enhanced their freedom," said Dr. Roskens, who is vice president for administration at Kent State University.

Many of the fraternity's collegiate chapters have inaugurated programs designed to foster constructive leadership on their respective campuses, according to Dr. Roskens.

#### LOCATION OF COLLEGIATE CHAPTERS

##### Arizona

Northern Arizona University.

##### Arkansas

Arkansas A & M College.  
Henderson State College.  
State College of Arkansas.

##### Illinois

Eastern Illinois University.  
University of Illinois.

##### Indiana

Ball State University.  
Valparaiso University.

##### Iowa

University of Northern Iowa

##### Kansas

Fort Hays Kansas State College  
Kansas State College of Pittsburg.  
Kansas State Teachers College.

##### Louisiana

Nicholls State College.  
Northeast Louisiana State College.  
Northwestern State College.  
Southeastern Louisiana College.

##### Maryland

Frostburg State College.

##### Michigan

Central Michigan University.  
Eastern Michigan University.  
Western Michigan University.

##### Minnesota

Moorhead State College.  
St. Cloud State College.  
Winona State College.

##### Missouri

Central Missouri State College.  
Harris Teachers College.  
Northeast Missouri State College.  
Northwest Missouri State College.  
Southeast Missouri State College.  
Southwest Missouri State College.  
University of Missouri-Kansas City.  
University of Missouri-Rolla.  
University of Missouri-St. Louis.

##### Nebraska

Chadron State College.  
Kearney State College.  
Wayne State College.

##### New Jersey

Seton Hall University.

##### New York

St. John's University.

##### North Dakota

Minot State College.

##### Ohio

Cleveland State University.  
Youngstown University.

##### Oklahoma

Central State College.  
East Central State College.  
Northeastern State College.  
Southeastern State College.  
Southwestern State College.

##### Oregon

Southern Oregon College.

##### Pennsylvania

Alliance College.  
California State College.

Clarion State College.  
Edinboro State College.  
Indiana University of Pennsylvania.  
Mansfield State College.  
Shippensburg State College.  
Slippery Rock State College.  
West Chester State College.  
Pennsylvania State University.

##### South Dakota

Black Hills State College.  
Northern State College.

##### Texas

Stephen F. Austin State College.

##### Utah

College of Southern Utah.

##### West Virginia

Concord College.  
Fairmont State College.  
Salem College.

##### Wisconsin

Northland College.  
St. Norbert College.  
Stout State University.  
Wisconsin State U.-Eau Claire.  
Wisconsin State U.-La Crosse.  
Wisconsin State U.-Oskosh.  
Wisconsin State U.-Platteville.  
Wisconsin State U.-River Falls.  
Wisconsin State U.-Stevens Point.  
Wisconsin State U.-Superior.  
Wisconsin State U.-Whitewater.

##### Canada

University of Windsor.

#### TRUTH IN LENDING

**HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, one of the major accomplishments of the 90th Congress was the enactment of the landmark Truth-in-Lending Act. I am most proud of the key role played by the Democratic members of the Consumers Affairs Subcommittee, on which I am privileged to serve, in securing the first Federal truth-in-lending law in history—and a strong and effective one at that.

It is propitious that this measure which will give an additional dimension to our people's freedom and well-being goes into effect the week we celebrate the Fourth of July. But, as pointed out in an editorial in the Newark News of June 25, the value of the law will depend upon the extent to which consumers take advantage of the information that must now be made available to them. This perceptive editorial "Truth in Lending" is printed in full below:

#### TRUTH IN LENDING

A new federal law designed to improve customers' ability to compare credit terms will take effect next Tuesday. But its usefulness will be impaired unless consumers learn to take advantage of it.

Today, about one family out of two owes some kind of installment debt, totaling more than \$90 billion. Yet few households have any clear idea of how much they pay in finance charges.

The law taking effect Tuesday, known as the Truth in Lending Act, was finally passed by Congress last year to make available to borrowers a clearer picture of the cost of credit. It does not regulate rates. It requires lenders to use uniform methods of stating

credit charges so consumers can compare deals.

An auto buyer, for example, finds it difficult today to find his way through a maze of unfamiliar terms when he borrows from a bank or sales finance company. One loan is described as add-on, another as discounted. One lender wants a service charge, another an investigation fee, a third demands credit life insurance premiums. But starting Tuesday, installment credit sources must disclose the total finance charge and the annual percentage rate or its equivalent, a yardstick by which different credit methods may be evaluated.

Full disclosure of credit costs will be of little help to consumers, however, unless the information is used. In addition to learning the amount of monthly payments, prospective borrowers should consider the length of time they'll have to pay, the annual percentage rate, the type of loan they choose and, perhaps most important, how much more it costs to buy on credit than to pay in cash.

**MARINE MIDLAND COMMENDED FOR SERVICE TO PUBLIC**

**HON. HENRY P. SMITH III**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Truth-in-Lending Act—Title I of the Federal Consumer Credit Protection Act—affects virtually everyone who issues credit. It requires the nearly half a million creditors in the United States to clearly and completely disclose all costs in a credit transaction and in every advertisement. Businesses as divergent as savings and loan associations, department stores, credit card issuers, credit unions, banks, automobile dealers, hospitals, consumer finance companies, plumbers, electricians, doctors and any other individuals or groups which extend or arrange for credit must comply with the legislation by July 1, 1969.

In an effort to inform the public as to the provisions of the "Truth-in-Lending Act," Marine Midland Banks, Inc., has launched what I consider to be a most commendable public service program.

In the June 25th edition of the American Banker, Marine Midland was recognized for its role in advising the public about the Truth-in-Lending Act.

The American Banker article follows:

**MARINE MIDLAND MARKETS TRUTH-IN-LENDING THROUGH PUBLIC SERVICE PROGRAMS, MANUAL**

**BUFFALO, N.Y.**—Communicating and interpreting the provisions of Truth-in-Lending to the many people and organizations affected by the legislation is a difficult and time-consuming undertaking which many banks have taken on as a responsibility and as an opportunity to create good will.

One of the many has been Marine Midland Banks, Inc., which has been conducting a public service Regulation Z program in the area served by the Marine Midland System.

When Federal Reserve Board Regulation Z, which implements the legislation, was issued on Feb. 10, 1969, with an effective date of July 1, 1969, Marine Midland assigned a team of three attorneys to study the legislation and the regulation, with special emphasis on the inherent consumer and commercial applications. From their studies a 76-page manual has been prepared that interprets, through narrative and sample forms, how Marine Midland Banks will comply with

the law. The guide has been made available through Marine Midland personnel to other organizations and individuals to help them in establishing systems to comply with Truth-in-Lending. Marine Midland has also made sample forms available to other banking organizations for use as prototypes and has offered assistance in preparing forms when requested.

A series of fourteen (14) statewide seminars was conducted by the team of attorneys for all Marine Midland executives from the bank's 240 offices in 150 New York state communities to cover legalities and ramifications of Truth-in-Lending. William J. O'Connor, of the Buffalo law firm of Buerger and O'Connor, discussed the legislation's effects on Marine Midland's Master Charge, custom credit and time plan programs. Frank J. Laski and Waldron S. Hayes, Jr., of the Buffalo law firm of Phillips, Lytle, Hitchcock, Blaine and Huber spoke on the personal, commercial, farm and mortgage lending applications of the Consumer Credit Protection Act.

Marine Midland has informed its merchant customers of the new credit changes through a series of news bulletins during the past few months. In addition, the bank's employees have been informed, through a similar publication, of the new developments, so that they can help both merchants and consumers who are interested in credit with a full understanding of the meaning of the new legislation.

Marine Midland Banks have taken great care to inform customers about potentially confusing terms, such as the Annual Percentage Rate and the Finance Charge. The annual percentage and dollar and cents costs, which form the basis for comparison credit shopping, are explained in terms of computation and conform to the Trust-in-Lending credit-contract and agreement forms. Through a series of mailings, bill-stuffers and the like aimed at 750,000 persons, Marine Midland believes it has made it an easy matter for the credit purchaser to be pre-informed about the new legislation, and to understand from the new invoices what he is being charged, how, why, and how much.

Financial and business editors of the press have been supplied with an information kit to help them interpret the complexities of the new information that consumers will be confronted with at the time of credit purchases and loans when they receive bills on and after July 1. Individuals, farmers and real-estate buyers will also benefit from the information that Marine Midland has so freely made available.

To further assist the average consumer who uses credit financing, Marine Midland has a program underway to provide leading credit spokesmen for television and radio interviews, as well as for meetings with community groups. These public service programs will be of great help in bringing the understanding of credit, what it costs and how it works to many thousands of individuals.

"The fourth generation may be descending on us quietly," Mr. Bradburn said. Its changes may seem relatively mild compared with yesterday's technical drama, he added, but under the surface lie the problems of an "industry in transition."

**IMPROVING FOREIGN AID**

**HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, America's commitment to less-developed nations should undergo major re-

vision. Over the last few years, I have consistently voted against the current structuring of our aid program—not because I am opposed to assisting development in low-income countries, but because I feel our present attempts are patronizing and ill-conceived.

As long as the practice continues of including military aid in with economic assistance, I shall not support any foreign aid legislation. Congress must realize that massive military aid programs rarely are positive actions toward overall development in recipient countries. Military aid tends to reinforce misallocations of resources away from areas of infrastructural economic growth and into wasteful assemblages of military paraphernalia.

In addition, I believe that "tying" much of our aid to U.S. exports creates a situation in which certain projects may be approved not because they are of a high priority to a recipient country, but instead because they have a high import content.

I favor general reorganization of our aid programs, with much more emphasis on multilateral assistance, and with greater help in the key area of population and family planning.

A good introduction to the type aid approach I would like to see Congress approve was published in the June 22 Los Angeles Times. The distinguished UCLA economist Neil H. Jacoby wrote this important article, "A Better Way of Extending Aid," and I would like to place it in the RECORD at this point:

**A BETTER WAY OF EXTENDING AID**

(By Neil H. Jacoby)

(NOTE.—Neil H. Jacoby is professor and former dean of the Graduate School of Business Administration at UCLA. He is currently a Visiting Fellow at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.)

Recent events raise hope for the realization of the long-desired American withdrawal from the war in Vietnam. They allow us to contemplate a reduction of the appalling burden of that conflict. We can at last begin to consider how to apply the released resources to more humane and valuable purposes. Among them is assistance to the poor countries of the world.

Thoughtful men everywhere are distressed by the deprivation in which most of the human community continues to exist. Malnutrition is the lot of 2 billion of the world's 3 billion people. Famine and epidemic disease stalk their lives. Their babies die with a frequency many times as high as in advanced nations. Those who survive receive little formal education. Their adult life span is little more than half that of Americans and northern Europeans. In 100 of the world's 125 nations, average income per person is less than \$500 a year; for most people it is under \$150 a year.

**POPULATIONS HAVE EXPLODED**

During the 25 years since World War II advanced countries have helped to change these somber conditions. Progress has been made, but at too slow a pace. A population explosion has cancelled out much of the anticipated increase in production per head.

The time required by traditional societies to move into the contemporary world has been grossly underestimated. Today, there is widespread frustration and disillusionment; foreign aid by advanced countries has been much reduced. It is timely to make a re-assessment. What have we learned that can be applied to speed up the progress of peoples in the future?

One fact we have learned is that development is an extremely long and complex process, whereby a country changes from a static traditional mode of life into a modern dynamic society. It is a process that, even with substantial foreign aid, requires at least two generations to complete. This process can only be initiated and sustained by the government and the people of the poor country; development cannot be imposed upon them from the outside.

#### PHILOSOPHIES MUST CHANGE

We have found that development is far more than economics or politics. At its heart it calls for a change in the philosophic values of the people of a low-income country—a willingness to embrace new beliefs, habits of mind, and ways of life. Farmers must learn new methods. Landlords must often accept lower rents, higher taxes or land reforms. Businessmen must open up protected markets to new competitors.

Another lesson of history is that development requires a union of the governing group and the masses of the people. The Alliance for Progress has not succeeded because in too many Latin American countries the ruling elite have blocked essential economic and social reforms that threatened their privileged position. All segments of society must unite in purpose and action behind an orderly program of change if violent revolutionary movements are to be avoided.

History also demonstrates that external assistance, when effectively used, can produce self-sustaining progress, as the examples of Greece, Taiwan, Iran and the Philippines testify. The successful experience of these countries helps us to formulate a fresh philosophy and policy of development with external aid.

The concept of a partnership between the aiding agency (an advanced nation or an international body) and the low-income country is central to the attainment of faster progress in the future. Both partners commit something to the development venture; both hope to gain something of value in return.

The developing nation commits itself to make, according to a definite time schedule, necessary social and economic reforms that will increase domestic savings and make investment more efficient. The aiding agency commits itself over an extended span of years to provide capital goods, technology and modern skills. The aided country hopes to realize a better life for its people from this partnership, and the aiding agency seeks to attain a more prosperous and peaceful world environment. Development assistance is thus a partnership for mutual gain; and is neither charity, obligation, nor indemnity.

Even under the heaviest foreign aid programs, external assistance does not apply more than one-third of the capital needed for development. Hence it is vital that the poor country take strong self-help measures to increase the productivity of the capital it must itself generate. It can do this in many ways: by freeing markets from government regulation and improving the conditions of enterprise; by fostering basic and technical education of its people; by raising productivity in agriculture through land reform and adequate credit facilities; by installing an equitable tax system, and by managing its money to prevent price inflation.

Advanced countries can also help to speed progress of the poor countries by opening their markets to the latter's products. Expanded trade can be a substitute for foreign aid. Less developed countries prefer to earn their own way through rising exports. The advanced countries should therefore be prepared to lower their tariffs and quotas against products of low-income countries, with or without reciprocation.

Population control must be an essential policy in all future strategies for development. This is the clear lesson to be learned from our postwar experience.

When one examines the annual growth of real gross national production since 1950, one finds that the less developed countries as a group have expanded their economies as fast as the advanced countries—between 4.5% and 5% a year. But when one looks at growth of real GNP *per person*—a truer measure of betterment in the material conditions of life—one finds that during recent years, it has been expanding 3.8% a year in the advanced countries and only 2.6% a year in the low-income countries.

Population has been rising 2.5% a year in the poor lands versus 1.1% in advanced nations.

The conclusion is inescapable: A commitment to family planning should be incorporated into the partnership agreement between the aid agency and every aided country wherein excessive birth rates are impeding development. Population control measures should be a condition of eligibility for external assistance.

Another needed change in development policy is to "d-politicize" foreign aid—to extend most aid through international organizations supervised by the United Nations, thus preventing it from being a tool in the "cold war" between capitalist and Communist countries. Competition between the United States and the Soviet Union in seeking to mould developing countries in their own images has led to wasteful duplication of aid. It has led governments of poor countries to believe that aid is politically inspired to serve the interests of the granting country. Many play off the United States and the U.S.S.R. against each other.

The idea of competitive coexistence between Communist and capitalist powers offers a basis for specializing the functions of multilateral and unilateral aid.

#### SOCIETIES MUST COMPETE

Different social systems should be allowed to compete with each other, and be judged by the welfare they produce for people. If the people of a poor country desire state-owned and operated enterprises and central planning of their economy, they have a right to choose that system. If they believe that a competitive market economy based upon private enterprise is the most flexible and efficient means of satisfying society's wants, no one should interfere with that choice. Let time judge the performance of both systems. Americans need not fear the outcome, in the light of the superior performance of our own economy in recent times.

We propose, then, that external aid to provide social infrastructure (railroads, highways, communications, power facilities) as well as to develop human resources (education, training, research and technology) should be supplied multilaterally by the International Development Assn. and agencies of the United Nations. These are governmental functions in nearly all countries.

Aid to agricultural and industrial enterprises should be supplied unilaterally by the advanced countries, because in these sectors advanced countries with different economic systems have opportunities to apply their special expertise. If a poor country elects collectivized agriculture, Communist countries are best prepared to assist it. If it opts for private enterprise in agriculture and industry, capitalist nations are best qualified by experience to assist.

#### DIVIDING THE BURDEN

The annual net flow of developmental assistance from developed to poor countries has been \$7.5 billion to \$9 billion a year, including private investment. Assuming that the low-income countries take measures to improve the efficiency of their use of foreign aid, under the partnership concept, their total need for assistance can be estimated at about \$13 billion a year. Of the total step-up of \$5 billions, the U.S. share would be

no more \$2-2.5 billions—well within our capacity to supply.

In his inaugural address, President Nixon offered cooperation with other nations "to reduce the burden of arms, to strengthen the structure of peace, to lift the poor and the hungry." With the wisdom distilled from experience, let the United States lead all nations in a fresh cooperative effort to lift the world's poor and hungry up to a humane condition of life.

#### POLLUTION CONTROL

### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a very meaningful bill today to amend the Atomic Energy Act. This bill amends the act of 1954 to permit a State under the agreement provision with the Atomic Energy Commission, to establish standards for the discharge of radioactive material from an atomic-fueled powerplant.

This issue has developed in Minnesota on a proposal to build two atomic energy electrical supply plants on the Mississippi River. The citizens of Minnesota are proud of our 14,000 lakes and of the slogan that is often attributed to our area as being "The Land of the Sky Blue Waters." They have therefore promulgated emission standards within the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency that are much lower than the AEC level of tolerance. The builder of the proposed plants has received the permission to do this from the Atomic Energy Commission. However, the work is now delayed because our State believes that the rate of discharge allowed by the AEC is too high.

While I am not quarreling with the maximum tolerances of the AEC, I am convinced that if the people of a State believe in the need for more rigid regulations, then that State ought to have the right to be responsive to their citizens. I will grant further, that all this should be done within the safety guidelines as established by the AEC.

The bill simply states that no State shall be refused the right to enter into an agreement with the Atomic Energy Commission, simply on the basis of having developed standards that permit a lower level of discharge than presently set as the maximum levels by the AEC.

The Mississippi River originates in Minnesota. It is the source of much of the water needs for many great cities in central United States as it flows southward across our continent.

As we well know, much of our pollution problems are caused by a continued buildup of the wastes from mankind. Like many of the present plant pesticides and herbicides that are commonly used, the residue does not disappear. It stays in the water, the air, or the soil and accumulates. We have probably all read of the tragedy this week on the Rhine River.

In all fairness to the citizens in every State, and especially to those who live

in those States served by this great river, they should be allowed to develop those standards for plants located within their boundaries, in full compliance with the maximum tolerances as established by the Atomic Energy Commission.

**SPORTS EDITOR HONORED FOR  
ATHLETIC EFFORTS**

**HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, one of my friends and constituents, Mr. Harley Bowers, sports editor of the Macon Telegraph, Macon, Ga., was recently selected to receive an award from the National Coaches Association for community service and promotion of high school athletics.

This honor for Mr. Bowers is of special note since he is the first newspaperman ever selected by this organization for such an award. But his record of achievements clearly reveals the National Coaches Association could not have made a better selection.

For years Mr. Bowers has provided outstanding coverage for all types of high school athletic events in the Macon area, a fact which has contributed greatly to enhancing the already excellent school athletic programs. He has been an active member of the Macon Recreation Commission. In recent months he has been greatly responsible for bringing to Macon the National AAU basketball tournament and the international tennis tournament.

Mr. Speaker, I think this award for Mr. Bowers is certainly deserved, and I extend my sincere congratulations to him. I would like also, Mr. Speaker, to include in the RECORD a short article about Mr. Bowers from a recent issue of the Macon Telegraph:

**SPORTS EDITOR HONORED FOR ATHLETIC EFFORTS**

Harley Bowers, Macon Telegraph Sports Editor, has been selected by the National Coaches Association to receive one of their eight annual district awards for community service and promotion of high school athletics.

Bowers, the first newspaperman in the country to receive the award, was selected for his record of high school athletic coverage and for his participation on the Macon Recreation Commission and work in importing the national AAU basketball tournaments and international tennis tourney.

The award, only given to one other Georgian, will be presented June 20 in San Francisco, Calif.

Bowers, Telegraph Sports Editor for 11 years, is a native of Moreland.

He graduated from Newman High School in 1938 and from the University of Georgia in 1942, after being named the outstanding graduate of the Journalism class.

Following college, he spent three and a half years in the Air Force and then returned to the University of Georgia for a year of graduate work.

Prior to coming to Macon, he was associated with the Atlanta Constitution, Columbus Ledger, and Albany Herald.

He resides with his wife Joyce and their three children, Cliff, Jack and Martha Claire,

at 2644 Northwoods Drive. He is a Sunday School teacher at First Presbyterian Church.

**STUDENT DISORDERS AND  
VIOLENCE ON CAMPUSES**

**HON. MARVIN L. ESCH**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, the questions of student disorders and violence on campuses throughout the Nation have occupied the attention of the news media, campus administrators, Government officials, the Congress, and the public for many months. The problem has been studied, talked about, and worried about. But, for the most part, there has been too little really constructive, forthright action to solve the problem.

Nearly 2 weeks ago I proposed that association of colleges and universities hold national and regional conferences directed solely at this problem and specific practical steps which might be taken to solve it. I urged that these conferences take place in cooperation with the administration and the Office of Education with Federal officials to serve as resource personnel. These conferences would be designed to develop a creative interchange of ideas on the procedures and approaches which had been successful on some campuses for dealing with the legitimate discontents of moderate students without bowing to the extremists and violence.

I do not envision the conferences to establish standard regulations or practices, since each college community is diverse and must be governed by its own environmental factors. I do envision these conferences as a means to open new channels of communication within the university community and between the university and the public.

I must make it absolutely clear that we cannot condone or tolerate violence either on our campuses or in our cities and I support efforts of National, State, and local law-enforcement officials to maintain law and order.

The American people are rightfully concerned with the violence on the campus, and it is my conviction that, unless the campus community takes constructive and immediate action to quell disorder and violence, repressive legislation and a drastic reduction in college funding will result. The educational community must take voluntary action now.

In line with this conviction, I was extremely pleased at the overwhelmingly favorable response which my proposal received from the associations of colleges and universities as well as from the Nixon administration. Both in personal conversations and letters, the associations have indicated to me their willingness to participate in conferences and their belief that such symposiums would serve a useful and constructive purpose. Assistant Secretary James Allen testified before the Education and Labor Committee last week in support of this concept and offered the coopera-

tion and assistance of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in setting up such a program.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this response speaks clearly of the dedication and recognition of responsibility which the educational community has. I am confident that campus disorders can be brought under control and that channels of communication can be opened without direct and repressive Federal interference.

Under permission granted, I include my letter and the representative responses which I have received at this point in the RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., June 11, 1969.

DEAR SIR: I write to you, a leader in the higher education community, urging you to take immediate action which might contribute constructively to the problems associated with the present unrest on our college campuses.

Having served on the Education and Labor Committee and having visited college campuses during the past two months and having constant contact with the public constituency, I believe the time is fast approaching when every representative organization must reappraise its efforts in responding to student unrest. The problem on the campuses is more structured and of greater potential intensity than many of us are aware. The results of continuing disorders and the resultant publicity are finding a restive audience in the American people.

For some time politicians, columnists, the news media, professional observers, and government officials have been berating, commenting or praising the motives and actions of our campus youth. If nothing else, this inconsistency is creating a demanding and an active majority in the American people who want to know what is or is not acceptable behavior in their society. In time, if allowed to continue in this manner, campus disorders may well result in the appearance of restrictive state or federal legislation which will have the ultimate effect of controlling the operating procedures of our colleges and universities. Further, as evidence has shown, the public reaction will curb the expenditures of local, state, and federal funds used to support the finest educational system in the world.

I will not support, nor will I vote for repressive legislation nor do I believe that the majority of students should be penalized by the cutting back of operating funds in order to punish a few.

Currently under consideration before our Education and Labor Committee is H.R. 11941. While I believe that the role of this bill is laudable in that it attacks the major problems inherent in our college campuses today, I am nonetheless concerned that it may set an unhealthy precedent.

Therefore, at this time I am calling upon your Association and urging that you join with others and convene a series of national and regional conferences of college and university administrators. Such meetings can have a positive effect upon this growing crisis. They would help to create better communication and understanding on the part of the American people, aid administrators in developing practices regarding discipline and conduct of students and faculty, and establish new means of communication with students. The interface which could be obtained by such a meeting would be most valuable to college leaders in providing an experience base for dealing with student problems. It would provide suggestion for solidifying the support of the large silent majority on our campuses and ideas for isolating the behavior and motives of militant reactionaries.

In general their purpose would be to develop concepts which would replace the current atmosphere of disruption and disorder on our campuses with a new positive force of creative interchange. I do not envision the conferences to establish standard regulations or practices as each college and university community is diverse and unique and must be governed by the factors within its environment. The independent operating integrity of each institution must be protected. Voluntary efforts on the part of the educational community must begin now.

I also recognize the limitations of such a conference and that there is no panacea for today's unrest.

The leadership your Association has shown in developing informal and overt actions in regard to this problem is most assuredly recognized. However, the urgency of this crisis requires the efforts of a massive coordinated breakthrough to bring about positive results.

It is my opinion that the National Administration is concerned about protecting the operational autonomy of our colleges and universities and they will be willing to participate cooperatively in any voluntary effort toward this end. I have written the President and members of his staff requesting this support.

I urge your consideration of my proposal and await your urgent response.

Sincerely,

MARVIN L. ESCH,  
Member of Congress.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,  
Washington, June 19, 1969.

The Honorable MARVIN L. ESCH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ESCH: I want to thank you for the concerns expressed in your letter of June 11. As your staff member, Mr. Bob Jones, doubtless told you last Friday afternoon I informed him of our Board of Directors' meeting to be held on Monday and Tuesday and the expectation that we would issue a statement, with copies to be circulated Tuesday morning to members of the Education and Labor Committee. In the event that your copy may have been misplaced, I am enclosing a second copy of it.

Now let me mention some of the things that the Council has been doing and is intending to do with regard to campus disruptions. In the spring of 1968 we conducted jointly with the University of Denver Law School a conference on "Legal Aspects of Student-Institutional Relationships." To this conference we invited a number of students, administrators, professors, and legal experts on the subject. The outcome was a special issue of the *Denver Law Journal* which we distributed without charge to all of our members. In addition to the *Law Journal* was widely circulated in the legal profession.

For the past year or two I and other members of the Council staff have been speaking in various parts of the country on varied aspects of this whole problem. For your information I am enclosing a copy of the several addresses I have given. They have all been published except the two papers I gave some weeks back at the University of Nebraska. These will appear in a book to be published by the University of Nebraska Press.

Also, I am enclosing a copy of a paper prepared by a former staff member of the Council, Otis A. Singletary, which we circulated to all of our members and to many others who requested it.

Our Office of Research is now conducting what is probably the most intensive empirical research being carried on anywhere with regard to this general problem. We expect to begin publishing results within a few weeks.

This afternoon we are having a meeting of the executive officers of many of the principal associations here in Washington in the field of higher education to get moving on our

Special Committee on Campus Disruption. We have promise of some foundation funds to hold a number of regional conferences during the latter part of the summer, and likewise we may collaborate with some other agencies in facilitating large, national conferences to be held—possibly in Washington—during the early fall. In these conferences, let me say, we do not intend to engage in endless talk about such broad matters as the generation conflict, the malaise of our era, and so on. We expect to get down to particulars about how to uphold both freedom and order on the campus.

In closing, let me say that we very much appreciated your being present during dinner at the Hotel America on Monday evening.

Sincerely yours,

LOGAN WILSON.

(NOTE.—Also, I am including a statement issued as a result of a conference the Council held some weeks ago in Chicago.)

#### EXPLANATION OF "A DECLARATION ON CAMPUS UNREST"

This statement was formulated by a group of educational administrators, trustees, and foundation officers who met April 4-5, 1969 in Chicago under Council auspices. Those present were three Council officers—President Logan Wilson, Vice-President Kenneth D. Roose, and David C. Nichols II, assistant to President Wilson—and the following:

Louis T. Benezet, president, Claremont Graduate Center.

Landrum R. Bolling, president, Earlham College.

Herman R. Branson, president, Central State University.

Robert D. Clark, president, San Jose State College.

Fairfax M. Cone, trustee, University of Chicago.

Thomas H. Elliot, chancellor, Washington University.

Robben W. Fleming, president, University of Michigan.

David D. Henry, president, University of Illinois.

Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president, University of Notre Dame.

James M. Hester, president, New York University.

Ralph Hetzel, trustee, Pennsylvania State University.

Roger W. Heyns, chancellor, University of California, Berkeley.

Joseph F. Kauffman, president, Rhode Island College.

William R. Keast, president, Wayne State University.

Malcolm Moos, president, University of Minnesota.

Mrs. Henry Owen, trustee, Washington State University.

Harvey Picker, trustee, Colgate University.

Alan Pifer, president, Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Wesley Posvar, chancellor, University of Pittsburgh.

Nathan M. Pusey, president, Harvard University.

John Ritchie, dean, Law School, Northwestern University.

John S. Toll, president, State University of New York at Stony Brook.

Edmund A. Stephan, trustee, University of Notre Dame.

F. Champion Ward, vice-president, The Ford Foundation.

Herman B. Wells, chancellor, Indiana University.

Charles E. Young, chancellor, University of California, Los Angeles.

Edwin Young, chancellor, University of Wisconsin, Madison Campus.

The statement was subsequently approved by the Council's Board of Directors, comprised of the following individuals:

Mason W. Gross, president of Rutgers-The State University, chairman.

Anne G. Pannell, president of Sweet Brair College, vice-chairman.

Gustave O. Arlt, president of the Council of Graduate Schools in the U.S., secretary.

Fred Harvey Harrington, president, University of Wisconsin.

Grayson Kirk, president emeritus, Columbia University.

Frederic W. Ness, president, Fresno State College.

Alan Simpson, president, Vassar College.

Thomas A. Spragens, president, Centre College of Kentucky.

Sharvy G. Umbeck, president, Knox College.

Kingman Brewster, Jr., president, Yale University.

G. Homer Durham, president, Arizona State University.

Samuel B. Gould, chancellor, State University of New York at Albany.

Darrell Holmes, president, Colorado State College.

Kenneth S. Pitzer, president, Stanford University.

Edgar F. Shannon, Jr., president, University of Virginia.

Joseph P. Cosand, president, Junior College District of St. Louis.

Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president, University of Notre Dame.

Roger W. Heyns, chancellor, University of California, Berkeley.

Martha E. Peterson, president, Barnard College.

Calvin H. Plimpton, president, Amherst College.

Willis M. Tate, president, Southern Methodist University.

#### A DECLARATION ON CAMPUS UNREST

The unprecedented, comprehensive, and often unpredictable changes that are taking place in this age both disturb and alarm large segments of our society. Most of the changes and attendant alarms affect the operations of our institutions of higher learning. They are also related to the values, concerns, and behavior of our young people. In coming to grips with the compelling issues, all who would think seriously about them must recognize that present-day society—in America and in many foreign lands—is in serious trouble on many fronts. We see around us racial conflict, continued poverty, and malnutrition amidst unparalleled prosperity and seemingly unlimited promise. We are confronted by pollution of our environment, decay of our cities, the continuation of wars and the threat of war, and everywhere a vague but widespread discontent with the general quality of life.

These problems affect all of society, not the university alone or the young alone. We must all be concerned to deal intelligently and responsibly with these problems that are neither the exclusive discovery, nor the sole responsibility of the young. Yet the depth of feeling among young people in many countries today about the issues, their general dissatisfaction with the slow-moving ways of society, and the extreme behavior of a small minority of students are evidence of the profound crisis that involves our entire society and, specifically, the university community.

The university itself has often become the immediate target of student discontent, sometimes couched as legitimate complaints about the deficiencies of the universities, sometimes devised as a softening-up exercise for assault on the wider society.

How to deal with campus crises arising from the widespread protests has become a major public issue and the cause of confused and angry debate. That there should be deep anxiety about the course of the conflict and its possible outcome is understandable. No social, racial, or age group that perceives itself and its values to be seriously threatened will fail to strike back. Increasingly there are backlash temptations to enact strong, often ill-considered, and largely futile measures to cope with a youth rebellion that

none of us fully comprehends, not even the youth themselves.

Certain balanced judgments are proper to make, however, as we search for understanding and solutions:

1. It is important for the public to understand that, despite the nationwide publicity given to student disorders, the great majority of American campuses have remained peaceful. On campuses where conspicuous disorders have occurred, educational programs generally have gone along their normal ways. Most students and faculty have continued to carry on their regular work. In the main, good teaching and good research, as traditionally defined, have been uninterrupted.

2. On the undisturbed campuses and among the majority of orderly students, however, there are widely shared discontents which extremists are at times able to manipulate to destructive ends. Moreover, even in the absence of violence, there has developed among some of the young a cult of irrationality and incivility which severely strains attempts to maintain sensible and decent human communication. Within this cult there is a minute group of destroyers who have abandoned hope in today's society, in today's university, and in the processes of orderly discussion and negotiation to secure significant change. Students and faculty are increasingly aware of the true nature of this group and are moving to deal with its destructive tactics. The necessity to deal with extremists, however, is placing an extraordinary burden upon the whole educational enterprise and upon those who man it. Consequently, universities are having to divert their energies and resources from central educational tasks in order to deal with student unrest in its various forms.

3. The spectacular events precipitated by the extremists should not be allowed to obscure the recent accomplishments of those students, faculty, and administrators who have serious interest in constructive changes in society and in the university. They have broadened the curriculum and improved teaching. They have moved toward a more open and participating pattern for university governance. And they have begun to make the work of universities more meaningful in dealing with the problems of society. Those efforts must continue. Reform and self-renewal in higher education are on-going imperatives.

4. Meanwhile, the speed and scale of social change have imposed many kinds of demands upon educational institutions for which their programs, their capabilities, and their funding are not always adequate. Moreover, universities are increasingly asked to perform functions for society, particularly in reshaping the behavior, values, and lifestyles of the young, on which the family and other social institutions have already had major influence or lack of influence. Some of society's expectations for universities are quite unrealistic. Insofar as these expectations can be dealt with, they involve a sharing of responsibilities among diverse social institutions. Many of society's demands require new resources and fresh approaches to old and new problems.

5. Recognizing the right of and even the necessity for constructive dissent and allowing for inevitable arguments over what is in fact constructive—certain axioms must be accepted as basic to the operation of any university.

(a) Disruption and violence have no place on any campus. The academic community has the responsibility to deal promptly and directly with disruptions. If universities will not govern themselves, they will be governed by others. This elementary reality is increasingly understood by all components of the university community. Student and faculty groups, including the American Association of University Professors and the National Student Association, have recently joined in efforts to improve disciplinary pro-

cedures and to formulate clear and realistic codes for dealing with misconduct, and more particularly with violence and disruption. Also, by involving students and faculty effectively in the governance of the university, it can be demonstrated that there are better ways of getting views considered and decisions made than by disruption.

(b) The historic concern of the university community with academic freedom needs to be restated, reaffirmed, and vigorously defended against all, within or without the university, who would obstruct the right of scholars to investigate, teachers to teach, or students to learn. This reiteration is not to claim for the university special privileges that put it above the law or that free it from critical public appraisal—rather it affirms that the university must maintain a basic institutional integrity to function as a university.

(c) Violations of criminal law must be dealt with through the ordinary processes of the law—and universities must attempt to deal with disruptive situations firmly before they reach the stage of police action. Governmental attempts to deal with these problems through special, punitive legislation will almost certainly be counterproductive. Meanwhile, students and faculty whose consciences demand that they express dissent through law violation must be prepared to accept the due processes and the penalties of the law. They should not be encouraged to expect amnesty from the effects of the law. Such an expectation would be the ultimate use of the *in loco parentis* concept against which many young activists passionately protest. Nor should they expect amnesty from academic discipline, which is the most effective sanction in disruptive incidents.

6. The education community needs to undertake a far more comprehensive effort than ever before attempted to study the underlying bases of youthful discontent and alienation and the broad social problems to which they are related. As social critic, the university must help society understand and solve such problems.

7. All universities should give particular attention to a continuing search for ways, including new social inventions, by which the life of rationality and civility, share concern, and mutual respect must be supported and strengthened within the university community. The survival of the university and its long-term contribution to society depend upon the ability of the institutions to make their everybody life reflect that spirit and pattern.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES,  
Washington, D.C., June 19, 1969.

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Cannon House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MARVIN: Since receiving your letter of June 11th, members of our staff have been in touch with you and your office several times concerning information at least partially responsive to your inquiry and suggestions. Because of the urgency of affairs in the Committee on Education and Labor, we have all wanted to act as quickly as possible in any and all ways that might be helpful to you and other Committee members.

Meanwhile our giving attention to these matters has delayed this more formal response in writing to your letter itself. We are grateful for your constructive posture and ideas on the very complex questions of student unrest and related legislation. More specifically, your idea of timely conferences strikes a very responsive chord. It would be inappropriate and inefficient for us to proceed alone on this, and my understanding is that several other national associations are also giving active consideration to the idea. A number of us are meeting together this afternoon, and I believe the proposed confer-

ences are one of the principal topics on our agenda. None of us wants to delay any action that promises to be of any assistance to the colleges.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD H. SULLIVAN,  
President.

THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN  
UNIVERSITIES,  
Washington, D.C., June 16, 1969.  
HON. MARVIN L. ESCH,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ESCH: I wish to acknowledge with appreciation your letter of June 11, 1969 in which you express concern about current campus disorders and particularly for your desire to have order restored without resort to federal or state legislation which conceivably might be repressive.

With reference to your specific request that the Association of American Universities join with others in convening a series of national and regional conferences of college and university administrators, I shall refer this question to our Association's Executive Committee for consideration. You are aware, I am sure, that some conferences have been held already and it is my guess that if additional meetings are needed, the American Council on Education should take the initiative in convening them. I may say that in the case of the Association of American Universities, which meets semi-annually and is an organization of university presidents, I cannot recall a single meeting of the Association since October, 1964 when a great deal of consideration has not been given to these very matters which are of concern to you. These discussions and exchanges have been helpful to all of our members and will doubtless continue in the future, but I believe most if not all of our members firmly believe that remedial action can and should be taken at each institution by its own trustees, administrators, faculty and students. We are already encouraged to believe some institutions are proving the efficacy of this procedure.

I thank you again for your discerning letter which I know will be studied with care by the members of our Executive Committee and who may wish to comment upon it more extensively than I have.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES P. MCCURDY, JR.,

MADISON, WIS.,  
June 17, 1969.

Congressman MARVIN L. ESCH,  
501 Cannon Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

As President NASULGC, I commend your positive approach to campus unrest problems outlined in letter of June 11. Understand you have talked with our Washington office. We offer continued assistance in your efforts to prevent repressive legislation. NASULGC will cooperate with American Council on Education in discussing proposed national conferences. We agree that broad support from national education organizations will be positive step towards preventing repressive legislation and solving the crisis. Your continued interests and efforts appreciated.

FRED H. HARRINGTON,  
President, National Association of State  
Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE  
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES,  
Washington, D.C., June 16, 1969.  
The Honorable MARVIN L. ESCH,  
Second District, Michigan,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Room No. 501, Cannon Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ESCH: In response to your letter of June 13th and in anticipation of the

House hearings this morning before the Committee on Education and Labor, I have taken the liberty of doing two things over the weekend.

Firstly, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities has asked Chairman Perkins if a member of our Board of Directors, Dr. Darrell Holmes, President of Colorado State College, might be allowed to testify this morning about the concerns of your letter. Secondly, I have prepared, along with President Holmes, a statement which he will present if given the floor by Chairman Perkins. I enclose a copy of that statement along with material which the statement alludes to.

I trust this strategy on our part is adequate in terms of the intent of your letter, Mr. Esch.

If I may be of further assistance at any time in the future, please call on me.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. CIPRIANO,  
Executive Assistant.

NEWS RELEASE BY THE AMERICAN COUNCIL  
ON EDUCATION

WASHINGTON.—The American Council on Education today (June 16) announced establishment of a Special Committee on Campus Disruption which will propose ways to strengthen procedures of self-regulation by colleges and universities.

In announcing the board action, Council President Logan Wilson said the committee "will focus on more effective decision-making, appropriate means of presenting grievances and proposing changes, clarification of due process and the use of campus and civil authority in response to disorder, and improved communication both within the academic community and between it and the public."

The action was taken by the Council's Board of Directors at its regular June meeting. As the nation's major coordinating agency for higher education, the Council has a membership of 1,538 colleges, universities, and education associations.

President Wilson said he is proceeding at once to name the chairman and members of the special committee in consultation with leaders of representative higher education associations.

A specific objective of the committee will be to formulate ways to deal effectively with campus disruption while protecting the academic or constitutional rights of members of the academic community and avoiding resort to repression or counter-violence.

The special committee will be asked to begin its work as soon as it is appointed and to report its findings to the Council's president and board at the earliest feasible date.

Establishment of the committee is one of a number of actions initiated within recent months by the Council in its concern about campus disorders and its historic interest in critical problems of campus governance.

In May 1968 the Council, acting jointly with the University of Denver Law School, sponsored, and distributed the proceedings of, a national conference on "Legal Aspects of Student-Institutional Relationships." The Council's Office of Research is conducting extensive research into the causes of campus unrest. In April the Council issued "A Declaration on Campus Unrest," a statement formulated by prominent educational administrators, trustees, and foundation officers. Most recently the Council published and distributed to its members the June 9 statement on campus disorder issued by the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. In October the Council's Annual Meeting in Washington, will focus on "The Campus and the Racial Crisis."

Directors present at the June 16 board meeting were the following: Gustave O. Arit,

President, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, *Secretary*; Mason W. Gross, President, Rutgers—*Chairman*; Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., President, University of Notre Dame; Roger W. Heyns, Chancellor, University of California (Berkeley); Darrell Holmes, President, Colorado State College; Grayson Kirk, President Emeritus, Columbia University; Martha E. Peterson, President, Barnard College; Kenneth S. Pitzer, President, Stanford University; Calvin H. Plimpton, President, Amherst College; Edgar F. Shannon, Jr., President, University of Virginia; Thomas A. Spragens, President, Centre College of Kentucky; Willis M. Tate, President, Southern Methodist University; Sharvy G. Umbeck, President, Knox College.

Unable to be present were: Kingman Brewster, Jr., President, Yale University; Joseph P. Cosand, President, Junior College District of St. Louis; G. Homer Durham, President, Arizona State University; Samuel B. Gould, Chancellor, State University of New York; Fred Harvey Harrington, President, University of Wisconsin; Frederic W. Ness, President, Fresno State College; Anne G. Pannell, President, Sweet Briar College, *Vice-Chairman*; Alan Simpson, President, Vassar College.

TRIBUTE TO EARL WARREN

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, we have a saying in California, from a poem, "The Coming American," which says: "Bring me men to match our mountains."

As we reflect on the record of Earl Warren, we cannot help but feel that here, indeed, is a man who matches our mountains—he is and has been the fulfillment of California's need as attorney general and as Governor, and the fulfillment of the Nation's need as Chief Justice.

Most Americans will remember him as Chief Justice, but those of us from California will remember him as a great Governor who was many years ahead of his time. Many of the causes for which young men in this House are laboring today were advocated many years ago by Earl Warren. Prepaid health insurance, an adequate income for every family, fair employment and civil rights protection, equal educational opportunities, to mention but a few, were part and parcel of the legislative programs advocated by this great American.

Two particular virtues seem to me to be especially worthy of mention on this occasion.

The first of these is his readiness to joust the centers of power and authority for what he believes is right, irrespective of the odds against him or of the chances of success. In his mind, right is an absolute, not a relative, quality—a compass by which you can guide your life.

The second of these is his kindness and the humility he brought with him to every public task assigned to him. He is dignified without being pompous. He is considerate without being condescending. And as a politician, he understood the difference between party responsibility and partisanship.

I have been proud to know Earl War-

ren, and I am proud that as a Californian I can claim a share of credit for the many contributions he has made to this great country. I wish him and Mrs. Warren the very best of a happy retirement and I join millions of others in saying, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

HUE AND KATYN—LESSONS IN  
COMMUNIST TERRORISM

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the terrorism of the Communists in South Vietnam ranks with that of the Communists in Eastern Europe during World War II.

During the Tet offensive early in 1968, the Communist forces slaughtered thousands of civilians for alleged "crimes." Mass graves have been discovered near Hue, ancient capital of Vietnam and a city long known for its scholarship and devotion to the arts.

Hue was not a well-armed city. Its population consisted largely of teachers, poets, students, artists, and priests.

As the allied and South Vietnamese forces have pieced together information about the atrocities that were committed by the Communists during Tet, they have discovered that the overwhelming majority of the murdered civilians were guilty of no larger "crime" than living in the imperial city of Hue, itself.

The bodies of priests, nuns, Vietnamese civilians, teachers, foreign residents of the city—more than 3,000 of them—have been found in mass graves, their arms bound. It is obvious that many were forced to kneel before being shot in the back of the head. Hundreds were buried alive, their mouths filled with dirt or rags.

This crime against humanity ranks with the Katyn massacre in Poland in September of 1939 when 15,000 Polish army officers were slaughtered by the invading Communist troops.

The world community, though reluctant to learn the extent of Communist terrorism in South Vietnam, is now being compelled to hear the silent voices that call from beyond these mass graves.

Mr. James Cary of the Copley news service has written a stark and graphic description of the horror which took place at Hue last year. I call this chronicle of terrorism to the attention of my colleagues with the sincere hope that it will increase their awareness of the inevitable consequences of Communist domination of Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cary's moving article follows:

MASSACRE AT HUE  
(By James Cary)

WASHINGTON.—On the night of Jan. 30, 1968, reconnaissance elements of South Vietnam's crack 1st Division were on an area surveillance mission in the Viet Cong infested countryside southwest of the old imperial capital city of Hue.

A regional forces company was probing the area to their east.

Neither expected to find much evidence of Communist activity. The annual lunar new year or Tet truce was under way.

Suddenly, about 10 p.m., a large Communist force hit the regional forces company hard, brushing it aside and driving straight ahead into the inner walled portion of the city called the Citadel.

That was the beginning of the battle for Hue, highwater mark of Communist strength in the now famous Tet offensive of 1968.

It was not until 25 days later that the last Communist troops were forced out. And it is only now, after months and months of interrogation of prisoners and survivors, and the finding of mass graves, that the world is learning what happened in and around Hue during those 25 days.

The picture that is emerging is one of massacre, mutilation and terror.

Of 3,000 persons missing, bodies of more than 2,200 have been discovered in shallow trenches at more than 25 locations.

Some were buried alive, standing, eyes open. Some were beheaded. Many were bound and shot in the back of the head. Some had dirt or cloth stuffed in their mouths to stifle their screams.

There were at least three death marches. A number of victims were lined up and machine gunned.

Nationality, occupation or political background was no protection. Scores of Buddhists in Hue's strong, anti-government resistance movement were slaughtered. So too were American and German civilians, French priests, South Vietnamese government officials, anyone with relatives in the South Vietnamese army, village chiefs, political leaders, anyone who worked for the Americans, and particularly anyone who was known for his opposition to the Viet Cong.

The Communists have admitted responsibility for the killings. A Communist document, captured in the delta area last November, instructed Viet Cong units to punish "reactionary" South Vietnamese who fell into their hands, claiming:

"We paralyzed the enemy machinery when we killed 2,000 reactionaries in Hue."

Again on April 27, 1969, a Hanoi radio broadcast boasted that the bodies then being discovered in the Hue area were "Hooligan Lackeys who had owed blood debts to the . . . Hue compatriots and who were annihilated by the southern armed (Viet Cong and North Vietnamese) forces . . . (last) spring."

The agony of Hue began almost with the first shots that were fired. After the regional forces company was shattered by the Communist advance guard more and more North Vietnamese battalions, supported by Viet Cong guerrilla and local force units, poured into the city from the south and west.

At 3:40 a.m. two salvos of enemy rockets came shrieking down on the city, setting widespread fires.

By dawn, the Communists controlled all of Hue except their two prime objectives—the 1st South Vietnamese Army Division headquarters in the northern corner of the Citadel, and the American military assistance compound south of the Perfume River. Attempts to capture both were thrown back with heavy Communist losses.

For two days after that the Communists left the population alone. Then VC cadres began to move from door to door.

Some confiscated radio receivers. Others, working from prepared lists, sought out South Vietnamese Government officials and invited them to political indoctrination meetings. They never returned, but it is now known what happened to some of them.

At the Gia Hoi High School and in a field behind the Tang Quang Pagoda, 33 mass graves containing 200 bodies have been found.

A monk at the pagoda told South Vietnamese interrogators that during the first two weeks of February he heard Communist execution squads at work nightly. The victims cried out, pleading for mercy. A volley

of pistol and rifle shots would follow. Then silence.

Nguyen Ngoc Ky, leader of the Vietnam Nationalist Party, was among the victims found here.

Another band of 80 to 100 civilians took refuge in the Redeptorist church in Hue. On Feb. 8 the Communists forced them to leave and started them marching east, across the Perfume river. Bodies of 20 of the group were found at Ap Lang Xa Con, a hamlet 4 kilometers from the church. National police said they had been buried alive with hands bound. The body of Tran Dien, one of five elected senators in the national assembly from Hue, was among them.

At the university of Hue, three German doctors on the medical faculty tried unsuccessfully to wait out the Communist occupation. The Viet Cong arrested them on Feb. 5 at their homes. On April 2, 1968, the bodies of Dr. and Mrs. Horst Gunther Krainick, and Dr. Raimund Discher and Dr. Alois Altkoester were found buried in a common grave in a potato field behind the Tu Quang Pagoda, two kilometers south of Hue. Their arms had been bound with wire. All had been shot.

Two French priests at the Thien An Mission suffered a similar fate.

Their monastery was located on a hill top surrounded by pines. When fighting engulfed the area 3,000 to 4,000 peasants sought refuge there.

Communists troops suddenly appeared. Many of the peasants attempted to flee. Two pleaded with the Communists to spare the building, but as one Vietnamese priest who escaped said later:

"They took over the whole building, firing from the ground level at first, and then mounting into the upper stories."

The bodies of the two resident French priests, Father Urbain and Father Guy, were among 201 bodies found later on the slope of a scenic overlook above the Perfume river.

Father Urbain, 52, had been bound hand and foot and buried alive with 10 others. His body was identified by a laundry number on his underclothing and by his silver denture and bald head.

Father Guy, 48, was stripped of his cassock by the North Vietnamese, forced to kneel, and shot through the back of the head.

Americans suffered similar fates. A U.S. report to the International Committee of the Red Cross reveals.

Stephen H. Miller's hands were bound behind his back. He was shot in the back of the head.

Kermit J. Krause and Jeffrey S. Lundstedt were cornered by the enemy in the bedroom of their house. They were shot in the face. Their bodies were dumped in bathtubs.

Thomas M. Gompertz, Courtney Niles and Robert T. Little were shot in the back of the head, apparently executed. Niles' arms were bound.

It went equally hard with the South Vietnamese.

On Feb. 9 Viet Cong came to the home of Maj. Tu Ton Khan, commanding officer, provincial revolutionary development (pacification) cadres. They ordered his wife to tell her husband to report to VC authorities. They threatened to burn the house if she did not do so.

Frightened, Mrs. Kahn called her husband and two other revolutionary development workers who were hiding in the attic. Maj. Kahn was tied up and taken away with all his belongings. His body was found Feb. 28, pierced by 200 bullet holes.

There are many similar stories.

Tran-Hy, a popular forces member, was arrested by the VC on Feb. 20 and buried alive with 20 others near the An Ninh Ha bridge.

On the night of Feb. 18, a Viet Cong group appeared at the home of Ho Tan Sy, a teacher, and invited him to attend a meeting. He was shot and killed as he left his house.

On Feb. 10 Le Van Tru, chief of the Thua Thien program for Communist defectors, was arrested and shot near the Dong Ba gate.

Nguyen Van Dong, a resident of the Hue Citadel, was arrested Feb. 17 and buried alive at Gia Hoi.

Viet Cong soldiers broke into the home of Miss Hoang Thitam Tuy on Feb. 22, and led her to Gia Hoi high school with four other persons. They were buried alive in the same grave, arms and legs bound. Of 200 bodies found at the school, Vietnamese authorities estimated more than half were buried alive.

By mid-February, the fighting for Hue had turned decidedly against the Communists. The enemy commander had been killed and his replacement, it was learned later, had asked and been refused permission to withdraw. Now the killing became if anything even more vicious as the Communist grip on the city weakened.

A Vietcong unit assembled more than 200 South Vietnamese civilians and local administrators at the town of Ton Nam Duong. They were marched north along a canal toward the sea. Just outside Ap Tong Gi Tay, nine kilometers east of Hue, 75 of the captives were taken into nearby rice paddies and shot.

Other similar marches began.

Nguyen Tan Chau, of the South Vietnamese Army's Medical Corps, was in Hue visiting his family during the Tet holidays when the Communists attacked. He was captured and held with 30 other prisoners. They were started south, bound together in three groups of ten.

He told South Vietnamese investigators later that when the column halted for a rest, he freed his hands and slipped away in the darkness. From a hiding place he witnessed the following scene:

"The larger prisoners were separated into pairs, tied together back to back and shot. The others were shot singly. All were dumped into two shallow graves, including those who had been wounded but were not dead."

Winter and early spring rains washed away the more obvious signs of the slaughter but the bodies were found later in the Phu Thu district about 20 kilometers south of Hue.

A similar story is told by Phan Duy, a key official of Anha hamlet, seven miles east of Hue. He knew his name was on the Vietcong's execution list after the Communists seized Hue. He slipped away from the hamlet to a small house on the outskirts of Hue, hoping to escape detection. The ruse almost worked.

It wasn't until Hue was virtually recaptured by U.S. and South Vietnamese forces that enemy troops discovered him as they pulled back through the area where he was hiding.

On Feb. 28 five Vietcong entered Duy's house, bound his hands and marched him seven miles to a row of houses near an area of sand dunes east of the city. He and four other prisoners were locked in one of the houses for seven days. They were allowed outside only to relieve themselves. But this was long enough for Duy to realize that some 100 prisoners in the other houses were being systematically shot.

On the seventh night Duy and nine other men were lashed to a bamboo pole and marched for 300 yards. Their hands were untied. They were told to remove all outer clothing. As he was undressing Duy heard his guards talking to a group of Vietcong laborers.

"Did you dig the trench yet?" they asked. "No, not yet, there are too many people and not enough time," the laborers replied.

Three of the guards left to help dig while the prisoners hands were retied. Duy managed to work his hands free, then made a run for it.

"I ran about 300 meters and I saw a pool," he said. "I fell into the water and covered myself with reeds."

Hours later, half frozen, he emerged and began walking toward the lights of the Hue radio tower beacon. He stumbled into the Phuvang district headquarters and reported what had happened.

Many others were not so lucky. So far 356 bodies have been found in the San Duen graves that Duy escaped. Investigators have reported the victims were killed in groups of 25 to 40. Cartridges from Russian-made AK47 rifles used by the Vietcong and North Vietnamese were found nearby. Some of those who died had been bludgeoned to death. Others had been shot.

Despite all these accounts the story of the Hue massacres is still not complete. Hundreds of other case histories are already known and reports are still being collected at the combined interrogation center in Hue.

The investigation has pinpointed the location of many still-unopened mass graves. Consequently there is little hope for the 800 citizens of Hue who are still missing.

They, too, are believed to be a part of the grisly record the Communists left behind the one time they have occupied a South Vietnamese city.

## TWO MARYLAND SERVICEMEN KILLED IN VIETNAM ACTION

### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. James O. Hall and Pfc. Charles G. Gray, two fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

#### TWO MARYLAND SERVICEMEN KILLED IN VIETNAM ACTION

A Montgomery county Marine and a Charles county Army private first class have been killed in combat in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

They are:

Marine Pfc. James O. Hall, Jr., 20, of Wheaton, who was killed Saturday when his helicopter was shot down about 24 miles northwest of Da Nang.

Army Pfc. Charles G. Gray, 25, of Waldorf, Md., who was killed Saturday by small arms fire while on patrol in Long An province, southeast of Saigon. A 1967 graduate of the John F. Kennedy High School in Wheaton, Private Hall enlisted in the Marines last July after attending Montgomery County Community College for a year.

He had been stationed with a reconnaissance company of the 3d Marine Division near Da Nang.

An accomplished athlete, Private Hall filled a cabinet in the family living room with trophies he earned as a basketball player, golfer and bowler, a relative said yesterday.

He is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. James O. Hall; a sister, Susan and his maternal grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Virgil McCullister, of Virginia.

#### WITH 9TH INFANTRY

Private Gray had been stationed with the 9th Infantry Division since coming to Vietnam in May. He was drafted by the Army last October.

He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Doris Gray, of Waldorf, and his mother, Mrs. Annie L. Gray, of Brandywine, Md.

CXV—1114—Part 13

## PHILADELPHIA ORCHESTRA IN ARKANSAS

### HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the quality of rural life has been under much discussion in recent weeks and months. For the consideration of my colleagues, I would like to give an example of the type of people who are contributing so much to improve the quality of life in Arkansas.

Miss Lily Peter, who is from Marvell in the First Congressional District of Arkansas which I represent, recently spent about \$60,000 of her own funds to finance an appearance of the Philadelphia Orchestra in Little Rock. To do this, she mortgaged 4,000 acres of her plantation in eastern Arkansas.

The orchestra, which played to two sellout crowds on successive nights in Little Rock, premiered a three-movement suite which Miss Peter had commissioned by Pulitzer Prize-winning Norman Dello Joio.

It is this kind of selflessness, Mr. Speaker, which is helping to improve the quality of life in Arkansas. It is this spirit of dedication and determination which is making Arkansas a great place in which to live and work.

At this point I would like to include an article from the Jonesboro Sun written by Associated Press reporter, Robert Shaw, concerning the performance of the Philadelphia Orchestra and Miss Peter's contribution to it:

#### MISS LILY THINKS CONCERT WORTH ALL

(By Robert Shaw)

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.—The Philadelphia Orchestra played Miss Lily Peter's concert Tuesday night and she figures that it was worth the \$60,000 she paid for it.

"It was worth every penny," Miss Lily, as her friends know her, said after the performance in Little Rock's Robinson Auditorium, jammed with 3,000 persons for the event.

"I know a good many adjectives, but none would fulfill this occasion."

The orchestra, which is to play tonight to a second sellout, premiered Pulitzer Prize-winning Norman Dello Joio's "Homage to Haydn," a three-movement suite commissioned for \$8,900 by Miss Lily.

Miss Lily mortgaged 4,000 acres of her plantation in the rich Delta plain of Eastern Arkansas to commission the work and to bring the orchestra to Little Rock as part of the observance of Arkansas' 150th anniversary as a territory.

She will receive none of the money from the ticket sales. It is to go for music scholarships at Arkansas State University and the University of Arkansas.

Miss Lily, who admits to being past 70 "but not quite 100 yet," shared the spotlight Tuesday night with works from Wagner, Debussy and Brahms.

At intermission, she received a standing ovation when Mayor Haco Boyd called her to the stage to present her with a bouquet of roses. Lt. Gov. Maurice Britt then told her that Gov. Winthrop Rockefeller had designated Tuesday as a day to honor Miss Lily.

"I hope you will remember this to be one of the happiest memories of your life as it has been one of the happiest memories of

mine," responded Miss Lily, blowing kisses at the audience.

"I hope you will go home and take with you the enrichment of this beautiful music."

Miss Lily, a sometime poet and photographer and fulltime farmer who sometimes clambers aboard one of her tractors, says she wanted the people of Arkansas to be exposed to good music.

"Miss Peter is a new lady in my life, but very close to my heart already," said orchestra conductor Eugene Ormandy. She "somehow became an idol in our eyes, an angel," he said.

Miss Lily stayed in the auditorium long after the concert greeting well wishers and accepting congratulations. "It is gorgeous," she said.

She had originally expected to spend about \$45,000 for the orchestra's appearance here and \$8,000 for Dello Joio's commission, but incidentals—such as buying her own ticket and those of many friends—brought the total to about \$60,000. She also is now talking about asking the orchestra to record Dello Joio's work.

Is she spending a trifle too much?

"Oh, I had the most beautiful cotton crop this year," she says.

## INDEPENDENCE DAY OF THE CONGO—KINSHASA

### HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to the Lt. Gen. Joseph Desire Mobutu of the Congo—Kinshasa—and the Congo's—Kinshasa's—Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Cyrille Adoula, on the occasion of the ninth anniversary of the Congo's—Kinshasa's—independence.

Since the Portuguese navigator Diego Cao first reached the mouth of the Congo River in 1482, the territory now encompassing the Democratic Republic of the Congo has symbolized for the Western World the vast unknown potential of Africa. The twisting turns of the 2,718-mile-long Congo River, the names of Stanley and Livingston, and landmarks such as the Mountains of the Moon have for the armchair traveler almost spelled Africa itself. Today, the Democratic Republic of the Congo is celebrating its ninth anniversary as an independent state in the family of nations. The desolate days of early independence when the state was on the verge of collapse and its people were caught in the violence of civil conflict are gone; a new mood of order and security now embraces the land and the Congo once again represents the tremendous potential of Africa for the development of a prosperous economic future and the creation of a stable and peaceful society.

The long strides toward stability taken by the Congolese Government under Gen. Joseph Mobutu are chiefly responsible for the new mood of optimism toward the Congo. Firmly in control of its own economic policy, the Government has launched a concerted effort to put the country on a sound financial footing. Monetary reform and other fiscal meas-

ures have contributed to the recent relative price stability and a foreign investment program has attracted new capital. Such American firms as Union Carbide, Continental Grain Co., and Pan American World Airways have demonstrated their confidence in the Congo by recently making large investments there. In 1969, more than 10 percent of the Government's budget will be devoted to infrastructural improvements which will strengthen the base of the varied Congolese economy. The hydroelectric project at Inga, financed by an international consortium, when completed will be the world's largest power complex. With 12 percent of the world's copper reserves, the Congo expects to increase its copper production in 1969 by more than 10 percent; in 1968 the Congo produced more than 330,000 metric tons of copper. Kinshasa, the Congolese capital, is one of Africa's fastest growing urban centers.

Political progress has also been made under the Mobutu government. A constitution has been approved by a national referendum and in 1970 national presidential and general elections are scheduled to be held. The Congo has been an active participant in inter-African affairs and in 1967 hosted the Organization of African Unity's conference for heads of state. Advancements in education have also been made as can be seen in the fact that while the Congo had only seven university graduates in 1960, today, 9 years after independence, half of her 22 Government Ministers and provincial Governors are university graduates.

On this anniversary of its independence, the Democratic Republic of the Congo is to be congratulated for its great progress in pursuit of its national goals. As one Congolese official has predicted, the Congo—once Africa's sick man—may become Africa's superman.

#### YOUTH PHYSICAL FITNESS

### HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, every year the U.S. Marine Corps sponsors a youth physical fitness program in secondary schools throughout the Nation. This program, conducted in support of the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports, is based on the five-exercise physical fitness examination used in marine recruit training.

There are six regions and competition is conducted among high schools within these areas in order to determine who will compete in the national championships.

In this regard, I would like to commend a group of young men from Caldwell High School in Caldwell, Idaho. This team was one of 12 high school teams from the six regions who competed in the national championships last week. Team members include Jerry Shaffer, Marc Stone, Mike Collsen, Joe Baumer, Carl Koprowski, and Gary Marcus. The coach of the squad is Caldwell high's

basketball coach, Sam Willard, who is well known around the State of Idaho for his fine handling of young athletes.

Idahoans and Caldwell, in particular, are proud of these fine representatives of our State.

The importance of physical fitness cannot be overemphasized. Sometimes in the hustle and bustle of our modern lives, we tend to neglect our bodily well-being. This program and the participation by the young men involved is a step in the right direction. The important thing for our young people to remember is that getting older and assuming different responsibilities does not diminish our need for exercise.

#### VATICAN SELLS TO ROCKEFELLERS

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement that the Vatican is selling its holdings which include the luxurious Watergate apartment complex overlooking the Potomac River in Washington, D.C., is only exceeded by the announcement that the purchaser was Rockefeller interests in New York City. Let us hope it is individually and not one of the tax-free foundations.

It seems that the Italian Parliament has declared that the Vatican must pay taxes on its earnings from investments.

Meaningful tax reform to U.S. taxpayers could likewise be achieved by taxation of church investments and businesses in the United States.

I include a clipping from the Washington Post, for June 19, and a report from Dixieland This Week magazine:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 19, 1969]

#### VATICAN SEEN SELLING SHARE IN WATERGATE

Several Italian newspapers reported yesterday that the Vatican is selling out its holdings in the Societa Generale Immobiliare that include the Watergate complex, the luxury apartment development overlooking the Potomac River here.

The firm, an international construction and real estate company, owned the site and financed construction of Watergate.

The Associated Press quoted Rome financial sources as saying the Vatican was negotiating the sale of its stock to Rockefeller interests in New York.

Aldo Samaritani, general manager of the Societa, left for the United States Friday for an extended stay, but the firm declined to discuss the purpose of this trip, the AP said.

The AP also quoted Msgr. Fausto Vallanc, press officer of the Vatican, as stating he had been instructed "from high up to reply with a 'no comment'" to queries about the reports.

Some sources linked the transaction to rumors that Bishop Paul Marcinkus, an American who recently became secretary of the Vatican's prefecture for economic affairs has inaugurated a plan in which the Vatican will liquidate many of its Italian holdings in favor of new investments in the United States and elsewhere.

Last year the Italian Parliament revoked a long-standing exemption and declared the Vatican must pay taxes on its earnings from its Italian stocks.

The size of the Vatican's holdings in the Societa Generale Immobiliare has never been made public, but it is estimated by some sources to be between 20 per cent and 25 per cent of the firm's outstanding stock.

[From This Week magazine, June 22, 1969]

#### AMERICA'S CHURCHES: BILLION DOLLAR BUSINESSES

(By Alfred Balk)

"Dropping, dropping, dropping, dropping, see the pennies fall," Sunday School youngsters used to sing as the offering plate was passed, and this image of the Church as a small-change enterprise persists. Some parishes, to be sure, are poor. But collectively America's religious community is rich—richer than any counterpart in recent history, richer than even most ecclesiastical leaders are willing to concede, and it is growing richer so rapidly that thoughtful churchmen are becoming alarmed.

Indeed, one of the nation's most eminent clerics, Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, has warned

"When one remembers that churches pay no inheritance taxes (churches do not die); that churches may own and operate business and be exempt from the 52 per cent corporate income tax, and that real property used for church purposes (which in some states are most generously construed) is tax exempt, it is not unreasonable to prophesy that with reasonably prudent management, the churches ought to be able to control the whole economy of the nation within the predictable future."

Consider these points:

Contributions and bequests to churches (taxfree) now exceed \$7 billion a year, about half of all U.S. charitable giving.

Though less than half of our populace attends church on an average Sunday, there now is one house of worship for every 600 Americans and at least \$1 billion is spent on church construction annually.

Churches' "visible assets" (land and buildings), according to a study sponsored by Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State, total at least \$80 billion, almost double the combined assets of the nation's five largest industrial corporations. (Of this sum, about \$45 billion is held by Roman Catholics; \$28 billion by Protestants; and \$7 billion by the Jewish faith.)

Denominational pension funds, mortgages, and annuities now total more than \$2 billion, much of it invested in dozens of blue-chip corporations.

Through subsidiaries and feeder corporations, churches own myriad numbers of businesses, including hotels, office buildings, shopping centers, radio-TV stations, luxury apartments, industrial plants, even a brand-name women's undergarment firm.

Moreover, because churches, unlike most other nonprofit institutions, are not required to issue public financial accountings, the above estimates of their wealth probably are conservative. As the Rev. R. John Fry, former news editor of *Presbyterian Life*, has noted, most church officials and members still "share the fantasy that they are not an ecclesiastical business juggernaut."

One of the most conspicuous evidences of their wealth is their buildings. In suburbs in particular, the norm now is not only the upholstered but often the air-conditioned pew. Peter de Vries perhaps best depicted the prototype in *The Mackerel Plaza*: "the first split-level church in America," with an elaborate clinic for psychiatric treatment and an interior "convertible into an auditorium for putting on plays, a gymnasium for athletics, and a ballroom for dances. There is a small worship area at one end."

Nor is this "edifice complex" peculiar to suburbs. In Dallas, for example, a Baptist

church's property includes a seven-story parking and recreation building with a skating rink, gym, and four bowling lanes. In Florida, a complex called Bibletown, U.S.A. encompasses a 2,500-seat auditorium, two education buildings, employee quarters, parking lots, a motel used for retreats, mass dining facilities, and 15 acres of recreation area, including a swimming pool and tennis and shuffleboard courts.

So much church wealth now is devoted to property, a recent General Assembly of the National Council of Churches was informed, that U.S. Protestant and Orthodox churches now spend only \$500,000,000 a year on services to those outside the churches, "only 41 cents a month for everyone who belong to a church in America."

Even more striking is the churches' accelerating involvement in profit-making business. Almost every commercial field now has church-owned components.

Christ's Church of the Golden Rule near Willits, California, for example, operates a \$500,000 motel and other enterprises; the Mormon Church in Utah owns, among other properties, a Salt Lake City newspaper, a radio-TV station, a department store and the Hawaii tourist attraction Laie Village; the Self-Realization Fellowship owns a chain of Mushroomburger restaurants, and the Società Generale Immobiliare, an Italian-based real estate firm in which the Vatican is said to be controlling stockholder, is financing the new \$70,000,000 Watergate shopping center-hotel-apartment project near the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington, D.C.

Possibly the most ecumenical portfolio, however, is that of the Ohio-based evangelical Cathedral of Tomorrow. It owns a shopping center, apartment building, electronics firm, wire and plastics company, even the Real Form Girdle Company, as *Women's Wear Daily* revealed under the headline "Rock of Ages on Firm Foundation."

"A church owns Real Form? This is preposterous!" the executive secretary of the Associated Corset and Brassiere Manufacturers exclaimed when informed of the purchase. But the pastor of Real Form's new parent organization cheerfully acknowledged the acquisition.

"There is nothing unusual about our owning business firms," he said. "What's the difference if it's a girdle company or an airplane company?"

Miscellaneous minority stock investments of religious organizations are almost beyond enumeration. The United Methodist Board of Pensions, for instance, recently reported assets of \$257,000,000, most of it in corporate stock. The \$300,000,000 portfolio of the Knights of Columbus, which includes the land under Yankee Stadium, holds similarly select stocks, and the Roman Catholic Jesuits reportedly own sizable shares of National Steel, Boeing, Lockheed, Douglas, Curtiss-Wright, the intercontinental DiGiorgio Fruit Company, and other firms.

Why have churches suddenly become active business entrepreneurs?

One reason is our tax laws. Since 1950, universities, secular charities, and most other nonprofit organizations have been discouraged from headlong commercial forays by a requirement that they pay taxes on all "unrelated" business income. Churches and church organizations, though, remain exempt from federal tax on any income property or business—even if totally unrelated to their sacerdotal functions.

A church, in fact, need not even amass a large down payment or procure specialized management talent. Because it is tax-exempt, through a "sale and leaseback" it can arrange a "bootstrap purchase"—that is, the business literally buys itself. The church simply pledges payment out of future tax-free profits, then leases the firm back to the original management, which not only re-

ceives a higher sales price than is available from taxpaying bidders but, along with this inflated capital gain, also retains its management status at an attractive salary.

Andrew D. Tanner, a Nashville attorney who conducted a study for the National Conference of Christians and Jews, estimates that a church can generally recover the entire cost of a property, plus interest, within 20 years.

Such exploitation of tax law, of course, severely affects taxpaying competitors. In Dayton, for example, one company complained that it had been underbid on an Air Force contract because the low bidder, a branch of the Roman Catholic Society of Mary, was tax-exempt. And in New Orleans, where a network TV station is owned by the Roman Catholic Loyola University, a spokesman for a taxpaying competitor laments:

"When I pay talent or buy feature film, I've got to use after-tax dollars. They use before-tax dollars. If they spend \$100,000 on promotion during rating periods, I need \$200,000 to match it. The university and its station are good citizens in our community, but I can't believe this is a fair thing."

Government officials are openly troubled about such situations. Stanley S. Surrey, until recently an assistant secretary of the Treasury, in 1966 asked Congress, at minimum, to eliminate exemptions for bootstrap purchases, and a bill to this effect was introduced by House Ways and Means Committee leaders, but it never reached a vote.

A National Council of Churches study in 1965-66 found notable religious sentiment for taxing church business operations, and a Southern Baptist Study Paper declares: "Federal income tax exemption on unrelated business income tends to (1) encourage promotion of or participation in secular business to the detriment of the principal mission of the church; (2) encourage morally unjustified business arrangements with businessmen or companies to reduce their income taxes, and (3) discourage financial support of church activities by voluntary contributions of all members." The United Methodist Church, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., American Lutheran Church, and Episcopal Guild of St. Ives have made similar policy declarations. Some groups have petitioned Congress for reform.

As property taxes have mounted, debate also has intensified over other church tax concessions. In Boston, about half of the city's real property valuation now is off the tax rolls; in Harrisburg, Pa., more than 40 per cent; in New York City, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, and other cities, at least one-third. And, according to one survey, in the state of Minnesota, tax exempt valuation is growing twice as fast as that of taxable property.

"This is serious," says Paul V. Corusy, executive director of the International Association of Assessing Officers. "The property tax base is being eroded."

As a stopgap, congregations in Cleveland, Des Moines, and several other cities have voted to make payments "in lieu of taxes" for police, fire protection, and other local services. Policy statements of United Methodist Church, Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and American Lutheran Church have urged other congregations to do likewise.

In New York City and Kansas City, Mo., former "rival" congregations now share facilities to avoid costly duplication of plant. Episcopal Bishop Horace W. B. Donegan, out of concern over "the whole urban crisis," has halted a \$12,000,000 fund drive for completion of the immense Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York City "until there is greater evidence that the anguish and despair of our unadvantaged people has been relieved." And the Most Rev. Fulton J. Sheen, upon becoming the Bishop of Rochester, N.Y., declared:

"There never should be a new church built here that costs more than, say, \$1,000,000.

If a diocese insists on spending more for a church, it ought to pay something like a 20 per cent tax for missions."

Christianity was founded by a poor man who spent His life among the underprivileged and admonished against privilege. Since then, His church has been weakest and most divided in precisely the periods of its greatest material success. Indeed, at times it has become so rich that governments have had to expropriate its properties, in France, Germany, Mexico and elsewhere.

This, then, is the challenge facing America's churches: to disengage from the trap of "earthly treasure." For, as Dr. Eugene Carson Blake has cautioned, "The economic power that will increasingly be wielded by ever richer churches threatens to produce not only envy, hatred or resentment of non-members, but also to distract from the purposes of the church members and leaders themselves."

## ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY: A DECADE IN PROGRESS

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, among the millions of words spoken and written this month in commemoration of the 10th anniversary of the St. Lawrence Seaway, there are the recurring themes of its broad acceptance as a basic fact of our economic life and of confidence in its future.

Amid these optimistic predictions and ambitious projects, it is difficult to recall that this link between the Atlantic Ocean and the heart of North America was ever the subject of doubt and derision.

Yet, it was a little more than a decade ago.

It took more than 50 years of troubled and often bitter debate to bring the 2,342-mile waterway into existence. More than anything else it was the resolute determination and faith of a few farsighted men that was responsible for the eventual creation of the seaway.

One of the most resolute and influential of these men was my mentor, my close friend, and my predecessor for 24 years in representing the 18th Congressional District of Michigan, the late Honorable George A. Dondero, of Royal Oak, Mich.

Among Mr. Dondero's many contributions to the progress and well-being of our Nation was his single-minded devotion and belief in the concept of the seaway as the water link between the industrial Midwest and the rest of the world.

He persisted in that steadfast dedication during the early years when the naysayers and doubters were in a majority. Those same qualities helped bring the concept of the seaway into being in the 1950's when Mr. Dondero served so capably as chairman of the House Public Works Committee.

Mr. Dondero never wavered during those years of skepticism. Critics contended that the concept was unfeasible from an engineering standpoint. Even if it were possible to create this vast ditch, they argued, it could never possibly be worth the immense cost.

The answers have long since been delivered as year after year the seaway, despite a number of built-in limitations and artificial restrictions, has regularly exceeded dollar and volume predictions of the experts.

In the 10 years since Queen Elizabeth II, then-President Eisenhower, and other dignitaries dedicated the seaway a great international partnership has been forged joining the States of Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin with the Canadian Provinces of Ontario, Manitoba, and Quebec.

The seaway began slowly but traffic has increased steadily transforming cities such as Detroit, Milwaukee, Chicago, and Toronto into world ports to their own and to America's increasing benefit.

Not the least of the seaway's achievements is the opportunity it affords the United States and Canada to demonstrate once more what nations working together in friendship can accomplish for their common good.

The dividend from this international partnership can be defined in cultural and human as well as economic terms.

While the still-infant seaway has demonstrated its vigor and potential, its horizons are just beginning to take definite form. There is a long way to go.

Yet, for that potential to be realized fully the seaway must become less a regional facility and more of a truly international asset—a fully integrated part of the national transportation plan and development program.

It was in that image that men of Mr. Dondero's vision saw the fully matured seaway.

The need for such full and complete use of the seaway is self-evident.

In a speech in Detroit not long ago, former Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd described it this way:

Transportation is one service which Americans need across the board. Without it, you can no more fight a war than you can mail a postcard—and there is little you can do in between.

America's system of transportation is by any standard mammoth. It represents an investment of some \$500 billion. It meets needs as diverse as the 200 million people who use it. It accounts for one of every six dollars in the economy; provides jobs for nine million people; and unites a continent.

Yet the increasing demands on the system already strain its capacity in some areas, and the growth to come—compounded by concentration of that growth—could bring its near collapse. Take the year of 1975 as a yardstick for growth—a good year because it is so close you can almost reach out and touch it.

By then the number of private aircraft will have nearly doubled. Commercial air travel will have tripled. Automobile traffic will be up 40 percent. Railroads, which now haul 750-billion ton miles a year, will be hauling one-trillion ton miles. Trucks, now carrying 400-million ton miles will carry 50 percent more.

In fact, if the demand for transportation continues to match America's economic growth, we will have to double in less than two decades the capacity of a system that has taken the lifetime of a nation to build.

In reference to Secretary Boyd's remarks, Mr. Herbert P. Doan, President of the Dow Chemical Co. of Michigan added this:

Mr. Boyd \* \* \* says to the people of mid-continent North America \* \* \*: the St. Lawrence Seaway must play its role in the national transportation system; it cannot be stifled; it must be used and nurtured; it is a natural asset which we cannot afford to waste.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that the America which has produced men with the vision of George A. Dondero will not allow such waste to occur.

In commemorating the waterway's first decade, it is important to recall the qualities of men like Mr. Dondero, who fought so long to bring it into being.

It will require the same sort of undeviating devotion that Mr. Dondero brought to the project during his 24 years as a Member of this distinguished body for the seaway to realize its full potential and proper place in the national and international transportation network.

#### A PROGRAM TO PROTECT THE SENIOR CITIZEN AS A CONSUMER

### HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House and Senate will, I am sure, agree that few Americans have made more contributions toward helping solve some of the many domestic problems that face our country than the distinguished former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Wilbur J. Cohen.

At present, Mr. Cohen is professor of education and dean-designate of the School of Education at the University of Michigan.

Under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of a recent address by Mr. Cohen on "A Program to Protect the Senior Citizen as a Consumer," delivered on May 9, 1969, at the 22d annual Conference on the Aging Consumer at Ann Arbor, Mich.

#### A PROGRAM TO PROTECT THE SENIOR CITIZEN AS A CONSUMER

(By Wilbur J. Cohen, professor of education, dean-designate, School of Education, University of Michigan)

As we look toward the White House Conference on Aging we must move now into a bolder, broader, more dynamic program for all older Americans.

I propose the following program to protect our senior citizens:

##### 1. IMPROVE SOCIAL SECURITY

Raise the general benefit level—by 50 percent and increase the minimum benefit from \$55 a month to \$100 a month for an individual and \$150 for a couple—over the next four years thus moving over 4 million persons out of poverty.

An immediate 15% across the board increase with a minimum benefit of \$80—thus moving over a million persons out of poverty.

Pay benefits based on average earnings over an individual's 5 or 10 consecutive years of highest earnings, rather than on his lifetime average.

Liberalize the retirement test for those individuals who must or want to work after age 65.

##### 2. IMPROVE MEDICARE

Extend Medicare to cover part of the cost of prescription drugs where the patient has recurring drug needs.

Extend coverage of Medicare to all disabled social security beneficiaries.

Simplify the entire Medicare program by consolidating both the hospital and physicians' insurance parts and financing both of them from contributions from employer and employees and a matching grant from government during the working life of individuals so they will have a paid-up policy at age 65 on a non-cancellable basis.

##### 3. REFORM THE WELFARE SYSTEM

Replace the present hodge-podge of 50 different State programs by a system entirely financed by the Federal government with eligibility determined on a national basis.

As a first step toward this goal provide a minimum budgetary standard in the Federal law of \$150 a month for a needy aged person.

##### 4. EXTEND ADULT EDUCATION

Provide for courses and institutes in elementary and high schools for adults in every community so that information and learning will be conveniently available to every older person.

Provide for institutes and training courses in gerontology in universities and colleges.

##### 5. PROVIDE SERVICES WHERE AND WHEN THEY ARE NEEDED

Strengthen homemaker and home health services in urban and rural areas so that aged persons can have health services in their own homes and aid in reducing mounting institutional costs.

Organize community self-help and friendly visitor services to keep in touch with the home-bound and to aid aged persons in an emergency.

Establish local and state agencies in cooperation with professional health personnel to assure the availability and reasonable costs of nursing homes, intermediate care facilities, and other services for the chronically-ill aged which will provide the services they need at prices which are reasonable.

Expand housing programs to meet the needs of older persons.

##### 6. STRENGTHEN FEDERAL CREDIT UNION SERVICES FOR LOW-INCOME PERSONS

Aid the low income aged person by encouraging saving of small amounts, credit at reasonable rates, and advice and counsel on consumer prices, products and services.

##### 7. SIMPLIFY AND LIBERALIZE THE FEDERAL INCOME TAX PROVISIONS ON THE RETIREMENT CREDIT

Simplify and liberalize the Federal income tax provisions for the middle-income taxpayer and make it feasible to compute and obtain his full tax advantages.

##### 8. REFORM THE STATE AND LOCAL PROPERTY TAX

Reduce the impact of the property tax by exempting aged persons with modest and low incomes.

Reduce the property tax for all persons by enacting state income taxes and closing the loopholes in the Federal tax structure.

##### 9. STRENGTHEN CONSUMER PROTECTION SERVICES

The Federal Government should publish information on products and services which are developed through research paid for by the taxpayer.

Federal financial aid should be provided to strengthen State consumer offices, and to provide educational and legal services to stop practices that short-change low-income people and perpetuate antiquated and inequitable laws relating to contracts, sales, and credit.

Make available comparisons on the costs and benefits of all kinds of insurance so the consumer knows what he is buying and can

obtain adequate protection at reasonable costs.

Publish a U.S. compendium on prescription drugs which would give the brand and generic names with all pertinent information on each drug, including a supplement on prices, to be available in every post-office and social security office in the United States.

10. PROVIDE WIDER OPPORTUNITY FOR OLDER PERSONS TO BE USEFUL AND CREATIVE

Expand senior centers, recreational and cultural opportunities.

Expand the Foster Grandparent program so that the aged may assist children who need help.

Appoint broad-gauged retired persons on appropriate Federal, State, and local boards where they will help to overcome the generational gap by contributing their ideas with emphasis on idealism, altruism, and the future of our nation.

Enable individuals when they reach age 55 to have a 3 to 6 month sabbatical to determine how to plan their future.

## MAKING HISTORY

### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of today's session, I spoke in defense of the faculty, students, and programs of Northeast High School in Philadelphia.

Northeast High is in my district, the Fourth, of Pennsylvania. It is currently being subjected to considerable scorn in a film "High School" being shown around the country. Sadly, Philadelphia Schools Superintendent Mark Shedd and the film's director-producer, Frederick Wiseman, refuse to show the film to our community.

From secondhand accounts received from around the country and from reports in the press, I have become convinced that the film is certainly a gross misrepresentation of the school's fine performance and program.

Indeed, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the filmmaker, in order to serve his own purposes, approached his project with singleminded preconceptions. This, of course, required that he show no evidence of the constructive, imaginative, and innovative work that goes on at the school.

The school abounds with exciting programs in counseling, advanced curriculum, individualized student programs, music, mathematics, child psychology; programs not found at most "typical, white middle-class schools," as Wiseman described Northeast.

One of these pioneering programs was a remarkable research project undertaken by history students at Northeast. Using original sources at historical societies and in city records, these teenage historians traced the history of Northeast Philadelphia from 1609 to 1854.

Now part of the fourth largest city in America, Northeast Philadelphia then was a loose quilt of separate townships and boroughs, churches and farms, in which crossroads served as commercial and community centers.

When the research was completed, the

school's printshop published a handsome, spiral-bound 200-page illustrated book.

While I have not been given a chance to see the film, "High School," I have read this book. It is a remarkable achievement, one of the many conveniently overlooked by the filmmaker.

I applaud the work of Mrs. Cora Hurwitz, the teacher who coordinated this project, and Dr. Mabel Haller, principal of Northeast.

I must say I am impressed by the students who did the research, writing, illustrating, and printing of this book and I congratulate them. I enter in the RECORD an account of their achievement which appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of Thursday, June 26: TEENS TOP NE ROOTS, WRITE BIG HISTORY BOOK

(By Barbara Murphy)

In the minds of many people, Northeast Philadelphia is something new, something strictly post-World War II, something without deep roots in the distant past.

But a group of teen-age historians at Northeast High School have written a book which tells quite a different story about this community with all of its suburban subdivisions, supermarkets and super highways.

"If the book 'Old Northeast Philadelphia County, 1609-1854' has taught its writers one thing," said Mrs. Cora Hurwitz, who supervised the project, "It has shown them that instead of being a brand new section, this is an area with roots deep in the past."

#### CHURCH HERE SINCE 1711

"They have learned, for instance, that there is a church—Trinity Episcopal Church in Oxford—that has been here since 1711.

"They have learned that there is a house on Pine road, the Ury House, part of which was built by the Swedes as a fort in 1645.

"They have learned that the Society of Friends has two still-functioning congregations here that were started in the 1680's.

"They have learned that Washington's Army came through here on its way to Yorktown and that several skirmishes in the Revolutionary War were fought in the Northeast."

#### THE FIRST HISTORY

Mrs. Hurwitz said the students' book is the first history of the Northeast ever written as far as she knows.

She said credit for the original idea goes to Dr. Mabel Haller, principal of Northeast High School.

"Dr. Haller saw an historical map of some sort in one of the papers one day in the fall of 1967," Mrs. Hurwitz said, "and she suggested a history of the Northeast might be written as a class project."

Mrs. Hurwitz, who became the school's college counselor last February, was teaching American history at the time and she put the idea to one of her junior classes.

The pupils were enthusiastic and set to work. They divided into six communities. Two worked on the area as a whole and the four others on the individual townships and boroughs which made up the "Old Northeast County." They were Bridesburg, Frankford, Whitehall, Oxford, Lower Dublin, Delaware, Byberry and Moreland.

Mrs. Hurwitz explained that the title of the book refers not to a separate county since there never was a "Northeast County" per se, but to the Northeastern part of the old Philadelphia County which existed as a separate, much larger entity before the city and county consolidated in 1854.

"The students went everywhere looking for information," she said. "And in the process they learned an awful lot about research. They consulted unpublished manuscripts, and city records and interviewed people."

#### PICKED BEST PAPERS

When each of the committees had finished its work, the committees exchanged papers and the class as a whole picked out the best papers in each group.

This was at the end of school year and Mrs. Hurwitz figured that was the end of the project.

"But some students were so interested," she said, "that they wanted to go on with the project. So all that summer this group came to my house in Frankford every Thursday night and rewrote and edited and organized the research into a single, coordinated work."

Last fall, the papers were mimeographed and presented as a completed project to Dr. Haller.

But that was not to be the end either.

#### GOOD ENOUGH TO BE BOOK

"Dr. Haller thought it was so good, we should make a real book of it," Mrs. Hurwitz said.

So the young people set to work again, doing more research, rewriting and editing and then turned over the project to the school print shop.

The result—published just before the end of the recently concluded school term—was a handsome, spiral-bound 200 page book, complete with introduction and illustrations.

#### WRITERS, EDITORS

Mrs. Hurwitz said the actual writing of the final version was done by Steve Aaronson, Howard Cobert, Louis Karchin, Arlene Levit, Neil Nameroff, Beverly Narod, Rhona Nerenberg, Michael Pearlman and Michael Raitman.

The editors were Sally Battilana, Elizabeth Berryman, Larry Carson, Rosalyn Chanin, Lona Cogan, Barbara Cohen, Marjorie Gottshalk, Robert Lankins, Steven D. Morise and Anita Solow. Marc Cohen did the art work and Larry Carson the cartography. William Nell supervised the printing work.

#### NOT DRIED UP, AFTER ALL

In doing research for the work, Mrs. Hurwitz said, the students discovered some errors in existing books.

Some books for instance said Byberry Creek had dried up many years ago, she said, but a group of researchers went to see for themselves and discovered the creek is still there.

In another instance, she said, it was found that a map dated 1681 by most books could not possibly have been made then since it contained names of settlers who did not arrive until 1682.

By careful checking, it was discovered the map had been made in 1687, some printer having mistaken a 7 for a 1.

Mrs. Hurwitz, a veteran teacher who came to Northeast in 1957, said she has been in charge of a lot of involved student projects, but this, she said, "is the first one ever put out for the world to see."

#### ONE HUNDRED COPIES FOR PUPILS

She said 100 copies of the 200 printed went to pupils involved in the project.

Most of the others, she said, will be placed in local libraries.

"But we are interested," she added, "in suggestions as to how we can make this available to people who might have an interest in the history of the Northeast."

Those with suggestions are asked to call Mrs. Hurwitz at Northeast High.

## GUN CONTROL

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. DINGELL, Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia's firearms registration

law recently went into full effect. The deadline for registration of firearms by residents of the District has passed, and what is the result? The Washington Evening Star of June 19, 1969, carried an editorial entitled, "This Is Gun Control?" which answers this question fully. So that my colleagues may be advised of results of the District's firearms registration drive, I include the text of the Star's editorial at this point in the RECORD:

**THIS IS GUN CONTROL?**

At the last report the formal deadline for registering firearms under the District's new gun-control law has passed with less than a third of the estimated number of weapons in the city signed up.

So what does the city government intend to do now? Launch a house-to-house search, perhaps, for the missing items? The silence from the District Building on the subject is quite deafening.

No doubt the exceedingly cumbersome and time-consuming requirements of the new ordinance contributed in large degree to the poor statistical performance, for the Washington public is not this contemptuous of any reasonable law. The basic failure, however, results from an erroneous premise that this regulation might prove to be of productive help in keeping firearms out of the hands of criminals.

Obviously no such ineffective law can be left unattended, and we await with interest the inventiveness of the city government as to what comes next. As to crime deterrence, however, the City Council should, as a first step, shift its focus on guns from registration to the support of some means of imposing really strong penalties upon anyone who actually uses a gun in the commission of a crime.

ADDRESS BY CAPT. FRANK A. MANSON, U.S. NAVY, RETIRED, DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS FOR THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF MARYLAND'S 49TH VFW CONVENTION IN BALTIMORE

**HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of addressing the department of Maryland's 49th annual convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Baltimore.

Capt. Frank A. Manson, U.S. Navy, retired, director of national security and foreign affairs for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, also addressed this convention. Captain Manson discussed his observations and suggestions following a 27,000-mile factfinding trip around the world. While many of Captain Manson's points are his subjective opinions, I think they warrant the attention of my colleagues. I am therefore setting forth his speech.

ADDRESS BY CAPT. FRANK A. MANSON, U.S. NAVY, RETIRED

Ladies and Gentlemen, I am honored to present the greetings of our Commander-in-Chief, Richard Homan, to the state of Maryland whose membership in the Veterans of Foreign Wars continues to grow at a fantastic rate. You are noted for your champions

in football and baseball and now you are membership champions in the VFW!

Your membership growth speaks for many things. It means you have attractive ongoing programs. It means that you have many workers. It means that you have imaginative and dedicated leaders. It means that you are looking at the future of our country as well as the present and past which should never be forsaken.

On a material basis you will be pleased to know that the V.F.W. has had a steady membership growth for 17 consecutive years. The V.F.W. is the only veterans organization that can make this claim and, in fact, I know of no other national organization that has established such a record.

Maryland represents one of our nation's best V.F.W. organizations and I compliment you on your record of achievement.

In this convention, I read your resolutions for the coming year, and I can see why your membership continues to grow. It is because you stand for, and you support, a strong, stable and harmonious country.

All of your resolutions would serve as models on a national basis, but I would especially like to commend you on Resolution No. 3. This resolution supports our Secretary of Defense and all those in authority in their efforts to continue religious training in character guidance to service personnel. I would like to read this resolution. Quote: "Supporting Secretary of Defense, and all others in authority, in their efforts to continue religious training in character guidance programs to service personnel."

This matter became a hot issue only a few months ago when a group was trying to force God out of the Army training manuals. This issue represents the heart of America's greatness, the heart of our Armed Forces. This issue represents the difference between America's leading the world as a nation under God or America competing as a secular power with material things representing the power of persuasion.

We pledge allegiance to our flag under God.

Our constitution is based on a national faith in God.

The V.F.W. derives its strength from a faith in God.

The Secretary of Defense made the decision in favor of God.

The V.F.W. helped expedite the decision. The reason why it is so difficult to deal with the Soviet Union is because that government does not recognize the existence of God nor does it recognize the Bible as a rule book for man's conduct on earth.

Without basic agreement on right and wrong, what then is good and evil?

America must keep faith with its idealism, with its flag, and its constitution which guarantees freedom and justice for all.

After completing a 27,000 mile fact-finding trip around the world, visiting 14 countries, including three of the most sensitive areas—the Far East, Southeast Asia and the Middle East, and after talking with those in high places and the man on the street, I am convinced the most obvious threat to the United States' national security is the production of Soviet armaments and the deployment of those armaments, along with trained military and technical personnel, to any area or country which shows promise for increased communist influence.

A more subtle threat, and in the long view probably more effective, is the continuing export of communist agents, trained subversive revolutionaries, trained in teaching, killing, psychology, theft, and all the other talents required to completely disrupt the harmony and stability of a society.

Mr. Herbert Rainwater, our VFW Junior Vice Commander-in-Chief, and I traveled completely around the Sino-Soviet periphery. We found the Sino-Soviet split to be real and the split seems to be deepening and wid-

ening. But both the Red Chinese and the Soviet government continue to export trained killers, people trained to kill village chiefs, trained in the use of the firing squad, and trained in torture and terrorism. The Soviet Union continues to export heavy military armaments on a massive scale to those countries where marginal chances for their use and influence exist.

For example, North Korea receives a continuous supply of first-line MIG aircraft, tanks and small, fast boats. The North Korean Navy has been recently supplied with high-speed diesel engines which make it possible for North Korea to build infiltration boats capable of speeds between 35 and 40 knots, faster than any surface craft the U.N. forces have in that part of the world. This new high speed boat resembles a fishing trawler until it starts to move. I suppose if the new boat is capable of carrying armed agents into South Korea, it is also capable of carrying automatic guns, mines, bombs and small rockets. In any case, the ambitions of North Korea's aging Kim Il Sung to dominate South Korea still exists. His ambition continues to be fed by the supply of arms from the Soviet Union.

South of the DMZ the Republic of South Korea's free enterprise system is making rapid economic development. The mayor of Seoul told us that he expects to completely eliminate slums in Seoul within the next three years. Every 90 days he builds new high rise apartment buildings, places 400 slum-dwelling families in each and charges each family \$7.00 per month rent. The new apartment buildings are complete with swimming pools, recreation facilities and modern in all respects. This is truly a revolution in urban development programs. It is taking place in a civilized manner under a free enterprise system operating in an open society.

Almost everyone who goes to Vietnam makes a report. So I will be no exception. South Vietnam and her allied helpers, including the United States, South Korea, Thailand, Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines have a preponderance of power. North Vietnamese Army regulars forces could not hope to gain a battlefield victory under present circumstances. South Vietnam and the United States, Thailand and South Korea have made heavy national commitments. For example, Thailand sent 1/3 of her total armed forces into battle when that country entered the conflict. The allied powers have lost thousands of young men in their struggle to give the ballot privilege over the firing squad as a means of governing the Republic of South Vietnam.

I believe the formula for allied victory has at last been found. I refer to the pacification program of destruction and construction, cleansing the villages of communist agents and replacing them with responsible human beings from South Vietnam who are now being trained in vast numbers to administer to their individual community needs with dignity and just and justice. South Vietnam's ability to self-determine, self-govern and self-sustain is improving with each new day.

Now, if North Vietnam persists in her tactics, it may be necessary for our armed forces to organize "surprise" tactics such as the U.S. used in World War II. In that war, the surprise department was known as "Dirty Tricks", but it worked.

Let us all hope that the cause for humanity can persevere at the peace table and that South Vietnam can follow in the footsteps of the Republic of South Korea, a government and a people we can be proud to stand alongside. South Vietnam is now miraculously built up with new harbors, new port facilities, new airports, new training facilities and equipment of all kinds which stagger ones imagination. The military structure is now built for the transformation of South Vietnam into one of the strongest economic nations in Southeast Asia. It would be an utter

shame to permit all the death and human suffering in this land, all the new harbors and buildings built by the world's greatest builders, America, to be lost in a web of communist political dialogue. The Commander-in-Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Richard Homan, has frequently urged President Nixon, in view of the continued shelling of civilians in South Vietnam to continue to reevaluate all of his options for bringing about a peaceful and prompt settlement of the conflict. I am sure President Nixon knows as well, if not better than anyone in the world, that peace will be achieved through unity and strength here at home. Communist leaders understand strength and unity.

But the Soviet government and the Red Chinese have problems of their own and they have problems with each other.

If the communist powers are going to continue to exploit the problems we have, then I say we should explore their problems. If they continue to pour sand into the machinery of our society then I feel it is only fair that we do some pouring of sand ourselves. One only has to look at our sand pouring talents among ourselves on domestic issues to know we can be the international champions.

The Soviet Union has some real weaknesses from within. She has boundary disputes with China. Some of the Soviet colonies don't like colonial rule, and some are saying so publicly. Some of the communist parties don't like the life of a parrot. Some of them like to say what they think and none of the communist nations except the Soviet Union seem to like what is now happening to Czechoslovakia. Many millions of people inside the Soviet Union don't like to speak Russian. Many of the Soviet people want to speak their own native language. Many want to worship their own God. Many want to publish books criticizing those in power. Many want the right to vote for a choice. Many want less poverty and more food.

The point I wish to leave with you is this: Life in the Soviet Union is not all vodka and caviar. Red China has problems, too. These problems may get worse because they each lack the spiritual base which America has.

The thing we must do is to keep our faith, believe in ourselves, work to the limit of our talents and I know we will remain America the beautiful, America, the symbol of justice and freedom and compassion for all men . . . everywhere.

#### TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH McCAFFREY

### HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, on the anniversary of his 25 years as a Washington correspondent, Joseph McCaffrey is deserving of a special tribute, not only from his listening public but particularly from the Members of the Congress. He is fair and factual in his presentations, and is very knowledgeable of the workings of Congress. He does a real service in keeping our fellow citizens well informed.

We are all well aware of the power of the communications media, and of the capabilities which it possesses in shaping the opinions of our citizens. The responsibility of reporters of the news, then, bears great significance on the future course of our country, and demands that nothing but honest, unbiased reports be presented.

Joseph McCaffrey is such a reporter. He does honor to his profession, for he has never had to resort to sensationalism nor distortion to retain the interest of his listeners, and he is most deserving of the great respect he enjoys. I wish to express my warm congratulations to Joseph McCaffrey, and my appreciation for the great service he has rendered.

#### EXPLANATION IN ORDER ON RELAXING NURSING HOME STANDARDS

### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to the relaxation in standards for nursing homes which are serving medicare patients.

If there is validity to the charges made by the head of the National Council of Senior Citizens, Inc., it seems to me that an investigation is in order by the Congress as well as a reassessment of the situation by the Health, Education, and Welfare Department.

Congress has sought through legislation to give assistance and consideration to our senior citizens. We have an obligation in this regard. A reduction in standards represents a backward step that merits prompt investigation.

Mr. Speaker, following is the text of the statement making the charge by the head of the senior citizens' organization:

NEW MEDICAID REGULATIONS REPRESENT GIVE-AWAY TO NURSING HOME OPERATORS

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 25.—A senior citizens' spokesman today denounced the new Medicaid nursing home regulations as "a give-away of Federal funds to the nursing home industry."

Nelson H. Cruikshank, President of the 2,500,000-member National Council of Senior Citizens, said "Congress set up Medicaid to help the needy and not to guarantee huge profits for private nursing home operators—the most predatory of health care suppliers."

The cutback in Medicaid nursing home standards was announced by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare Monday through publication of the reduced standards in the Federal Register.

Medicaid is the three-year-old Federal-State program of health care for the needy.

Cruikshank accused the American Nursing Home Association of putting heavy pressure on officials of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to get them to order a relaxation of care standards for large numbers of men and women receiving nursing home care paid for under Medicaid.

The senior citizens' spokesman said: "The main concern of the American Nursing Home Association is to increase profits of its members and it is unfortunate that Department of Health, Education and Welfare officials caved in under this pressure."

Until today, Medicaid regulations required that a nursing home receiving funds under Medicaid have one registered professional nurse in charge on one shift and that licensed practical nurses who have graduated from State-approved nursing schools be employed on other shifts.

The new regulations allow employment in nursing homes receiving Medicaid funds of nurses who have never attended nursing

school and are licensed regardless. This is called licensing by "waiver."

Cruikshank said delegates to the National Council of Senior Citizens' recent annual convention in Washington had protested the undue influence of the nursing home industry on Medicaid administrators.

The resolution condemned "actions of Federal Medicaid administrators in employing a paid representative of the nursing home industry to write regulations for nursing home participation in the Medicaid program."

Newspapers have reported that Harold G. Smith, a nursing home consultant, was hired to help draft the Medicare nursing home regulations.

Cruikshank urged that humanitarian organizations concerned with problems of the elderly protest this surrender by Medicaid administrators to the nursing home industry."

Cruikshank declared: "It is a sham and a fraud for the Federal Government to pay for skilled nursing home care, then permit untrained nurses to provide the care."

"This will prolong the widespread disregard of professional standards of nursing home care and continue the exploitation and neglect of unfortunate nursing home patients."

#### NEW JERSEY ISSUES TEMPORARY INJUNCTION AGAINST INTERNATIONAL MAGAZINE SERVICE OF THE MID-ATLANTIC, INC.

### HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in further reference to the subject of deception and misrepresentation in the sale of magazine subscriptions, I would like to call attention to a temporary injunction issued yesterday against one magazine sales company doing business in New Jersey.

Superior Court Judge Alexander P. Waugh yesterday granted a preliminary restraining order against International Magazine Service of the Mid-Atlantic, Inc., to prohibit the sales company from continuing certain sales practices which the New Jersey attorney general contends violate New Jersey laws.

The order directs IMS to refrain from misrepresenting that certain magazine subscriptions are free when in fact they are not, that monthly payment amounts were less than they turned out to be, and from failing to reveal the total contract price until after the consumer had signed a contract.

Judge Waugh set a final hearing on the case for October. The New Jersey attorney general has asked that at that time the court order IMS to stop all operations in New Jersey, to rescind all contracts, to return all money obtained through misrepresentation, and be fined \$100 for each illegal transaction. Nineteen consumers were identified in the complaint.

The preliminary restraining order is expected to be made effective by July 2. It represents a significant step to wipe out unscrupulous sales practices where they exist in the magazine sales industry.

The Easton Express, an Easton, Pa., newspaper, deserves a great deal of

credit for the uncovering of magazine sales misrepresentation through its public service feature, "Action! Express." Complaints received by the newspaper from New Jersey readers led to the attorney general's action to seek an injunction.

I invite my colleagues' attention to the account of yesterday's decision as reported in the Easton Express:

NEW JERSEY COURT CURBS MAGAZINE SERVICE  
(By F. Alan Shirk)

MORRISTOWN, N.J.—Superior Court Judge Alexander P. Waugh today decided to issue a preliminary restraint against International Magazine Service of Mid-Atlantic Inc. to prohibit it from continuing certain sales practices which the New Jersey attorney general says are in violation of the state consumer laws.

Judge Waugh reached the decision on a show cause order of the attorney general as to why an interlocutory injunction should not be granted against IMS to suspend certain operations in the state.

The case was heard in the Morris County Courthouse here.

The action against IMS resulted from consumer complaints mailed to the attorney general by Action! Express, a public service column of the Express. These and other complaints have prompted a nationwide investigation of the magazine subscription sales industry.

The restraint expected to go into effect by next Wednesday, will prohibit IMS from misrepresenting that certain subscriptions are free when in fact they are not, that monthly payment amounts are less than they turn out to be, and that the total contract price is not revealed until the consumer signs the contract.

Judge Waugh set a final hearing on the matter for October. The attorney general in the final action wants IMS to stop all operations in New Jersey and rescind all contracts and return all money obtained through misrepresentation. He also asks that IMS be fined \$100 for each illegal transaction.

The hearing today was continued from last Friday when it was adjourned on a legal technicality concerning the rules of evidence.

IMS contested the attorney general's action on the basis that the court did not have the jurisdiction because IMS was a Maryland based corporation with independent franchises doing business in New Jersey.

Douglas J. Harper, deputy attorney general, contended this morning the franchise agreement between IMS and the independent franchises proved that the defendant had too much control and therefore the state's complaint was proper.

Harper said that IMS controlled the independent franchises because it had the right to accept or reject subscriptions, could alter commissions, could make cash advances to the franchisees, provided that all contracts automatically became the property of IMS, issued the monthly payment booklets and ran all subscriptions through a central collection agency.

Harper also said the contracts carried the name of IMS.

#### DEFENDS FRANCHISE PLAN

Barry Mowrer, attorney for IMS, argued that the violations charged by the attorney general were committed by the independent franchisees and not by IMS.

"The independent franchisees are just that—not employes or agents," Mowrer said.

He also argued that the contract language was not misrepresentative, but the oral portion of the salesmen's talk might have been.

Judge Waugh said the arrangement between IMS and its franchisees was "merely a facade," and that the franchising agreement was unusual because IMS did have so much control.

He said that in the correspondence and letters sent to consumers who signed contracts, the name IMS appeared frequently.

"Based upon your showing before me, there is not this independent franchise between defendant and Bernstein to insulate the defendant from restraint," Judge Waugh said. The Judge referred to Stanley Bernstein, one of the independent franchisees mentioned in the complaint.

The judge said he reached his decision primarily on the basis of Harper's argument about the close relationship between IMS and the independent franchisees and also on a state statute regarding habitual violation of a state law.

### HANOI VISITOR REFUTES CLAIM THAT BOMBING HALT IS HELPING UNITED STATES

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are deeply indebted to Mr. Andrew Borowiec, foreign correspondent for the Washington Star, for his recent dispatch from Paris in which he quotes a recent visitor's visit to Hanoi.

Mr. Borowiec points out that the bombing halt has not reduced tensions in the North as some observers have recently indicated in the American press and that on the contrary, the North Vietnamese seem to have profited from the halt of the air war to improve their production techniques and transportation system.

I have seen naive statements in some publications that the bombing halt has created great morale problems in Hanoi because since the bombing attacks have stopped, Ho Chi Minh is having difficulty maintaining a war spirit among his people.

Mr. Borowiec offers us the first authoritative report on the situation in Hanoi and from his article we immediately see how misleading are those who insist the bombing halt has in some way helped our war effort.

The Communists continue to keep their people in a state of permanent tension by warning that America will resume its bombings. I am deeply concerned that the bombing halt has obviously given Hanoi an opportunity to build up its defenses and as the article points out, should the raids ever resume, North Vietnam would be in a much better position to cope with them.

While it is true that Mr. Borowiec points out there is little damage to be seen from the bombing, I think it should be remembered that more than a year has elapsed since we started the bombing pause and the Communists have had ample opportunity to repair the damage.

The article by Mr. Borowiec follows:

HANOI VISITOR SAYS REGIME STIRS TENSIONS  
(By Andrew Borowiec)

PARIS.—Communist authorities in North Vietnam are keeping the country in a state of permanent tension, warning that the "Americans may attack any time."

This was reported by a highly placed neutral observer who visited North Vietnam re-

cently. The visitor asked to remain anonymous.

He said the state of tension was apparently aimed at preventing the population from lapsing into apathy, harming the war effort.

Thus, air raid alerts are sounded periodically, although the United States has stopped bombing the North. While certain emergency measures have been relaxed, industry, schools and all governmental activity remain highly decentralized and on a permanent war footing.

"The war is not over, keep fighting until final victory," is the main theme of official propaganda.

#### NO SLACKENING

The visitor, who toured large portions of North Vietnam, said he had not noticed any signs of slackening vigilance. The country remains in the grip of a powerful and all-embracing Communist machine, he said, and it would be highly premature to speculate on any slackening of the war effort due to the halt of U.S. bombing.

On the contrary, he said, the North Vietnamese seemed to have profited from the halt of the air war to improve their production techniques and transportation system.

"Should the raids ever resume, they would be in a much better position to cope with them," he said.

#### BOMBING MINIMIZED

The visitor appeared unimpressed with the results of the bombing. It failed to disrupt life and industrial activity in the North, he said.

"One sees comparatively little damage as one travels through the country," he said. "The North Vietnamese like to capitalize on attacks on civilian targets but they are often quite close to military objectives. Invariably, the military targets seemed to have suffered less."

While, on the whole, impressed with the organization, determination and loyalty of the North Vietnamese, the visitor saw "staggering examples of inefficiency."

Thus, he recalled, at one stage during the air war, factories and some port installations of Haiphong were dismantled and hastily evacuated. Even today, specially formed teams are looking for various components.

Boilers, machinery and other pieces of equipment can be seen literally strewn in the fields, unguarded by anybody, he said.

He was unable to determine the impact on the population of the losses suffered by North Vietnamese regulars in the South. However, he did see large numbers of young men in the cities and villages and concluded that North Vietnam is not faced with any dramatic manpower shortage at this time.

### TRUMAN WARD—A GREAT LOSS TO THE CONGRESS

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, all of us were greatly shocked and saddened by the passing of our dear, esteemed friend, Mr. Truman Ward, who as majority clerk for so many years served the House and its Members with such outstanding efficiency, fidelity, and cheerfulness.

His loss is indeed a great one to all of us, and in a real personal sense, especially those of us who knew Truman well during his long years of faithful service and looked up to him and relied upon

him to perform tasks for us which he always did so effectively and well.

Truman Ward was respected, admired, and loved by all who knew him. He was an honorable, God-fearing man, devoted to his church, his family, his friends, and his very important work on this historic Hill.

Indeed, these are the things that really were his life, and he centered his attention upon them.

I had no inkling that Truman was seriously ill, and therefore the shock of his passing came upon me with special impact, shock, and deepest grief.

My heart goes out to his devoted wife and family, who have sustained such an irreparable loss, which all of us prayerfully share.

I join them in mourning Truman's passing. He will be missed here in the Congress, where he rendered conspicuous assistance to the Members of the House for so many years far beyond the call of duty.

He will be missed wherever he was known for his amiable personal qualities, his loyalty to his friends and his country, the skill and conscientious effort that he put into his work, and his warm friendship that was so deeply appreciated by so many people.

A great American has passed from the earthly scene, from these honored Halls, where he spent so many years of his life, from his friends and dear ones to his eternal, heavenly reward.

I express my most heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Ward and her family and hope and pray that the good Lord will bring them reconciliation and peace in their most sorrowful bereavement.

Truman's memory will always remain with us. He has left us a real legacy of loyalty, hard work, the meanings of friendship and attention to duty that will endure for many years.

May he find happiness, peace, and rest in his heavenly home, and may his dear ones be sustained and helped by the mercy and compassion of the living God to bear their truly grievous loss with true fortitude, faith, and courage.

#### BATTLE KILLS GLEN BURNIE MARINE

#### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Cpl. William M. Stone, Jr., an outstanding young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD.

#### MARINE DESCRIBES BATTLE DEATH OF GLEN BURNIE MAN

"The North Vietnamese troops threw a grenade, and he jumped on it to try to save everyone else from getting hit. He tried to jump on it, but he missed it and the fragments just tore him up.

"We had two guys wounded by the grenade besides him. He was a real good guy."

That is how a Marine described the death of his friend, Lance Cpl. William M. Stone, Jr., 18, of Glen Burnie, whose death was announced yesterday by the Defense Department.

#### SQUAD AMBUSHED

The friend, Cpl. Emmet D. Close, of Brooklyn Park, said their squad was ambushed June 17, about four miles south of the Demilitarized Zone.

"The grenade was thrown from a tree line just in front of us. . . . Just before he died he asked me to come over and see him [in Glen Burnie], and I told him I would, but he died right there on the spot," said Corporal Close.

"He couldn't understand why we were fighting there," said the Brooklyn Park Marine who was the dead man's squad leader.

Corporal Close, who is home on an emergency leave, said he was nominating his friend for a silver Star. The two had known each other for the past 10 months only in Vietnam, even though their houses were but four miles apart.

#### SURVIVORS NAMED

According to Corporal Stone's mother, Mrs. William M. Stone, Sr., he enlisted in the Marine Corps last year after working at several odd jobs. He had dropped out of high school in the ninth grade.

Besides his mother, he is survived by his father; a brother, James A. Stone; and two sisters, Donna Lynn Stone, and Beverly Ellen Stone, all at home.

#### PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SPEAKS OUT AND TAKES ACTION ON PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT

#### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues an example of clear thinking on some of today's problems by the Prince Georges Chamber of Commerce. I commend the members of the Prince Georges Chamber for their conscientious concern as responsible citizens to help find solutions to some of our perplexing problems.

I could not let the occasion pass without bringing this fine program to the attention of my colleagues, so I am setting forth a letter from Mr. Charles Belinky, president of the Prince Georges Chamber of Commerce:

HYATTSVILLE, Md., May 13, 1969.

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN,  
Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOGAN: As a result of the recent discussions between our Executive Committee and yourself, the Board of Directors of the Prince Georges Chamber of Commerce on May 5, 1969 gave special consideration to the problems arising from vociferous persons advocating the seizure and control by force and violence of some of our public and private institutions. We coupled with this discussion our concern regarding current activities reaching from the college campus to the ghetto where violence is employed to accomplish ill-conceived objectives. This letter is being written in the direction of our Board and with the unanimous approval thereof.

We do not believe that the solution to these problems will result from either a single or simple solution. On the other hand, we are not dismayed by the belief that such problems have no solution at all. We feel that democratic capitalism is not only a political-economic system which is good for this country, but which can and will work effectively in the interest of all of our citizens. We are indeed anxious to contribute our part and are pleased with your efforts and your concern for making our political-economic system more viable and appealing to all.

There are obviously large numbers of people in our community who, with justification, feel that they are out of the main stream of our economy and who feel that they do not have a reasonable opportunity to promote their own economic and political well being. If our system is to work properly, such people must be given the incentive and encouragement to feel that they do have a welcome place and an important role to play. It is quite obvious that the dream of Henry Ford in manufacturing goods that his own workers could afford contributed greatly towards setting the high and prosperous pace of our society. We who are more successful in our personal lives can obviously expect to gain if we can transfer citizens from welfare rolls into productive employees who bear their own share of taxes and who become paying customers and avid consumers.

With this spirit, the Chamber of Commerce has established a Committee for Opportunity which is intended, as the name implies, to provide opportunities for those who sincerely wish to better their economic well being. It is hoped to provide opportunities in the fields of both education and employment.

On the other hand, we feel that it is imperative for the preservation of our society that certain fundamental standards of conduct be clearly recognized, that all our citizens be encouraged to abide by these standards, and if they fail to do so, that the law deal firmly, swiftly, justly and equally with such deviations. Obviously inciting to riot, advocacy of violence and use of violence is included within such standards. In short, respect for law, settlement of controversies by the Courts and modification of law through orderly legislative processes is an uncompromising essential element of democratic capitalism and to domestic peace and prosperity. These principles we are prepared to defend against all those who would seek to ignore, disregard or overturn them.

The Prince Georges Chamber of Commerce is prepared and, indeed, is actively engaged in providing opportunities for those who wish to better themselves and who are willing to comply with the simple standards of recognition of the rights of other persons to the security of their person and property. We are, indeed, anxious to do more for our County, State and Country within the framework of these principles and we are encouraging you and others to suggest what else we may do.

Very truly yours,

PRINCE GEORGES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC.,  
CHARLES D. BELINKY, President.

#### LAW AND ORDER EVERYONE'S CONCERN

#### HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer for inclusion in the

RECORD remarks made by an outstanding public servant of the State of Alabama recently. Sheriff Mel Bailey, of Jefferson County, was speaking to a meeting of the Blount County Democratic Women's Club, and the text of his address is as follows:

**LAW AND ORDER EVERYONE'S CONCERN**

"In our nation where peace under law is a cherished way of life, all agencies and officers of law enforcement face a challenge of paramount importance.

"The problem of crime in our streets and in our cities has reached unprecedented proportions, and law enforcement must find a way to discharge its basic responsibility: The protection of society.

"The ability of law enforcers to do this depends in large part upon the cooperation and support of law-abiding citizens; and unfortunately, that ability has been hampered to some extent in recent years by misunderstanding or deliberate distortion of the facts.

"Some people have tried to make the phrase 'law and order' somehow synonymous with prejudice or repression, and this is not an honest position.

"Enforcement of the law and maintenance of order are essential if justice is to be assured all citizens. If any citizen's rights are violated by a law enforcement officer, then that officer is not enforcing the law. He is exceeding and abusing the power of his office, and he should be disciplined appropriately.

"I have emphasized this ever since I became sheriff of Jefferson County.

"On February 28, 1967, I formally reaffirmed the policy of the Sheriff's Department.

"The state law imposes the duty to effect a legal arrest where the situation warrants it." I said then, "and reasonable and necessary force may be legally used to prevent the escape of a felon, to effect his arrest or to protect citizens and in defense of the life or safety of the officers."

"I also made it clear that any deputy who was wanton in his use of force would be subject to disciplinary action commensurate with the findings of any investigation establishing that fact. That remains the Jefferson County Sheriffs Department's policy.

"So does the following, also quoted from my 1967 statement:

"The policy of the Sheriff's Department is to enforce the laws of the State of Alabama fairly and impartially without regard to race, color or situation in life.

"In the carrying out of this policy, our deputies are expected to be courteous in the performance of their duties and are so instructed. A lack of courtesy on the part of an officer is construed as a weakness and will not be tolerated by this department. No deputy shall willfully mistreat any person, prisoner or otherwise, and shall not use profanity or derogatory language in the discharge of his duties.

"I think that says it as clearly as it can be said.

"Lest there be any doubt whether this still represents the policy of this department, I restated it, as reported in the newspapers, only last week.

"If any citizen or any member of the Jefferson County Sheriffs Department still has any question, then I reaffirm here and now that even-handed, impartial, professional enforcement of the law and equal protection of the rights of all citizens of whatever race or social status or persuasion are the criteria by which I expect to be judged and by which the deputies assigned to this department will be judged.

"Now, let me repeat here that there is another side to his coin, and that is the side of public responsibility to give the law enforcement agencies full support in the performance of their duties.

"Even with the notable advances in police efficiency and scientific crime detection, law enforcement agencies cannot grapple alone with the crime problem and hope to succeed.

"Lawmen must be aware of our responsibility to the people we serve. But we also have a right to expect and get the respect and the support of those same people.

"Without that kind of cooperation and mutual respect, the lawless minority will continue to prey on the honest, law-abiding majority of all races and economic classes. No one's rights, property or life itself will be safe.

"Good law enforcement comes down finally to the men who are charged with providing it, of course: But it begins with You and all citizens who believe in a just and lawful society.

"Furthermore, there is a responsibility on the part of the city, county and state governments to make as diligent an effort to help prevent crime as police agencies are expected to make in apprehending and prosecuting criminals.

"Too often there can be found in the three levels of government and in their various departments a lack of attention to the needs of the poor, in such areas as welfare, food stamps, school and parks, housing and health, and so on.

"Out of this sometime lack of diligence in tackling social problems have come street demonstrations, campus unrest, rioting and, consequently, additional pressure on police forces.

"All systems and levels of government must do their part to provide and maintain social stability and peace in the community.

"It is not good enough to leave one segment—the law enforcement agencies—to face the brunt of attack because of failure of other departments of government to do their part of the job.

"So I hope you can see that if we are to enjoy peaceful, lawful communities in which the rights of all citizens are secure, we all—law enforcement agencies, other government departments and private citizens and organizations—have to shoulder a part of the responsibility.

"I can tell you, and all other interested citizens, that the Sheriff's Department of Jefferson County intends to accept its share of the load.

"I expect from my men high standards of professionalism and, above all, moral integrity. They and I in return expect the understanding and support of the community.

"I can think of no better way to end this than to quote one more paragraph from my 1967 statement:

"It is the sworn duty of every member of the Sheriff's Department to protect the rights of every citizen. It is the duty of every citizen to cooperate with an officer when he is carrying out his sworn duty."

"Neither the situation nor this department's policy has changed since then."

**CUTTING OF FUNDS FOR PORT OF NEW YORK AND NEWARK BAY**

**HON. JAMES J. DELANEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I strongly protest the administration's discriminatory proposal which singles out New York-New Jersey Port projects to absorb a grossly disproportionate share of the cutback in harbor improvement projects.

Of the \$13.7 million reduction in funds, the ports in our area are cut \$5.4 million, or 39 percent. At the same time eight seaport projects sustained no cuts at all.

The value of the Port of New York's oceanborne foreign trade in 1967 amounted to nearly \$13 billion, divided almost equally between exports and imports. In addition, a total of some 786,000 passengers entered and departed the port by ship in that year. This commerce was carried by nearly 23,000 vessel trips, which in turn generated over \$816 million in customs revenues—about 30 percent of the total customs revenues for the entire Nation for both air and sea transportation.

A port's ability to function successfully is in no small measure controlled by the adequacy of its piers and docks and the waterways leading to them. This is not to minimize other port handling, transportation, and administrative services. However, unless a ship can enter a harbor safely, and load and unload its cargo efficiently, there will be no traffic and commerce to support these other services.

From 1946 through 1965, private terminal operators and waterfront industry in and around New York Harbor, together with the city of New York and the Port of New York Authority, spent nearly one-half billion dollars to build and rehabilitate marine facilities to accommodate this area's massive oceanborne commerce. More recently, the city and port authority have agreed to construct a long-needed \$60 million modern passenger ship terminal on the North River waterfront.

The magnitude of ocean commerce handled by the New York Port, and the local self-help improvements instituted by New York City Port interests, calls for most careful consideration of any cutbacks in port projects which might have an adverse effect on the continuing economic progress in this area.

I strongly urge that full funding of New York Port projects be favorably considered.

**ON THE EDGE OF THE MOON**

**HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harry LeVine, Jr., of the General Electric Co., recently brought to my attention several articles in a special section of the London Times of June 3, 1969. Because of their significance and the indication of international interest in our Apollo program, I am including these outstanding articles in the RECORD. I commend the reading of these articles to Members of Congress and to the public:

[From the London Times, June 3, 1969]

1,800 YEARS OF SPACE TRAVEL: FROM DREAM TO REALITY

Man has been traveling to the moon for centuries; to dig the gold, eat the cheeses, explore the forests or wrestle with Dan Dare's

Mekon. His transport has been romantic, ingenious, foolish and brilliant; chariots of swans, giant guns, artificial clouds and enormous metal springs; even rockets.

These journeys, dreams that ranged between ludicrous fantasy and prophetic imagination, are not recorded much before the second century A.D. But later, as writers discovered science fiction and the appetite men had for it, the stories proliferated.

At times, either by luck, reasoning, knowledge of science, or uncanny inspiration, they foresaw details of voyages like Apollo 10's and that planned for next month.

In 1646 Cyrano de Bergerac, accomplished wit, swordsman and satirist, imagined himself lifted towards the moon in a flying machine propelled by rockets. But tales of space travel can be traced back at least as far as 160 A.D., when the Greek satirist, Lucian of Samasota, wrote *Vera Historia* (True History), which had all the basic ingredients of space travel fiction: the outward journey, the moon landing, a description of the moon, and the journey home. It set the pattern for many that followed.

Lucian's hero found himself on the moon by accident. His sailing ship was caught in a violent whirlwind that snatched it from the sea and carried it through space. On the moon the traveler found lunar inhabitants called Hippogpyl, who rode on three-headed vultures with wings that were "bigger than the mast of a ship".

Until the end of the middle ages apparently little was written of man's dream. Then in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries works by Kepler, Copernicus and Galileo started what has been described as a "veritable astronomical revolution". Johannes Kepler's work, *Somnium* (The Dream), a space fantasy, spoke of transportation by demons who abhorred the sunlight and could travel only by night. Travellers were given an anaesthetic potion as protection against the ill effects of rarefied air.

Another weird fantasy was that of Francis Godwin, a seventeenth-century bishop of Hereford. His *Man in the Moone* travelled by a chair-like device drawn by 25 geese. Like modern man, he used an animal for the test flights—a lamb. He found on the moon a "huge and mighty sea", "herbes, bestes and birds", but none was like anything he had seen on Earth.

Cyrano de Bergerac in one of his schemes "planted my selfe in the middle of a great many glasses full of dew, tied fast about me; upon which the Sun so violently darted his rays that the heat, which attracted them, as it does the thickest clouds, carried me up so high that at length I found my selfe about the middle region of the air". The voyage was a failure—Cyrano landed not on the moon but in Canada.

His next attempt, by a rocket-powered "machine", was also a failure. Firecrackers were tied to a large wooden box, the fuses were lit and Cyrano jumped on board. He swept through the clouds to a great height but the fireworks went out and he plunged back to Earth.

David Russen in *Iter Lunare* (Voyage to the Moon), writing at a time when space travel was becoming increasingly popular, imagined a giant launching spring constructed on the top of a mountain. Other writers bizarrely devised great ladders.

#### CAPSULE SHOT FROM A GUN

However, ideas for leaving the Earth were changing. Readers were becoming more aware of science, and writers were becoming more sophisticated as they struggled to make their fiction more realistic. Some machines were fitted with "anti-gravity" devices; space travelers even tried balloons.

Jules Verne in *De la terre à la Lune* was as scientifically accurate as knowledge at the time permitted. His scheme to shoot a capsule at the moon from an enormous gun was

not feasible because its occupants would have been crushed by the acceleration. However the story was good enough to excite his readers into wondering whether it was a possibility.

Columbiad, the name Verne gave his spaceship, was fired from a place called Stone Hill, Florida, little more than 100 miles from what is now Cape Kennedy. It was 9 ft. wide and 15 ft. high. Made of aluminum, it was luxuriously furnished and had gas to provide light and heat. There was an ingenious system for smoothing the impact of take-off, and a chemical plant to produce oxygen.

H. G. Wells' great science fiction works—including *War of the Worlds*, published first as a magazine serial in 1897—came at the end of the long line of fiction that had searched for a method of leaving the Earth. Towards the end of the nineteenth century fantasy was increasingly overtaken by reality—the rocket engine was the solution. Although the dreams of space travel did not falter, science began to dictate terms to the writers.

The exact date of the rocket's invention is lost in history. Stories and legends suggest it was in use before the thirteenth century, but these are hard to confirm. Most authorities point to 1232 when the Chinese were besieged in the town of Kai-Feng by Mongols. They tied rockets, apparently used by them for signalling, to flaming arrows.

Certainly in 1258 a war rocket was used at Cologne, Germany. The Paduans apparently employed them to attack the town of Mestre, near Venice, in 1379. Two years later Bologne, which was under siege, was destroyed by a "fearful device".

In following centuries rockets were continually used as battle weapons. Spewing fire in all directions, they at least caused severe psychological damage. But they were inaccurate. Unless the gas flow from a rocket's tail were directed straight backward, it would curve in flight wide of the target. Guns were much more effective, and impatient military inventors tended to concentrate on these.

The potential of the rocket first began to fascinate European military strategists in the late eighteenth century, mainly because it was being used effectively by their oriental enemies to resist the encroachment of imperialism.

Troops of the Indian state of Mysore had used rockets on British colonial troops in the battles of Seringapatam, in 1792 and 1799. Weighing between 6lb. and 12lb., their casing was made from iron piping and they had a large stick attached for stability. They had a reported range of up to a mile.

Accounts of these battles differ, but one young officer named Bayly wrote: "So pestered were we with the rocket boys that there was no moving without danger from the destructive missiles." He added: "... every illumination of blue lights was accompanied by a shower of rockets some of which entered the head of the column passing through to the rear, causing death, wounds, or dreadful lacerations from the long bamboos of 20 or 30 feet which are invariably attached to them."

Passed over by the military, the reaction rocket gradually took shape in the minds of scientists around the turn of this century. Its potential for space travel was realized independently by three men: Konstantin Eduardovitch Tsiolkovsky, of Russia, Robert Hutchings Goddard, of the United States, and Hermann Oberth, of Germany.

Tsiolkovsky, born in 1857, was of humble origin. He showed an early talent for mathematics and physics, and had an inventive mind. The germ of the idea of interplanetary travel occurred to him while he was still in his teens. Most of what he learnt in the early days was self taught. In 1878 he became a "people's school teacher" and moved to Borovsk. In a home laboratory he started

experimenting. On the basis of papers he later produced he was elected to the Society of Physics and Chemistry in St. Petersburg.

In 1903 Tsiolkovsky published in the journal *Nauotchnoye Obozreniye* (Scientific Review) an article entitled "The probing of space by means of jet devices". The first to understand and develop the use of rockets in space travel, he created the mathematically precise theory of rocket propulsion.

The spaceship that Tsiolkovsky planned was to be powered by heated gases produced by mixing liquid oxygen and liquid hydrogen—the basic chemical formula that powered the upper stages of the Saturn 5 rocket and enabled it to send nearly 50 tons to the moon.

Tsiolkovsky's theories on escaping from the Earth's atmosphere and gravitational field place him, in the view of many historians, at the head of all rocket scientists. But he confined himself mainly to the conception and development of theories.

Robert H. Goddard devoted most of his work to the practical application of rocket propulsion. Born 25 years after the Russian, his interests in rocketry also started in his youth. From the age of 16 Goddard started keeping notes of his ideas. Though his work almost certainly had enormous influence on the rocket research, he did not receive the recognition due him until after his death in 1945.

#### IT MIGHT COST A MILLION DOLLARS

Until 1920 most of his research was devoted to powder and solid propellants. His most famous work, published in 1919, was "A method of reaching extreme altitudes." In it Goddard speculated that it would be possible to send a rocket to the moon with enough magnesium powder for the impact to be visible from the Earth through telescopes.

After a great deal of calculation and initial experimenting, Goddard launched on March 16, 1926, the world's first liquid fuel rocket. It rose 41 feet from the ground at a maximum speed of 60 m.p.h. and was in the air for about 2½ minutes.

Three years later he told Charles Lindbergh, the aviation pioneer that it was possible to send a multi-stage rocket to the moon. "But he smiled a little bit and said it might cost a million dollars—and of course that was out," Lindbergh recalls. The 1969 budget for the Apollo programme will be many times Goddard's estimate.

During the Second World War Goddard worked under contract with the U.S. Navy Bureau of Aeronautics and the Army Air Corps. The principles he developed were applied to missiles used by the Navy.

After his death Goddard received a number of honours and awards. In 1960 the United States Government paid the Guggenheim Foundation and Mrs. Goddard \$1m. in settlement for government use of more than 200 of the pioneer's patents.

Hermann Oberth's interests in space travel started at the age of 11 when his mother gave him Jules Verne's famous books. It set him on a series of experiments into weightlessness and propulsion. In one he even went to the extent of taking drugs, to deaden his nerves, and immersing himself in water. The feeling of weightlessness, he concluded, would at first be very frightening.

His interest in combat rockets drove him to propose to the German war department, in 1917, the development of a liquid-propelled, long-range bombardment missile.

Oberth's first book, *Die Rakete zu den Planetenraumen* (The Rocket into Planetary Space) was published in Munich in 1923. It became a classic. He discussed thoroughly almost every aspect of rocket travel, including the effects of pressure and weightlessness on the human body. The book, only 92 pages of text, was packed with reasoned thought: how a rocket could operate in a void, that it

could move faster than the velocity of its own gases, and that it could launch a payload into orbit.

Six years later Oberth published a 423-page expansion of *The Rocket into Planetary Space*. Retitled *The Road to Space Travel*, it earned for Oberth what is believed to be the first international astronautics prize, instituted by Robert Esnault-Pelterie and Andre Hirsch.

During the Second World War Oberth worked on rocket developments including the V-1 and V-2 at Peenemünde and Reinsdorf. After the war, before retiring, he worked for a few years in the United States with Wernher von Braun, his erstwhile pupil and the man who completed the bridge between the early rockets and today's giants like Saturn 5.

Tsiolkovsky, Goddard and Oberth did much more than is recorded, however. Their work inspired many to follow, and the impetus provided by their publications attracted numerous scientists and engineers to rocket and space travel research.

Space travel, like rockets and rocketry, owes much to fear and war. Had there been no Second World War, no east-west arms race and no nuclear weapons, it is doubtful that man would have achieved so much so soon.

If there is one other man whose name is likely to loom as large in space history as those of Oberth, Goddard and Tsiolkovsky, it is Dr. Wernher von Braun. Now 57, he lives and works in America, where he is Director of the Marshall Space Flight Centre. It was he who turned Hermann Oberth's idea of long range bombardment missiles into reality. Luckily for Britain and the rest of Europe his V-2 was not ready until the end of the war. In spite of successes at Peenemünde, Hitler could not be persuaded of the value of von Braun's weapon.

Nevertheless, southern England and the Continent were to experience the horrors of rocket warfare in 1944 and 1945. Some 4,000 V-2s, each carrying a one-ton warhead, were fired during those two years. Traveling at speeds faster than sound, they gave little or no warning of their approach.

Both Russia and the United States were quick to realize the value of the V-2. As they invaded Germany at the end of the war they competed in capturing rockets, plans and the men who designed them.

Von Braun went to the Americans.

Though it was probably the Americans who won this scramble for German minds and machinery, it was Russia that was first off the mark in the space race.

Sputnik 1 went into orbit on October 4, 1957. It caused bitter disappointment in America, and recriminations in Washington. The U.S. Army had planned to put a satellite into orbit in September but apparently red tape had prevented it. The world marveled at Russian technology.

A month after Sputnik 1, the Russians launched the dog Laila in Sputnik 2 and demonstrated that life in a spaceship was possible.

America launched Explorer 1 three months later but by this time Russia's success had made a jarring impact on the West. Americans and Europeans were thinking of space as an advantage in the battle for nuclear superiority . . . and Russia seemed to have that advantage. It seemed that the man with superiority in space had superiority in missile power. Many people envisaged the Russians planting the hammer and sickle on the moon and declaring it their own. The Russians would dominate the world. They would be able to aim a rocket at the earth and they would be invincible.

We now know that in a nuclear war the time it takes a missile to reach its target is critical. A missile launched from the moon would probably arrive when the war was over.

Somewhere in the race that followed Sputnik 1, the Russians adjusted their sights.

Whether they raised them from the moon to the planets or kept them on the moon but fell behind in shooting capacity we may know only when the Russians land elsewhere in the solar system.

#### FIRST GLIMPSE OF THE DARK SIDE

If, as now seems certain, the Americans are the first to step on to the moon's barren surface, it will not mean that the moon is American. Thanks to an agreement signed by some 60 nations in 1967, the moon is international territory.

In 1961 President Kennedy set the target for a moon landing "within the decade", but it was not until the mid-60s that the Americans seemed to be catching up.

On September 13, 1959, Russia's Lunar 2 crashed into the moon's surface. A month later Lunar 3 provided the first glimpse of the moon's dark side. On April 12, 1961, they put Yuri Gagarin into orbit. One month later the Americans put Alan Sheppard into space, but it was a short, 15-minute, sub-orbital flight. The Russians sent back the first television pictures in August, 1962. In 1963 they achieved a flight of over 100 hours, in 1964 they put three cosmonauts up together, and in 1965 they made the first space walk.

But by 1965 the Americans were only a few months behind, and midway through their Gemini programme they started to take the lead. They managed a successful docking—the linking of two space vehicles—essential for reaching the moon by the American method of separate "excursion module".

By 1967 the space commentators were saying that America was ahead. The two-man Gemini flights had been such a success that there was even an air of over-confidence. It may well have contributed to the disastrous fire of January, 1967.

Three astronauts, Edward White, the first American to walk in space, Virgil Grissom, who had made two flights, and Roger Chaffee were doing a simulated countdown for the first manned Apollo flight. At this time the Americans were using pure oxygen for the atmosphere of their space craft.

A small spark from the electrical system is thought to have started the fire: the men were sealed in the capsule and had no chance of escape. They died within seconds.

Apollo underwent sweeping design changes. The atmosphere was changed and new, quick-opening hatches were fitted. The added weight ran into hundreds of pounds and the work on reducing this put the programme back.

Apollo 7, the first Apollo flight, flew in October, 1968. It stayed up for more than 260 hours, making 163 Earth orbits. Two months later Frank Borman, James Lovell and William Anders piloted Apollo 8 on two Earth orbits and 10 moon orbits. They came within 70 miles of the moon's surface and travelled farther from Earth and faster than any man before.

They demonstrated that man could travel through space, and that the dreams of Lucian of Samasota, Kepler and Verne—of going to the moon and of looking back at the Earth—were not to remain dreams forever.

Man has been to the moon, the next problem was to land on it.

For this task, the Americans developed the lunar module, a spidery-looking vehicle which, like a flying bedstead, cannot glide. When tested in the Earth's gravitational pull, six times stronger than the moon's, it proved to be one of the biggest stumbling blocks in the whole Apollo project.

The Russians had decided on a jumping-off platform in Earth orbit. The Americans, after years of debate, had chosen to have their platform circling the moon. Thousands of millions of dollars made the decision irreversible. No wonder those who were sniffing the first hints of victory were shocked when the lunar module, crashed repeatedly during Earth tests and seemed uncontrollable. But

its designers stood by it and were vindicated by the inflight trials of the Apollo 9 and 10 missions.

Man is expected to stand on the moon's surface in little more than a month. He will owe much of his achievement to the science fiction writers and the rocket men. But it will not be the end of the dream. Fiction tells too of journeys to Mars, Venus, and to other solar systems. The men who devoted themselves to the science of space travel looked on the moon only as a first step.

[From the London Times, June 3, 1969]

#### HOW TWO MEN WILL WALK ON THE SEA OF TRANQUILLITY

The perilous journey to the moon of Apollo 11's marvelous ironmongery began, at a grinding speed of less than half-a-mile-an-hour, while Apollo 10 was blazing a triumphant trail in space.

Since superlatives are inseparable from space pioneering, it was the world's largest tracked vehicle, "the crawler", that carried the 3,000 tons of Saturn 5 rocketry from its lofty assembly building to launchpad 39A. It took some six laborious hours, the most laggard progress it is likely to make.

Apollo 11 makes its thunderous, fiery exit from Earth at teatime on July 16 with its three-man crew: Mr. Neil Armstrong, a civilian who is destined to be first on the moon, Lieutenant-Colonel Edwin Aldrin, who will walk the surface with him, and Lieutenant-Colonel Michael Collins, who will stay in the orbiting command module.

Following the flight of Apollo 10, the lunar voyagers will orbit the earth one-and-a-half times before firing their third stage Saturn 4B rocket that shoots them on to their moon course.

Ninety-eight hours into the flight the 16-ton lunar module will extend four spidery legs, and part from its mother craft to begin its descent to the moon. Its two-man crew, held only by a safety harness, will stand at the controls, peering through canted triangular windows.

For a quarter of an orbit Apollo 11 and its offspring will fly cautiously in formation a few hundred feet apart, in case a quick rescue is necessary. The two moon-walkers will be in the lunar module's upper, or ascent stage. The lower, descent stage will become a launching pad from which they will take off after their 22-hour stay.

The module will take an hour to drop to 50,000 ft. (eight nautical miles). Its descent engine will be fired and in eight minutes it should land on a chosen site in the Sea of Tranquility.

To the men on the previous mission, the spot, from a distance less than twice the height of Everest, looked firm enough. According to Colonel Tom Stafford, the Apollo 10 commander: "There's plenty of holes there. The surface is actually very smooth like a very wet clay . . . with the exception of the bigger craters."

Automatic radar will continuously measure the angle, speed, altitude and range as the lunar module approaches. The pilot takes over, manually, only in the final seconds. He can hover, if he wishes, and take it up again without landing, if necessary. Pads on the module's legs take the touchdown impact.

The module must land cleanly and evenly if it is not to jeopardize its take-off later. As soon as they are down, Mr. Armstrong and Colonel Aldrin will spend two hours checking the module's systems. Then they will stop for a meal, and a four-hour rest. They will eat a second meal before they depressurize their craft and open its hatch for the first time. In fact they will have been on the moon for 10 hours before Mr. Armstrong ventures outside, and into the world's history books.

Wearing a bulky space suit and a special thermal garment over it to protect him from radiation, temperature extremes and parti-

cles of meteoroids, and carrying a life support system on his back, Mr. Armstrong will climb down the ladder attached to one of the module's legs.

Colonel Aldrin will televise and photograph the moment from the module before following Mr. Armstrong down the ladder 31 minutes later. Because of the moon's curvature, the astronauts standing on the surface will be able to see only two miles, rather than the 20 they could see on Earth. Under a cloudless black sky the landscape will glare whitely.

They will set up a television camera to send pictures of the module back to Earth. Then the astronauts will rig a solar wind collector—which they are to take back with them—and seismic equipment and a laser reflector which will be left behind.

The wind collector, developed and paid for by the Swiss Government, is a thin sheet of aluminum on a frame like a window screen. It will trap rare gases like argon, helium and xenon from the sun's rays.

The 100 lb. seismic station will collect power from the sun which it will use to radio volcanic movement or lunar activity below the surface back to Earth for perhaps a year.

The reflector, which weighs 70 lbs., will reflect laser beams directed from Earth. These will enable the distance between the Earth and the moon to be measured with great accuracy and any variation to be recorded. Measurements will be repeated several times a day for a year or more. This should enable scientists to refine their knowledge about the shape and size of the moon.

Perhaps the greatest prize awaited from the journey is the 50 lbs. of lunar rock and soil the astronauts are expected to gather for international distribution to scientists.

When Mr. Armstrong first descends the ladder it will be to familiarize himself with the surface and its stability. He will climb back then for a contingency sample bag into which a handful of rock or soil can be thrust quickly in case they need to leave in an emergency.

The astronauts' life support systems allows them four hours air. They will work for three, with an hour in hand as a precaution. Though the moon's gravity is one-sixth of the earth's, movement in their enveloping suits and equipment will be slow and awkward.

Simulation tests have improved ways in which they can go about it. One astronaut, for instance, will carry both experimental packages because his balance is improved, in the same way as when a suitcase is carried in either hand. The packages have to be moved about 70 ft. from the lunar module and on the Earth weight a total of some 160 lb. Special design has made them relatively simple to set up. Lanyards are pulled, releasing springs holding the instruments together as a parcel.

Adjustments are then made to solar panels capturing the sun's rays to provide electrical power for both pieces of experimental equipment. Radio aerials connected to the units will be adjusted so that they send a continuous stream of information back to earth. The equipment starts to operate as soon as the panels are unfurled.

The astronauts will have three prospecting tools for collecting samples. One is a scoop to gather loose soil, another is a pair of tongs for picking up rocks, and the third is a boring instrument. This is hammered into the ground to take a 12 inch core sample, which it automatically ejects into a container. It will give scientists material uncontaminated by man or rocket exhaust. While they are on the surface the astronauts will stay within 300 ft. of their craft.

At 7:32 a.m. on July 21 Colonel Aldrin and Mr. Armstrong will climb back into the lunar module. They will eat two more meals, with a rest of nearly five hours between be-

fore blasting off from the moon at 5 p.m. The lower half of their craft, which now becomes a launching pad, remains on the moon. It may be useful to subsequent visitors for fuel or spare parts.

The ascent stage, just 12 ft. high, weighs under a ton on the moon. The astronauts must fire themselves into an elliptical orbit between 15 and 36 miles high and then make this circular with another burn. The lunar module will be travelling in a lower, and therefore faster, orbit than the command module. They will narrow the gap for two hours before they dock.

The two spacecraft must equalize pressure before the hatches are opened for the two moon-walkers to return to the command ship. The lunar module will then be jettisoned.

The mothership will circle the moon twice while preparations are made for the return. To leave lunar gravity its speed must rise from 3,600 m.p.h. to about 5,400 m.p.h. to begin the long journey home and the dangerous reentry procedure.

Apollo 11 is due to splash down at 5:52 on July 24, eight epoch-making days after they set out. But their personal welcome by an incredulous world will be delayed. They will go into isolation for 21 days from the time they left the moon to be minutely examined by scientists.

Before they leave their spacecraft they will even vacuum clean the inside to prevent possible contamination of the earth by particles from the moon, which may be dangerous. As soon as the astronauts emerge from the spacecraft they will don isolation garments and be sponged off with organic iodine.

[From the London Times, June 3, 1969]

#### WHAT THE SCIENTISTS ARE HOPING TO LEARN FROM THE MOON

If the engineering of the Apollo project passes its final test with the flight of Apollo 11 in July, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration planners will have the moon in their grasp. In deciding what to do with it, their first goal will be to explore the lunar terrain. The results of this may be crucial to the longer term schemes envisaged by enthusiasts for man's role in space, such as manned lunar bases, the construction of telescopes and the use of the moon as a launching pad for flights to the planets.

The geology of the moon is not only of great interest in its own right but will also help in reconstructing the early history and structure of the Earth. This is not just because two planetary bodies will be easier to understand than one. Whatever the origin of the moon, its crust may still retain the fossil evidence, long since vanished from Earth, of events that occurred at the dawn of the solar system. The geological forces that continually remould the face of the Earth have destroyed all but the vestiges of its primordial crust and left a gap in the record from time of the Earth's formation, some 4,900 million years ago, until the appearance of the first sedimentary rocks nearly 2,000 million years later.

The scale of geological activity on the moon has been much smaller, and the moon's surface, perhaps not greatly altered since the time of its formation, may help to make good the pages missing from the early history of the Earth. Nonetheless, the occasional eruptions seen in lunar craters and the volcanoes spotted by the Apollo 10 astronauts suggest that the moon may not be the fossil planet it is sometimes supposed.

The astronauts of Apollo 11 will spend 2½ hours outside their landing module, long enough to set out a package of instruments and scoop up some samples of lunar soil. Ten more flights are planned with existing Apollo equipment or slight adaptations of it, the pattern of which will be to allow progressively more time on the lunar surface.

Apollo 12 will allow two excursions of 2½ hours each, and the astronauts of Apollo 13 will have up to three days on the moon. But short excursions, even at different landing sites, will bring back diminishing returns. In further flights the lunar module will be equipped with extra oxygen tanks so as to prolong the stay to a week, together with some kind of transport which will give the astronauts a range of five to 10 miles from the module.

One proposal, still very much in the air, is to combine the payloads of two Apollo flights. The lunar module of the first would be replaced by an unmanned capsule capable of landing some 7,000 lb. of logistic support for the astronauts who would arrive on the second flight. The extra equipment would probably include shelter and life systems for a fortnight's stay, and a roving vehicle to explore the surface.

The flights after Apollo 11 will probably be interspersed with unmanned flights designed to reconnoiter the best spots for manned landings. The first landings are planned for sites along the moon's equator. These are easier to attain than polar landings and the orbit of the spacecraft is least at risk there from disturbances by the curious gravity anomalies of the moon. But unmanned spacecraft suggest that the lunar poles may promise more surprises for the explorer.

Just how interesting the moon turns out to be will determine the rate at which it is explored and exploited after the first Apollo landings. If President Kennedy had not made the landing of men on the moon before 1970 a national goal it is unlikely that the scientific aspects of the mission alone would have commanded the necessary funds—the return tickets for the two Apollo 11 astronauts will have cost some \$10,000m. each.

After Apollo, space flight will have to be justified by scientific rather than political considerations, and in present circumstances scientists will choose to devote a large slice of what funds may be available to making unmanned flights to the planets. But priorities could change overnight if the moon were to yield any big surprises, such as if, for example, an astronaut were to pick up a fossil skull from the lunar soil.

Apart from exploration, the other possible uses of the moon will depend on the tempo of space activity, and particularly on the demand for manned flights around the solar system. It requires very much less energy to launch a planetary probe from the moon than from Earth, and the economics of doing so might become attractive if rocket propellants such as hydrogen and oxygen could be extracted from the moon. This is why advocates of manned space flight, and science fiction writers before them, have pointed out the advantages of maintaining a manned lunar base which, it is hoped, would be largely self-supporting and need only a minimum of supplies to be ferried from Earth.

Nobody envisages that a manned base would be set up on the moon before the 1980s, but even this date may be too optimistic if the Apollo landings fail to find water, which is the key to any large-scale exploitation of the moon. Water can be separated by electrolysis into oxygen and hydrogen and these three substances between them would provide the bulk of the material needs of a lunar colony. But does water exist on the moon? One possibility is that there is a layer of frozen water, like the permafrost of Siberia, a few feet below the lunar surface. Another is that water molecules may have been trapped in the permanently shaded craters at the poles of the moon and over millions of years have grown into glaciers perhaps 100 ft. deep.

Even if both these suggestions are proved false, and there is no positive evidence to support them, it may conceivably be economic to extract oxygen from the lunar rocks for the benefit of a lunar colony.

A lunar base, which would be an economic alternative to more than a certain number of individual return trips, would be manned by some 20 to 60 people living in prefabricated aluminum chambers. A small nuclear power station, machinery for exploiting lunar water, and a hydroponic farm would be the essential supports of the colony's existence. Geological exploration would be a major part of the colony's role, but there might also be opportunities to construct an observatory, for which the moon offers several unique advantages. The moon has no ionosphere and its far side is the only place in the solar system that is permanently shielded from man-made electromagnetic disturbances by 2,000 miles of solid rock, which makes it an ideal site to pitch a radio-telescope.

X-ray observations, which at present can be made only from balloons and rockets launched to the top of the Earth's atmosphere, could be carried out on a more permanent basis from the surface of the moon. Optical astronomy would also benefit. Without the interference of an atmosphere telescopes could be designed and operated to the theoretical limit of their resolution. Their structure would be far less massive than on Earth because of the smaller pull of the moon's gravity. The 200-inch reflector on Mount Palomar weighs 500 tons whereas a 200-inch telescope constructed on the moon's surface would probably weigh only 10 tons.

An observatory on the moon would be able to reach farther out into space than Earth-based telescopes, with incalculable advantages for astronomy. The counting of various types of very distant stars might help to resolve the debate about the origin and structure of the universe. The precision of astronomical measurements would be extended so as to put the determination of stellar distances on a much firmer basis. A lunar telescope might also be able to detect the planets of the nearer stars. Nevertheless the benefits to astronomy would afford only a marginal justification for a lunar base because many of the advantages offered by lunar sites can be gained far more cheaply by telescopes put in orbit round the Earth.

The costs of running a lunar base have been estimated at around \$1,000 million a year for a 20-man base. Labour costs on the moon are expected to work out at nearly \$100,000 an hour, and the price of transporting supplies from Earth to moon would be of the order of \$10,000 per kilogram. If these estimates are even approximately correct, it is clear that a manned lunar base will be justified only as part of a space programme much larger than what is envisaged for the immediate future, and too large, perhaps, for the resources of any one nation.

But this has not stopped Mr. Barron Hilton, for example, from putting forward his ideas for a three-floor hotel beneath the lunar surface, or Mr. Arthur Clarke, who predicted communications satellites some 20 years before the event, from giving a warning that in two centuries conservationists will be trying to save what little is left of the lunar wilderness.

#### SALUTE TO AMERICA

### HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Robert M. Freedman, has composed a "Salute to America," which he feels should be

adopted to replace the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag. I place Mr. Freedman's salute in the RECORD at this point for the interest of my colleagues:

#### SALUTE TO AMERICA

This is my country and, as an American, I shall defend it with my life. I will never lose sight of my heritage. I will stand with the giants of this land, for no one country, no one person, near or far, shall deprive us of God's will, for man to be free.

#### THE NATIONAL COMMITMENTS RESOLUTION

### HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, as you know, earlier this week the other body voted—70 to 16—in favor of the advisory, sense-of-the-Senate resolution which, though ambiguous and presumably without force of law, is being regarded as an attempt by the other body to reassert some of its constitutional prerogatives in the field of foreign policy to the possible effect that future Vietnams might be avoided.

Whether or not this would prove to be the case is, I suggest, somewhat conjectural and one can rather easily imagine that, resolution or no resolution, American Presidents will probably go on conducting American foreign policy largely as they see fit as long as the Constitution—vague and ambiguous though it, too, may be in this same respect—seem to make that possible and practicalities, especially in a nuclear age, are deemed to make it necessary.

The debate on this matter in the other body makes for some interesting reading but will probably leave constitutional scholars still pretty much in the dark as to what, exactly, was accomplished by this bill's passage—on which, of course, the House does not have to act. There can be no question, however, but that this action springs from our unfortunate experience in Vietnam. And there can equally be no question but that this entire matter ought to be explored further and, in my judgment at least, some better approach sought for putting Congress—both Houses thereof—more actively back in the arena where far-reaching foreign policy decisions are to be made.

I have been interested in this problem for a long time—as I know a goodly number of my colleagues have, too. Recently, I ran across two items in the same general area that are worth consideration. The first of these is a rather lengthy discussion of the so-called national commitments resolution, as written by Arlen J. Large and appearing in the June 20 edition of the Wall Street Journal and, under leave granted to do so, it is now included as a part of these remarks:

#### SENATE WEIGHS U.S. GLOBAL COMMITMENTS (By Arlen J. Large)

WASHINGTON.—Congress has never voted directly on the merits of waging the kind of

war that ultimately evolved in Vietnam. Indirectly it endorsed a much smaller military effort by voting for the 1964 Gulf of Tonkin resolution. And indirectly it sustained the ballooning conflict by voting arms appropriations for it.

Now the Senate is once again acting indirectly, debating the merits of an intervention U.S. foreign policy that produced the unhappy experience of Vietnam. It's being done in the guise of considering a fuzzy sense-of-the-Senate resolution that attempts to define a "national commitment." The resolution says the Senate doesn't want U.S. troops sent abroad to back up future defense commitments that haven't been specifically approved by Congress.

The ambiguity probably attracts votes for the resolution, with different Senators supporting it for different reasons. There is always some automatic support for anything asserting Congressional prerogatives in rivalry with the Executive Branch. The Nixon Administration, which opposes the resolution, at one point seemed content to let it pass unnoticed as a meaningless exercise in Senate parochialism. Now its resistance is stiffening, with Senate GOP Leader Everett Dirksen trying to persuade the sponsors to change the wording to something less offensive to the Administration. The debate could easily deteriorate into a partisan scrap between the Democratic Senate and the Republican White House.

#### A NATIONAL WEARINESS

But there are Senators in both parties who want to debate the resolution at a deeper level of meaning, symbolizing some measure of national weariness with the U.S. global role since World War II.

A view of America over-committed diplomatically and over-extended militarily around the world is held by the resolution's principal backers, Foreign Relations Committee Chairman William Fulbright of Arkansas and Majority Leader Mike Mansfield of Montana. Sen. Fulbright explains the resolution would "inhibit the President from making politically significant foreign commitments solely on his Executive authority, with any foreign country or organized force without the prior and explicit authorization of Congress."

The whole thing "smacks of neo-isolationism," says Democratic Sen. Gale McGee of Wyoming, who is an unreconstructed Vietnam hawk and an advocate of strong Presidential authority over foreign policy. Sen. McGee thinks many of his colleagues are bemused by the legalistic arguments over Senate foreign-policy prerogatives, failing to see the more subtle assault on U.S. policy itself. "This may not be the hottest issue going, but it could be one of the most important," he says.

The gap between the viewpoints represented by Sens. Fulbright and McGee was widening well before President Nixon himself denounced the "new isolationists" two weeks ago. The national commitments resolution was first introduced in 1967 and directed against the Johnson Administration, which also opposed it. Then as now, it was offered in terms of a stale dispute in Constitutional law, with the Senate wanting to reclaim treaty-ratifying and war-declaring powers it feels have been surrendered to the Executive. But then as now, it was an indirect reflection of growing unhappiness with the nation's global role.

For much of the post-World War II era it was an agreeable role for Americans. It conferred the title of "leader of the free world" on Presidents, and allowed Congressmen to boast of creating the most powerful nation on earth. Literally millions of American citizens have gone abroad since the late '40s to serve in the armed forces or in diplomacy,

and for a lot of them—where there was no shooting—it was fun.

Congress and the public soured on offshore adventures only when the going got tough. It was inevitable that the going would get tough. Mixing deeply into other peoples' political disputes means bumping some day into some locals who care more deeply about the outcome than most Americans do. Endless casualties in Korea and Vietnam produced demands that policymakers show clearly that the foreign enemy was indeed a threat to citizens at home. The Administrations in office at the time could not do it, at least to the satisfaction of millions of voters.

It would be different if light had burst through the entire length of the Vietnam tunnel in, say, the summer of 1966, with the other side shriveling in discouragement. There would be no "national commitments" resolution pending in the Senate today. Global policing, having worked cheaply, would remain high adventure and the military-industrial complex would be as popular as a paycheck.

Instead there's a backlash against both the diplomatic and military establishments of the Executive Branch. Sen. Fulbright's Foreign Relations Committee, in a report explaining the "national commitments" resolution, takes an unaccustomed swipe at the diplomatic profession, complaining in effect that the U.S. has become saddled with too much foreign policy, made by too many policymakers.

It's doubtful that, by itself, the resolution would have much impact on Presidential foreign policymaking. The turgid language would have no force of law, merely expressing the Senate's opinion that: "A national commitment by the United States to a foreign power necessarily and exclusively results from affirmative action taken by the Executive and Legislative branches of the United States Government through means of a treaty, convention or other legislative instrumentality specifically intended to give effect to such a commitment."

The Foreign Relations Committee's report mentions Thailand, Israel and Spain as nations that have no such ironclad, Congressionally sanctioned U.S. defense pledge. But oral promises of support by Executive-branch officials or the presence of U.S. military bases, or both, inspire the committee's fears that defense obligations to these countries have been created without anyone's asking Congress.

Cutting Congress into defense commitment decisions, it's theorized, would help avert U.S. involvement in marginal foreign quarrels. A defense treaty presumably would be ratified only when a broad cross-section of Senators agreed a commitment was vital, ultimately justifying U.S. battle casualties. Such nations as Israel, Biafra and Rhodesia, for example, all have passionate friends in Congress, but each rooting section could prove too small to pass a "legislative instrumentality" that would put GIs into troopships.

#### AN UNACCEPTED DARE

The problem is that this is no guarantee against U.S. involvement in wars that later become unpopular. Congress after all did pass a "legislative instrumentality"—the Gulf of Tonkin resolution—authorizing Lyndon Johnson to use armed force to defend South Vietnam. Sen. Fulbright and others bitterly claim they were misled, but they never accepted President Johnson's dare to repeal it. The North Atlantic Treaty, ratified by the Senate two decades ago, could still trigger U.S. defense of the military government in Greece.

Thus if the Senate passes its "national commitments" resolution, it will be primarily a symbolic act—a complaint against the unsuccessful Vietnam war and a warning against more of the same. Sen. Fulbright himself has conceded that "neither Senate reso-

lutions or any organizational or procedural devices are likely to restore Congressional authority in foreign affairs. The restoration of Constitutional balance will depend on decisions of a more fundamental nature, decisions as to the kind of country we want America to be and the kind of role we want it to play in the world."

"A veritable army of foreign-policy experts has sprung up in government and in the universities in recent years," contributing greatly to our knowledge and skill in foreign relations but also purveying the belief that foreign policy is an occult science which ordinary citizens, including Members of Congress, are simply too stupid to grasp," says the committee report. There is a trenchant reminder to the State Department that:

"Foreign policy is not an end in itself. We do not have a foreign policy because it is interesting or fun, or because it satisfies some basic human need; we conduct foreign policy for a purpose external to itself, the purpose of securing democratic values in our own country."

At least some Senators who have been turned off by the Vietnam war believe Americans can remain global-minded in terms of trade and travel, but should leave the guns at home. Marlow Cook, Kentucky's new Republican Senator, openly applauds a national mood of "neo-isolationism," which he defines as "not economic or cultural but military." The new mood, he said in a speech, "is born of a frustration with excessive militarism, whether it takes the form for costly missile systems which increase international insecurity or ill-advised unilateral intervention in foreign countries which take the lives of thousands of young Americans."

#### IDEOLOGICAL ARGUMENT

Whether there is "excessive militarism" depends upon an assessment of the threat to Americans from Russia, China, the Vietcong or whomever. The argument tends to be heavily ideological, often with side quarrels over diversion of arms money to civilian uplift, but not always. Here are two Democrats, both domestic liberals, assessing the world around them in recent speeches:

Sen. Stuart Symington of Missouri: "I am confident every American would agree that, when Mr. Stalin was alive, the cold-war aspect of our foreign relations was far more serious than today. Then there was a monolithic structure behind the Iron Curtain, and a man running things whom we all know was interested in taking over the world. That is far from true today."

Sen. Thomas Dodd of Connecticut: "We are now heading into the most perilous period in the history of our republic. . . . If we succumb to the neo-isolationism and anti-militarism that have become so prevalent in our society, if we appear to lack the will to defend ourselves and our allies, then I truly fear for the future."

Not surprisingly, Sens. Symington and Dodd are more or less on opposite sides in discussions of Vietnam and the anti-ballistic missile. But it's a sign of the ambiguity of the "national commitments" resolution that both of them voted for it in the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, as you will note, it is Mr. Large's conclusion that passage of this Senate resolution is "primarily a symbolic act—a complaint against the unsuccessful Vietnam war and a warning against more of the same."

And, then, Mr. Large goes on to quote from the chief sponsor of the resolution, and we find him coming more or less to the same conclusion but adding:

The restoration of Constitutional balance will depend on decisions of a more fundamental nature, decisions as to the kind of

country we want America to be and the kind of role we want it to play in the world.

Precisely so, Mr. Speaker—but, then, how do we go about injecting the congressional influence more than it has been into the arena where those kind of decisions are made?

The answer does not come easily, but one of the most intriguing suggestions along these lines is that made by the respected columnist, Roscoe Drummond, in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor. And Mr. Drummond's suggestion—which I consider most worthy of developing further—is for Congress to match the National Security Council, the President's major instrument for achieving a coordinated global view of foreign policy, military policy, and domestic policy, with a joint Congressional Security Committee of its own.

The Drummond column, under leave also granted, is now set forth as a part of these remarks, and I would hope that my having brought it to the attention of others will give this idea the consideration it so richly deserves:

#### HOW CONGRESS CAN RECLAIM ITS POWER (By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Congress is always fretting about its loss of power and initiative to the President and the Supreme Court.

It should. Something needs to be done and can be done. The time is ripe for Congress to repair the balance.

But, first, it needs to be understood that Congress has not lost powers because anybody has taken anything from it, but because Congress has failed to exercise powers it possesses.

Every activist president from Franklin Roosevelt to Lyndon Johnson has enlarged the role of the executive by using more decisively the powers the Constitution gives him—a process enhanced by the focus which radio and television give to the White House. Congress has lagged behind.

In two landmark decisions—public desegregation and the one man, one vote ruling providing for reapportionment of state legislatures—the Supreme Court has done more to change the face of the nation than anything Congress has done in two decades.

It was always open to Congress to act in these two areas. It failed to do so.

What can be done? What should be done?

One thing is sure: what Congress is presently trying to do won't work. It is trying to increase its powers by attempting to decrease the president's.

This was the stated objective of the original draft of the Fulbright resolution which prescribed that the president as commander in chief must not use the armed forces outside the United States without prior approval by the Senate. That would have meant that President Kennedy couldn't have acted, as he did successfully, to get the Soviet missiles out of Cuba. That would have meant that President Eisenhower could not have acted promptly in sending United States troops to Lebanon. That would mean that no president could act quickly, as needs require in this uncertain and turbulent world.

But the resolution has been so watered down that it is nearly meaningless, except that it cannot fail to plant doubts in the minds of America's allies and adversaries that the president is losing his freedom of initiative. He isn't, in reality, because no resolution by Congress can amend the president's constitutional powers.

They are broad and, in my judgment,

have been used prudently. I know of no foreign policy or foreign military commitment which has not had Senate approval. SEATO (the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization) was overwhelmingly ratified by the Senate. Every military action which President Johnson took in Vietnam had explicit authorization in the Tonkin resolution, also overwhelmingly approved.

There are valid reasons why Congress should recover the powers and initiative which it has lost through neglect. It can do this by effectively using the great powers it possesses—the power of the purse, the power of scrutiny and review, the power of congressional advocacy.

But it can do this only when it is willing to organize and equip itself with the means to do the job.

For years the initiative has always been with the president in part because he has in his hands the means to achieve a coordinated global view of foreign policy, military policy, and domestic policy. The instrument is the National Security Council.

Congress urgently needs the same kind of instrument so it can look at the whole of United States policy, not merely at its separate parts. What is needed is a joint congressional committee on national security to match the work of the National Security Council.

At the present time, at least six different committees in each House—12 in all—examine the bits and pieces of foreign, political, and military commitments and defense spending, and no single committee of Congress ever looks at the whole.

No wonder Congress falters in its job.

No wonder Congress accomplishes so little in supervising and controlling defense spending despite the fact that its powers are great. It deals separately with symptoms, not with causes.

When Congress matches the National Security Council with a joint congressional security committee, it will galvanically recover powers it has long allowed to erode. Now is the time. It's needed.

#### KREMLIN-WATCHERS DOUBT ARMS TALKS' VALUE

### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star carried an excellent article by Mr. Henry S. Bradsher which should be read carefully by those who want to set aside development of America's defense capability until after Mr. Nixon meets with the Soviet leaders to discuss arms control.

Mr. Bradsher has performed a commendable public service with his penetrating analysis on the futility of trying to deal with the Communists.

His excellent article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 25, 1969]

#### KREMLIN-WATCHERS DOUBT ARMS TALKS' VALUE

(By Henry S. Bradsher)

A sampling of Sovietologists shows skepticism about the usefulness of arms limitations talks which the Nixon administration hopes to open with the Soviet Union this summer.

Traditionally favoring strong defenses, the Kremlin now has to worry about a potential

Chinese danger in considering any weapons agreements, the American experts on the Soviet Union say.

They estimate that the Soviets are spending about \$60 billion a year on all aspects of defense, a figure equal to or greater than this country's non-Vietnamese military spending. Yet the Soviet economy is only half as large as the American one.

Kremlin decision-makers—who, the experts emphasize, are Communist party careerists rather than military men—appear willing to continue bearing a big defense burden. The Soviet public is simply forced to accept it.

#### TIGHTEN DISCIPLINE

Beyond the arms talks, the experts saw the Soviet Union currently engaged in an effort to tighten internal discipline, but they said it is wrong to characterize this as a turn back to Stalinism. Focusing narrowly on a small group of dissident Soviet intellectuals and generalizing from their harsh treatment might give too dark an impression of the overall Soviet situation.

These observations were given by eight specialists on the Soviet political system, economy and military machine. They testified Monday and yesterday before the Congressional Joint Economic Committee's subcommittee on economy in government.

The topic was "the economic basis of the Russian military challenge to the United States," but questioning ranged far afield.

In fact, the chairman and only committee member to sit through all nine hours of the hearing, Sen. William Proxmire, tried to lead several witnesses into expressing opinions on the controversial question of Soviet first-strike capabilities. He got only cautiously hedged answers.

#### DIMMEST VIEW

The dimmest view of basic Soviet receptivity to fruitful arms control talks came from an expert within the administration, which has set a July 31 target for beginning the strategic arms limitations talks (known as SALT talks).

He was David E. Mark, deputy director for research of the State Department's bureau of intelligence and research. Mark warned that "it will take many years" before Soviet thinking shifts from basic hostility toward the West to one of common interests.

The Kremlin cannot understand substituting law for force, Mark said, and so it believes in keeping a powerful military machine.

Although SALT prospects are better than before, the Soviets still hesitate to launch into an unknown field, Mark said. Previous East-West agreements like nuclear non-proliferation and a limited test ban did not touch so directly on Soviet strength as will the SALT talks.

#### PRESSURES ABSENT

Prof. William R. Kintner of the University of Pennsylvania, an expert on Soviet strategic thinking, saw no pressure on the Kremlin to make SALT talks productive, while on the contrary a Soviet fear of rising Chinese strength might argue against it.

"The SALT talks will be far more complicated than either the nuclear tests or non-proliferation talks," Kintner warned. "And those took two or three years apiece."

A specialist on the Soviet armed forces, Thomas W. Wolfe of the RAND Corp., thought that bureaucratic pressure would tend to keep Soviet military spending about the same despite the talks. Both countries can see the need for arms limitations, he indicated, but he was pessimistic of the Soviets agreeing, Wolfe said.

Merle Fainsod and Alex Inkeles, both Harvard professors, said the Soviets want to talk but neither held out any assurances that talking would be fruitful.

The estimate that Soviet military expenditures in 1968 were about \$60 billion was

vaguely ascribed to "the U.S. intelligence community," including the Central Intelligence Agency and other analysts of secretive Soviet budgetary practices.

"Some observers have concluded that the defense share of the Soviet gross national product must come to 15 percent, rather than the American 10 percent," Mark said.

The \$60 billion estimate, higher than a generally used one of \$50 billion by the British Institute for Strategic Studies, includes all Soviet space activities, militarized border guards and other elements besides defense research, production and pay.

#### IMPACT ON FARMS

Prof. Holland Hunter of Haverford College, an academic rather than intelligence community expert on the Soviet economy, quoted the announced Soviet defense budget for 1968 as \$25.3 billion. Hidden items run it higher.

Investment in inefficient and backward Soviet agriculture is suffering from military demands, and both general investment and consumer needs are expendable when the Kremlin thinks weapons are needed, the experts said. This enables the Soviet Union to keep its more primitive economy going while matching U.S. weapons.

Wolfe cautioned Proxmire that it would be a mistake "to look for a rational tie" between Soviet military spending and Soviet world policy. The Soviet military-industrial complex had a momentum of its own.

And it has failures of its own, too, it was noted. He cited an early Soviet missile that had to be scrapped.

Mark quoted former Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's complaints about failures in the Soviet armaments industry and cited the abandonment of what possibly was an early 1960's anti-ballistic missile system.

"I don't foresee any domestic unrest" in the Soviet Union, Mark said, "that would cause any difficulties for the defense industry."

#### UNREST ISOLATED

"Unrest is isolated, small-scale, intimidated, worrisome in terms of breaking conformity since the leadership likes conformity, but not of serious concern to them."

Mark and Fainsod emphasized that there has not been a return to Stalinism in the full sense of the terror and bloodshed which the Soviet Union once suffered.

"What I see, rather," Mark said, "is an effort by the leadership to tighten up discipline, to keep the young in line with the objectives of the regime, to restrict contacts with the West, to restore the morale of the repressive agencies like the KGB—the secret police—to give some continuity to Soviet history so that Stalin plays an important part."

"All these things are happening," Mark added. "But they don't necessarily have any connection with Soviet foreign policy."

#### DISSENT CITED

Fainsod said there is, "to a degree unparalleled in the Stalin period, a degree of dissent manifest in the intellectual and scientific community. It's underground."

There is today, Fainsod said, "a very, very different society of the one of Stalin prison camps and absolute limitations on the freedom of movement."

"We are beginning to see a new generation in the Soviet Union, a generation that has lost its fear, that didn't know Stalinism."

A person with contacts among the dissidents who sees the police moving in on them "might be tempted to say that Stalinism is back in full flower," Fainsod added "but no one who knew Stalinism is likely to make that statement."

Inkeles, a sociologist who has long studied Soviet society, said the current evidence could not be carried so far as to "deny that we

have been a shift to a new, more complex system of reaching decisions" in Soviet society compared with simple Stalinist degrees.

Wolfe added to the discussion that "in the long term, it won't de-evolve into Stalinism. And it's not going to evolve into a democratic society, either, but a pluralism that, hopefully we will be able to deal with better than a dictatorship.

COMMUNISTS POUR ABUSE ON NIXON DURING FRUITLESS SESSION IN PARIS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the very distinguished writer for the Washington Post, Mr. Murrey Marder, reports from Paris this morning of the insults and abuses being heaped upon President Nixon by the Vietcong and North Vietnamese negotiators.

Mr. Marder quotes U.S. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge as stating glumly: "They don't negotiate."

I am placing Mr. Marder's remarks in the RECORD today and renew my demand for an explanation on how much longer does the United States intend to let this charade in Paris continue while American boys are being needlessly killed in Vietnam.

President Nixon has made the Communists a most generous offer on several occasions to bring the hostilities in Vietnam to an end.

Mr. Nixon has made a whole series of concessions in his honest and determined effort to bring this war to an end.

Everyone of his proposals has been swept aside by arrogance and insults from the Communist spokesmen.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has previously stated that the United States will have to reappraise its position if this needless suffering continues.

We are now on the verge of seeing the death rate among American soldiers killed in Vietnam since the bombing pause exceed the number of Americans killed in Vietnam from 1961 until March 24, 1968, when the bombing pause began.

The intensity of the suffering has increased. We need only look at the huge punishment being hammered at our American soldiers and at South Vietnamese troops in the battle at Ben Het.

I have suggested here on this floor that we serve notice upon the Communists that if an effective cease-fire is not effectuated by noon, August 1, 1969, the United States will have to take two steps to bring this war to an end.

First, in order to placate American concern about our high rate of casualties, we should withdraw all of our combat troops from South Vietnam as quickly as possible.

Second, to impress upon the Communists that our withdrawal does not mean any victory for them, we should consider resuming bombing of the North and assist the South Vietnamese in whatever

other military steps they wish to take to bring this war to a successful conclusion.

Current reports from Paris clearly indicate the Communists have no intentions of ending this conflict in that they are counting on the fact that the United States will be forced to abandon its program of assistance to the South Vietnamese.

I believe that after due warning, resumption of bombing will convince the Communists that while we have placated American concern about the high rate of casualties among our ground troops by withdrawing these ground troops, the resumption of bombing means a long haul of suffering for the Communists in the North.

It is my firm belief that only when the Communists realize their suffering and damage from bombing will continue indefinitely in the North, will then agree to start making some meaningful progress toward ultimate peace.

It is perfectly clear that right now the North Vietnamese have no reason to agree to any kind of peace terms because under the present bombing pause, the tide is on their side.

Mr. Marder's excellent article follows: COMMUNISTS POUR ABUSE ON NIXON DURING FRUITLESS SESSION IN PARIS

(By Murrey Marder)

PARIS, June 26.—North Vietnamese and Vietcong negotiators heaped unusual personal abuse on President Nixon today, charging him with "brazen falsehood and deception" in blaming the Communist side for intensifying and prolonging the war.

A secondary target of theirs was the South Vietnamese government of President Thieu. But even when they assailed Saigon the burden of their attacks was directed at Mr. Nixon personally, for his refusal to disavow the entire "Thieu-Ky-Huong administration."

At the end of one of the most fruitless sessions in the five months of expanded peace talks, U.S. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge said, glumly, "they don't negotiate."

Salgon's chief delegate, Pham Dang Lam, said that in light of the Communist demands for "the monopoly of political power in South Vietnam," and the total unconditional withdrawal of American troops, "What is there to negotiate?"

No new ingredients were added to the diplomatic mix today by either side. Lodge, who returned to Paris last night after a three-week absence, concentrated on trying to accentuate the positive.

He repeatedly said he saw "common ground" in the positions of the two sides. But he told newsmen afterwards, "There's got to be some mutuality in it (the negotiating process), and I regret to say there was no sign of it today."

The Hanoi-Vietcong position in today's meeting of nearly five hours confirmed what was foreshadowed by North Vietnamese Politburo member Le Duc Tho in an interview here Sunday with The Washington Post.

That is that, for the present, the Communist side is standing firm and discrediting all talk of compromise in order to put maximum pressure on President Nixon to change the military-diplomatic policy of his Administration.

There is no evidence here that any such shift is coming especially in U.S. support of the Saigon government. Lodge told his adversaries, "As President Nixon made clear in his press conference on June 19, we cate-

gorically reject your demand that we 'replace' the legitimate government of the Republic of Vietnam."

Both Ha Van Lau, acting chief of the North Vietnamese delegation, and Mrs. Nguyen Thi Binh, newly designated Foreign minister of the recently formed Provisional Revolutionary Government that represents the Vietcong, zeroed in today on President Nixon's latest, controversial comments on troop withdrawals.

ATTACKS NIXON

Mrs. Binh attacked Mr. Nixon for what she called his "ambiguous statement" in his June 19 press conference to the effect that he "hoped" to withdraw considerably more American soldiers from South Vietnam, beyond the 25,000 whose withdrawal was announced at the Midway conference June 9.

Lau said the "hope that Mr. Nixon expressed" exemplifies his "ambiguous and perfidious statements" that "are merely a scene of the play staged by Mr. Nixon to appease and deceive public opinion in the United States and the world . . ."

Lodge reiterated President Nixon's view that the withdrawal of 25,000 troops represents "a significant step," and that "further reductions" will take place.

But Lodge avoided any direct reference whatever to the President's declared hope that the United States "will be able to beat" the timetable proposed by former Defense Secretary Clark M. Clifford, which touched off the controversy. Clifford called for a pull-out of "about 100,000" troops this year, and the withdrawal of all American ground combat forces by the end of 1970.

The U.S. delegation here has avoided any such projection like the plague, on grounds it would undermine their entire negotiating position.

SPOKESMAN PRESSED

When pressed as to why Lodge avoided any reference to President Nixon's hope of topping the Clifford proposal, American spokesman Harold Kaplan said:

"There was no particular reason for that. The disposition of forces on our side remains, so long as there is no real negotiation here in Paris, a problem between us and our allies."

Kaplan was asked to explain how the disposition of allied forces in the South can be a "military housekeeping" problem for the allies, and simultaneously a door-opening move toward peace.

If the recall of 25,000 American forces is only a "replacement" of them by South Vietnamese forces (terminology that Saigon has insisted upon in place of "withdrawal") Kaplan was asked, will the total remain unchanged?

"It is perfectly true that as our forces are replaced by the South Vietnamese and other allied forces there, the total strength on the allied side does not change," Kaplan replied. "But the fact remains," he said, "that the withdrawal of non-South Vietnamese forces should, if the other side is disposed to go down the road, constitute an opening, a possible invitation. . . ."

Salgon delegation spokesman Nguyen Thieu Dan, when asked what he believes the Communist side thinks of gradual U.S. troop withdrawals, said:

"They don't like it—and I may say they also fear it, because it represents a strengthening of our capacity for defense." But if the allied reduction is succeeded by a reduction in North Vietnam troops, said Dan, "that would be the beginning of de-escalation, mutual de-escalation. . . . There won't be any unilateral de-escalation."

The Communist side also came in for its share of hard questioning from newsmen in the post-conference briefings. The Hanoi-Vietcong program calls initially for replacing the entire Saigon government with a provi-

sional coalition government, but even before that, the Communist side says, a "peace cabinet" should replace the existing regime.

The Hanoi-Vietcong negotiators, however, have avoided formally demanding, as part of their official program, the total removal of the Saigon government as a precondition. One reason, presumably, is to avoid the charge of making such a sweeping demand; instead they call for initial ouster of "Thieu-Ky-Huong" or the "Thieu-Ky-Huong administration."

When pressed by newsmen today, Vietcong spokesman Duong Dinh Thao spent more than 15 minutes stressing this distinction.

The net result was that he said the Provisional Revolutionary Government supports the demand of the "urban population" for replacing the present Saigon government with a "peace cabinet," and will not be drawn into "maneuvers" for holding elections of the so-called constitution of Thieu-Ky-Huong administration or "under the threat of the (American) bayonets. . . ."

### A PRAIRIE ACROPOLIS IN ILLINOIS

#### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the Krannert Center for the Performing Arts was opened at the University of Illinois in Urbana.

The center consists of theaters and halls that will be used to educate and train young people interested in the performing arts. It will also serve as a cultural center of great distinction for the Midwest.

The donors of this \$21,000,000 center—Mr. and Mrs. Herman C. Krannert—wanted to make a permanent and edifying addition to the University of Illinois campus. With the opening of this great center for the arts in mid-America, Mr. and Mrs. Krannert have earned distinguished positions in the cultural heritage of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, information describing the Krannert Center in detail follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 19, 1969]  
A PRAIRIE ACROPOLIS IN ILLINOIS—A GIFT OF GREAT MERIT

The opening today of the Krannert Center for the Performing Arts at the University of Illinois Urbana campus is an event of importance both to students and others devoted to music, drama and the dance.

The \$21,000,000 complex of theaters and halls will be employed both as a center of training in the performing arts and as a major cultural center.

It will be, as university President David D. Henry said, important at a time "when we seek answers to how to enhance the quality of life."

The center bears the name of the principal donors—Mr. and Mrs. Herman C. Krannert of Indianapolis. Krannert, a University of Illinois alumnus, is founder and chairman of the board of Inland Container Co. The Krannerts also were major donors for the University of Illinois Krannert Art Museum, dedicated in 1961.

The university and its students—all Illinois in fact—owe a debt of gratitude to the

Krannerts. The opening of the new center today indeed will be a great stride toward enhancing the quality of life.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 19, 1969]  
A MAGNIFICENT HOME FOR PERFORMING ARTS

After years of preparation, the Krannert Center for the Performing Arts is being dedicated today in Urbana. In the Great Hall, the University of Illinois Symphony orchestra opens a month-long festival in celebration of the university's adding to its physical plant a new 21-million-dollar fine arts complex. At a bound, Urbana acquires facilities for mounting concerts and theatricals such as have few if any equals elsewhere.

Thanks to the princely generosity of the principal donors, Mr. and Mrs. Herman C. Krannert, the stunning new center for the performing arts belongs to present and future generations of the state university community—and to the citizens of Champaign-Urbana, the region and state of which that city is a part, and beyond. Innumerable Chicagoans will find or make occasion to appear on the stages and in more than 4,400 theater seats of the Krannert center.

The intent of the design is that "the arts of music, drama, and dance can operate both in training and in performance as interrelated and complementary to each other," at a single site. The center is both a performing and a teaching instrument. Its theaters accommodate audiences as large as 2,100 and as small as 150. Here both individual beginners and professional operatic and orchestra companies will find the means to function with a minimum of handicaps and a maximum of access to tangible and intangible supports of every sort.

Private generosity has made the Krannert center possible. To appropriate tax money to build an installation so expensive, and one without which the university has been able to reach its present distinction, could hardly be justified. Yet the fine arts have much to offer university students and everyone else. The Krannerts have acted in the best tradition of patronage of the arts, in which people of wealth provide the means for people of artistic talent and genius to do their work and find their audiences.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 9, 1969]

#### A PRAIRIE ACROPOLIS—ABRAMOVITZ'S NEW ARTS CENTER IN ILLINOIS

(By Robert C. Marsh)

CHAMPAIGN-URBANA, ILL.—For David D. Henry, the university of today requires not merely classrooms, libraries, and laboratories but a home for the artist at work. It was this idea, seconded by the generosity of Mr. and Mrs. Herman C. Krannert, that led to the Krannert Center for the Performing Arts on the Champaign-Urbana campus of the University of Illinois.

President Henry, the Krannerts, and architect Max Abramovitz gave seven years to the planning and construction of the project, which brings a major cultural center to the center of the state and offers the music, drama, and dance departments of the university a facility for instruction and performance that rivals (or surpasses) professional working conditions anywhere in the world.

Krannert Center places first emphasis on education. It is a place for students and teachers, not transient performers, although it is hoped that visitors will work with students whenever possible to maintain a constant link between active professionals and the classroom.

This was shown in the first concert when violinist Tossy Spivakovsky played the Bartok Concerto No. 2 with the University of

Illinois Symphony Orchestra, Bernard Goodman conductor, and later held a master class for student string-players.

That event, April 19, was the beginning of a month of festival performances to dedicate the new buildings, events which were planned to present a cross-section of student and faculty achievement as well as the work of leading professionals such as the Philadelphia Orchestra and the American Ballet Theater.

#### UNIFIED FOR USE

Krannert Center is a tightly unified architectural composition in which four public halls are linked by a large and handsome lobby and share a complex of rehearsal rooms, scenery shops, and other facilities essential for their activities.

The buildings are a pleasure to see. Abramovitz has called them "a prairie Acropolis," and it is an apt phrase. Rising from the street in terraces, the central building conceals its vast interior space and draws the eye to a skyline in which strong, redbrick forms stand out from green plantings against a blue Midwestern sky.

Approaching Krannert from the campus the eye first sees the facade of Great Hall, a concert room of 2,100 seats where the dedicatory concert was held. It is a handsome auditorium finished in traditional materials, hard plaster for the ceiling, warm golden wood for the walls and floor, and is very resonant—so much so that some dampening may be needed. Slightly above street level in the center of the composition is a Grecian amphitheater with places for 560, an inviting outdoor facility with uses for music, drama, and dance.

The high point of the center is the 97 foot stage tower of the Festival Theater, an intimate hall for drama with music or dance events. The philosophy of the design is shown in the seating capacity, 985 rather than a couple of thousand. The reason, of course, is that the student voice is not fully developed, and student productions, to be seen and heard at their best, should be placed in an appropriate frame. The large halls required by the high payrolls of professional shows are not a relevant criterion.

#### SMALL HALLS

Continuing the same approach, the Playhouse, a theater for the spoken word with elaborate electronic equipment for special effects, is limited to 678 seats. One need not be a 19 century tragedian to project a line to the back of the house.

Much of the important work of the center will probably be done in the smallest hall of all, the Studio Theater, a large, flexible room with overhead lights which normally will hold about 150 persons. Here the emphasis is flexibility. The location and size of the stage can be adjusted to any requirement; the seating can flow into all the available space.

Many cultural centers have faced the problem of creating facilities without the additional planning required to fill them with audiences and performers. The Krannert Center avoids this, since the university community is the prime source of both performers and audiences and, even more important, the new buildings are simply a further step in the development of programs of instruction in the performing arts. These are already well established on the campus, despite past difficulties with inadequate classrooms and theaters.

Important as well is the impetus Krannert Center may give to a fresh look at Midwestern culture in general. For there is nothing at all strange about a major artistic center such as this flourishing in central Illinois. Quite the contrary, it is characteristic of a region in transition from a provincial, rural past to a cosmopolitan future.