

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

VIETNAM MORATORIUM

HON. LEN B. JORDAN

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, with the Vietnam moratorium demonstrations set for today, I believe it is vital that all who support this protest reflect carefully on its validity. I invite the Senate's attention to a much-publicized column written by David S. Broder which discusses this demonstration as a part of "The Breaking of the President."

In response to the denials of this charge by participants in the moratorium, Mr. Broder this week has written another column, which asks those participants three important questions: First, since President Nixon is now following policies recommended in 1968 by the antiwar faction, what is the target of this protest? Second, what alternative policies are recommended? Third, does the method of the moratorium set a dangerous precedent for other groups with strongly held views, who may well decide to force their will on the country by staging what is in effect a general strike?

I ask unanimous consent that both columns be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 7, 1969]

A RISKY NEW AMERICAN SPORT: "THE BREAKING OF THE PRESIDENT"

(By David S. Broder)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—If there are any smart literary agents around these days, one of them will copyright the title "The Breaking of the President" for the next big series of nonfiction best-sellers. It is becoming more obvious with every passing day that the men and the movement that broke Lyndon B. Johnson's authority in 1968 are out to break Richard M. Nixon in 1969.

The likelihood is great that they will succeed again, for breaking a President is, like most feats, easier to accomplish the second time around. Once learned, the techniques can readily be applied as often as desired—even when the circumstances seem less than propitious. No matter that this President is pulling troops out of Vietnam, while the last one was sending them in; no matter that in 1969 the casualties and violence are declining, while in 1968 they were on the rise. Men have learned to break a President, and, like any discovery that imparts power to its possessors, the mere availability of this knowledge guarantees that it will be used.

The essentials of the technique are now so well understood that they can be applied with little waste motion.

First, the breakers arrogate to themselves a position of moral superiority. For that reason, a war that is unpopular, expensive and very probably unwise is labeled as immoral, indecent and intolerable. Critics of the President who are indelicate enough to betray partisan motives are denounced. (That for you, Fred Harris.) Members of the President's own party who, for reasons perhaps unrelated to their own flagging political careers, catapult themselves into the front ranks of the opposition are greeted as heroes. (Hooray for Charley Goodell.)

The students who would fight in the war are readily mobilized against it. Their teachers, as is their custom, hasten to adopt the students' views. (News item: The Harvard department of biochemistry and molecular biology last week called for immediate withdrawal from Vietnam.)

Next, a New England election (the New Hampshire primary is best but the Massachusetts Sixth Congressional District election will do as well) surprisingly shows that peace is popular at the polls. The President's party sees defeat staring it in the face unless it repudiates him, and the Harris poll promptly comes along to confirm his waning grip on public trust. The Chief Executive, clearly panicky, resorts to false bravado and says he will never be moved by these protests and demonstrations, thus confirming the belief that he is too stubborn to repent and must be broken.

And then, dear friends, Sen. Fulbright and the Foreign Relations Committee move in to finish off the job.

All this is no fiction; it worked before and it is working again. Vietnam is proving to be what Henry Kissinger once said he suspected it might be—one of those tragic, cursed messes that destroys any President who touches it.

That being the case, any President interested in saving his own skin would be well-advised to resign his responsibility for Vietnam and publicly transfer the assignment of ending the war to Congress or the Vietnam Moratorium Committee or anyone else who would like to volunteer for the job.

But he cannot. And that is the point the protesters seem to overlook. Assume that they and the President are both right when they assert the time has come to end this war. Assume that the protesters know better than the President how to do so—despite the conspicuous absence of specific alternatives to the President's policies in their current manifestos.

There is still a vital distinction, granting all this, to be made between the constitutionally protected expression of dissent, aimed at changing national policy, and mass movements aimed at breaking the President by destroying his capacity to lead the nation or to represent it at the bargaining table.

The point is quite simple. Given the impatience in this country to be out of that miserable war, there is no great trick in using the Vietnam issue to break another President. But when you have broken the President, you have broken the one man who can negotiate the peace.

Hanoi will not sit down for secret talks with the Foreign Relations Committee. Nor can the Vietnam Moratorium's sponsors order home a single GI or talk turkey to Gen. Thieu about reshaping his government. Only the President can do that.

There is also the matter of time. It is one thing to break a President at the end of his term, as was done last year. It is quite another thing to break him at the beginning, as is being attempted now.

The orators who remind us that Mr. Nixon has been in office for nine months should remind themselves that he will remain there for 39 more months—unless, of course, they are willing to put their convictions to the test by moving to impeach him.

Is that not, really, the proper course? Rather than destroying his capacity to lead while leaving him in office, rather than leaving the nation with a broken President at its head for three years, would not their cause and the country be better served by resort to the constitutional method for removing a President?

And what a wonderful chapter it would make for Volume 2 of "The Breaking of the President" series.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 14, 1969]
ILL-ADVISED VIET MORATORIUM COULD SET A RISKY PRECEDENT

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—The larger the plans for Wednesday's Vietnam moratorium, the more the central message and tactic of the demonstration have been obscured. If the event is to be gauged properly, it is important to uncover its original premises from the debris of clichés and endorsements in which they have lately been buried.

A number of men active in the moratorium have taken time to point out what they consider the errors of the argument in this column last week that it is a plan for "the breaking of the President." With sincerity and conviction, they have asserted that, far from breaking the President, they are out to save him, by persuading him to make the peace the nation craves and, incidentally, to save the political system by keeping the antiwar movement out of the hands of the radicals and in control of those with a commitment to peaceful forms of protest.

Their conversations and correspondence have helped to define three questions which might be borne in mind by those planning to participate in the moratorium.

First, what is the target of this protest? Sam Brown, the able spokesman for the moratorium, says it is not an anti-Nixon move because "we learned in 1968 that what we must oppose are not personalities but policies."

But if the Nixon administration is following the very policies recommended in 1968 by the antiwar faction, as I believe, then their moratorium is mobilizing public opinion against its own policy recommendation to the President. The minority plank at the Democratic convention, endorsed by all the leading doves, called for a halt in the bombing of North Vietnam. This has been done. It recommended a reduction in offensive operations in South Vietnam. The President has ordered this and it is in effect.

It asked for a "phased withdrawal over a relatively short period of time" of all foreign troops. The Nixon administration has begun pulling Americans out of Vietnam without waiting for North Vietnam to agree to mutual withdrawals, as the doves thought necessary.

Finally, it recommended that the United States use the leverage of troop withdrawals to "encourage" the Saigon government "to negotiate a political reconciliation with the National Liberation Front" looking toward "a broadly representative government" but recognizing that "the specific shape of this reconciliation will be a matter for decision by the South Vietnamese."

If this is not precisely the policy of the current administration, as enunciated by the President and the Secretary of State, then words have lost their meaning. And if the moratorium sponsors want to argue—as some have—that the President is lying about his purpose, their suspicions must be weighed against the facts of reduced fighting, reduced troop levels and reduced casualties, which his policies have brought about.

Second, what is the alternative they recommend? It has been described in moratorium publicity as everything from a negotiated settlement to immediate, total American withdrawal from Vietnam, but Brown said Sunday on "Face the Nation" that it is the latter that the moratorium has "consistently" demanded.

If that is the case, then the elected officials, clergymen and educators who have lent their prestige to the moratorium can properly be asked if this is the program they endorse. Many of these sponsors were involved in the fight for the minority plank at the Chicago convention which specifically said the war "will not be ended by military

victory, surrender or unilateral withdrawal by either side."

It might be well for those men to explain Wednesday when and why they concluded that their opposition to unilateral withdrawal was wrong. It would be even more useful if they could explain why a one-dimensional plan to pull out troops is any more likely to be wise policy than the one-dimensional plan that sent the troops in. Have we not learned yet to examine the political consequences of military decisions?

Third, and most important, what about the method of the moratorium? Is it compatible with the maintenance of representative democracy or does it substitute the rule of the street?

The sponsors say the name "moratorium," rather than "strike," was chosen to emphasize that the protest is to be peaceful and non-coercive. It is a nice distinction. The non-coercive feature may be almost invisible to the thousands of students whose colleges will shut down Wednesday. If the moratorium continues, as planned, for two days in November, three days in December, and so on, it will more and more come to resemble the general strike so familiar to European politics.

And if it succeeds in its aim, what is to prevent other majorities or sizable minorities in the country from using the same technique to force their views on agencies of the government? The moratorium sponsors say Vietnam is an extraordinary issue, but they must know it is not the only issue which agitates millions of people.

One wonders what the moratorium sponsors would say if Billy Graham were to ask all the parents who want prayers restored to public schools to withdraw their children from school for one additional day each month until the Supreme Court reverses its school-prayer decision.

Suppose pro-prayer teachers agreed to meet the pupils in private homes on moratorium days to discuss "the overriding significance of religion in human life." Would the Vietnam moratorium sponsors cheer? What would they say if landlords and real estate men opposed to integrated housing declared a moratorium until Congress repeals the open-housing law?

My view, just to be clear, is not that the Vietnamese moratorium is un-American, illegitimate, meanly partisan or personally vindictive in its motivation. My view is that it is an ill-timed, misdirected protest, vague in its purpose and quite conceivably dangerous in its precedent.

As was said last week, its immediate result may be the breaking of the President. In the serious weakening of his power to negotiate peace or to achieve any of the other purposes for which he was elected, its longer term effects may be to subvert a system of democratic government I happen to believe is worth preserving.

COLUMBUS DAY

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the discoverer and the discoverer of America. The story and the achievement of Columbus, however, did not begin or end with the date October 12, 1492. When we celebrate the anniversary of that date we pay tribute to a man who deserves our gratitude and our honor in two respects. We revere Columbus both for what he was and for what he did.

In the first place, his character is symbolic for us of the spirit of exploration and discovery which led men of iron courage and inflexible will away from the old world and its familiar ways to the unknown dangers and incredible hardships of the new world. The spirit of Columbus—that has been the spirit of all the explorers and pioneers who conquered this land and built a great Nation here. The name of Christopher Columbus heads the list of those who have fared forth boldly into the unknown, dreaming of lands and peoples yet unseen by Europeans, and carrying to these new lands and people the heritage of European civilization.

For the timid and the cowardly, for the doubters and detractors, Columbus had just one answer, to go on, to conquer. The indestructible faith, the penetrating vision, the unalterable determination of Christopher Columbus conquered myth and mystery and solved the terrifying riddle of the Atlantic. The stains of greed and cruelty and broken faith that marked the career of some later discoverers and pioneers left unsmirched the character of Columbus. Generation after generation, down to our own time, have been inspired by his contagious courage and persistence, just as were the captains and crews of his three little vessels. The story of the discovery and exploration of America which began with his great voyage across the Atlantic has not yet ended. It will never end so long as Americans continue to hold on to that spirit which was the legacy of Christopher Columbus and those who followed him. For Americans there will always be new frontiers.

The second aspect of the magnificent achievement for which we revere Columbus began when his ship, the *Santa Maria*, ran aground off the island of San Domingo. A fort was built of materials from the stranded hulk, and the first colony in the new world was established with 44 members of her crew. Columbus returned to Spain with his two remaining ships, but only long enough to put together a great new expedition to secure and extend the discoveries already made. In the fall of 1493, three huge galleons and 14 light frigates carrying 1,500 men, including 12 missionaries, and all the animals and materials necessary for colonization, set out for the new world. On the island of Haiti, or Hispaniola as he called it, Columbus founded the city of Isabella.

The city of Isabella was not very successful because the colonists were more interested in getting rich as quickly as possible—by grabbing whatever gold and silver they could lay their hands on—than in building a solid and permanent base for the settlement of the new world. Yet Columbus never gave up his vision of a great and prosperous colony. His vision became a reality, though not in his lifetime, and Columbus was the father of the immigration which peopled a continent.

While the memory of Columbus has a particularly precious significance for Americans, we should remember that it is revered as well by many other nations and peoples. For our Latin neighbors to the south, the story of the New World

also begins with the achievement of Columbus. Columbus belongs to Italy as the land of his birth and his parents. He belongs as well to Portugal, whose charts and navigational methods were his sole equipment against the unknown oceans. And he belongs to Spain, under whose flag his voyages of discovery were made.

Columbus never reached the shores of our own country and, if he had not made any of his voyages, the Western Hemisphere would undoubtedly have been discovered by someone else; nevertheless, his insatiable curiosity to find out, to know; his unshakable faith and courage and his indomitable will—these are the elements of the spirit shared by all who participated in the building of America. The legacy of the pioneer spirit and the melding on the new continent of contributions from the peoples of every land is the unique heritage of America, and the tremendous achievement of Christopher Columbus is symbolic of that heritage.

TRENDS IN PORTABILITY AND VESTING OF PENSIONS

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Mr. Thomas C. Edwards, president of the Teachers Insurance & Annuity Co., has written for the August 1969 edition of *Best's Review*, a most perceptive article on trends in portability and vesting of pensions. Mr. Edwards examines many of the reasons which are usually advanced to defend the failure of many pension plans to contain reasonable vesting provisions protecting employees against forfeiture of all pension rights upon termination of their employment, and finds them wanting.

As Mr. Edwards points out, the cost ostensibly saved by not including vesting provisions in pension plans may well be borne in other ways by the business community.

Mr. Edwards also discusses the possibility of purchasing insurance which might protect plan participants against the loss of accrued benefits if their employment were terminated. This is a particularly interesting idea, and I hope very much that it will be investigated further.

Mr. President, as the author of S. 2167, a bill which would provide minimum standards for private pension plans, particularly minimum standards concerning vesting, I read Mr. Edwards' article with a great deal of interest. I commend it to Senators who are interested in this problem and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

TRENDS IN PORTABILITY AND VESTING OF PENSIONS

(By Thomas C. Edwards)

Pension people on both sides of the question of early vesting are really very close together on basic objectives. Both sides want

pension plans to continue as a strong element on the social and economic scene. Both want pension plans to complement Social Security, not collide with it. Both want pension plans to retain their flexibility and innovative capacity. Both want pensions plans to help management recruit and retain top-flight people. Both want employers and employees to be able to part company at retirement on mutually satisfactory terms. And both consider it undesirable to pay an excessive cost to do these things.

Any disagreement, then, seems to be over whether early or late vesting will best accomplish these objectives in the 1970's. Unfortunately, this sort of disagreement is almost irrelevant today. The options have changed. The choice is no longer between early and late vesting; it's between "do-it-ourselves" early vesting and "leave-it-to-uncle" early vesting. There are real advantages in doing it ourselves.

By now some must be thinking: "Doesn't he know about the trustees, legislators and unions we'd have to fight to take vesting down below the 10-year level?" I do, and I know it's not easy; no struggle for survival ever is. But this one we should be able to win right within the family by joining forces for the social good, rather than seeming to take on the whole country against it.

One source of worry is the impression that spokesmen for private pensions give when they say that pension plans must be allowed to improve at their own pace. They appear unresponsive to the times or, worse, entrenched against the tide of social change, which of course, just isn't so. And when it is predicted that laws requiring early vesting will roll back the progress of private pensions and discourage their further growth, this is music to the ears of Social Security expansionists.

Therefore, perhaps efforts on behalf of pension plans will have the most beneficial results if directed within the family, trying to speed the pace of improvements already under way. Fortunately, the conviction that early vesting from within is needed soon, and that it is in the best interests of employers, employees and the total pension effort, grows in comparison to the alternatives and as one peels away the objections to early vesting.

Those who favor early or immediate vesting consider pension benefits a deferred part of compensation earned by a person just as he earns his salary—by his work, not by passing a loyalty test. They point out that a man's compensation at any given point should be unconditional by his future actions or by the future judgments of others.

CRITICISMS AND OBJECTIONS

Critics of private pensions who would either legislate early vesting or turn the whole job over to Social Security have been known to add that pension plans actually pay retirement benefits to only a small portion of the people they cover, and are therefore not fulfilling the broad social purpose for which the plans receive tax-exempt status.

Few pension spokesmen who object to early vesting would say that a person does not earn his retirement benefits by his work, or that a pension plan should not pay benefits to most or all of its participants. Rather, the objections heard most frequently are:

On Cost: "Early vesting would cost so much that either we can't afford it, or we'd have to cut way back on other plan provisions."

On Holding Power: "The thought of losing benefits holds people in their jobs, and this gives us a valuable management tool."

On Loyalty: "Management's pension obligation is to those who stay, not to those who leave. This loyalty factor is a condition of employment that everyone's supposed to understand when he's hired or when he's thinking of leaving."

THE QUESTION OF COST

Whenever early vesting is discussed, the question of cost predominates. Obviously, there is a cost factor, since it takes more money to pay benefits than not to pay benefits. But whether this cost factor is large or small, it reinforces the social arguments in favor of early vesting. If the cost is large, should individual workers have to carry it by being insecure in their old age? And if the cost is moderate or small, what's all the fuss about? Why not vest?

Social arguments aside, however, is the volume of benefits now being taken from Peter, who leaves, to pay Paul, who stays, really a major factor in financing modern pension plans? It is doubtful. When all the positive aspects of early vesting are considered, the cost implications are neither as serious nor as one-sided as they may seem, for several reasons.

In the first place, a great deal of turnover cost can be eliminated from a pension plan by requiring a reasonable waiting period before new employees become eligible—say one or two years and attainment of age 25 or 30. This leaves ample time to build substantial retirement benefits, and eliminates much of the cost and bother of having to preserve long-term benefits for short-term employees.

A TWO-WAY STREET

If, in addition, there is no vesting for the first three or four years of participation in the plan, the program will be geared largely to employees who have demonstrated substantially more than a passing interest in their employer and their work.

In the second place, mobility takes place on a two-way street. As more and more plans provide early or immediate vesting, accrued benefits will increasingly be owned by arriving employees, as well as by those who leave. Each period of a person's employment will contribute to his total retirement income, whether he works for one employer or for several. A company's whole working environment is healthier, both economically and psychologically when employees in mid-career come to a new job with accrued pension benefits intact and can therefore look forward to a more secure retirement.

MORALE AND PRODUCTIVITY IMPROVED

Moreover, substantial cost reductions are possible when pension contributions are invested and accumulated for everyone over a 35- or 40-year period, instead of relying on the last 20 or 25 years of employment to do the job.

A third factor to be considered in discussing cost is that early vesting would help to remove some of the morale and productivity problems caused by low-yield employees who are now held in place by pension strings. The pressures on both the employer and employee to temporize are strong enough without throwing in the fact that a job change will cost the employee the benefits he has accrued during the years of loyal, though perhaps marginal, service. Early vesting doesn't solve personnel problems, but at least it neutralizes the pension plan as a factor in most job decisions, which the employer and the employee can then make on the merits of the situation.

And a fourth cost factor is one that is seldom mentioned in vesting discussions, probably because no one is particularly proud of what it does to retirement security. As long as the contributory pension plans of industry and public employment offer the departing employee a cash settlement of his own contributions in lieu of vested pension rights, too many people will unfortunately take the bait, thereby eliminating all vesting and all further pension costs on their behalf.

HURTS THE WHOLE PENSION EFFORT

This velvet trap destroys vesting for everyone but the relatively few who are willing to forgo some spending money today in order

to keep their retirement benefits intact for the future. It also hurts the whole pension effort in much the same way nonvesting does—by wiping out deferred benefits normally worth many times the cash settlement, and by passing the blame for ultimately inadequate benefits on to the last employer in line, the company willing to hire a mid-career person on his merits, regardless of his retirement prospects.

For these and other reasons, it is hard to believe that cost is really the great deterrent to early vesting it is often made to seem. But if management and pension advisors continue to view the cost of early vesting as merely a function of turnover rates, and if unions don't want to press for early vesting for fear of losing something else, then perhaps there are other ways to protect the integrity of accrued benefits, or at least to put the problem in better perspective.

Suppose an insurance company offered a "vesting protection" rider for pension plans that would protect participants against the loss of accrued benefits if they quit or were fired before meeting their plan's vesting requirements. Or better yet, suppose the pension plan itself offered this protection through a VP rider. Do you think participants would buy it at a premium of say 0.5% or 1% of salary?

The price for a VP rider under any pension plan could be calculated from an analysis of turnover rates, and coverage could start after the first day, the first year or the first five years of employment. Actuarial ingenuity could easily remove the tontine aspect from pension rights, using techniques already available. A VP rider would sell, the price is right, and no one will offer it because there are much simpler and more direct ways to accomplish the same thing.

But if the cost of vesting really worries management and the unions, why not smoke out the risk by pricing it, and then let participants insure themselves against it? Is it because of the holding power argument—that an employee's fear of losing substantial benefits is a valuable management tool?

Most employees with several years of service behind them have no intention of leaving a job anyway, for reasons having nothing to do with pensions. They like their work, they're well paid, they have some seniority, and they haven't had a good offer lately.

On the other hand, every organization does have people who have been there a while, who want to make a change, and who should make a change. Perhaps they see greater opportunity elsewhere; perhaps they were passed over for a promotion; maybe they can't work well with a new boss, or with the people around them; or health reasons or domestic difficulties may suggest a change. Whatever the reason, some of these people move on, leaving part of their retirement security behind, while others are held in place by the threat of forfeiting benefits if they leave. Either way they lose something.

Ironically, the threat of losing benefits seems to have the least holding power on the very people the firm wants to keep the most—the top producer; the gifted person; the highly trained physicist; the computer expert, engineer or actuary; the creative writer. These people are the ones most likely to get the good job offers, and are the ones least likely to march to the beat of the corporate drum.

So they move when they believe they should even though they lose part of their future security. Attempting to tie such people down with strings of one kind or another only seems to irritate them, to give them a reason for looking around.

Conversely, the fear of losing the status and security of accumulated pension rights seems to have the most holding power on the very people management wouldn't mind losing. The gold at the end of the rainbow, how-

ever tarnished, gives the low-yield worker or the square peg a financial reason for staying put, as well as a convenient rationale for not even looking around. And if he does get a job offer elsewhere, it often isn't enough better than his present job to make up for a pension loss. But if he could leave and still keep his pension intact, this might be of some help in facing up to an unproductive situation and taking a chance on another job. And his new employer could afford to experiment, since he wouldn't be taking on an excessive pension obligation.

This leads to the argument that an employer's pension obligation should extend only to those who have served him loyally and long. In this day of negotiated wages and benefits and "total compensation," it is surprising indeed to hear this argument at all. It should be heard even less in the years ahead, as employers look more and more to pension portability, not forfeitability, as the management tool of real value.

The shortage of specialists and qualified executives is forcing employers to look increasingly outside their own walls for people with experience in the new technical and human skills required to run a modern organization. Employers can't develop a successfully integrated 360 system or a successfully integrated personnel policy today on loyalty or long service alone.

ECONOMY PAYS A HIDDEN COST

Recruiting these experienced people is expensive enough without having to take on more than a fair share of obligation for their retirement years. Having to forfeit his accrued pension benefit where he is won't make a highly marketable specialist or executive more loyal to his employer, nor will it stop him from joining someone else. But it will up his price. And the extra paid for this often splashes over to raise the salaries of present staff. So the economy is now paying a hidden cost for nonvesting that may exceed the true cost of early vesting.

In short, there are good reasons for management's increasing awareness that unimpeded mobility both to and from an organization is desirable in an era of rapidly changing skills and technology. Indeed, the loyalty of most value to an organization today may be the intensity of the employee's devotion and effort while he's with a company rather than the duration of his service.

"AT THE 'BARRICADES,' 'REVOLUTION' DIDN'T AMOUNT TO MUCH"

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker—

Oh wad some power the giftie gie us
To see ourselves as others see us!

Mike Royko of the Chicago Daily News Service in an article "At the 'Barricades,' 'Revolution' Didn't Amount to Much" which appeared in the Indianapolis News on October 10, 1969, bestowing on the "Students for a Democratic Society" the "honor" they so richly deserve. The article follows:

CHICAGO.—Never having covered a real revolution before, I got to Lincoln Park early so I wouldn't miss a thing.

I knew that if the revolution was successful, it would be my last, since it is customary for revolutionary governments to shoot newsmen. I didn't want to miss anything that important, especially with a weekend coming up.

The size of the SDS crowd surprised me.

At most, 300 people huddled around a bonfire, or paced nervously amidst the trees.

Now, 300 people might seize the kingdom of Monaco, or even a dean's office. But that didn't seem like enough to overwhelm 11,000 policemen, plus 3,000,000 or so unfriendly citizens.

And, frankly, the people in the park did not look like they could seize a geriatrics ward without a good tussle.

They were talking tough, as always, using a lot of Negro slang, greaser jargon, mixed in with Marxist slogans, which is not an easy way to talk if you have a master's degree in anthropology and your father is a stockbroker.

But like most SDS'ers, they grew up in the rough-and-tumble jungles of wealthy suburbs, where they had knock-down brawls with their baby sitters, which they probably lost.

History tells us, of course, that most revolutions are started by intellectuals and members of the upperclasses. But they usually goad the peasants and workers into doing the fighting.

So, while a pretty young lady led everybody in a love-chorus for "Che," I looked around the park for any peasants or workers who might be hidden away.

A middle-aged man was sitting on a bench, but he said he wasn't part of the revolution. "I'm just watching. I hope the cops kill those fairies."

That's the SDS's biggest problem. Nobody wants to join. Most college students think they are noisy bores. Militant blacks think they are suicidal loonies, and the white working man, whose alleged unhappiness the SDS wants to exploit, would be less unhappy if he could stomp on the SDS.

This is why the SDS is the fastest-shrinking revolutionary force around.

So it appeared the 300 in the park would have to do it alone. Being out-numbered, they used surprise as a tactic.

One minute they were chanting slogans. The next, somebody shouted: "To the Drake." And they began running out of the park.

The Chicago revolution was on.

At first I was confused about the destination. The Drake is probably the city's most aristocratic old hotel. I wonder if they had suddenly abandoned the revolution and were rushing to meet their parents for dinner and dancing in the Camelia Room.

But no, the Drake was to be the symbol of wealth, luxury and all the other things they know, from experience, are not as good as work and sweat, which they have read about.

As they jogged from the park, they began protesting the war in Vietnam by breaking windows in the Chicago Historical Society, a notorious arm of the military-industry complex.

And they dealt a blow to racial injustice, caving in the windows of a barber shop, an antique shop, and the Red Star Inn, an old German restaurant.

Moving down the street, they smashed the windows of car after car, store after store. The idea seemed to be that society would collapse from the sniffles if you broke all its windows.

For several blocks, they were unhindered. The police, surprised at first, were forming ahead.

That would be the big moment of the revolution. And as they approached the police, the SDS'ers swaggered, just as they had seen the tough kids do, when they drove through city neighborhoods.

When they met the police, they charged. A moment later they ran the other way and took off down side-streets, resuming their window breaking.

The police had pulled a sneaky trick. Instead of flailing anything that moved, as they did during the Democratic National Convention, they acted coolly, professionally, made quick arrests, and kept the head-bust-

ing to a minimum. It was the most remarkable personality change since Mr. Hyde.

The SDS found itself scattered all over the near Northside. And it is harder to be brave, and charge police lines, in groups of four or five. The rear rank is too near the front.

By midnight, the student warriors were either in jail, an emergency ward, or straggling back to the pad.

By yesterday morning, they had shamelessly resorted to sending the SDS girls out to confront the police in Grant Park.

Most of the girls didn't wear bras, which is probably just as good a way to get the boys home from Vietnam as breaking windows.

They flung themselves at the police lines, so the police arrested Celeste and Kathie, Judy and Suzie, Linda and Dee, and even Phoebe.

The other girls surrendered their clubs and lead pipes, burst into tears, and gave up for the day.

Although the broadcasts and headlines have made it sound like the Battle of the Bulge, the revolution hasn't been much, by modern standards of urban whoopee.

If the minirevolution proved anything, it is only that the SDS doesn't have many members left, and those who remain could not fight their way into a Polish wedding.

By last night, they had retreated to the suburbs and were last reported boldly occupying some churches in Evanston.

I think it is safe for us to come out now.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OPPOSE USE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES BY VIETNAM MORATORIUM SPEAKERS

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker I insert two telegrams I just received from the Veterans of Foreign Wars in my State. I agree with the commander of the VFW that the House of Representatives should not be used as a sounding board on such subjects as the Vietnam war, especially as long as our young men are fighting and dying for our country in Vietnam this very minute. I hope the House leadership will not tolerate a stampede by certain Members of the House in making the House of Representatives a spectacle in the eyes of the majority of the American people.

The telegrams follow:

COLUMBIA, S.C.,
October 13, 1969.

HON. JOHN McMILLAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

I urge you to take every action at your command to prevent use of House of Representatives as a sounding board for Vietnam moratorium speakers October 15. Consider it disgraceful that any elected congressional representatives would even attempt use of congressional hall for any action designed to give aid and comfort to our enemy, undermine our bargaining position at the peace table and further endanger lives of our fighting men in Vietnam.

ARNOLD MUIR,
National Veterans of Foreign Wars.

COLUMBIA, S.C.,
October 14, 1969.

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Department of South Carolina Veterans of Foreign Wars adamantly oppose use of House

of Representatives by Vietnam moratorium speakers on October 15.

Please take appropriate action to deny these misguided Representatives right to use House floor to oppose position of the President, the majority of Americans, and the VFW on Vietnam in support of dissidents who can only give further aid and comfort to enemy and endanger the lives of our fighting men in Vietnam.

LAURIE L. LANE,
Commander, Department of South
Carolina Veterans of Foreign Wars of
the U.S.

LOBBYING EFFORTS OF CITIZENS' COMMITTEE FOR POSTAL RE- FORM, INC.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Citizens' Committee for Postal Reform, Inc., a bipartisan group, was formed last spring to muster financial and public support in behalf of converting the Post Office Department into a public corporation.

The fact that two former national chairmen of the two major political parties joined hands to head this committee was an interesting exercise in lobbying to begin with.

The extent of their lobbying efforts shows that they pulled out all the stops.

What we still do not know, for sure at least, is exactly what they told these high-powered executives to get them to climb on the national bandwagon in behalf of turning our postal system into a public corporation.

The most intriguing information to come from the Citizens' Committee for Postal Reform are the reports on their revenues.

They made one report to our House Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the postal reform hearings in July. Now they have prepared a supplemental report which shows the contributions up to October 1.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken the time to study these reports carefully and I believe they warrant publishing in major part for the edification of the Members and the American public.

The reports show that the committee has collected \$261,083, plus three uncollected pledges of \$5,000 each.

Would you believe that \$201,920 came in pledges of \$5,000 each or more?

Would you believe that \$43,547 came in pledges of \$1,000 or more, but less than \$5,000?

Those are pretty healthy contributions, come from pretty well-heeled sources, and make up most of the total. That full-page advertisement which the committee ran in major newspapers last summer invited contributions from everyone, particularly the little fellows.

Well, my check of the list shows that 77 persons gave a dollar each. One gave 50 cents, another gave 25 cents, and still another gave 1 cent. We will not list those names.

However, Mr. Speaker, since about \$245,000 of the total collected by the committee is in donations of \$1,000 or more, I think they should be listed. I think we will also be interested in just what type of activities are conducted with these sums.

Following are two lists; the first is of contributions of \$5,000 or more, the second is of contributions between \$1,000 and \$4,999:

Donations of \$5,000 or more

Name and address	Amount
Bank of America-National Trust and Savings Assn., 300 Montgomery St., San Francisco, Calif. 94120	\$5,000
The Boeing Co., P.O. Box 3707, Seattle, Wash. 98124	5,000
Scott Paper Co., Philadelphia, Pa. 19113	5,000
Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza New York, N.Y. 10020	5,000
General Foods Corp., 250 North Street, White Plains, N.Y. 10602	5,000
Cummins Engine Co., Inc., 301 Washington St., Columbus, Ind. 47201	5,000
Union Carbide Corporation, 270 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10017	5,000
Westinghouse Electric Corp., 3 Gateway Center, P.O. Box 2278, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230	5,000
The Minneapolis Star and Tribune, 5th and Portland, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415	5,000
Pan American World Airways, Inc., Pan Am Building, New York, New York 10017	5,000
The Coca-Cola Company, P.O. Drawer 1734, Atlanta, Georgia 30301	5,000
Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation, Toledo, Ohio 43601	5,000
Eastman Kodak Company, 343 State Street, Rochester, New York 14650	5,000
Southern Pacific Company, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, California 94105	5,000
Montgomery Ward, 619 West Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60607	5,000
Time, Inc., Time and Life Bldg., Rockefeller Center, New York, New York 10020	5,000
J. C. Penney Co., Inc., 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10019	5,000
Boys Town of the Desert, c/o Mr. Z. R. Hansen, Mack Trucks, Inc., Box M, Allentown, Pa. 18105	5,000
Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Walnut and Pacific Streets, Stamford, Conn. 06904	5,000
McGraw-Hill, Inc., 330 West 42d St., New York, N.Y. 10036	6,920
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Wilmington, Del. 19898	5,000
R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C. 27102	5,000
Castle & Cooke, Inc., Post Office Box 2990, Honolulu, Hawaii 96802	5,000
Kimberly-Clark Corp., Neenah, Wis. 54956	5,000
Bechtel Corp., 50 Beale St., San Francisco, Calif. 94119	5,000
Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Human Ave., Chicago, Ill. 60607	5,000
Proctor & Gamble Co., Post Office Box 599, Cincinnati, Ohio 45201	5,000
Whirlpool Corp., Administrative Center, Benton Harbor, Mich. 49022	5,000
Merck & Co., Inc., Rahway, N.J. 07065	5,000
3M Co., 3M Center, St. Paul, Minn. 55101	5,000
General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Ave., New York, N.Y. 10022	5,000
American Express Co., 65 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10006	5,000

Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio, 44316	\$5,000
Ford Motor Co., The American Rd., Detroit, Mich. 48121	5,000
Union Carbide Corp., 270 Park Ave., New York, N.Y. 10017	5,000
Westinghouse Electric Corp., 3 Gateway Center, Post Office Box 2278, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15230	5,000
General Foods Corp., 250 North St., White Plains, N.Y. 10602	5,000
Federated Department Stores, 222 West Seventh St., Cincinnati, Ohio 45202	5,000
Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp., Post Office Box 901, Toledo, Ohio 43601	5,000
Standard Oil Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10020	5,000

The committee reported the following as outstanding pledges not paid as of September 30:

Federated Department Stores, Inc., 222 West Seventh Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202	5,000
Texas Instruments Inc., P.O. Box 5474, Dallas, Tex. 75222	5,000
Continental Oil Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10020	5,000

Donations of \$1,000 to \$4,999

Name and address	Amount
Litton Publications, Inc., Division of Litton Industries, Oradell, N.J., 07649	\$1,350
Burlington Industries, Inc., 301 North Eugene St., Greensboro, N.C., 27402	2,500
West Point Pepperell, P.O. Box 71, West Point, Ga., 31833	2,000
Borg-Warner Corp., 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill., 60604	2,500
The Quaker Oats Company, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., 60654	1,000
Allied Chemical Corporation, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y., 10006	1,000
Campbell Soup Company, 375 Memorial Ave., Camden, N.J., 08101	1,000
USM Corporation, Boston, Mass., 02107	2,500
Kennecott Copper Corporation, 161 East 42nd Street, New York, N.Y., 10017	2,000
The Conde Nast Publications, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y., 11017	2,500
Cowles Communications, Inc., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., 10022	1,500
Meredith Corporation, Des Moines, Iowa, 50303	1,000
Newsweek, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., 10022	1,000
Reynolds Metals Company, Reynolds Metals Building, Richmond, Va., 23218	1,000
Republic Steel Corporation, Republic Building, P.O. Box 6778, Cleveland, Ohio, 44101	2,500
Chilton Co., Chestnut and 56th Sts., Philadelphia, Pa., 19139	2,012
Cahners Publishing Co., 221 Columbus Ave., Boston, Mass., 02116	3,222
Pentagon Publishing Co., 1213 West Third St., Cleveland, Ohio, 44113	1,463
Hon. C. Douglas Dillon, 767 Third Ave., Room 1800, New York, N.Y., 10017	2,000
Deering Milliken, Inc., 234 South Fairview Ave., Spartanburg, S.C., S.C., 29302	1,000
B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main St., Akron, Ohio, 44318	2,500
Deere & Co., Moline, Ill., 61265	2,500
Allied Chemicals Corp., 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y., 10006	1,000
Burlington Industries, Inc., 301 North Eugene St., Greensboro, N.C., 27402	2,500

MARIHUANA ABUSE—ENCOURAGED BY PERMISSIVENESS

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, on July 14, 1969, the President submitted his message on the drug problem to the Congress in which he summarized the seriousness of the problem of illicit drug use in the following words:

Between the years 1960 and 1967, juvenile arrests involving the use of drugs rose by almost 800 percent; half of those now being arrested for the illicit use of narcotics are under 21 years of age. New York City alone has records of some 40,000 heroin addicts, and the number rises between 7,000 and 9,000 a year. These official statistics are only the tip of an iceberg whose dimensions we can only surmise.

The number of narcotics addicts across the United States is now estimated to be in the hundreds of thousands. Another estimate is that several million American college students have at least experimented with marihuana, hashish, LSD, amphetamines, or barbiturates.

It is against this background that I view with considerable alarm the fact that the debate over marihuana penalties has been given the limelight at the expense, I fear, of the psychological impact of the President's own admission that:

A new urgency and concerted national policy are needed at the Federal level to begin to cope with this growing menace (abuse of drugs) to the general welfare of the United States.

Consider these headlines: "HEW Egeberg Hits 'Pot' Penalties"; "Egeberg Criticizes Marihuana Laws"; "Administration Flexible on Penalties in Drug Bill"; "Mitchell Favors a Flexible Drug Law." I am sure that such reading gives our younger citizens much encouragement to think that our predecessors were all wet on the harmful effects of marihuana, despite the fact it is still admitted that comparatively little is known about the long-term physical effects of marihuana. The advocates of lesser penalties for the use and possession of marihuana are quick to say that they are not encouraging the use of marihuana over other dangerous drugs, but merely want the penalties to be more reflective of the actual dangers of the use of marihuana. Of course, they do not distinguish between the dangers to the individual and the dangers to society, and I believe it is the latter to which we should be directing our attention. In this connection, I would point out the findings of the Health Subcommittee of the Special Presidential Task Force Relating to Narcotics, Marihuana, and Dangerous Drugs:

Marihuana contains a number of potent compounds called tetrahydrocannabinols—THC—which affect the mind and body in various ways.

While marihuana contains many ingredients, THC is believed to be the principal psychoactive ingredient.

Since marihuana products produce effects similar to other hallucinogens like

LSD, and their reactions are often indistinguishable from those produced by other psychedelics, they are pharmacologically classified in that category.

THC in sufficiently high doses can induce psychotic reactions in almost any individual.

It has also been demonstrated—in connection with studies on the effects of marihuana—that THC, when administered in sufficiently high dosage, will cause a psychotic-like state, similar to that induced by LSD.

There have also been reports of adverse psychological effects of marihuana both in this country and abroad. Recently a group of some 1500 psychiatrists, psychiatric residents, internists, general practitioners and psychologists in the Los Angeles area reported that they had seen almost 1900 "adverse reactions" to marihuana. It is difficult to interpret this finding since "adverse reaction" was poorly defined, and there has been no follow-up to define just what the reactions to the drug were. However, there have been reports of an increased number of hospitalizations following the usage of marihuana.

I suggest that while the dangers to the individual users of marihuana may be of minimal consequence, although the reported findings would tend toward a contrary view, the dangers posed by the widespread use of marihuana, in the context of the general public, reach significantly greater proportions whose consequences, adverse to the general welfare, are potentially disastrous.

Another bit of information came across my desk within the past few days. In a recent issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association, two doctors report mental disturbances among American servicemen in Vietnam after using marihuana which were made potentially more dangerous because of the combat zone environment. I feel that an environment of belligerency, not unlike that in the combat zone, exists on college campuses and in the streets across the Nation whose impact on the minds of the marihuana users may pose an indeterminate threat to the public safety. We can only surmise how many of those involved in these now common violent outbursts are under the influence of marihuana or some other mind-altering drug. However, the large number of arrests for narcotics use in connection with these disturbances should disturb even the most liberal and permissive minds among us, not because the arrests were made in the first instance, but because of the violence with which drug abuse has clearly come to be related.

What does all of this suggest? In my estimation, Mr. Speaker, the misplaced emphasis on making the penalties for the use and possession of marihuana less severe tends not only to give tacit license to an admitted evil, but to suggest that some useful social purpose will be served behind the mask of justice. I fail to see what justice there is in permissiveness, justified on the basis of an alarming increase in drug abuse among young persons. If, as is claimed, justice would be served by making the penalties fit the proven dangers to individuals who use marihuana, the argument disappears with the admission that such proof cannot be found in the scant records of re-

search. The dangers, not as to individuals, but as to the general public, are to be inferred from what is known of the drug, and I contend the evidence is sufficient to establish that the dangers to the public safety and general welfare are real.

NEW LIGHT ON WHY THE UNITED STATES IS IN VIETNAM

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, various weekly publications have published a poll which shows that 58 percent of the people in the United States think it was a mistake to have ever become engaged in a war in Vietnam. Various reasons have been advanced as to why we are fighting in Vietnam, and I am submitting the following explanation which appeared in U.S. News & World Report, on January 31, 1966:

NEW LIGHT ON WHY UNITED STATES IS IN VIETNAM

A fresh version of how—and why—the U.S. became so deeply involved in Vietnam has now come to view.

This footnote to history revolves around three world figures of 1961: President Kennedy, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, and Premier Nikita Khrushchev of Russia.

The story is told by James Reston, associate editor of "The New York Times" and a syndicated Washington columnist. On a television program, Mr. Reston was asked this about Vietnam:

Was there any point at which a President should have seen what was coming—and either have backed out before it was too late or have refused to take steps which escalated the war?

A TALK WITH J. F. K.

Mr. Reston, in answer, told of a talk he had had with President Kennedy a few minutes after the Kennedy-Khrushchev meetings in Vienna in the spring of 1961.

"At that time we really had a hard time with Khrushchev," Mr. Reston recalled. "Khrushchev tried to bully him through the four meetings, and Kennedy said to me at that time that he thought he understood why Khrushchev had taken this position."

"He said—looking back at the Bay of Pigs fiasco—that Khrushchev had decided that anybody who was stupid enough to get involved in that situation was immature, and anybody who didn't see it all the way through was timid and therefore could be bullied."

"And Kennedy said to me then: We will never do anything with these people now, unless we make our power . . . credible. Otherwise, we'll get nowhere on anything."

Mr. Reston then listed steps President Kennedy took: "He increased the military budget by 6 billion dollars. He sent the Rainbow Division to Germany. And, most important, he escalated in Vietnam—not because the situation on the ground demanded it in Vietnam, but he wanted the 12,000 men in Vietnam at that time because he wanted to prove a diplomatic point, not a military point."

"And that, I think, is where we began to get off the track in my view."

M'NAMARA'S ROLE

Did Mr. Kennedy's advisers agree?

"No," said Mr. Reston. "There was a big battle about that [and] one of his advisers said: Don't go down that track, because once you get 12,000 men committed, you'll get

into a situation in which you will keep on developing it.

"And one of his other advisers said: If you go that way, it may take 300,000 men.

"And at that time Bob McNamara took the position: Whatever is necessary, I think we ought to put in there.

"Then there was a real battle, because the State Department—or at least part of the State Department—said: You must never ask the President of the United States to go all the way through in circumstances he can't foresee, because you don't know what's going to happen in the world. Therefore, don't commit yourself that much.

"And this was, in my view, one of the critical historic debates that went on. And from that I think we made one step after another until now we have almost 200,000 men."

Mr. Reston's remarks were made on a broadcast January 17 by National Educational Television.

BIG OIL: THE TAXLESS BILLIONAIRES

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the October 9 edition of the *Hammond, Ind., Times* reveals only a minute picture of the tax exemptions credits and depletions the Congress continues to give "big oil":

BOTH WAYS FOR OIL

It's an interesting rationale of Sen. Russell B. Long's that a senator or congressman has no conflict of interest problem when his financial interests "completely parallel" those of his state.

The senator's reasoning developed in response to disclosures that he had received nearly \$330,000 since 1964 in tax-free oil royalties from holdings in his home ground of Louisiana, which he claims produces more oil and gas per acre than any other state.

"If I didn't represent the oil and gas industry, I wouldn't represent the state of Louisiana," he argues.

But as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Long wields considerable influence on tax reform legislation pending in Congress. And nearly every citizen is dunned for taxes. A major reform of the tax bill is a reduction in the oil industry's coveted 27½ per cent depletion allowance, the "loophole" that gave the senator his nearly \$330,000 tax-free.

The industry opposes lowering the allowance to the proposed 20 per cent. Naturally Senator Long more than agrees. And at least one must respect his frankness; he is protecting his own pocketbook.

The industry, however, is being more subtle. It is directing a nationwide scare campaign at the gasoline consumer who is being warned that unless the allowance remains intact, fuel prices will rise. And with prices rising all around him, that kind of talk makes a fellow think.

The industry says absolutely nothing about the effect of oil import quotas on fuel prices. These controls stem the tide of cheap, foreign oil that could drive prices down, could make them competitive.

A fresh Interior Department analysis discovers that retention of the controls could cost the driving public anywhere from \$2.2 billion to more than \$8 billion a year by 1980. Not only does the industry enjoy tax favoritism, it has price favoritism too.

ROTH STUDY DRAWS PRAISE

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Delaware, BILL ROTH, continues to receive highly favorable and much deserved acknowledgment in the national press for his independent inquiry into the size and complexity of the Federal Government.

A year ago he announced the results of a study which he personally directed from his own congressional office. It revealed that the Federal Government administered more than a thousand grant-in-aid programs. He continued that inquiry and recently announced that hundreds of additional assistance programs have been identified and should be added to the 1968 figures.

Among the many newspaper accounts of BILL ROTH's disclosures are articles by Jerome Cahill of the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, Washington Bureau, and syndicated Columnists Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond. I commend to the attention of all Members the reports which follow in the RECORD:

[From the *Philadelphia Inquirer*,
Sept. 18, 1969]

U.S. GRANTS-IN-AID HARD TO DECIPHER
(By Jerome S. Cahill)

WASHINGTON, September 17.—Representative William V. Roth, Delaware's congressman-at-large, had some unsettling news this week for American taxpayers who are perplexed at the growth and complexity of the federal bureaucracy. He has found that big government is even bigger than he first reported 15 months ago.

The 48-year-old lawyer from Wilmington, who is in his second term in the House, gained nationwide attention in June, 1968, when he disclosed the results of an in-depth study by his office of Federal grant-in-aid programs. The study found Uncle Sam was operating 1090 grant-in-aid programs.

Now Roth has surfaced from another plunge into Washington's sea of red tape with word that there are 225 more Federal assistance programs that should be added to his 1968 list. And, he told the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations Wednesday, "there is evidence that an additional 100 to 200 programs may still be unreported."

So labyrinthian are the ways of the Federal establishment, apparently, that some high-level department officials even have difficulty in keeping tabs on grant programs in their own departments. When Roth's office recently asked an assistant secretary at the Department of Transportation for a listing of DOT programs, for example, the number totaled 16.

But a check of individual operating agencies within the department boosted the total to 41.

Maintaining a maze of assistance programs with widely varying eligibility standards in a state of semi-secrecy is advantageous to the bureaucrat, of course, because it enhances his influence over the channels grant monies take in leaving Washington. On the other side of the coin, it does little to smooth the way of local instrumentalities not adept at the game of Federal grantsmanship.

Roth sought to eliminate some of the mystery by publishing as House Document No. 399 the fruits of his 1968 research—the 1090

program titles, together with 541 program descriptions.

Now the congressman is ready with his updated 1969 handbook, and is pushing a bill that would require the President to publish an annual catalogue of Federal aid programs and to update the catalogue each month. His appearance before the Senate panel was to promote that legislation.

According to his study education is the most widely splintered of the Federal aid programs. Roth found in existence today 165 programs of educational aid in 14 different Federal agencies. Close behind were 163 health and safety programs in six agencies, and 112 housing programs in five agencies.

A businessman shopping around for Federal help, according to Roth, would have to do a lot of agency-hopping. The congressman found 14 different agencies active in the business and economic development field. Those 14 agencies administer 51 separate programs.

The latest Roth listing includes 45 titles from the Department of Defense, but the congressman suspects there are a lot more that the Pentagon isn't talking about for security reasons. He hasn't made an issue of such security classifications, but the congressman is a bit impatient when secrecy extends to programs not involved in national security.

"No one in the Federal Government at any level," he said Wednesday, "has full knowledge available today as to what Federal assistance programs do in fact exist. Furthermore, employees in various agencies have advised me that they, in turn, are unable to direct applicants to the best source of assistance because they have too little or no knowledge about other programs."

[From the *St. Louis Globe Democrat*, Sept. 26, 1969]

BIG GOVERNMENT FALTER

(By Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Daniel P. Moynihan, the liberal Democrat who is serving President Nixon so ably as urban affairs aide, long tried to persuade his fellow Democrats that the federal bureaucracy is so big, so lethargic, so inefficient, because of the thicket of overlapping programs that it simply can't do its job.

He put his view arrestingly in these words: "The federal government has proved itself good at collecting money and bad at dispensing public services."

So far very little has changed. Moynihan's view was rejected by the Democrats and never effectively taken up by the Republicans. The President is making a beginning in his welfare proposals, in his advocacy of revenue-sharing and in his plan to finance the job-training program at the state level.

But even this beginning is only in the talk stage. These steps face a rough road when they come before Congress next year. If these moves—and others equally needed—to decentralize Big Government somewhat are to be approved, an alert and aroused public opinion will be necessary.

Do the facts justify an aroused public opinion? Do they justify Moynihan's harsh verdict? We'll lay out the facts—you decide.

The source of these facts is the best-informed, perhaps the only fully informed and objective authority on federal assistance programs in Washington. He is a second-term Republican member of Congress, Rep. William V. Roth Jr. of Delaware. For two years he has been conducting a one-man canvass of the maze of far-flung federal assistance programs, much to the annoyance of the agencies themselves and often encountering their resistance.

He also encountered widespread ignorance. Some agencies really didn't know what programs they were administering.

His study is not complete. It may never be, because this year he found 225 more programs than he was able to discover last year. He expects there are 100 to 200 programs still unreported.

As of today, there's what Congressman Roth has found:

1. There are at least 1,315 federal assistance programs for all of which Congress appropriated more than \$25 billion last year.

2. These overlapping programs constitute such a maze that those who are intended to benefit often don't know they exist, where to apply, whether they qualify or how much money is available.

3. There is no centralized planning or management of federal assistance programs in the government's executive branch.

4. Here is how the federal assistance programs overlap and duplicate themselves. There are 51 business and economic development programs in 14 agencies; 23 civil defense and disaster-relief programs in four agencies; 19 civil rights programs in six agencies; 165 education programs in 14 agencies; 62 environmental and natural resource programs in nine agencies; 48 rehabilitation programs for the handicapped in 11 agencies; 163 health and safety programs in six agencies; 112 housing programs in five agencies; 27 law-enforcement and police-assistance programs in four agencies; 41 maritime, fishing and waterways programs in eight agencies; 32 programs for state, local government facilities and public works assistance in nine agencies; 28 transportation (excluding sea) programs in five agencies, and 33 water resources and conservation programs in eight agencies.

Congressman Roth proposes a useful first step. He has 184 cosponsors in the House and 11 cosponsors in the Senate for his Program Information Act which would require the President to publish an annual catalog of all federal aid programs and update it monthly.

But Rep. Roth and others know this is just a start, that much more needs to be done.

This brings us back to Moynihan's provocative verdict that the federal government ought to make more tax money available to state and local governments to administer aid programs nearer to their beneficiaries.

Some argue that state and local governments aren't good enough to do it. But who knows until we try? Certainly the federal government hasn't been so good at it.

CORPORATE FARMING: A STEP TOWARD SOCIALISM

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the economic future of the family farm is a matter of continuing discussion in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District, where, probably, there are more of these units than can be found in any other congressional district in America.

One of the most authoritative voices in behalf of the family farm is that of editor Don Olson of the *Marshall, Minn., Messenger*.

With your permission, I would like to insert in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* at this time, Editor Olson's latest editorial of this matter.

Soon Congress will be called upon to consider a new farm bill. I urge my colleagues to keep Mr. Olson's editorial in mind when the time arrives for that vote. The editorial follows:

CORPORATE FARMING: A STEP TOWARD SOCIALISM (By Don Olson)

Farm programs, as we've known them for the past generation, probably will die with this or the next session of Congress. Opposition to farm subsidies, the desire for lower food prices and the belief that farm programs cause high prices are the prevailing sentiments in Washington today.

Agriculture always has been the most fragmented of American industries. It never has developed a voice, so it hasn't been able to express its point of view.

After 1952, when farm prices started down a long, general slope to disaster, most Americans still looked at the farmer as an extremely wealthy, selfish doer. As things got worse, no amount of fact could persuade the average American that the profit had been taken out of agriculture.

Those who cared at all echoed the CED's recommendation: "Let the inefficient farmers get out of agriculture." Most of the rest said simply that they were interested only in lower food prices . . . which already were the lowest in the world.

Last week the Nixon administration sent to Congress recommendations for a new look at agriculture. The recommendations encompass virtuous-sounding goals such as increased income for farmers, fewer government controls over farmers and more exports of food products.

The increased income supposedly will come from the fewer controls and larger exports. The American consumer presumably will buy food cheaper because only the most efficient farmers will remain in agriculture.

It is an altogether appealing package . . . at least on the surface.

But it overlooks the fact that family farming has been, by all odds, the most efficient form of food production the world ever has seen. Within the past few months a Midwestern extension economist said that the most recent studies prove conclusively that the family farm still can produce more economically than the large, corporate farm.

Corporate agriculture has it over the family farm in only a few areas, such as the ability to get more credit, the ability to ride out tough times and, in some cases, the ability to purchase more economically.

Corporate agriculture is at a disadvantage when it comes to farm labor. While the farm family donates much of its labor to the family enterprise, corporate farms have no such pool of loyal, diligent and generally-efficient labor.

A few years ago farm labor came under the minimum wage law, and in a few years farm workers will be organized in labor unions. Farm labor costs will skyrocket.

They will try to offset higher labor costs by mechanization, but buying more machines isn't a cure-all. Machinery purchases will require a larger input of capital and money these days is expensive. It also takes high quality labor to operate sophisticated machines, so the labor-saving machines may not save much in payroll.

But the most telling argument against corporate agriculture is the one that will cause the consumer the most grief. Corporations, over the short haul, may be willing to lose money on their farm operations. They may have profits from other enterprises against which they can charge the losses from farming.

But sooner or later the farm corporations will have to make money. If they are operating as economically as they believe possible, they will raise their prices to make the desired profits.

No amount of threatening by the government and no buyers' strikes will deter them from their goal. They will sell wheat and milk the same way that steel companies sell steel and automobile companies sell cars . . . at a profit.

This is bound to mean higher food prices

for the consumer, and a dwindling . . . not expanding . . . export market.

All of this very likely will result in a socialized form of agriculture. The step in ownership from big corporation to federal government is, after all, a small one.

THE ELECTORAL REFORM BILL

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, due to illness in the family, I was forced to miss the final vote on the electoral reform bill, which passed the House by an overwhelming majority of 339 to 70. Had I been present, I would have voted against it. It was another one of those bills where emotion carries more weight than judgment.

There has been much "hoopla" about the dangers of the existing electoral college system, and what dire results would happen if it were not reformed. Bear in mind that this Republic had been operating under this system for some 180 years, since 1789, when such a system was provided for in the Constitution.

My position, I am certain, is contrary to the wishes of 70 or 80 percent of the people in my district, according to the polls, but the polls can be very misleading. A simple question "Should there be electoral reform?" would generally be answered in the affirmative. The public feels that something is askew and that reform will, ipso facto, remedy it. Few people who were questioned had time to consider the historic and constitutional background of this system. The electoral college was a part of the checks and balances provided for in order to form the Union. At that time there were 13 States, ranging in size from Delaware to the Commonwealth of Virginia. Where was the power to reside?

The little States were afraid to surrender their sovereignty for fear of domination by the larger States. By compromise and agreement, each State, regardless of size, was to have two Senators and a proportionate number of Members in the House of Representatives, based on population. There was to be a head of State called the President of the 13 States. Again, to protect the rights of the smaller States, this President was to be selected by the States, with each State voting its prescribed number of electors as a unit. We now have 50 States and the President, though he may be President of all of the people, is technically the President of the 50 States. Election of the President by popular vote will deprive the smaller States of any voice in selecting the President and the campaign will be conducted in a dozen of the most populous States, and small attention will be paid to the little States.

If this constitutional amendment should be adopted by three-fourths of the States and become law, the next thing will be to dissolve the States themselves, for there will be little reason for the existence of the States. They will become provinces controlled by bureau-

crats in Washington, D.C., eliminating local control. We would cease to be a republic as conceived by the Founding Fathers, and would become a democracy as in France. Who would want that?

The strength of this Republic is in the fact that there are 50 sovereign States, each with its own constitution, its own Governor, its own legislature, and its own constabulary. Under our present system, if the District of Columbia were captured by a foreign nation, it would not be capturing the United States, as there are still 50 separate States that would have to be conquered, and this is a great source of military strength.

During debate, it was proposed that the President be selected by congressional districts, with two bonus votes for each State, representing the Senators. That is, California, with 38 congressional districts, would cast the number of votes for President according to the number of congressional districts carried by each candidate. If there were 19 congressional districts for one candidate and 19 carried by another candidate, there would be 19 votes cast in the electoral college for each, and two additional votes, for the Senators, would be cast according to the way that the total State went. That proposal lost on a rollcall vote by 245 to 162. I do not feel that this district plan would be any more representative than the system we now have.

To argue that the States should divide their vote according to congressional districts for the electoral college, is not more feasible than to elect the Governor of the State in accordance with the number of congressional districts that he carried. It was argued that it was wrong for the winner to take all, that is, if a candidate carried the State of California by 1,000 votes, it was wrong that he should control the entire electoral vote of California. You might as well argue that, if Governor Reagan were elected by 1,000 votes that he should not become the Governor for the 4-year term, but that the other candidate should be Governor for half the time. Nobody is silly enough to argue this. No one has suggested that because I carry only 65 or 70 percent of the vote in my district that my opponent should be Congressman for 30 or 35 percent of a 2-year term.

A system that has not failed us in 180 years should not be discounted just because somebody wants to play tiddly-winks—a nice pastime, but not productive.

BIG TRUCK BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my editorials for today are from the Davenport Times-Democrat and the Oelwein Daily Register, in the State of Iowa. The editorials follow:

[From the Davenport (Iowa) Times-Democrat, Aug. 3, 1969]

BIGGER TRUCKS, MORE DIE?

Rep. Fred Schwengel of Davenport is stepping up the force of a battle which deserves

the support of this eastern Iowa and western Illinois area—and every other across the country.

In his battle against a bill which would permit bigger trucks on the federal interstate highway system, he said this last week: "I'll take it to the people of the United States (if he cannot stop it in the House Public Works Committee). I'll make a speech on the floor of the House every day. They won't get it through a roll call vote."

That's fighting language. It springs from his deep-felt conviction that safety of the traveler on the highway is more important than the profits of the truckers and those who use their services.

Efforts to legalize wider, heavier and in some cases longer trucks and busses on interstate highways represent a skillfully organized campaign of the American Trucking Association and its associated groups. If success crowns the campaign in Congress, it will become increasingly difficult for individual states to resist similar authorizations.

As Representative Schwengel points out, the United States has the best truck transportation system in the world. He cites figures to show that in 1968 it traveled more than 100 million miles in the continental U.S. than that totaled by operations in all of the rest of the world combined.

This is due, of course, in large part to the fact that this country has more than \$70 billion committed to the construction of a 42,000-mile interstate system which now is two-thirds finished.

Opponents of the drive to authorize larger trucks and busses argue that the trucking industry is attempting to take undue advantage of the benefits conferred by this system which has cost the American taxpayer so many billions.

Already they enjoy tremendous reductions in maintenance and operations costs because of access to superhighways cleared of intersections and stop-and-go situations. With the need to leave the interstate routes only for gasoline, food and rest, they increase the mileage which can be covered by a driver during his work period, and they cut down on costs for gas and brake service. They undoubtedly have effected savings also because of a system which reduces accidents.

If the bigger trucks would have improved braking systems, as proponents contend, that would be only a step toward overcoming a lack of control which has worried safety authorities. Evidence has been introduced to back arguments that the huge trucks, weighing up to 35 tons, do not have the braking efficiency of the average passenger car.

Contentions that the wider, heavier and in some cases longer trucks would effect economies in shipping are not impressive. While this very well could be true, it is open to challenge whether in the long run the savings might not be overmatched by the added cost of highway and bridge maintenance.

In any event, that is not the main point. What worries the Representative Schwengels, the American Automobile Association, the American Association of State Highway Officials, the county engineers' groups and the Federation of Women's Clubs is the records show that in truck-car collisions, there are 38 deaths in the private vehicles for every truck killed.

There is no sense in lengthening the odds. Residents along the interstate routes, like those in the Quad-City area and every other where life is held important, should be in this fight.

[From the Oelwein (Iowa) Daily Register, July 10, 1969]

DAVENPORT'S SCHWENGEL'S RESISTANCE

As we recall, Rep. Fred Schwengel of Iowa was assailed from the floor of the House by a fiery little legislator from Michigan several months ago because Schwengel exposed some nasty and true information about the truck lobby's stranglehold on national legislators.

You've read in these columns about how its ruthless power was felt in the state General Assembly.

Congressman Schwengel is leaving nothing undone to defeat efforts by the truck and bus lobby to endanger our highways and secure new legislation opening the door for bigger and bigger buses and trucks.

As has been reported in the newspapers, Rep. Schwengel made his position quite convincing when he stepped outside the capital and interviewed bus drivers. He then took some seat and rear vision mirror measurements proving statements made by the lobby weren't true.

We only wish more congressmen had Schwengel's courage.

Most significant in the testimony were the statements by drivers who happened to be in buses parked outside declaring even the present lengths are hazardous to safety and difficult to drive in towns and cities. "Don't vote in favor of making them bigger," they appealed to Schwengel.

The discussion involved legislation which would authorize states to increase width, weight and length of buses on the interstate highway system. If Iowa's was a tollway, it might not be such a bitter pill to swallow. Perhaps Rep. Schwengel can get the job done. We hope so.

Mr. Speaker, it should be stated that at no time have I implied directly or indirectly the motives of any Member of the House in connection with this controversy.

VIOLENT CRIMES DROP IN TOLEDO AFTER IT GETS LAW CONTROLLING GUNS

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, in August of 1968, the city of Toledo, Ohio, enacted an ordinance which prohibits anybody in the city from keeping or obtaining a pistol, revolver, or other handgun without a license from the police. Since that time, the violent crimes of rape, murder, robbery, and aggravated assault have dropped 31.5 percent in Toledo. While it might be inaccurate to credit only the gun ordinance for such a drastic drop, the mayor of that city strongly believes that the unavailability of guns is a big factor.

Mr. Speaker, I concur with this judgment and I hope that all of my colleagues will take a moment to read this article from the October 7 Wall Street Journal. I believe it upholds my support of the Gun Control Act of 1968. The article follows:

CURBING FIREARMS: VIOLENT CRIMES DROP IN TOLEDO AFTER IT GETS LAW CONTROLLING GUNS

(By Jerry Landauer)

TOLEDO.—This city of 400,000 on the western tip of Lake Erie was once known as the gun capital of the Midwest. Firearms of all kinds could be bought at jewelry stores, gasoline stations and pawn shops. Gun dealers hawked pistols for as little as \$4.95 vied for choice locations along roads leading in from Detroit, where controls were stricter. The crime rate soared.

The state legislature declined to restrict the trafficking in lethal weapons despite repeated appeals from Toledo officials. So in August 1968, the city council enacted an ordinance aimed especially at the sale of "Saturday-

night specials"—cheap guns toted by holdup men to terrorize merchants on busy week-ends. The ordinance prohibits anybody in the city from keeping or obtaining a pistol, revolver or other handgun without a license from the police.

At the time, few law officers believed the ordinance would reverse the city's mounting crime rate; unlicensed residents can still buy guns outside the city limits. But whether because of the gun-control law or because of other anticrime measures or even mere chance, crime is abating here while still surging higher in most cities.

DRAMATIC STATISTICS

This development shows up most dramatically in statistics released late last month by the FBI. For the nation, the violent crimes of rape, murder, robbery and aggravated assault—armed or otherwise—rose 9% in the first six months of 1969 from the like period last year. But in Toledo these violent crimes dropped 31.5% from the first half of 1968. "We're the only major city which shows such a dramatic decrease," exults John J. Burkhardt, the city's chief counsel.

Indeed, crime in most other cities that have adopted gun controls, such as Washington, D.C., continues to move up pretty much in step with the national pattern. "Even if firearms were totally eliminated," contends a gun-control foe, "other weapons would be substituted."

However, crimes committed with a gun in Philadelphia have dropped since that city adopted a licensing law in 1965, even though the law exempts firearms owned at the time. In New York, Mayor John Lindsay credits gun laws with keeping murder rates low; despite its rising crime, New York often ranks lowest among the 10 largest U.S. cities in number of homicides per 100,000 population.

But Toledo's experience is unique. It may be traceable in part to special restrictions on gun dealers as well as owners, to a tough, well publicized court crackdown on violators of the control law and to other city efforts against crime.

CRIME CATEGORIES ANALYZED

Whatever other factors may enter in, gun-control advocates insist that a close look at developments in major crime categories here supports their case:

In the year before the ordinance was adopted, Toledo's police counted 422 aggravated assaults, with guns and without; these include shootings, stabbings and other attacks intended to maim or kill. In the year after enactment, the number of such attacks dipped 9% to 385. But the assaults with guns dropped much more steeply—from 152 to 83, or 45%.

In the year before the ordinance, 36 people were murdered, 22 by handguns; in the following year, murders totaled 14, of which eight were by gun. (Because murders with other weapons dropped at roughly the same rate as murders with guns, it's possible that some factor other than the control law may be at work.)

Robberies both armed and unarmed dropped from 1,188 in the year before gun control to 798 in the next year, a decline of 33%. But gun robberies dropped even more sharply—from 350 to 160, or 54%.

RIFLE GROUP'S VIEW

Statistics can be tricky, of course. Woodson D. Scott, a New York attorney who is president of the National Rifle Association, an opponent of most gun control, says: "The statistics only prove that the statistics are down. In terms of cause and effect, it doesn't prove a thing."

The unexpected crime statistics have sent city counsel Burkhardt scrambling to recheck them. "I've gone over every possible angle to see whether there might have been a mistake. I can't find any," he reports.

"I'm as much puzzled as anybody," Mr.

Burkhart adds, noting that Toledo enacted its ordinance primarily to persuade the legislature that gun controls can be imposed with little inconvenience and minimum intrusion on citizens' rights. "It was really an effort to sell the General Assembly," says the city counsel. "I didn't think we'd be able to make an impact on crime in less than three or four years."

His caution in checking and interpreting the statistics arises partly from the gun law's relatively lenient licensing standards. Unlike New York's Sullivan Law, the Toledo plan doesn't require residents to show good cause for possessing a gun. Instead, the police must issue a numbered "handgun owner's identification card" costing \$3 and good for three years to all applicants except fugitives, minors under 21, certified mental cases, narcotics addicts, habitual drunks or people who have been convicted twice in the past year of crimes involving the use or threat of force.

So far the police have issued 16,000 ID cards; roughly 100 applicants have been rejected. It also seems likely that some people have been deterred from buying guns because, for various reasons, they did not want to apply to the police for a license.

Police Chief Anthony Bosch reports the law has had a harsh effect on gun dealers who formerly sold to almost any cash customer. One such dealer ran Toledo's biggest gun store in a seedy neighborhood on Jackson Street just five minutes from Interstate Route 75 linking Toledo and Detroit. In one nine-month period, his register rang up sales of 16,000 guns, including 5,500 to residents of Michigan who couldn't legally buy at home without a police permit (the revolver used in the highly publicized 1966 synagog slaying of Detroit Rabbi Morris Adler came from Toledo). But now, along with perhaps half the other gun outlets in town, the big store stands abandoned.

Besides the Toledo gun law's licensing provision, it requires detailed monthly gun sales reports to the Toledo police. It also prohibits selling to out-of-towners who aren't armed with authorization from their local police chief or sheriff.

SEVERE SENTENCES

"The sale of cheap guns is down to nothing," Chief Bosch says. "The punk who walks down the street, buys a gun and knocks off a gas station—that's all been eliminated."

In municipal court, Judge George M. Glasser says severe sentencing of violators may be another reason for the gun law's apparent effectiveness. Already, court records show, city judges have packed 37 people off to jail (the average is 90 days), mainly for possessing a gun without a license. In addition, judges have imposed 27 fines ranging from \$25 to \$1,000.

"The word is out that you can't just carry a gun around here without doing days in the workhouse," says Chief Counsel Burkhardt, praising newspapers, radio and television for publicizing the court crackdown.

(In contrast to Toledo, crime-ridden Washington can impose penalties no harsher than 10 days in jail or a \$30 fine—the maximum allowed by Congress. So far there have been no prosecutions.)

In the mayor's office here, square-jawed ex-Marine William J. Ensign cites other measures that may have helped bring crime down. He points to improved street lighting; an expanded, improved police department; an active program to prevent juvenile crime; an ordinance making it a crime to harass or abuse school children or newsboys; more effective probation and parole procedures, and a 4,000-member citizens group that distributes cards pledging people to cooperate with the police whenever possible.

INQUIRIES FROM OTHER CITIES

Mayor Ensign also feels sure that the gun law helps a lot. "You just know that the

unavailability of guns has got to be a big factor," he observes. Officials in other cities think so, too. The drop in crime here is drawing inquiries about the Toledo ordinance from Wichita, Los Angeles, Dayton, Cleveland, Baltimore and Cincinnati.

As these inquiries suggest, the gun-control controversy may be shifting to the cities, while antigun agitation in Washington and in state capitals is losing steam. Last year, of course, Congress banned mail-order sales of all firearms across state lines except to licensed dealers and prohibited dealers from selling handguns over the counter to out-of-state customers. One hope was to encourage state and local governments to enact stricter controls.

One Federal official who has urged local authorities to act is FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover. He has said: "I see no great problem to the individual in requiring all guns to be registered, if the owner has nothing to hide and if he is a law-abiding citizen."

But some local policemen oppose municipal gun controls. Deputy Chief Lloyd Forbus of the Columbus, Ohio, police force, for example, asserts that the possible crime-curb-ing effects of local gun-control laws don't justify violating a cardinal principle of the National Rifle Association—that restrictions should be aimed only at those who misuse firearms. Mr. Forbus is an NRA member and serves as a sale manager for a gun wholesaler in his spare time.

Many hunters, marksmen and gun collectors remain convinced that ordinances such as Toledo's will eventually disarm the law-abiding citizenry. Insists Walter W. Schumacher, speaking for the League of Ohio Sportsmen: "This is the first step toward total disarmament."

But for the foreseeable future the civilian population will surely remain heavily armed. According to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, headed by Milton Eisenhower, probably 30 million guns were added to the civilian stockpile during the last decade, bringing the total to 90 million—35 million rifles, 31 million shotguns and 24 million handguns.

HOW ABOUT TRAITORS' DAY?

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, Indiana's largest newspaper, the Indianapolis Star, has made some interesting editorial comments concerning events unfolding October 15.

The article follows:

HOW ABOUT TRAITORS' DAY?

It is odd that so many supposedly pure, irreproachable protests against the United States role in Vietnam happen to coincide with Communist demonstrations in the same cause.

It strikes Senator Paul Fannin (R-Ariz.) as odd, too. He says that an Oct. 15 college "moratorium" to protest continuation of the Vietnam War looks like a Communist anti-American gambit.

Fannin received a poster and publicity material mailed from Cuba boasting an Oct. 15-21 demonstration to be called "Days of Support for Vietnam."

He asked, "Is it a coincidence that an organization of Latin American students, mailing their literature from Communist-controlled Cuba, happened to pick Oct. 15, the same day that is being advocated as a day of protest in this country?"

Plans for observance of the "moratorium"

are being made at colleges throughout the nation. Fannin noted preparations are under way for the Oct. 15 event at Indiana, Purdue and Indiana State universities, the University of Notre Dame, and at Earlham, Goshen, Hanover and Marion colleges in Indiana.

Fannin asked in the Senate: "Are those who are aiding these groups prepared to accept the anarchy and chaos which these people are proposing to unleash among us?"

"Far more important, are those who deliberately undercut the President on these matters willing to accept and be responsible for the cost in lives of additional American servicemen who are killed by an enemy finding strength in the irresponsible dissent being voiced here?"

"Are they aware that this strategy was formed during an East Berlin peace conference held on June 25?"

We wish to answer Senator Fannin's questions and make a proposal.

We think some of the supporters of the Oct. 15 protest are patriotic and sincere and are prompted by the purest motives. Others, we think, are muddle-headed and easily led dupes of the Communists and their front organizations.

Some, we are confident, are out and out traitors dedicated not only to working in every way they can for Communist victory in Vietnam but for Communist control of the entire planet and all of its inhabitants. Their true colors have emerged in their many phony "peace" demonstrations in which they have spit and trampled upon the American flag while flying the Viet Cong flag and in their gushy idolatry of Red heroes and bosses.

So we propose that Oct. 15, along with being the day of a "moratorium," also be set aside as Communist Dupes' Day, in behalf of the muddleheaded but unwitting followers of the Red line, and that, in addition, it be set aside as Traitors' Day for the Judases and turncoats whose thoughts and actions are plain old-fashioned treason.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this summer I distributed a questionnaire to my constituents asking them a number of questions about current issues of national importance. I was very pleased to receive a return of almost 12 percent or more than 17,000 cards. Since most of these were signed by two people they would represent the opinion of about 30,000 residents of the Sixth Congressional District of North Carolina. It is obvious to me that many of our fellow Americans feel that there is a great distance between them and their Government and that they respond so well to this kind of an inquiry because it offers them an opportunity to make their voice heard in Washington. About a third of the returned cards had messages written on them and between 300 and 400 were accompanied by letters—some as long as six typed pages—in which the writers spoke with great conviction about their concern for their country's welfare, their loyalty to the United States and their determination that we must make it a better place to live.

I believe it appropriate to share with my colleagues the results of this questionnaire, and for that purpose I am entering in the RECORD a summary of the answers to the questions included:

Question and answer

[In percent]

Vietnam:	
Favor withdrawal gradually.....	54
Favor immediate withdrawal.....	20
Favor escalation.....	14
Favor continued peace talks.....	5
Undecided, no answer.....	6
Draft:	
Favor volunteer army.....	35
Favor continuation present draft.....	32½
Favor lottery at 19.....	25½
Undecided or no answer.....	7
ABM System:	
Favor.....	50½
Oppose.....	25½
Undecided or no answer.....	24½
Election of President:	
Favor direct election.....	75
Favor present electoral college.....	14
Favor electoral college by district.....	7
Undecided or no answer.....	4
Controlling campus disorders:	
Deny funds to students involved.....	67
Leave to administrators, etc.....	20
Deny funds to colleges disrupted.....	8
Undecided or no answer.....	5
Lowering vote to 18 years:	
Opposed.....	52
Favor.....	44
Undecided or no answer.....	4
Farm program:	
Add limitations on single farm support.....	39
Do away with all farm support.....	22
Continue present program.....	18
Undecided or no answer.....	21
Cigarette advertising:	
Favor warnings but allow advertising.....	62
Favor warnings and forbid advertising.....	29
Undecided and no answer.....	9
Three top priorities after war:	
Crime control.....	66
Tax cut.....	59
Pollution control.....	53
Education.....	36
Low income housing.....	28
Defense.....	16
Urban transportation.....	8
Space exploration.....	8
Undecided or no answer.....	1

¹ Less than 1 percent.

MAINE'S TIME TO FIGHT FOR TRADE ZONE IS NOW

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, 15 months ago the State of Maine made an application for a foreign trade zone. The approval of this zone would open up new industry for Maine. The oil refinery to be constructed after the zone has been established would provide substantially lower prices on heating fuel and gasoline for all of New England. The importance of the trade zone is reflected in the following article which appeared in the October 5 issue of the Maine Sunday Telegram. I call the article to the attention of my colleagues in the House.

MAINE'S TIME TO FIGHT FOR TRADE ZONE IS NOW

If Maine wants to get the Foreign Trade Zone, which Maine merits and long ago applied for, now is the critical time for Maine citizens to make their voices heard clear and loud in the White House and the Commerce Department.

Unless Maine's million citizens speak up now to insist upon getting what is rightfully theirs, Maine may get shafted while our back is turned; and we may wake up eight weeks hence to find, too late, that the Oil Lobby has killed Maine's claim to a Foreign Trade Zone and thereby has done lasting damage and injustice to Maine people.

It has been months since the words "Foreign Trade Zone" have been up in the headlines of Maine newspapers and radio and television news.

Remember how these words were a burning issue last year, when heated hearings on the subject were held in Washington and Portland? When a battle royal was raging between Big Oil and little Maine? When the hassle involved Lyndon Johnson's White House, Secretary of Interior Stuart Udall, and Secretary of Commerce C. R. Smith?

When Maine served a "writ of mandamus" upon Secretary Smith, requiring him to carry out the statutory duties of his cabinet office, and render a decision? Remember how the Big Oil lobby then, with its influential friends in and out of Congress, got the vital question of a foreign trade zone for Maine postponed and postponed until finally it was a hot potato handed over to the new Nixon Administration?

Since then, Maine has been lulled sweetly to sleep over this once-burning, still vital, issue.

But the Washington-based opponents to Maine's still-pending application for a deserved foreign trade zone have been busy at work backstage.

Those opponents to this ingredient in Maine's commercial health are today praying that Maine citizens will go on snoozing for a couple of months more. For if Maine rests quiescent, while they are actively lobbying around the White House and the Commerce Department, their chances of killing Maine's foreign trade zone application will get better, and Maine's chances of getting what is rightfully ours will get worse.

Hence the need now for Maine's citizens, and Maine state representatives and senators to speak up and voice their concern, through letters to the White House and the Commerce Department.

Reason for prompt action now is that during November President Nixon's cabinet-level report on the United States oil import policy will be issued. And Nixon's Secretary of Commerce, Maurice Stans, has said he will issue his decision upon Maine's application for a foreign trade zone only after that report is completed. In itself, this shows that the question of oil import quotas is wrongfully dictating a decision on Maine's application for a foreign Trade Zone.

Certainly, the background to Maine's application for a foreign trade zone in the Portland area and a sub zone in Machiasport, is related to the oil import and quota policy, but is not by any means umbilically tied to it.

Oil import policy decisions are lodged with the President. They are a matter for Executive decision.

But the law and the regulations governing foreign trade zones are a matter of statute, passed by the Congress.

The statute and its surrounding regulations spell out precisely the conditions under which an application for a foreign trade zone shall be granted.

Maine's application, submitted 15 months

ago, has met all the requirements. But it has not been granted.

Maine's application was studied harder and longer at more hearings than any previous application by any other state.

After months of hearings and testimony, the Foreign Trade Board of Alternates decided last November, almost one year ago, that Maine met all the statutory requirements. The way was clear, a favorable decision for Maine was imminent. But an oil slick got in the way.

In December, Secretary of Commerce C. R. Smith, a man with close links to the oil industry, chose to break with precedent. He announced he would not act upon the recommendations of the Board.

The State of Maine, in response, broke precedent. Maine slapped a writ of mandamus upon the Secretary of Commerce. This writ is a court order which can enforce a public officer to perform the public duties assigned to him by law. By law, Smith was charged with acting upon Foreign Trade Zone applications.

But Smith and the Johnson administration were out of office before the writ had to be answered. So they handed the hot potato to the incoming Nixon Administration. The decision now was up to the new Secretary of Commerce, Maurice Stans.

What then?

This past February, a month after taking office, Stans made it known that he would decide in a matter of days upon Maine's application. His announcement was hailed in Maine, because it implied that, in keeping with established procedure, the new Secretary would accept the favorable findings, already on record, made by the Board which had studied Maine's application. Maine, it seemed, was about to get its merited Foreign Trade Zone.

Then, suddenly, in an off the cuff interview with a foreign correspondent, Stans said he would not make his promised decision upon Maine's long standing, much studied application.

Instead, Stans revealed, he would wait until a newly appointed Cabinet-level group appointed by Nixon, had completed an overall review of American oil import and quota policies.

This is the review due for completion in November.

Certainly its conclusions will likely affect the prospects of Occidental Petroleum establishing a refinery at Machiasport. But Occidental could retaylor its plans, and, furthermore, other oil companies are standing in line for Machiasport.

But Machiasport is included in Maine's application only as a sub zone. The principal foreign trade zone is for the Portland area.

And, whatever decisions in regard to oil imports which the Executive branch makes, the fact remains that Maine's application for a foreign trade zone fulfills all the requirements set down in the statute passed by Congress. And therefore should be granted.

This application, so long kicked around in Washington due to opposition from Big Oil interests, should be granted on its own merits, according to existing law.

Maine people's economic future is at stake here. The commercial health of Maine is at stake here. Future jobs for Maine youngsters, which a foreign trade zone will generate, are at stake here. Maine has met the legal requirements for getting a foreign trade zone in the state. Under laws, we deserve to get it.

The rights and well being of Maine citizens, under the law of the land, must not be further negated nor made a catspaw to the political pressure exerted in Washington by a single industry.

Now therefore is the moment for Maine citizens to safeguard their rights, and their children's economic future, by writing to the White House and the Commerce Department

and urging that Maine be promptly issued its merited license for establishing a foreign trade zone in Maine.

IS A RECESSION INEVITABLE?

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Labor has announced that the unemployment rate for the month of September jumped to 4 percent, highest in over 2 years. Coming on the heels of August's increase to 3.6 percent, these seemingly small figures actually translate to more than a quarter of a million jobs gone in just 1 month and about 600,000 since the first of the year.

Reports are that the administration has welcomed the news as strong evidence that its anti-inflation campaign is "taking hold." The administration's happiness, based on the old rule of thumb that a rise in unemployment also means a decline in inflation, ignores one important fact—inflation is continuing to rise right along with unemployment.

There is an uneasy awareness among the American people, Mr. Speaker, that thus far attempts by President Nixon to "seed the eye of the inflationary hurricane," as some have put it, have proven unsuccessful. A Harris poll published last month showed that the man on the street voted 61 to 25 that the President has done a "bad job controlling inflation."

As we all know, the administration's strategy to bring us down safely from the summit of high prices consists primarily of tightening up the Nation's money belt. The "soft landing" envisioned by the President's economic advisers would squeeze only the "excesses" out of our overheated economy, or, as the administration has been quoted so often, "disinflation the economy without deflating it."

But for some reason the inflationary balloon continues to drift steadily upward. In fact, since President Nixon's inauguration the consumer price index has been rising at a rate of 7 percent, nearly twice the rate for last year.

In 10 months interest rates have skyrocketed a staggering 26 percent; the prime interest rate has been increased five times from 6 to 8½ percent, highest in more than 100 years. Medical costs, especially for our senior citizens, are up as much as 44 percent over a year ago.

History has taught us that rampant inflation such as that we are experiencing now leads to recession—the classic "boom-bust" cycle.

If this is allowed to continue, there will be an even greater loss of jobs. The noted economist Milton Friedman, a close Nixon adviser during the presidential campaign, told Senator PROXMIRE's Subcommittee on Economy in Government that he fears our Nation is facing "an unnecessarily severe recession next year," with unemployment ranging above 7 percent.

In my own State of Washington that

specter is already nearing reality. You may have read that the Boeing Co., long the economic backbone of the Puget Sound region, has laid off some 11,000 workers so far this year and plans to cut back at least an additional 1,000 jobs per month well into 1970. And, as I commented before this body 2 weeks ago, several homebuilders in the congressional district which I represent already have been forced to lay off employees because of the shortage of mortgage money.

Although regional unemployment statistics for September are not yet available, August's figures showed unemployment in the Seattle metropolitan area among the highest in the Nation: at 4.5 percent, a full percentage point above the national average at that time.

Last December, national unemployment was down to 3.3 percent, lowest since 1953. During the 8 Kennedy-Johnson years literally millions of Americans worked their way out of poverty. They were willing to work and 8 years of unprecedented economic prosperity provided the jobs. Last year alone, some 2 million people were removed from the official Federal poverty rolls.

These are the people—the poor, the newly employed, the unskilled—who are first and hardest hit by a recession. They are the first to go out the door when an employer must cut down his work force.

To put them out of work again is not only to stop their contribution to the economy and society, it is to put them again in the role of "takers" who will have to be supported by the people who are employed.

To do so because an administration is either incapable of handling the problem or too stubborn to admit that it has failed and then go on to a real solution, is not only tragic; it could be dangerous.

With the summit of inflation already too high and the President willing to offer the working man as a sacrificial lamb to his faltering economic policy, an easy descent from inflation seems more and more uncertain and a major recession more and more likely.

There is still the time and the means, however, for the President to change his tactics and successfully fight inflation without destroying jobs in the process. Several Members of this House have urged the President to withdraw his opposition to pending legislation which would establish effective wage-price guideposts. In brief, these bills would give the President authority to announce acceptable wage-price increases following full consultation with management and labor. They also would allow him to focus the spotlight of public opinion on specific wage and price proposals which threaten national economic stability. In addition, the administration must now give serious consideration to wage and price controls. With inflation and unemployment both rising at rapid rates, wage and price controls may prove the only way to reflect the national interest in price stability.

Time is running out swiftly for the President in this war against a recession. More important, it is running out for thousands and perhaps millions of

American workers who stand to lose their jobs if he persists in his failure to act.

NIXON SILENCE ON RHODESIA COSTLY

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, in the face of right wing pressure to recognize Rhodesia and to lift sanctions, I believe it is time to speak out against racism in our foreign policy. More exactly, I feel that we must seek to stem a reversal of American policy against racism in southern Africa. Americans of conscience, both black and white, urge that the U.S. Consulate in Rhodesia be withdrawn so that de facto recognition to a white, minority government is not extended by the United States. The attached article by Carl T. Rowan from the September 27, 1969, edition of the Evening Star thoroughly explains the current impasse. The article follows:

NIXON SILENCE ON RHODESIA COSTLY

(By Carl T. Rowan)

President Nixon went to the United Nations with a forlorn plea to the 126 nations represented there to pressure Hanoi into peaceful settlement of the Vietnam war.

Nixon will get no help, no sympathy, no consolation from most of these 126 nations. The reason is that, in the eyes of much of the world, whatever moral justification he once had in Vietnam is rapidly disappearing.

If the President wonders why, all he need do is look at White House policy—or lack of policy—where the racist, outlaw regime in Rhodesia is concerned.

There has been a not-so-subtle shift of attitude in the White House from the Johnson administration to the Nixon administration, with the latter showing a lot more sympathy for the tiny white minority that has seized Rhodesia under conditions where, barring ultimate violent overthrow, that minority will forever rule and suppress the black majority.

For two months, the White House has sat on a State Department recommendation that the United States pull its consulate out of Rhodesia, but the White House has declined to do so. Thus, the U.S. consul general, Paul O'Neill, recently returned to Salisbury, an act that the ruling regime called the best possible boost to the morale of the white minority.

A U.S. that pursues this kind of policy cannot possibly have good relations with black Africa. So whatever little help the African countries might give in extricating the U.S. from a grievous dilemma in Asia is not going to be forthcoming.

A country that ignores basic principles of human worth and decency, that overlooks a brazen trampling of the rights of self-determination in Rhodesia, will never be convincing when it says it is in Vietnam only to guarantee to the South Vietnamese the right to decide their own destiny.

White Rhodesians are in the process of approving a new "constitution that will make that land an even more pernicious police state than it has been these last several years."

That constitution will make it impossible for Rhodesia's 4,800,000 Africans ever to wrest power legally from the 228,000 whites.

In theory, Africans might someday achieve "parity"—that is, an equal number of seats in parliament. But there is a neat little

stipulation that this can occur only after Africans pay an equal share of income taxes.

The hooker here is that Africans now pay only about one percent of the taxes. One reason is that while the average wage for a European is about \$4,000, it is only \$400 for an African.

Not in a millenium will Africans reach the economic level where they can meet the tax qualification. Nevertheless, the Ian Smith regime has raised other qualifications for voters, an act designed to exclude thousands of blacks from elections.

Finally, the whites have put in another hooker providing that even after "parity," half the black seats in parliament would be named by the chiefs, who are mostly Uncle Tom servants of the whites, and thus under effective control of the minority regime.

Another outrage is the way the Smith regime has divided up the land. It has set aside 45 million acres for 4,800,000 Africans and 45 million acres for 228,000 whites.

The regime is now in the process of chasing Africans out of "islands" within the areas reserved for whites. The courts ruled that the Africans had the right to remain, but parliament got around this simply by passing a new law.

The new constitution extends to the government the right to censor the press and other publications, a right already exercised on radio and TV. Enshrined in the new constitution is the right of "preventive detention," without bail or speedy trial, of anyone arrested on charges of trying to overthrow the white dictatorship.

This is the kind of regime the White House can't make up its mind about—despite the existence of a United Nations resolution calling upon member states to withdraw their consulates.

The rationale coming out of the White House is that there are 1,100 Americans in Rhodesia, about 850 of whom are missionaries, and that we need a consulate to look after their interests.

We didn't even have a consulate in Southern Rhodesia until 1949 and the American missionaries there prior to that time managed to get along fairly well.

The other argument is that we need eyes and ears in Rhodesia to send back reports on what is going on in the southern end of Africa. We could post observers 10,000 miles away and the odor wafting out of Rhodesia would make it clear what is going on.

Someone in the White House apparently scoffs at the notion that morality—racial, social, or otherwise—ought to be a big ingredient in foreign policy. They assume that you go with power, and obviously the whites in Rhodesia have the power. They say you go with strength, and obviously the economic interests who want U.S. relations with Rhodesia to continue have more strength in Washington than do the weak, divided African countries that look with so much anger and disquiet on what is happening in the southern end of their continent.

But it was precisely this disdain for the moral elements in foreign policy, it was this notion that might ultimately makes right, that got the United States in the Vietnam dilemma that becomes a tighter, stronger web around Nixon every week.

ABDICATION OF RESPONSIBILITY

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, various views have been expressed on the stands being taken by different Members of

Congress with respect to the Vietnam moratorium scheduled for October 15. The Evening Sun—a prominent daily newspaper in Hanover, Pa., of my congressional district—carried an editorial on this subject in its issue of October 6. Because of the timely nature of this editorial, I insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ABDICATION OF RESPONSIBILITY

The two dozen members of Congress who are planning to ally themselves with students who are to stage an Oct. 15 boycott of classes in protest of the Vietnam War are not exercising the kind of judgment expected from men of their office and influence.

First there is the question of the desirability of supporting the principle of boycotting.

Those Americans who are tired of paying taxes, taking a tip from the 12 senators and 12 representatives who obviously believe a boycott an effective and legal weapon, may decide to boycott the paying of taxes. Then how will the government function?

Just how far are the federal lawmakers willing to go in their support of boycotting?

The second consideration involved here is the stamp of approval by some members of Congress on an endeavor that may turn into a prolonged period of chaos in partnership with violence.

The fact that 24 duly elected members of the U.S. Congress are planning to lend support to the campaign is an encouragement for other action on the part of youthful organizers that may well shock the two dozen congressional dissenters.

We believe in the principle of dissent. We also believe it can be carried out by our government leaders in a responsible manner.

Just as firmly as we support the principles of free speech and dissent we support the functioning of a responsive government through normal Constitutional processes.

We will not endorse government action that is dictated from behind street barricades nor members of Congress who abdicate responsibility.

ANOTHER OUTRAGE BY THE HOODLUM LEFT

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House is devoted to the preservation of individual liberty, but every Member is also well aware that absolute individual liberty results in anarchy. Events in the last few days in my own city of Chicago have proven once again that violent "dissent" is not genuine dissent at all, but a deliberate attempt, not to change, but to destroy. The feelings of a majority of the people of this country are expressed, I think, in the editorial which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on Monday, October 13, and I include it in the RECORD:

ANOTHER OUTRAGE BY THE HOODLUM LEFT

Richard J. Elrod, assistant corporation counsel of the city of Chicago, lies in the hospital paralyzed from the neck down after being hit by a young revolutionary mobster during another outbreak of violence in the Loop Saturday. This is the latest outrage during a carnival of mindless terror organized by far-out elements of Students for a Democratic Society.

Arrested as Mr. Elrod's assailant is a 22-year-old student at Columbia university,

which a year ago was converted into a pilot plant for revolutionary disruption. He was being held in \$100,000 bail on a charge of attempted murder. The prisoner, Brian Flanagan, a superior student from a well-to-do Long Island family, has been alienated from his widowed mother since the start of the current school term.

His parent, Mrs. Elise Flanagan, told the Tribune she did not comprehend his conversion into a revolutionist and apostle of violent action. She said of her son and his mobster political associates: "I don't blame the Chicago police. They should knock the head off every one of them. I don't understand these kids at all. The world I knew is much different from the one they live in now. I just don't understand."

This mother's bafflement is shared by most Chicagoans who have seen or read of the senseless assaults on police and citizens and the vandalism which inflicted thousands of dollars in property damage on the city in organized forays during four days of last week. This criminal activity was supposed to be in support of eight revolutionary leaders on trial before Judge Julius J. Hoffman in federal District court on charges of crossing state lines to incite a riot in committing illegal acts toward that end.

The terror in the streets is hardly conducive to building sympathy for the defendants and the revolutionary movement. The hoodlum fringe took to the streets armed with chains, pipes, bludgeons, and other lethal weapons. Scores of police and civilians were injured in hand-to-hand combat; and Mr. Elrod, who had distinguished himself by his patience and restraint in trying to contain the violence, may be permanently incapacitated. Broken windows and damaged automobiles marked the course of these insane efforts to organize a putsch.

It seems to us that the time has arrived for the law-abiding community to invoke the laws of criminal syndicalism or whatever other legal protections the law affords against the New Barbarians. These people are attempting to mount an all-out attack on society, and their tactics are patently criminal. It sickens us to hear them described as "kids" who are merely expressing "dissent" and to hear bleeding hearts say they should be treated with all the respect given a pet snake.

Their behavior puts into perspective the disorders last year at the Democratic national convention, for which the eight defendants are on trial in federal court. The riots at that time provided a field day for persons eager to tear down the reputation of Chicago and its government and police. Anybody who still clings to the myth that these were expressions of legitimate protest deserves a session on the analyst's couch.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was a profound shock to learn of the unexpected passing of the Honorable Joseph Y. Resnick who represented New York's 28th Congressional District in the 89th and 90th Congresses. It is always a shock when one loses a colleague, or former colleague, but much more so when he is truly in the prime of life. Such a man was Joe Resnick who, at 45, was a vital leader of the community whose drive and determina-

tion will be sorely missed. In the 4 years he served here Joe Resnick left his mark, as he did in the business world before coming here to the House of Representatives. He was a hard working and hard fighting man who knew no sacred cows; he never hesitated to espouse a cause he felt right, popular or unpopular. He was indeed a man of integrity and courage. His talents were well recognized here and his friends were many.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in saluting a gallant man and I extend to his wife Ruth, his children, his brothers and sisters my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

INDIANA LABOR LEADER VISITS BEHIND IRON CURTAIN

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Joe Jenkeske of Hammond, Ind., and one of Indiana's leaders of organized labor, visited his parents' native Lithuania recently and in an interview with the Hammond, Ind., Times records some interesting comments and factual experiences which he had during his visit to Lithuania and the Soviet Union. The interview follows:

JENESKE: IRON CURTAIN PEOPLE LACK BASIC NEEDS

EAST CHICAGO.—Joe Jenkeske's found a new way to lose weight.

Jeneske dropped 16 pounds in 15 days on a visit behind the Iron Curtain.

Jeneske's parents were born in Lithuania. His dad died when Joe was very young. The only father he ever knew was Adolph Wetkus, 75, of 3724 Deodar St.

When Jeneske and Wetkus landed in Vilnius, the capital of Lithuania, it was the first time the older man had stepped on his native soil in 55 years. For Jeneske, it was a first-ever visit.

It was a gruelling trip.

Jeneske has been a steelworker most of his life. Yet he shunned official labor contact during his visit which included Moscow and Riga, Latvia, in addition to Vilnius.

"I wanted to get as real a look at the country and people as I could," Jeneske says. "I wanted a true reflection."

Jeneske and his step-father took the guided tours in the Iron Curtain cities but they got closer to the truth through visits with about 50 relatives.

"I asked them how things were," Jeneske says, "and I got the same answer usually: 'They're better than they were.'"

In an attempt at self-analysis on the visit, Jeneske would cite two dominant feelings:

1. The Lithuanian, Latvian and Russian families are closer-knit than those in America; the people are healthier and less spoiled.

2. The people behind the Iron Curtain do not have the basic necessities which Americans take for granted; foodstuffs are bought daily because of no refrigeration; there is little clothing variety.

"I wouldn't want to live here under those conditions," Jeneske says. "And they have no freedom of expression. They all want to listen to the Voice of America."

"But they seem happy. Man is adaptable," Jeneske made these other observations about the visit:

Tourists are restricted in their movements. The language barrier in Russia is terrific; almost nobody speaks English.

Most Russian churches have been con-

verted into museums; Roman Catholicism is practiced in Lithuania.

Goods in what Russian officials claim to be the world's largest department store—Gooms in Moscow—were depleted in a 2½-hour buyer's rush.

Most consumer items are more expensive than in the United States.

Cars are at a premium; new car buyers must wait often several years for delivery.

Traffic laws are more strict than in the U.S.; fines are ordered for dented fenders which go unrepaired, missing accessories such as hubcaps and for dirty vehicles.

Moscow's subway is modern, elaborate and efficient.

Most building construction is of prefabricated cement; there is little steel usage in buildings.

Sanitary conditions are relatively good.

Drinking water is excellent.

The diet includes vegetables, soups, fish and bread; meats do not compare with those to which Americans are accustomed.

It's not uncommon to have warm beer with breakfast.

Mineral water, sold in vending machines which utilize a "common" drinking cup, is the equivalent of American soft drinks.

Coffee is most bad; milk is available if one seeks it.

Russian shoes, with the exception of military footwear, are among the world's worst; nylon and rayon is heavily used in clothing materials; cotton is seldom used.

Television sets are common; there is no air conditioning.

Contemporary Western clothing (mini skirts, etc.) is common in Lithuania.

Russians are generally better versed in matters such as space shots.

Tavern patrons often stand in line waiting for a seat.

Tourist hotels are adequate.

No tipping is allowed; Kennedy half-dollars are highly treasured.

One of the mementos Jeneske has from the trip is a telegram sent from Moscow to the Calumet Region. It took 14 days to arrive. Jeneske beat it home.

SUBCOMMITTEE PRAISED FOR MIRV REPORT

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week a 10-page subcommittee report was issued which deserves the close attention of the Congress, the administration, and the American people. The report is entitled, "Diplomatic and Strategic Impact of Multiple Warhead Missiles," and was prepared by the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Development, chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

The report is the outgrowth of hearings held on various resolutions relating to a proposed mutual moratorium with the Soviet Union on the flight testing of multiple warhead missiles. The subcommittee heard 15 witnesses including representatives from the Congress, the administration, and the scientific and academic communities. These hearings are published in a 302-page volume entitled, "Diplomatic and Strategic Impact of Multiple Warhead Missiles."

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the

subcommittee and its distinguished chairman on the outstanding service it has rendered by both holding these hearings and by presenting this Congress with such a well-balanced and penetrating report. I think the widespread congressional support for these resolutions—113 cosponsors—coupled with the work of this subcommittee, has helped to focus the attention of the administration and the public on the crucial issues posed by MIRV. Although the subcommittee has recommended against sending a resolution to the House floor, it has recognized the usefulness of this type of expression. In the words of the subcommittee report:

We reaffirm the right and necessity of expressions from the legislative branch—House as well as Senate—on issues affecting America's security and strategic posture. Through the resolutions on a MIRV moratorium and the hearings which they occasioned, officials of the executive branch have been apprised of the thoughtful views and deep concerns about MIRV held by a substantial number of Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the conclusions drawn by the subcommittee in its report substantiate the fears and concern expressed by those of us who offered the moratorium resolutions. The subcommittee states that MIRV may increase the temptation for a preemptive first strike and therefore poses a substantial threat to the present nuclear balance; that the deployment of MIRV by either the United States or Russia will jeopardize the chances for a meaningful arms control agreement and could touch off a costly escalation in the arms race; and that it is still possible to halt the deployment of MIRV by a mutual test moratorium.

The subcommittee has consequently urged the administration to give high priority to a MIRV freeze when the strategic arms talks begin. In the words of the subcommittee:

Because both sides have a stake in maintaining the nuclear balance, it is natural that they should enter into negotiations to discuss the control of technological advances in weaponry which might threaten the stability of the balance. That is, at least in part, the rationale behind the SALT talks. Because MIRV'ing by either or both sides threatens the balance, therefore, it deserves early consideration within the bilateral discussions.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Soviet Union is just as mindful of the dangers posed by MIRV and that it will soon announce its decision to accept President Nixon's proposal to begin arms talks. Time is of the essence on the MIRV issue since, but next summer, we may have passed the point of no return and thereby foreclosed the possibility of a meaningful agreement to halt the deployment of this dangerous new member of the nuclear arms family.

POLLUTION KILLING OUR FISH

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, Associated Press reports indicate millions of fish are

CXV—1904—Part 22

being needlessly killed in our national waters by the incessant march of pollutants. It is a tragic waste of natural resources to allow this continuing fish loss from elements being discharged into our waters that need not be.

Every reasonable effort must be made to check water pollution throughout the Nation. The Congress has recently tripled the budget requests for the Department of the Interior's Water Pollution Agency. Next year it is hoped we can do even better.

Let us resolve to bury our wastes or burn our wastes or convert them to fertilizer where possible but to stop discharging them into our rivers and lakes. It is a continuing obligation of the Federal Government to give financial aid to the clean waters program.

Associated Press item follows:

15 MILLION FISH HELD 1968 POLLUTION TOLL

More than 15 million fish were killed by water pollution last year, "a macabre reminder that our rivers, lakes and streams are being poisoned by many highly toxic and dangerous substances," the Interior Department said today.

The number of dead fish, set at 15,236,000 on the basis of reports from 42 states, is up 31 percent from 1967. It is the highest since 1964 when municipal sewage, industrial wastes and other pollutants killed 18,387,000 fish.

HONORS AND AWARDS CONFERRED ON GENERAL LEWIS B. HERSHEY

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, a newspaper that pompously boasts it carries "All the News That's Fit to Print" has rather strange ideas at times over what is and is not "fit." I refer today, in particular, to an article in the New York Times of Saturday, October 11, 1969, about General Hershey; the phrases in question are as follows:

Along the way he has collected many medals, among them the Distinguished Service Medal, conferred on him by President Truman for administrative excellence during World War II and the Magnolia Cross of the State of Mississippi.

In 1964, Governor George C. Wallace of Alabama added an Oak Leaf Cluster to the general's Distinguished Service Medal from that state.

This is all there is to say about General Hershey's admitted "many medals." This is all that is "fit to print?" The implications are pretty clear in this, but let us set the record straight. Following is a list of the General's decorations and awards that have come to him over the years:

Distinguished Service Medal, Army.
Distinguished Service Medal, Navy.
American Legion Distinguished Service Medal.

Distinguished Service Medal, National Guard Association, U.S.

Distinguished and Meritorious Service Certificate, Regular Veterans Association, U.S.

Citation for 1953 from HAM-PARNES, Post 151, Jewish War Veterans.

Distinguished Service Award, Military Chaplains Association, U.S.

Special Award, Freedoms Foundation.

Medal of Merit, North Dakota.

Medal and Citation, State of Louisiana.

Magnolia Cross, State of Mississippi.

Distinguished Service Medal and Oak Leaf, State of Alabama.

Minuteman of 1964, Reserve Officers Association.

Boy Scouts of America, Silver Beaver, Silver Antelope, Silver Buffalo.

Association of United States Army President's Gold Medal for Outstanding Service to the United States Army.

Distinguished Service Medal of Indiana.

Bernard Baruch Award, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Distinguished Service Award, Military Order of World Wars.

Golden Good City Medal, Sons of American Revolution, Washington, D.C. Chapter.

Caleb Smith, Masonic Award, State of Indiana.

Award, National Rifle Association.

Golden Pin, Northeastern Lodge 210, Freemont, Indiana.

General Benedict Crowell Gold Medal, American Ordinance Association, Cleveland, Ohio.

Silver Helmet Defense Award, AMVETS, 1968 "Service to Mankind Award."

Sertoma Club of Washington, Loyalty Day Award, Washington, D.C., Department of Veterans of Foreign Wars.

CONGRESSMAN GILBERT OPPOSES CUT IN MODEL CITIES BUDGET

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, as Representative of a district that counted heavily on a model cities project to get a new start, I protest vehemently the administration's decision to cut 42 percent from the budget of this hopeful program.

I am as determined to fight inflation as any Member of this body, Mr. Speaker, but I am appalled at the shortsightedness of a decision which reduces expenditures precisely where they are most desperately needed, in our decaying inner cities.

This decision stands in particular contrast to the President's announcement that he would subsidize research on the supersonic transport, a project of dubious social value which will run into the hundreds of millions of dollars.

The model cities program was one of the finest to emerge from the social thinking of recent years, and the dedication of recent administrations to making our cities livable again. To strangle it now represents a betrayal, in my view, of the promise extended to urban America.

My own district in the Bronx is the site of one of the first pilot model cities projects. We have not yet received the official figures on how much expenditures must be cut back. But when one realizes that the strength of model cities idea was to be its attention to the totality of the problems in a given urban area, then a 42 percent cutback can only mean disaster.

POINT REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I call to the attention of my colleagues the following series of articles on Point Reyes National Seashore by Leo Rennert of the Sacramento Bee.

The articles are a precise and reliable accounting of the status of the Point Reyes project by an able and skilled journalist. Mr. Rennert is to be commended for his keen sense of integrity and for his strict adherence to the high principles of journalism.

Conservationists throughout the country will agree that they are fortunate to have a man with his great insight and ability reporting not only on conservation matters but also on the entire Washington scene. The articles follow:

POINT REYES SUPPORTERS PLACE FATE ON SHOULDERS OF PRESIDENT, MURPHY
(By Leo Rennert)

WASHINGTON.—Congressional and conservationist supporters of the Point Reyes National Seashore, which faces imminent death without further infusion of federal funds, have concluded its fate now rests squarely with two men—President Nixon and Sen. George Murphy, R-Calif.

So far, the White House has not lifted a finger to help complete a federal takeover of the scenic peninsula north of San Francisco in the face of strong threats posed by land speculators and subdivision builders.

While Murphy has agreed to cosponsor legislation to permit the National Park Service to acquire sufficient holdings and has promised to intercede with Nixon to obtain the necessary cash, he has yet to display an all-out sustained interest.

RETAIN HOPE

But conservationists believe there still is a possibility the logjam will be broken in time.

They are looking forward with particular interest to Wednesday's visit by the President to the Redwood National Park for clues as to whether Nixon is inclined to pick up the conservationist banner of his predecessor.

The chief executive and Mrs. Nixon will be accompanied by former President Lyndon B. Johnson and Mrs. Johnson for the dedication of the Lady Bird Johnson Grove in the new park.

IN AWKWARD SPOT?

Conservationists think the event—which will receive extensive nationwide publicity—may put Nixon in the awkward position of calling attention to a magnificent achievement bearing the LBJ brand.

Unless, of course, this very contrast prods the White House to get moving on Point Reyes and other national parks across the country which still are on the drawing boards or barely under way.

Congress authorized a 53,850-acre national seashore at Point Reyes in 1962 and provided \$14 million for land acquisition.

At the time, it was thought much of the land would remain in private ownership with provisions for compatible uses, such as farming or dairying.

CHANGE PICTURE

But pressures exerted by speculators and subdividers soon changed that pastoral picture and forced the National Park Service to revise its land purchase and scenic easement plans.

In 1966 Congress boosted the authorization ceiling to \$19 million, a level which since has remained unchanged.

The real estate situation, however, did not remain static. With the funds provided by Congress, the government was able to acquire only 19,453 acres in scattered parcels—less than 40 per cent of the seashore.

To complete the job and make the seashore a manageable unit would take another \$30 to \$40 million.

Faced with rising costs at Point Reyes and other proposed sites for national parks, Congress last year voted to double the annual income of the land and water conservation fund from \$100 to \$200 million for a five-year period by tapping offshore oil receipts.

The special fund, established in 1965, finances federal park acquisitions as well as grants to state and local agencies to help them develop outdoor recreation projects.

Former Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, R-Calif., a prime mover in gaining approval of the legislation, predicted it would guarantee completion of Point Reyes and assure orderly expansion of the national park system.

Bolstered by these developments, Rep. Jeffery Cohelan, D-Berkeley, the leading conservationist in California's House delegation, introduced a bill at the start of the 91st Congress to raise the payment ceiling for Point Reyes from \$19 to \$57 million.

OVER HALF JOIN

More than half the members of the state's congressional delegation, including Sens. Murphy and Alan Cranston, joined as cosponsors.

But when the House Interior Committee opened hearings May 13, the roof fell in.

George Hartzog Jr., director of the park service, said the Interior Department would support a more modest \$47 million plan.

But he was unable to assure the committee this was in fact the administration's position and had full White House support.

NEED LETTER

Under Washington rules such assurance can be provided only by a letter from the Budget Bureau, which acts as legislative spokesman for the President.

The Interior Department's Point Reyes report carried a notation the Budget Bureau would express "its concern with the implication" of the Point Reyes bill in another letter to the committee.

With the White House remaining aloof, the committee chairman, Wayne N. Aspinall, D-Colo., exploded in anger. He told Hartzog the Interior Department's position was "meaningless" without White House back-up.

"DOES NOT SPEAK WELL"

"To have a report with qualifications come before us on a project as important as this, 115 days after the administration has taken over, just does not speak well," he declared.

Hartzog immediately got on the telephone and called Phillip S. Hughes, the No. 2 man in the Budget Bureau.

When he returned, he assured Aspinall there would be no delay in spelling out the administration's views.

"I think you are going to get it expeditiously," he told Aspinall. "I talked to Mr. Hughes and the letter is now being drafted. They are at work on it."

MORE TIME PASSES

As of Friday, another 101 days had passed. And Aspinall's office still had not received a signal from the White House.

To make matters worse, the President refused to include the entire \$200 million available in the special conservation fund when he submitted his budget to Congress.

Nixon recommended that local, state and federal development of outdoor projects be limited to \$124 million in 1969-70—although the remaining \$76 million was clearly available in the special fund and cannot be used for any other purpose.

Aspinall threw up his arms. Without assurance of adequate financing, he said, there was no sense in Congress' approving more park authorization bills, including completion of Point Reyes.

MAKES IT CLEAR

On July 22, during House debate on the budget bill for the Interior Department, the Appropriations Committee made it clear it was prepared to provide additional money for Point Reyes and other projects once the administration lifted its freeze.

"I am going to be very frank and say that we would be happy to appropriate the full \$200 million if we receive proper guidelines on how and where it is to be expended in a practical manner," said Rep. Julia Butler Hansen, D-Wash., chairman of the Interior appropriations subcommittee.

"With regard to Point Reyes, when the authorization is approved for additional expenditure, additional appropriations will undoubtedly follow."

ADMINISTRATION PROBLEM

This tossed the ball directly into the administration's court. Would it be prepared to change its position and agree to spend the full \$200 million in the special conservation fund?

A Budget Bureau spokesman said Congress will receive an answer next week.

In the meantime, conservationists have become increasingly restive.

"The trail leads right to the White House," said a Sierra Club official. "They just aren't showing any leadership on natural resources."

EQUALLY DISAPPOINTED

The Sierra Club has been equally disappointed by Murphy's attitude. It assumed that since he is up for re-election next year, he would want to battle openly for a major conservation project such as Point Reyes.

Club officials invited him to join a planned "walk-in" at the Lake Ranch on the peninsula to dramatize the seashore crisis.

The ranch, still in private hands, is the key link to tie together several parcels acquired by the Park Service. Its owner has been waiting for Uncle Sam to buy him out. But faced with rising property taxes, he is on the verge of turning it over to developers. The property is valued at about \$6 million.

PLANNED EVENT

The Sierra Club had planned a picnic lunch to draw attention to the importance of the ranch and the urgency of a quick move by the federal government.

But Murphy so far as turned a cold shoulder to the invitation. Some club officials speculate he may have inside information that the White House will turn thumbs down on more money for Point Reyes and does not want to be associated with a lost cause.

On the other hand, some conservationists still are hopeful that Murphy will respond favorably if he becomes convinced that a fight for Point Reyes only can improve his re-election chances in 1970.

MORE INFLUENCE

As California's senior senator and a veteran GOP campaigner, Murphy is considered to have more influence at the White House than any other member of the state's congressional delegation.

"It really boils down to just how many political chips he's willing to cash in with Nixon," said one Capitol Hill source.

In a lesser sense, the outcome of the battle to save Point Reyes also may hinge on how much influence can be exerted at the White House by two other men—Interior Secretary Walter Hickel and California Gov. Ronald Reagan.

On June 22, Hickel instructed the Park Service in a long memorandum to put new emphasis on bringing "parks to people." The secretary said special priority should

be given to development of parks close to major cities.

EXPANDED PROGRAM

Henceforth, he said, consideration should be given to "an expanded program of federal acquisition . . . of park and recreation lands in the large urban centers of our nation."

Point Reyes fits this criterion perfectly. It is 30 miles from San Francisco and less than two hours driving distance from a metropolitan area of 5 million. By the end of this century, the region's population is expected to reach 10 million.

The Park Service has described Point Reyes as a "combination of scenic, recreation and biologic interests which can be found nowhere else in the country near a large center of population."

Hickel, however, has been increasingly ignored by the White House—particularly when he pushes ideas which cost money.

HAS TAKEN OFFENSIVE

As for Reagan, he often has taken the offensive when the federal government has frozen special funds reserved for highway construction. Conservationists are hopeful he will take the same attitude in pushing the White House to order a thaw in its freeze of conservation money.

It is against this background that Nixon and Johnson will meet in the serene and inspiring setting of the Redwood Park on Wednesday.

Conservationists are hopeful the occasion may stimulate Nixon to set in motion his own program for expansion of national parks.

INCLUDES BOTH

The district of the host congressman Republican Rep. Don H. Clausen of Crescent City, includes both the Redwood Park and Point Reyes. Dedication of the Lady Bird Johnson Grove is expected to give Clausen an opportunity to put in a plug for Point Reyes.

Other prominent conservationists who have been invited to the ceremony may have the same idea.

MURPHY, CRANSTON URGE NIXON TO ACT QUICKLY ON POINT REYES

WASHINGTON.—California's two senators today appealed directly to President Richard M. Nixon for immediate action to save the Point Reyes National Seashore.

In separate letters to the President, Sens. George Murphy, R-Calif., and Alan Cranston, D-Calif., urged the White House to endorse legislation to raise the spending ceiling for land acquisition from \$19 to \$57 million.

Without quick infusion of additional funds, they warned, efforts to establish a natural preserve on the scenic peninsula north of San Francisco may be doomed.

Murphy suggested that Nixon meet with California officials to discuss ways of completing the project.

"The need cannot be questioned," he told Nixon. "Time is truly of essence. I urge you to act favorably and without delay."

"The efforts and hopes of all of us who recognize the importance of developing Point Reyes as a national seashore will have been in vain unless your administration acts promptly and favorably in this matter."

Budget Director Robert Mayo said yesterday the White House plans to announce its position this week. So far, the administration has balked at providing additional funds.

Since Congress authorized the project in 1962, less than half the acreage has been acquired by the National Park Service. Much of it is in scattered parcels which could not be turned into a manageable unit if owners of adjacent property decide to sell out to subdivision developers.

Murphy told Nixon there is an urgent need for the government to acquire the Lake

Ranch, which occupies a strategic position on the peninsula. Owners of the ranch have indicated they are anxious to sell but cannot wait much longer for the Park Service to come up with the necessary cash.

Cranston also emphasized that time has become a critical factor. Subdivision development, he said, represents an imminent threat to Point Reyes.

"As a native Californian," he told the President, "you must be well acquainted with the urgent need to set aside in its native state at least part of the magnificent sweep of our California coastline."

"The promontory, the beaches and the inland lakes and hills of Point Reyes have a unique status among our natural resources of beauty and grandeur."

BIPARTISAN BACKING

Cranston noted legislation to authorize more funds for Point Reyes has bipartisan support from the California delegation but is being held up on Capitol Hill as long as the administration shows no predisposition to spend additional money.

He rejected arguments now popular within the administration that expenditures for parks must be reduced as part of an overall effort to keep the budget in the black and stem inflation.

Cranston, a former state controller, said it is "ridiculous" to consider investment in parks on a par with expenditures for other purposes.

CAPITAL ASSET

"When the United States buys a park, it acquires a capital asset which not only does not depreciate over the years, but actually and inevitably appreciates."

"In no other area of government do we invest the taxpayers' money in something which continually increases in value."

"Thus to decrease our federal investment in park and recreation lands in obedience to budgetary demands is a false economy which simply makes no sense."

Cranston said completion of the seashore project also would be "far less inflationary than the speculative and inflated values which would accompany private development of Point Reyes."

Further delays he told Nixon, would invite commercial interests to shape one of the most scenic stretches of California's coastline.

"If our nation is to preserve for public use by present and future generations of Americans the best of our beaches and coastal scenes, we must act now—during your administration," he said.

NIXON VOWS ACTION ON SEASHORE PROJECTS

(By Leo Rennert)

WASHINGTON.—Breaking a long silence, the White House today promised to forward in a few days suggestions to Congress on ways to complete acquisition of the Point Reyes national seashore.

"We certainly are not going to drop Point Reyes," said budget Director Robert Mayo.

As President Nixon's chief legislative spokesman, Mayo is drafting a letter to the House Interior Committee to spell out the administration's position.

The letter, he said, also will tackle the problem of the Cape Cod national seashore—like Point Reyes a far-from-finished project plagued by rising land costs.

Establishment of a scenic preserve on Point Reyes, located 30 miles north of San Francisco, was authorized by Congress in 1962.

So far, however, less than half the acreage has been acquired by the National Park Service. Several key parcels still in private hands may be sold to subdivision developers if the government stops its purchase.

Rep. Don Clausen, R-Crescent City, whose

district encompasses Point Reyes, called May's remarks "very encouraging."

Along with many other members of the California congressional delegation, Clausen is sponsoring legislation to increase the expenditure ceiling for Point Reyes from \$19 to \$57 million.

The Interior Department is backing a more modest \$47 million plan. But so far its position has lacked White House backing.

Mayo indicated that the Budget Bureau, in presenting Nixon's official recommendations, may offer only some general proposals without specifying an exact dollar amount.

This would toss the problem back in the lap of Congress. So far, Chairman Wayne N. Aspinall, D-Colo., of the House Interior Committee has refused to act on Point Reyes legislation because of an absence of funds for the project in Nixon's budget.

Under legislation approved last year, income from offshore oil drilling and other sources is pumping \$200 million a year into a special conservation fund which can be tapped for acquisition of additional parks and seashores.

Nixon, however, has clamped a \$124 million ceiling on expenditures from the fund this year—with no earmarked allocations for Point Reyes.

Washington interest in Point Reyes rose after the President's recent visit to Redwood National Park which called attention to the Nixon administration's lack of a comprehensive conservation program.

Sen. George Murphy, R-Calif., discussed the problems confronting completion of the seashore with the President aboard Air Force One en route to the redwoods.

SENATOR BIBLE FORESEES NO EARLY ACTION IN UPPER HOUSE ON POINT REYES FUND

(By Leo Rennert)

WASHINGTON.—Sen. Alan Bible, D-Nev., who holds the key to national parks legislation in the upper house, today announced he has no plans to act on bills to complete the Point Reyes National Seashore.

Bible said he sees no prospect for any move by the Senate until the House acts.

House action appears equally remote in view of the refusal by Interior Committee Chairman Wayne N. Aspinall, D-Colo., to authorize additional funds for Point Reyes as long as the administration shows no inclination to spend the money.

The Bible-Aspinall position thus has the effect of tossing the Point Reyes controversy back into the lap of the White House, which only last week declined to assume any responsibility.

Caught in the stalemate are efforts by conservationists to boost the Point Reyes spending ceiling by \$38 million to save the seashore from strangulation by land developers.

Bible's attitude is considered highly significant since he heads the Senate interior subcommittee on national parks, which has jurisdiction over all parks and seashore authorization bills.

Sen. Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash., chairman of the parent interior committee, was described by an aide as being in full agreement with Bible's position to defer action pending developments in the House.

Bible also heads the Senate interior appropriations subcommittee, which would have to approve any followup funds once the authorized spending ceiling for Point Reyes were lifted.

Like Aspinall, Bible expressed strong criticism of the administration's decision to freeze funds earmarked for development of natural resources.

As long as the White House refuses to spend available money on parks and public works, he said, there is no point in having Congress add to the growing backlog of projects awaiting adequate funding.

"You can't force the administration to spend money," he observed.

MURPHY SEEKS DEMO AID ON POINT REYES (By Leo Rennert)

WASHINGTON.—Rebuffed by the White House, Sen. George Murphy, R-Calif., has turned to one of the Senate's most powerful Democrats for help in California's effort to save the Point Reyes National Seashore.

Murphy sent a letter to Interior Committee Chairman Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash., urging prompt approval of legislation which would increase the spending ceiling for land acquisition from \$19 to \$57 million.

An aide to Jackson, however, said he is pessimistic about chances for quick action in view of the administration's refusal to lend its full support.

Murphy dispatched his letter to Jackson yesterday afternoon—less than 24 hours after the White House announced it will not oppose his Point Reyes bill but views its spending implications with considerable concern.

VAIN APPEAL

The White House position was spelled out by Budget Director Robert Mayo a few hours after Murphy and Sen. Alan Cranston, D-Calif., appealed in vain to President Nixon for all-out backing to obtain sufficient funds to complete land acquisition.

Without additional outlays, conservationists have warned that key parcels still in private hands soon may be sold to subdividers.

The administration's cool response appeared to have created a stalemate between the executive and legislative branches—with each inviting the other to move first.

House Interior Committee Chairman Wayne N. Aspinall, D-Colo., said the Budget Bureau's response fails to meet his oft-expressed stipulation that congressional authorization of additional outlays hinges on administration willingness to spend the money.

"Somebody's going to have to get them off dead center," he remarked. "I'm not going to waste my time."

NOT COMPLETELY LOST

Point Reyes supporters said their cause is not entirely lost. They agreed that considerable pressure on both the White House and Congress will be required in the next few weeks to keep the project alive.

While Murphy told Jackson he is "extremely pleased" that the Budget Bureau did not express flat opposition to his legislation to raise the authorization ceiling, he conceded the bureau's stress on budgetary constraints.

"However," he added, "I am confident that the urgency for completion of land acquisition at Point Reyes is so great that once the authorization ceiling is increased, adequate funding will also be approved by the administration and Congress."

Murphy said congressional action would emphasize to landowners and would-be developers that the government is committed to completion of the seashore at the earliest possible date.

WHITE HOUSE WILL NOT BAR POINT REYES CASH

(By Leo Rennert)

WASHINGTON.—The White House has informed Congress it will not seek to block legislation to authorize additional funds to complete land acquisition for the Point Reyes National Seashore.

But it cautioned such action would result in "extensive curtailment" of land purchases already approved for other proposed parks.

The long-awaited decision disappointed conservationists who had hoped for more forceful support from the administration.

It fell far short of an outright endorsement of pending Point Reyes Bills as requested only yesterday by Sens. George Murphy,

R-Calif., and Alan Cranston, D-Calif., in last-minute appeals to President Nixon.

The White House position also turned out to be considerably less enthusiastic than the stance of the Interior Department, which earlier this year suggested a boost in the spending ceiling for Point Reyes from \$19 to \$47 million.

Reaction from the California congressional delegation, which has rallied behind legislation to lift the ceiling up to \$57 million, was mixed.

MURPHY IS PLEASED

Murphy said he was "highly pleased" that the administration decided not to oppose legislation to complete the seashore. He announced he would press for immediate congressional action to provide additional funding.

Rep. Don H. Clausen, R-Crescent City, whose district includes Point Reyes, said the White House announcement gives Congress an opportunity to consider various methods of completing the seven-year-old campaign to preserve the scenic peninsula north of San Francisco.

"I'm thankful for any little thing," he remarked.

Rep. Jeffery Cohelan, D-Berkeley, a leader in the fight to save Point Reyes, said Congress will have to assume a conservationist task shirked by the administration.

"We'll just have to do it by ourselves," he remarked. "It's a cop-out."

Rep. John E. Moss, D-3rd, Sacramento County, district said the administration has failed to develop priorities for urgent national park and seashore projects and thus finds itself unable to cope with the urgent problems confronting Point Reyes.

Since the seashore was authorized in 1962, the National Park Service has acquired less than half the acreage. Owners of other parcels have indicated they soon may sell out to subdivision developers.

Moss said the administration's position threatens preservation of important natural resources such as Point Reyes. He also warned that the ultimate acquisition cost "will be many times what it would be today."

Chairman Wayne N. Aspinall, D-Colo., of the House Interior Committee remains the key figure in any evaluation of prospects for further congressional action.

Earlier this year, he served notice his panel would not authorize additional funds for any project which the administration is not prepared to finance.

The White House position was spelled out in a four-page letter from Budget Director Robert Mayo to Aspinall.

Mayo said the Park Service, at the rate of present budgetary outlays, will not be able to complete acquisitions for another four years of park lands already approved by Congress—let alone additional properties such as the remaining parcels at Point Reyes which still await a green light on Capitol Hill.

The Budget Bureau, he said, has given a "great deal of thought" to development of priority criteria to determine which projects deserve urgent action.

Among key factors which would govern a final decision, he listed the "threat" of conflicting or adverse development and price escalation—both considered critical at Point Reyes.

But Mayo emphasized the Budget Bureau still is studying this approach and will need additional time to draft a priority rating system which can be applied in "sufficiently precise fashion."

Lloyd Tupling, Washington representative of the Sierra Club, termed the White House response a blow to the campaign to save Point Reyes.

"I don't think we've gained a thing," he remarked. "They're backing away from any commitment on new parks and recreation areas."

Tupling said conservationists now will have to exert greater pressure on the White House to lift its partial freeze on land acquisition money available in a special \$200 million-a-year conservation fund approved by Congress last year.

NIXON HOLDS THE KEY TO POINT REYES

The one man who can and should insure that the Point Reyes National Seashore will be developed to its full potential will be standing in the shadow of a monument to California conservation credited to his predecessor, former President Lyndon B. Johnson and his wife, Lady Bird.

The man is native son Richard Nixon, who as President has the real power to preserve Point Reyes and its splendid shoreline or let it fall into the hands of land speculators and subdividers, as is now threatened.

As the President and Mrs. Nixon attend the dedication of Lady Bird Johnson Grove in the Redwood National Park in Humboldt County the thought cannot help but rise in many minds as to the Nixon administration's commitment to preserving the state's natural beauties for present and future generations.

All evidence indicates a lack of a supporting recommendation from the White House's fiscal arm, the Budget Bureau, has held up necessary further appropriations by Congress for finishing the Point Reyes development.

The President need not give his affirmative nod and fund approval would be forthcoming. Delay in the matter already has proven costly as land values escalate.

What Nixon does in this matter could be the signal for keeping up the momentum for conservation of the country's natural beauty sanctuaries. What better monument to his commitment than completion of the Point Reyes National Seashore in Nixon's own state?

Another key figure also to be on hand for the dedication of Lady Bird Grove is California's senior senator, George Murphy, who is up for re-election next year.

Murphy should make every effort to persuade Nixon to give Point Reyes favorable consideration. It is a matter of far-reaching import to influential conservationist groups and Murphy has promised he will try.

It should be plain to the President himself, at any rate, that Point Reyes will be seen as a symbol of his concern for the natural beauties of America.

SOLON ASKS NIXON AID IN SAVING POINT REYES FROM SUBDIVIDERS

(By Leo Rennert)

WASHINGTON.—Rep. Jeffery Cohelan, D-Calif., today called on President Nixon to support efforts to save the Point Reyes National Seashore from strangulation by land developers.

"The question of saving Point Reyes from the very real and impending threat of bulldozing and subdividing is entirely dependent on the administration's willingness to support the expenditure of more funds for acquisition of park land," he said.

The Berkeley congressman is chief author of a house measure to authorize an additional \$38 million to permit the National Park Service to complete its seven-year-old attempt to create a national preserve on the scenic peninsula north of San Francisco.

The bill has picked up support from most members of the state's congressional delegation. But the House Interior Committee has refused to take action pending a White House decision that the money actually would be spent.

So far Congress has made available \$19 million. But more than half of Point Reyes still remains in private ownership. Key parcels, which have been in agricultural use, are planned for sale to developers if the government fails to act.

Cohelan, who played a leading role in last

year's successful uphill struggle to establish the Redwood National Park, said Congress coupled this action with legislation creating an annual \$200-million fund for federal, state and local outdoor recreation projects.

But the administration, he added, requested only \$124 million for the current fiscal year.

"Only \$17 million of this amount was appropriated for land acquisition for the entire national park system, an amount equal to less than 12 cents for each person in the country, and less than half of what is needed for Point Reyes alone," he said.

"None of this money was designated for Point Reyes.

"I have on several occasions urged the Congress to take the necessary steps to assure acquisition of the entire acreage of Point Reyes, as originally dictated by Congress in 1962.

"Now, seven years later, the Point Reyes peninsula faces an irreparable splintering that, if allowed to happen, will spoil much of this unique and beautiful natural preserve.

"The burden of action in this instance lies with the Nixon administration.

"As soon as Congress convenes after Labor Day, we intend to resume our efforts to enlist the administration's support for the Point Reyes project.

"The legislation which I have introduced is bipartisan in nature and has the support of most of the California delegation.

"Many more of my colleagues in the House share my interest and enthusiasm in conservation projects and my sincere belief in the need to preserve the small bit of this country that remains natural, beautiful and free.

"Point Reyes is an excellent example of this type of terrain, a wild, unfettered expanse, an embodiment of the soul of this country.

"Point Reyes can be acquired during this Congress, if only the administration will act responsively now. I intend to work actively to encourage the president to take such action."

FIGHT TO SAVE POINT REYES NARROWS TO FOCUS ON ONE MAN—THE PRESIDENT

The fight to save the Point Reyes National Seashore has narrowed down to a sharp focus on one man—President Richard Nixon.

The President need but give the word and the additional \$40 million necessary to complete acquisition of the remainder of the site will be released, thus preserving this scenic jewel of California's coastline for now and generations to come.

All the other elements in the struggle to save Point Reyes from land speculators and subdividers have fallen into place. The state's congressional delegation has given it solid bipartisan support. It is viewed favorably by Congress. Owners of the remaining land are willing to sell but warn they will not hold out indefinitely. The state's two United States senators, Alan Cranston, Democrat, and George Murphy, Republican, wholeheartedly endorse the plan.

And Cranston and Murphy have spelled it out plainly to the White House: Further dallying may mean the death of the Point Reyes Project.

Nixon, a native son, should be first among those determined to preserve this heritage of natural beauty whose rarity is enhanced by the rapidly dwindling number of such sites still preservable for the future.

Cranston scorned the excuse of economizing, said to be argued by some of Nixon's advisers. Investment in a park such as Point Reyes, he said, is not in the same order as expenditures for other aspects of government.

Said Cranston: "When the United States buys a park, it acquires a capital asset which not only does not depreciate over the years but actually and inevitably appreciates. In no other area of government expenditure do we invest the taxpayers' money in something

which continually increases in value. Thus to decrease our federal investment in park and recreation lands in obeisance to budgetary demands is a false economy which simply makes no economic sense."

The fate of Point Reyes rests squarely on the doorstep of the White House. Nixon is the one man who can—and should—give Point Reyes the victory it deserves.

LADY BIRD'S GROVE IS FITTING, POINTS UP NEW OPPORTUNITY FOR PT. REYES

Lady Bird Johnson Grove it will be called, and the cluster of magnificent trees in the Redwoods National Park in Humboldt County will perpetuate the grace note of beautification the former First Lady fostered the length and breath of the land.

Appropriately, Californian Richard Nixon and Mrs. Nixon will join with former President Lyndon B. Johnson and his wife at the grove's dedication Wednesday and hopefully the awareness of all will compass not only the redwoods monument, but another area of cherished natural beauty to the south—the Pt. Reyes National Seashore project.

For it was at the dedication of Pt. Reyes in 1966 Mrs. Johnson directed attention to the priceless heritage of the Humboldt redwoods and urged a program for their preservation. She was an active supporter of the campaign to create the Redwoods National Park.

Mrs. Johnson was an equally effective campaigner for beautification of America from the national capital to scenic highways and local parks. Her "keep America beautiful" fight, viewed at first with bemused skepticism by some, burgeoned into a successful drive which heightened the consciousness of all Americans to the preservation of their natural beauties.

A modest, gracious woman who tackled her task with energy and efficiency, Lady Bird in a quiet way left a mark on this land which will be long enduring.

Lady Bird Grove in California is but one of the many benefices accruing from her efforts. She was also influential in starting the Pt. Reyes development.

That wonderful opportunity to preserve the coastal beauties along Pt. Reyes got off to a good start but has faltered for lack of funds to acquire a major portion of the land comprising it. Now its future is threatened by the sale of that land to private developers and speculators.

The example of Mrs. Johnson's efforts should inspire President Nixon to strive for congressional authorization of funds to complete Pt. Reyes. The President is the key figure in the future of the seashore development.

It would be appropriate should the day come when a Pat Nixon Beach would take its place with Lady Bird Johnson Grove as another important monument of California conservation.

OUR FLAG WILL SYMBOLIZE THE RESPONSIBLE MAJORITY ON MORATORIUM DAY

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, for every one negative critic in our country, there are dozens of proud, unashamed Americans. With massive demonstrations threatened in many of our major cities tomorrow, it is important that people around the world, friends and enemies alike, know that the demonstrators who take to the streets Wednesday do not

speak for millions of concerned, responsible Americans who want peace, but who know that the way to achieve it is not to demoralize our men in Vietnam or weaken President Nixon's efforts to reach an honorable settlement and prepare the South Vietnamese to defend themselves.

For this reason, I have publicly urged every patriotic Tennessean to fly his country's flag on Wednesday as a symbol of national unity and as a message to those who think the street protests of a noisy minority have undermined the faith of Americans in their leaders and themselves.

DEMAND INCREASE FOR OIL IMPORT REFORM

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that New York City Mayor John V. Lindsay has joined the growing chorus of those who have urged the abolition of the inequitable mandatory oil import control program which has been so costly to the consumers of his city and the entire Northeast.

Mayor Lindsay has expressed his views in a letter to Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz, Chairman of the Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control. I am honored that the mayor has endorsed my bill, H.R. 10799, which would gradually eliminate the quota system over a 10-year period.

Mr. Speaker, I want also to mention that the entire New England House delegation has once again expressed its unanimous position that the time has come to change drastically, if not eliminate completely, the oil quota system. Following a recent luncheon meeting with 100 representatives of the New England Fuel Institute, our delegation sent a letter to President Nixon urging his serious and prompt consideration of measures to relieve the burdens which the inequitable quota system has imposed on our region.

For the information of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I include copies of both the Lindsay letter and the letter sent by our New England delegation:

OCTOBER 6, 1969.

HON. GEORGE P. SHULTZ,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I understand that in the very near future the President's Task Force of Oil Import Controls, of which you are Chairman, will be making recommendations on the nation's future oil policies.

In this connection, New York City's Mayor's Commission on Inflation and Economic Welfare, which is studying the causes and effects of the current inflation and steps to combat it, has just completed a report indicating that mandatory federal oil import controls cost New York City residents alone more than \$95 million annually. Enclosed is a copy of that report.

The \$95 million cost figure for New York City is, I am sure you will agree, a very conservative one. Indeed there is evidence that the cost to New York City residents of oil

import controls may well exceed \$250 million each year. And the cost to Americans across the nation is equally staggering. The Inflation Commission's report places the national cost at up to \$6 billion per year. Dr. John Blair, Chief economist of Senator Philip A. Hart's Antitrust Sub-committee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which has held extensive hearings on the oil import controls, estimates the cost of the program to American consumers at \$7.2 billion annually. And a recent report prepared for your Task Force by the U.S. Department of Interior estimated this cost at between \$7 and \$8 billion annually over the last decade.

Whatever the exact figure, it is amply clear that the average car owner in this country pays more for gasoline and private home owners pay more to heat homes with oil because of the higher prices on domestic oil.

The people of New York City, like people across the nation, are suffering the grip of acute current inflation. They are deeply troubled. Higher and higher prices are causing countless strains and hardships to the average family. Goods and services that were once a matter of course for most households are now considered luxuries by many.

We should not allow these conditions to continue while fair and practical means exist to eliminate them. I urge strongly that our present oil import policies be revised so that consumers in New York and throughout the nation may obtain relief from the enormous burden imposed on them by current policies.

We know that the original justification for the oil import restrictions was a determination more than ten years ago that unlimited imports of oil threatened our national security. The purpose of the program was to encourage domestic exploration. It seems clear now, in the light of the ten-year history of the program, that all that the restrictions have accomplished is to place a price umbrella over the entire domestic industry. This policy has injured the oil industry's competitive posture; indeed it has practically destroyed competition, as reported to you by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. And it has resulted in crude oil prices at home that are far higher than anywhere else in the free world. Combined with the myriad tax advantages which the oil industry has access to, the oil import quotas have produced record profits for all the major oil companies year after year at a steep cost to American consumers. It is the consumer who has to pay the bill for the extravagant benefit accorded the oil industry by our existing oil import policy.

I am not convinced by the oil industry's claim that allowing a free flow of oil into this country would ruin the entire industry. The American oil industry is the largest and most profitable industry in the world. It competes successfully in virtually every country in the free world. There is no reason whatsoever to suspect that this industry could not compete just as successfully here at home if the mantle of protection now surrounding it were withdrawn.

The six New England states, three of which border on New York, have been fighting vigorously to relieve their citizens from the onerous burden imposed by Federal oil import policies. All six New England governors, all 12 senators, and all 25 congressmen from that region have urged that oil controls be lifted. A bill introduced by Congressman Silvio O. Conte of Massachusetts would accomplish this by phasing out the import restrictions. I favor this proposal, and am personally urging the entire New York Congressional Delegation including our two Senators, Jacob J. Javits and Charles E. Goodell, to stand with our sister states in the struggle to win relief for our consumers by supporting Congressman Conte's legislation.

Enormous pressure will be applied by the oil industry to preserve the present system. It is time legitimate needs and concerns of

America's consumers be given the priority deserved in formulating national oil policies.

Sincerely,

JOHN V. LINDSAY,
Mayor.

OCTOBER 1, 1969.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: When the review which you assigned to the Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control is concluded in the near future, you will be called upon to decide oil import questions of critical importance to New England—and to the nation.

We are writing, as a united delegation representing the six New England states, to request that you give careful consideration of the special problems of our area and take effective action to solve these problems.

Perhaps the best brief statement of these problems is found in the presentation of the 6 New England Governors to the Task Force:

"The New England region has no indigenous sources of crude oil, and no operating oil refineries. The only crude pipeline in New England delivers to Montreal foreign oil landed in Portland. It is ironic that the oil flowing through this pipeline benefits not New England, but Montreal, which enjoys distillate heating oil at a price more than 3 cents/gallon lower than in Boston.

"The structure of demand for petroleum in New England is significantly different from that of the national average. Whereas New England consumption of all types of petroleum products represents close to 9 percent of the national total, the demand for distillate heating oil by the six-state region is closer to 21 percent. The harshness of the winter climate in the New England area is such that the assurance of an adequate and reliable fuel supply is not a matter of mere comfort. It can be a matter of survival. The region is remote from other energy sources, and therefore particularly sensitive to the cost and reliability of its oil supplies."

The people of our region would be willing, we believe, to accept their special situation—and bear the burden of the highest heating oil prices in the country—if these were the result of the natural adjustments and expected regional imbalance of a free economy. But they are not. New England is bearing a disproportionate burden *only* because of the inequities in our present Oil Import Program.

Knowing of your commitment to a free economy, your desire to reduce the role of the Federal Government in our society, and your pledge to fight inflation, we are confident that you will approve changes in the Import Program to strengthen competition and bring the benefits of lower-priced petroleum products to the American consumer.

Most of us are co-sponsors of legislation introduced by our Colleague Silvio O. Conte (H.R. 10799, 10800, 10801) to eliminate the Mandatory Oil Import Program, gradually over a 10 year period.

Several agencies of the Federal Government have pointed out that elimination of the Program would mean substantial savings to consumers and involve no risk to our national security. Our own review of Submissions to the Task Force confirms these facts.

However, even if you decide that some system of controls is required under the authority of the National Security Clause (Title 19 U.S.C. Section 1862) we urge recognition of the special position of New England. We strongly urge that any control system be designed to:

- (a) bring relief from high fuel oil prices paid by New Englanders;
- (b) provide assured supplies to avoid the tight, dangerous stock crises similar to those of the Winters of 1967, 1968 and 1969;
- (c) provide sufficient low sulfur oil to aid in the fight against air pollution in our area;
- (d) establish an equitable balance be-

tween the oil-consuming and oil-producing areas of the nation;

(e) assure competitive equity for independent fuel oil dealers, marketers and deepwater terminal operators vis-a-vis the major, integrated oil companies.

In order to achieve these objectives, we strongly endorse proposals to:

(1) establish a petroleum refinery in a foreign trade zone at Machiasport, Maine, which will provide lower priced fuel oil through independent marketers in New England;

(2) allocate substantial import quotas for home heating oil for independent deepwater terminal operators.

In reaching your decisions, we know that you will recognize that, in a free economy, the burden of proof rests on those who seek to maintain import controls.

In conclusion, Mr. President, we should like to commend you for your efforts to seek a thorough, incisive review of U.S. oil import policy. All of us are anxious, we might add, that the Task Force Report be made public as soon as it is completed sometime in November.

We appreciate the difficulty involved in dealing with this program. However, we are confident that you will make the decisions—and approve the changes—necessary to relieve the excessive economic burdens and correct the market distortions forced upon our nation, and particularly the New England region, by the Oil Import Control Program.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully yours,

Silvio O. Conte, Edward P. Boland, Harold D. Donohue, Philip J. Philbin, F. Bradford Morse, Torbert H. MacDonald, Margaret M. Heckler, James A. Burke, Fernand J. St Germain, Peter N. Kyros, Louis C. Wyman, Robert T. Stafford, Robert N. Glalmo, John S. Monagan, William L. St. Onge, Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., John W. McCormack, Hastings Keith, Robert O. Tiernan, William D. Hathaway, James C. Cleveland, Emilio Q. Daddario, Lowell P. Weicker, Jr., Thomas J. Meskill.

SUPPORTING THE PRESIDENT

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

MR. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star of October 13 contained an editorial which speaks for itself. At this point in the RECORD, I insert the editorial for the attention of my colleagues:

SUPPORTING THE PRESIDENT

Two prominent Democrats have rallied to the support of the President as Mr. Nixon prepares to face Wednesday's Vietnam Moratorium, billed as a protest against the war but in reality a demonstration against the President.

Following a Friday White House conference, Hubert Humphrey told reporters that Mr. Nixon is "proceeding along the right path" in Vietnam, has made some progress, and that "the worst thing we can do is to try to undermine the efforts of the President."

The second assist also came on Friday in a speech by Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State, who was accepting an award for distinguished service in foreign affairs.

Mr. Acheson spoke out against those who would have us believe that "we elect to public office the most zealous imbeciles bent upon every imaginable folly, extravagance,

and disastrous adventure, determined to blight the hopes of the young, poor, and disadvantaged, and probably venal into the bargain." He said that even from the vantage point of the opposition, this strikes him as an extreme view, and also a damaging and foolish one. Speaking as one who has had broad experience in what the Supreme Court has called the "vast external realm," the former Secretary of State said that the choices open to any responsible government in dealing with foreign affairs are narrow ones. In his view, however, "as an attitude for the informed private citizen anxious to play a constructive role in policy making, support of the responsible leader is a sound role."

It is too much, perhaps, to expect that the wise counsel of these two men will exert any restraining influence on the Fulbrights, the Kennedys, the Churches and the Goodells. No doubt they will persist in their reckless effort to destroy confidence in the President and his efforts to end the war. But it may not be too much to hope that the voices of men like Messrs. Humphrey and Acheson will be heard by the American people in spite of the sound and the fury of the wrecking crew.

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, each day each of us in Congress receive dozens if not hundreds of letters. On some occasions we all echo the old statement, "The public has spoken, but did it have to speak so loud," but on other occasions we learn directly what are the concerns of our people.

Recently I received such a letter, one that expresses better than I can, the depth of thoughtful and intelligent concern of one of my constituents. Mrs. Edwina M. Norton of Santa Clara, Calif., outlined the kind of decisions we must make, decisions which we have failed to make. Mr. Speaker I insert her letter in the RECORD so all of us may share her thoughts:

SANTA CLARA, CALIF.,
October 9, 1969.

Congressman DON EDWARDS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EDWARDS: I have long intended to write this letter but have put it off because it must necessarily be a long and complex one: the list of needs in this country is long and complex. I hardly know where to begin, there are so many things I feel must be done, so I won't attempt to list what I consider priorities in an order of importance. As a starter, however, let me comment on the current issue of the supersonic transport that the President recommends we develop in order that we maintain our leadership in air transportation. Perhaps it will reveal my mood. Spending government funds on such a project seems to me exasperatingly absurd, especially at a time when so many other problems need attention desperately. I don't think our taxes should go to develop something that will profit private industry; I don't think we can handle the sonic boom problem, let alone what such a plane would add to the already serious air pollution problem; finally I can't see that going a couple of hours faster than we can already will benefit most people, especially when our airports and air lanes are already overcrowded.

We seem, as a country, or as a government, still to be ignoring the real problems we have. Not only are we spending great sums of money on essentially destructive programs—the war, the ABM, the supersonic plane proposal—but we are pretending that we don't yet have to plan for the very near future when overpopulation will kill us, if air and water pollution don't get us first. From the reports I have read about these severe problems, I would say we haven't much time left to deal with pollution and population. Perhaps it's already too late to prevent the disaster; we may only be able to reduce the problems, if we start now. If this is the case, why are we still ignoring these problems?

My exasperation is turning to desperation. As an American, proud of our ability to grow, to progress, I feel on the one hand that we are able to do anything we want and need to do, but on the other hand I am profoundly disillusioned by the apparent inability or unwillingness to do what is so obviously necessary. It is time—long past—that we turn our energies away from the status quo, from the pressures of private interest groups and their lobbies, and look to the needs of the people of this country. In short, it is time we de-emphasized our technology and emphasized programs that will make ours a humane environment, one in which people can live with a minimum, not a maximum, as we now have, of frustration, danger, and distress.

What are the things that would humanize our environment? Here are just a few:

1. A comprehensive program for reducing present, and controlling future, pollution—pollution of all kinds, that from gasoline engine exhaust, from jet exhaust, from industrial and domestic waste dumped in lakes, bays, and oceans, from DDT and other harmful sprays, from sound pollution such as from factories, sonic booms, and jet airports located close to cities and people's homes; also pollution in the form of ruination of our natural resources, our parks, our wildlife.

2. Intelligent controls over our technology which has, it seems to me, already run away with itself: Why can't we stop the trend toward even more supercars which cause, at their high speeds, more and more accidents, more exhaust, more repairs which have become impossibly expensive for most of us? Why can't we direct our monies away from space research, as thrilling as the moon landing was, and into plans and programs for discovering and improving our own planet? Why can't we trim that Pentagon budget so that we can spend money on our domestic problems?

3. Tax reform: The polls seem to be correct in saying that people are most concerned about inflation and taxes. Everyone I talk to is angry about these problems. Very many of them are also feeling helpless and hopeless and cynical about these problems ever being solved.

4. Draft reform and educational reform: The young, being one half the population, are now a definite political force that can no longer be ignored, but why can't the older generation begin these reforms? Make the draft equitable or better yet, extricate ourselves from unfeasible commitments abroad, and eliminate the draft. As for education, federal support and leadership of the right sort could help enormously in making education relevant and valuable. It has to change. Instead of educating children to fit the technology, we must help them to be human beings perhaps in spite of that technology.

5. Racial equality: Certainly we have gained some ground here, notably in the last two years, often, unfortunately, through violence. We must do much more, however; the more we can direct our energies and monies to a more humane environment for all people, by way of jobs, housing, medical care,

education, the faster we can heal our divisiveness.

6. Workable programs to overcome poverty and to make welfare workable are needed. The guaranteed minimum income, if administered humanely—i.e., without demeaning people—might be the answer.

All of these problems are, of course, interrelated. All need to be solved; each is dependent on at least one other, if not several others. If we can turn our spending away from destructive and irrelevant pursuits, we can spend money on these much needed domestic priorities. If we can improve the lives of the poor, we can heal some social wounds; if we can provide relevant education for the young, we can tap a rich resource for further improving our society, etc. And if we can provide and cultivate a humane way of life for all, we can reduce our alarming crime rate. (I have not listed crime separately, for it is so directly the result of our failure to attend to people's needs in other areas. If we can eliminate the inadequacies and abrasiveness of our society, crime is bound to be reduced. We also need a thoroughgoing revision of our legal system and penal codes; they seem to be working less and less.)

I realize that these problems are not simple ones, but I do feel that the key to solving them is in forming a new attitude toward our country and what we want it to be. We must take the chance and turn away from our technological orientation—in a sense turn away from some private interests—and turn toward humane and public needs. Our country is not yet 200 years old. It is shocking to think that it may never reach its 200th anniversary, yet I sometimes feel that because we still seem to ignore our crucial problems, we may be dooming ourselves, if not as a civilization, perhaps as a democracy.

I think that the time has come for the Congress, the representatives of the people, to speak to the problems we have and to see to it that they are solved. We desperately need your most earnest and rational concern for our welfare, and we look now, more than ever before, to your leadership.

I don't know how many of your constituents you hear from; if I can judge from what people say about their belief, or more accurately, their disbelief, in government today, I would guess you don't hear from many. Whenever I urge someone to write to his congressman, I get one or two responses, a guffaw or an embarrassed silence. I used to be angered by this, thinking it meant apathy, disinterest, but lately I am not so sure I have diagnosed the response correctly. It seems more to mean a kind of desperate cynicism, and a despair of ever being represented as people would like to be. Even though most people don't express these feelings to you, most people do seem to be feeling them: without hope, they are even beginning to seem cowed. I think that is a terrible state for people in a democracy to be in. Can't we change this?

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. EDWINA M. NORTON.

THE YOUTH OF OUR TIME

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, Miss Nonette Mayes, a senior at Crosbyton, Tex., high school, recently made an address to the Lions Club of my hometown of Lubbock, Tex., in regard to the challenges confronting American youth. Miss Mayes speaks eloquently in behalf of

the great majority of our youth but points out the dangers which confront the country as a result of the lack of restraint and discipline among a minority. Under permission granted earlier today, I am pleased to include the full text of her speech:

ADDRESS OF MISS NONETTE MAYES

Mr. President, Lions, visitors, when Mr. Lipscomb called and asked me to come to the Lubbock Lions Club as a representative of the youth of Crosbyton, I was honored that I should be invited to address such a distinguished audience. But more than that I am grateful for an opportunity to bring a message from the young people of Crosbyton to the civic leadership of Lubbock.

For many years the Lions Club has encouraged our active participation in civic affairs. You have recognized that channeled in the right direction, young people can make a significant contribution to the growth and development of any town.

Under the leadership of Lions Clubs and the churches, we have witnessed a healthy trend toward greater involvement and participation by youth in public affairs.

The youth of today face many challenges. Two years ago last June at the Commencement exercises of Southern Methodist University, Bob Hope reviewed the troubles of today's world. In a light vein of humor, he concluded with the traditional word of advice to the graduating seniors about to go out into the world. His advice to them was: "Don't go!"

A small segment of college students, bitter about what they call the imperfect world which their parents have given them, have taken that advice literally and have refused to become involved in the society of their parents. They are the bearded beatniks, the protest demonstrators, the draft card burners and the social misfits of our society. They have congregated about many of our colleges and Universities and stand around bearded and bathless. *They refuse to go out into the world.*

Others dropping their flowers and their beads and picking up clubs and switch blades, have become high handed hoodlums intent on getting their own way. They pretend to be adults, but are desperately afraid of growing up and assuming responsibility. They are so busy exercising their right to freedom of speech they have forgotten their responsibility to make a positive contribution to society.

Across the nation, the questions are asked: Who are these rebels? What do they want? How deep seated is student unrest? Where is it heading? And educators continue to probe for the answer to why a small minority—2 percent, no more than 3—of the nation's undergraduate population of 7 million are involved in the current upheavals—the riots, seizures of buildings and disruption of academic life.

Quite naturally, this unrest and disruption among youth is causing widespread concern among older citizens. News headlines are punctuated with stories of riotous campus demonstrations and unlawful protest. Time magazine in one issue asks: "Can you trust anyone under 30?" And the headline of one issue of U.S. News & World Report screams: "Why do students revolt? Is America really sick?"

A certain segment of American youth is sick. There is no denying that the arrogant draft card burners and the defiant protestors who glorify violence as a form of political action—the young "Totalitarians" as President Johnson effectively described them, are sick. It is this group which makes a mockery of lawful and intelligent dissent designed to strengthen the opportunity for each citizen to make his beliefs and opinions known. It is this group—this small minority—which gives the great majority a black eye.

But as an American youth, I am tired of

being told that I am sick. And so are hundreds of thousands of other youth in this country who are going about the business of getting an education, grateful for the opportunities which are ours, and many holding down substantial jobs in order to prepare for the responsibilities which you will pass on to us. Most college, and a lot of high school students, in Texas, are far too intelligent to be captivated by the harsh cries of a militant few. But when a small minority can damage the image of all youth, we must not be unmindful of the potential dangers. As we have become so painfully aware these last several months, violence breeds violence. Therefore the question confronts us: How can we turn back the tide of restlessness and lawlessness?

I would suggest the national news media take a long look at itself! You may search daily, in vain, through the mass of national telecast and news broadcasts for one word that would reassure the average citizen that all negro youth are not Stokely Carmichaels; that all students are not draft dodgers; that not all of us have lost faith in our President in his honest efforts to do the best job he can under difficult circumstances; that most of us are still proud to be Americans; that most of us know democracy will work and labor diligently to see that it does. . . .

We need more commentators like the Topeka, Kansas, newsman who reported on his morning broadcast the story of the 25 demonstrators who had staged a sit in. His broadcast stated: "There are 25 protesting college students sitting on the floor in the governor's office this morning. The other 63,000 students of the state are going about their business grateful for the opportunities that are theirs."

I would suggest that you as responsible civic leaders in our community, provide us with faculty members who will teach that freedom is not free, and that it must be defended daily. Whether on the fields of combat, or on the perpetual battlefields where good citizenship wages war with bad.

Now one word to the parents. Like our youth, you have been unjustly criticized for the activities of a few. But the indulgent and permissive parent who produces the spoiled youngster, must share the guilt with the son or daughter for ultimate consequences.

The youthful dissenters of today are ignoring history. Mr. Strong, Mr. Krebs, Mr. Kay, and a large number of others, went to college during what our history books refer to as the great depression. Thousands were unemployed and barely stayed alive in poverty and hunger. There was no work for millions who were trained, competent and eager to work for any wage. The average American of that day did not live as well as most of those rioting in dissatisfaction today. And I am told, millions would have regarded the lot of the worst of us today as near Utopia. Hitler and Tojo and Mussolini led united, hostile, nations against you in world wide war that dwarfs the localized conflict in Viet Nam. Most of my generation does not know the real meaning of poverty, hunger, unemployment, and war.

In short, the trouble and problems of the world into which you, as parents, graduated, were more numerous and more severe than the world today. Our world is not perfect, but I am convinced that it is a better world than the one my father stepped into upon graduation. . . . I am grateful that you, as parents, have made more progress in the past 30 years than any generation before, grateful that you have given us a better world where opportunity for service and fulfillment are greater. . . .

Most of us look forward to going out in the world to follow in your footsteps. . . . In the words of President Kennedy: "Only a few generations in the long history of civilization have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger." This is the role which is ours too. May we

accept this responsibility with enthusiasm and confidence. May we never shrink from this challenge.

SAFETY IN THE COAL MINES

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, shortly, this body will consider the all-important coal mine safety bill, approved some weeks ago by the House Education and Labor Committee, under the distinguished chairmanship of Congressman CARL PERKINS.

I received yesterday a letter, dated October 9, from Mr. W. A. Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers of America, regarding a matter raised by a near disaster in the Loveridge coal mine in the First Congressional District of West Virginia, which I am privileged to represent.

The issues raised by this near disaster are set forth in this letter and deserve the close attention of every Member of Congress. I sincerely hope the issues raised in Mr. Boyle's letter will receive the scrutiny they deserve.

The letter follows:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,

Washington, D.C., October 9, 1969.

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOLLOHAN: Three weeks ago a fire broke out in the Loveridge mine of Consolidation Coal Company, almost within shouting distance of the #9 mine of Consolidation Coal Company where 78 coal miners lost their lives in last year's tragic underground explosion. But for the grace of God, the Loveridge fire could have been a repetition of the disaster at #9 mine. More than 100 miners were at work beneath the ground when flames swept through a section of the mine. Fortunately, none were trapped in the area where the flames erupted.

Almost as the flames scoured the Loveridge mine, the House Committee on Labor and Education reported to the floor a proposed coal mine health and safety act riddled by serious loopholes. Unless these loopholes are closed, the act will continue to invite tragic death and loss of limb for thousands of miners employed in allegedly non-gassy mines.

The United Mine Workers of America beseeches you to remove all exemptions in the law which would permit any group of coal operators to postpone installation of spark-free equipment for as long as six years or even indefinitely. In addition, we are entirely opposed to provisions vesting any board of review with the right to overrule the decisions of the Secretary of Interior. Further, we urge that the bill be amended to provide that the permissible dust level be measured over one shift as opposed to the weaker method of averaging such dust level over several shifts as the present house bill provides.

As reported to the floor, the federal coal mine health and safety bill testifies loudly to the power of the Washington lobby of the coal industry. It testifies also with chilling shrillness to the determination of these operators to put profits above the lives of those who dig coal.

These coal operators are resorting to the same industrial blackmail that they have perpetrated upon the nation and its miners since time immemorial. They have always claimed that they would shut down their

mines if required to grant decent wages and safe working conditions. They would probably bring back the child labor of half a century ago if they had their way.

The time has come to call the bluff of these operators and it is our considered opinion that few will shut down if their mines are covered by the provisions of a strong federal coal mine health and safety act. The choice before the Congress is clear. The lives of miners must be the foremost consideration in this legislation. Congress can prove to the entire world that the lives of working people weigh more heavily on the scales of justice than the sugared words of any coal mine operators' lobby.

The nation's organized mine workers urge you to work for and to vote for a federal coal mine health and safety law that gives the nation's miners the maximum health and safety protection humanly possible. We are opposed to all loopholes, and have been assured of the cooperation of the AFL-CIO in our efforts to have a truly satisfactory law enacted.

We have already informed the coal mining industry that it will face a direct confrontation with the United Mine Workers' membership in our next contract negotiations unless the maximum possible health and safety of that membership is assured. It is our sincere and fervent hope that we can win by law the protection so urgently needed. Your vote can help to assure this nation's miners that ours is a government dedicated to justice and humanity as well as to law.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. BOYLE, President.

VIETNAM MORATORIUM

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a democracy cannot survive with an apathetic citizenry. Democracy is enhanced by peaceful citizen participation. We are fortunate in that America has a heritage rooted deeply in democratic tradition—a tradition of self-government.

In order for a democracy to function, its people must make their views known; its citizens must make use of their right to vote; they must petition their elected leaders. How else can a representative government function? If the citizenry did not take an active part in our Government, we would no longer have the democratic system we cherish.

In reference to the President's statement on September 26, 1969, that he would not, under any circumstances, be affected by the October 15 "Vietnam moratorium," I think two points should be emphasized. First, the President, by issuing statements that conflict with his actions, is in danger of losing his credibility. Obviously, the wishes of the American people are, and rightly so, important in the President's decisions. The most recent illustration is the release of General Hershey as Director of the Selective Service. General Hershey was a symbol of the war and the draft, and he was relieved to appease the dissidents. The President, although he said he would not be affected, was, in fact, affected by public opinion.

This leads to the second point: Instead of trying to stifle constructive discussion,

the President should encourage people to make their views known by peacefully demonstrating and petitioning their elected representatives.

Vice President AGNEW has described the "moratorium" as "absurd."

My impression of that comment is that anything SPIRO AGNEW terms as "absurd" must have some merits.

After considerable thought on the meaning of the moratorium, it is my judgment that this is a day of discussion—a day of participation.

Responsible discussion should be the theme of the "Vietnam moratorium." Americans, regardless of their views, should analyze our situation in Vietnam, realize the implications of each alternative, formulate a constructive solution and, finally, petition their elected officials as to their views. Most everyone agrees that the bloodshed should cease in Vietnam. Our dilemma arises when we discuss the alternatives to this objective.

The President is aware of the views of a small, vocal minority of the Nation, but he does not know the views of the great majority of the people. I feel reasonably sure that the President of the United States would respond in a positive way if he knew the views of the consensus of American public opinion.

Everyone should discuss Vietnam—the most pressing crisis of our time. The moratorium cannot and should not be ignored. In the past, participation has been limited primarily to the campus, but Vietnam involves all of us—not just the youth. Therefore, all Americans should observe the moratorium by discussing our current policy, and the alternatives, in the home, in the place of business, and in the place of worship.

TOM FLETCHER

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, a man I am honored to have as a friend, Thomas W. Fletcher, will soon be leaving this area after more than 2 years of distinguished service as Deputy Mayor of the District of Columbia.

Tom Fletcher was first appointed to his post by President Johnson and reappointed early this year by President Nixon. Neither Chief Executive could have made a better choice, for Tom is widely regarded as perhaps the ablest city administrator in the Nation.

He earned his enviable reputation during 5 years as city manager of my own city of San Diego, and added to it with his service often under the most trying conditions in Washington.

Tom's achievements in our Nation's Capital have been duly noted by Washington's leading newspapers. It is a great pleasure for me to include at this point editorials commending him from the Evening Star and the Post.

[From the Evening Star, Oct. 10, 1969]

DEPUTY MAYOR FLETCHER

Thomas W. Fletcher will be greatly missed when he pulls up stakes shortly to return to

his native California as city manager of San Jose. As deputy to Mayor Washington during two eventful years in this city's history, he served as a kind of Mr. Inside—the man who worried about budgets and administration and, in general, tended to the day-to-day operations.

For this, he was well-qualified professionally with a broad background in city government. By temperament, Fletcher had no personal need for limelight, but instead took quiet satisfaction in getting the job done.

In point of fact, Walter Washington and his deputy had the sort of close working relationship that the captain of a Navy ship hopes to establish with his executive officer. The Mayor was free to set the tone and broad policy, because his number two was willing to assume responsibility for detailed supervision.

We wish Thomas Fletcher well in his new job. As Mayor Washington said, he will be a hard man to replace both as an administrator and a colleague.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 10, 1969]

AN EXCEPTIONAL DEPUTY

The remarkable thing about Thomas W. Fletcher's all too brief appearance on the Washington scene was the way he played the role given to him—to understudy, support and backstop his chief, Walter Washington, but not to compete with him. He performed well. The wheels of government turned at his bidding for he was the administrative chief, the budgeteer, the trouble shooter who frequently identified the broad policy areas that needed Mayor Washington's attention.

When things ran smoothly, one did not hear much of Deputy Mayor Fletcher. When they got out of hand, as they did in the effort to settle the dispute over highways, he was in the eye of the hurricane, but generally unflappable. Technically, of course, his official title was the self-effacing one of assistant to the commissioner. Presidential and popular usage made him the deputy mayor.

Mr. Fletcher was literally plucked out of an automobile in Rapid City, S.D., by President Johnson for the assignment as the No. 2 city executive. He had been en route to Washington from San Diego to take a job as deputy assistant secretary of HUD. He had been city manager of the California city and Mr. Johnson's talent scouts had identified him as the most outstanding professional manager in the nation. Two years later he takes leave of the Washington job for the city managership of San Jose, Calif., with his standing enhanced.

For the city of Washington, the departure of Mr. Fletcher poses an enormous problem. His replacement must, like him, be an outstanding and nonpolitical professional. Like him, he must be someone who can learn rapidly how to thread his way through the incredible congressional maze where ultimate power over the city rests. Like him, he must have sensitivity in dealing with the city council and its vocal constituents of both races. Like him, he must be able to establish a rapport and relationship with the Mayor to avoid the threat of divided government. And, to avoid a hiatus, he must be found quickly.

FIGHT AGAINST INFLATION

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, it is time for the American people to cry halt to the policies we have been following in the so-called fight against inflation. The

selective suffering that these policies have brought upon our people are no longer tolerable in the light of the little progress that has been achieved. The housewives suffer from increased demands in the grocery stores and from demands in every walk of consumer life for their household dollar. Small business suffers by being bounced from the borrowing bench of the banks. The housing industry has suffered because of its inability, in a rising interest market, to compete with shorter term paper with high liquidity. Mortgage money, except for that developed by FNMA, is a mere trickle. Enough, enough, already.

There must be a better way—there is a better way. One of the major ingredients of this so-called inflation is underproductivity. Labor must understand that it is robbing one's self when the price of labor exceeds the honest value of the services rendered or the product created.

Equally, management must understand the price of a product is equally restricted by its honesty and it must reflect the value.

The credit restrictions of the Federal Reserve should be looked into. Emphasis in that agency should be upon the relationship between the money growth and the real growth in gross national product. The Federal Government must in these times emphasize policy which directs money into those activities which most surely promote sound growth. In that regard, it seems to me most clear that available capital is far more useful in the homebuilding industry than devoted to financing mergers or in the building of conglomerates. Of course building as a multiplying factor from 9 to 11 creates a produce of substantial longevity. Capital utilized in mergers and acquisitions create a new value, build no new product and merely pay the cost of paper shuffling and reflect in inflated stock prices.

Here are a list of practical programs and policies that this administration could activate that would realistically match the kind of problem our economy now faces.

First, immediately fund and vigorously pursue labor training programs for both young and mature workers. Matching their skills to the requirements of the labor market and provide real competition among labor elements.

Second, reduce the forces in the military further enlarging the labor market.

Third, be prepared to be a residual employer for a portion of the unemployed. With work oriented strongly to the development of parks and the advancement of our timber resources.

Fourth, delay consumer purchases with some application of regulation W increasing downpayments and decreasing term.

Fifth, relax the credit restrictions presently enforced by the Federal Reserve.

Sixth, encourage lead and reward in industry, business and labor to a policy of productivity and quality as a basic standard for price and wages. These are the only guideposts which make sense and they are the two that are the eco-

nomic imperative of an international world market in which our economy is an essential part.

Finally, Government economists should understand and develop measurements for input-output studies so the interrelationship and interdependency of and between elements of our economy are far better understood and measurable. Such economics also provide data for projecting multipliers upon which the velocity of this economy depend.

By pursuing such proposals we would recognize just as overproduction was found to be underconsumption, the present inflation would be found to be underproduction in both the commitment of labor and the application of capital.

HON. PATSY MINK DELIGHTS MISSOURI DEMOCRATIC WOMEN WITH ELOQUENT SPEECH ON THE POLITICS OF LEADERSHIP

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, when an outstanding Member of Congress makes a truly eloquent speech on the issues which confront our Nation and mankind, we all derive a sense of pride in an achievement which reflects credit upon this House as an institution and upon all of us privileged to serve here. To be present, in a hushed and attentive audience, and share the occasion is an even greater pleasure.

Thus it was a thrilling experience for me Sunday night to be present at the annual dinner of the Missouri Federation of Women's Democratic Clubs in Jefferson City, Mo., and to hear the Honorable PATSY MINK, of Hawaii, make what I believe was one of the best addresses of the year on political issues—to any group. It was my great privilege to introduce Mrs. MINK to a capacity audience of Missouri political leaders, including Gov. Warren E. Hearnes, and to nearly 1,000 Democratic women. She made me proud of my party, of the Congress in which we serve, and of women in public life.

And she put into perspective the controversy initiated by the President over the weekend on the respective roles of Congress and the Executive in guiding national policy and achieving national goals. Every Democratic Member of the House will applaud her straightforward analysis of these issues; and our Republican colleagues undoubtedly will agree that what she said was honest, reasonable, and fair. For that is the only way Congresswoman PATSY T. MINK knows how to be.

She is brilliant, witty, charming, glamorous—an ornament to the House—but more important than that, she is a superb Representative of the 50th State. And we are understandably proud of her achievements in the Congress.

Born, reared, and educated in Hawaii, a graduate of the University of Chicago School of Law, a former member of the

Hawaii House of Representatives and of her State senate, charter president of the Young Democrats of Oahu which she organized in 1954, first territorial president of Hawaii Young Democrats in 1956, and national vice president of the Young Democratic Clubs of America in 1957, Mrs. MINK has been a hard-working, effective, and influential Member of Congress since 1965. She is the first woman to be elected as a U.S. Representative from Hawaii. She is now an outstanding member of the House Committee on Education and Labor and of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. When she speaks in the House, we listen—for we know she has done her homework, researched the issues, studied the facts, and made reasoned and independent judgments.

Representatives WILLIAM J. RANDALL, RICHARD H. ICHORD, and JAMES W. SYMINGTON shared with me the pleasure of hearing one of our colleagues in the House charm and delight the Democratic clubwomen of Missouri Sunday night. And I am sure they join me in urging our associates in the Congress to read her excellent address which I submit for inclusion in the RECORD as part of my remarks, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MRS. MINK

Thank you, Mrs. Sullivan. It is my pleasure to join you in saluting the President of the Missouri Federation of Women's Democratic Clubs, Mrs. Zola King; the Chairman and Co-Chairman of this great Convention, Mrs. Ruby Jane Happy and Mrs. Dee Whitecotton. The importance of this occasion is signified by the presence of Governor Hearnes, Representative Symington, Representative Ichord, Representative Randall, many leading State officials, and the Missouri Mother of the Year, Mrs. Allen Cooper, and other Honored Mothers. To these distinguished persons and to the Women Democrats whose untiring efforts are the foundation of Democratic strength in this great State of Missouri, Aloha.

The presence of so many distinguished elected officials from your State proves that no one dares underestimate the power of women! I am extremely honored to be invited to your banquet tonight, and particularly privileged to have your most distinguished Leonor Sullivan to introduce me. I have been in the Congress for only five years now, but it never fails to astound me to watch Mrs. Sullivan lead the House on so many important issues like Food Stamps, Truth in Packaging, Truth in Lending, Consumer Protection, Housing, Health, Wholesome Meat and Poultry, and yes even to help improve the maritime industry of this country. The Women Democrats of the State of Missouri have someone to be mightily proud of, and I am equally proud tonight to share this platform with her, and my other distinguished colleagues.

The decade of the sixties is rapidly coming to a close. We have witnessed turmoil and dissension in our country. We all yearn for the calm of a new day when we can be truly joined in a unified and progressive national commitment to Peace, Tranquility, Opportunity, Equality and Justice.

The President issued a statement yesterday intimating that the Democrats in the Congress were stalling his program of reforms. For a man whose popularity has been steadily sinking, this tactic is as obvious as it is transparent. The country knows that despite lack of White House leadership, the House of Representatives passed the monumental tax reform bill; that again without White House support the House of Repre-

sentatives overwhelmingly passed the electoral reform bill; that over President Nixon's strenuous objection the House passed an appropriations bill for education which added \$1 billion for our schools, our colleges and our libraries; and that against his budget recommendation the House raised to \$600 million our national effort against water pollution. These are only a few examples of our record thus far, and yet the President dares to suggest that we ought to begin to work! I submit it is he who should roll up his sleeves and get to work!

I served in the House on the Committee on Education. In this vital field I know of no single piece of legislation offered by the President to help improve the quality of education in America. In fact in his 4,000 word message to Congress yesterday he failed to say a single word about our national crisis in education! Recently after the House voted to increase the education appropriations by one billion dollars, the President issued a statement to the effect that no matter what the Congress did, he would not allow these additional funds to be spent for our children and for the cause of improved educational opportunity in America. The gullibility of the American public cannot be stretched to such a degree, for they will remember his words in the campaign of 1968 in which he pledged himself to a "massive upgrading of our education effort." As a candidate, Mr. Nixon told the country that, "Investment in education is an investment in America's future; none that we make will pay better dividends," he said. Yet now as President of the United States he says that our actions to help education were unwise, and yes that the \$1 billion is better invested in super-sonic planes and ABM's!

Last week the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development sent a report to the President expressing its deep concern over the absence of Federal initiative in the field of education. They reminded the President that while Commissioner Allen was pronouncing how every child had the "right to read," the Department he heads was being ordered to cut \$8 million of a meager \$13 million program to train teachers of reading! The Council admonished the President that it was concerned by not only a reduction in funds but by an absence of direction and planning. The Council said, "in dramatic fashion, these decisions and actions add up to default on the proclaimed responsibility of the Federal government to act as a partner with the other levels of government in supporting the nation's educational enterprise. When the States in the last 2 years increased their expenditures for higher education by 38% and for elementary and secondary education by 28% . . . we find that Federal government is cutting back!" The Council continued, "we sense a worsening climate in American schools and colleges. . . . The needed improvements and reforms will come about only if appropriate leadership is offered." "It is now we must act. It is now that we must demonstrate, mainly to ourselves, that a nation which can take such just pride in its extraordinary achievements in the material realm is no less resourceful, no less vigorous, no less sacrificing in dealing with matters of the spirit."

I subscribe fully and wholeheartedly to this report filed by a National Advisory Council on Education and regret that it could not have served as the basis for at least a paragraph of concern in the President's legislative program.

Doubtless the most far reaching piece of legislation to be enacted by the 91st Congress will be the tax reform bill. There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that this will become law during this Session of Congress. This bill was written by the Democratic leadership of the House. It is the product of our own initiative. President Nixon's efforts are underway in the Senate to water it down, to

lower the taxes on corporations, and raise it instead on individuals! The average taxpayer in America is in revolt and rightfully so! They will know whose tax reform bill they favor and it is our job to tell it like it is.

I have said over and over again the past four years that we need to end the war in Vietnam. 38,000 American boys have already lost their lives. There have been no new plans revealed by the President despite all the campaign implications and the modest return of 25,000 men in August has not brought the total men deployed there to any lower level than President Johnson previously had maintained in January of 1968!

Meanwhile we continue drafting our boys and sending them to Vietnam.

The President stated that the Congress has failed to enact necessary reforms to our Selective Service system. What he does not emphasize is that he has had the power all along to bring about the changes which he has talked about, save only one, and that is the implementation of a lottery system from among the 19 year olds only. And even in this one area which does require legislation, his spokesmen appeared before the House Armed Services Committee with no precise and clear idea of how they would implement this lottery plan. I happen to agree with the President that these changes about which he has talked so much are absolutely essential, and I hope that our young people will wake up to the fact that the President could by Executive Order tomorrow put them into effect. It may not have been sensible to give the President such broad powers, but the fact of the matter is that, the Congress did. Let us make it crystal clear to the President that it is he who should make good on all these promises, and never mind the buck passing to the Congress.

There seems to be a lot of concern in Washington these days for big business. Interest rates are shooting sky high and it is virtually impossible for a working man to consider buying a home for his family. A \$30,000 mortgage with 25 years payment period at 10% interest means that home will have cost \$81,000 by the time 25 years are up. In a high-interest period, banks all over the country have been refusing to tie up any of their money in loans to students under the Federal guaranteed loan program which allows a maximum interest rate of only seven percent. Failure of Executive policy in keeping down interest rates is denying help to working people who need help desperately to finance their children's education. The banks are holding out for at least ten percent interest, so Congress was forced to enact an emergency bill sent down by the President to give the banks an additional three percent interest subsidy on all student loans. Failure of the President's real commitment to education denied our children needed funds which could have been released under our existing direct loan program.

The Congress is more than willing to consider each of the President's recommendations on their merits. But I am certain that the people will insist that we give them careful and thorough scrutiny.

For instance, no one in this country expects the Congress to move to a guaranteed annual income family assistance plan without long and careful study of all of the implications. The President only sent his bill to the Congress on October 3. It is absurd to talk about foot dragging! Even the President has changed his mind on several points since it was first announced. At first it would have excluded benefits of food stamps; now he says that it must. No well thought out proposal would have called for the exclusion of this one workable program to feed the hungry poor.

We cannot willy-nilly discard programs that have worked merely because someone wants to try another plan; merely because REFORM is somebody's watchword! A mere

substitution of State welfare funds with Federal dollars is no solution for the poor. \$1,600 subsistence funds for a family of four, is scarcely adequate without subsidized housing, food distribution plans and medical care. Further to offer welfare payments to the working poor is to subsidize wages for industry that should be required to pay a living wage. Congress' first obligation is to guarantee that the incentive to work is rewarded by an adequate living wage without tax supported welfare.

The need to increase Social Security benefits is another issue worth examining. Obviously an increase is needed. Former President Johnson's recommendation of a ten percent increase this year was slashed by President Nixon to seven percent effective next year.

Under great pressure from the Congress and facing a Democratic caucus vote in support of 15% increases this year, the President, as has become typical, changed his position and today is in support of a 10% increase, next year. Our majority leader, Carl Albert says, "this is too little and too late." Nixon has shown no leadership and we Democrats must mobilize public opinion against this premature attack upon the Congress and its already affirmative record.

In the most recent special elections, in three heavily favored Republican districts, three Democrats have been elected to Congress. Republicans sense trouble in the 1970 elections and are beginning to unleash a propaganda barrage.

Permit me to say that the Administration position also on civil rights is disgraceful. I have looked in vain for strong leadership in this field from the White House.

Instead, all we have witnessed is a wavering in the face of resistance to orderly school desegregation. Attorney General Mitchell seems to have overruled HEW Secretary Finch, and recalcitrants have been given another delay in the requirement of opening their classrooms to all children equally. The President's Civil Rights Commission headed by Father Hesburgh has decried these actions and attorneys in the Justice Department are in revolt. Further the Administration's proposals to amend the voting rights act will be rejected and instead Congress will summarily extend this historic civil rights legislation without any watered down amendments.

Congress has its work cut out to save our past progress and to set our own priorities.

We desperately need a re-ordering of our national goals. We cannot allow our cities and local communities to crumble in decay, our highways to clog up with traffic, our school children to be deprived of the best educational opportunities available, and our poor to continue to go to bed hungry while our resources are expended on more and more weapons of war and destruction. This continues to be our most pressing agenda for this nation.

I believe that progressive thinking of women like you is absolutely imperative if we are to meet the challenges posed by the school dropout, the parentless delinquent, the underachiever, the nonreader, and more recently the rebel with a cause who simply drops out of a society he does not agree with and does his own thing without feeling any responsibility to the community as a whole.

Your help is needed to cope with the resentment of young people who increasingly oppose the standards of their elders. Many in today's generation cannot understand why our 18 and 19 year olds are sent to the Great War in Vietnam to fight on a lonely and isolated battlefield. They do not understand our democracy which fails to hold true to its cherished ideals of equality and justice. They do not share the average citizen's goals of success based upon material wealth. Do we have the capacity to relate to these young people of today? I believe that we must and resist those who advocate only suppression and discipline as the solution.

This is a special challenge for women and I invite you to participate in the national and local policy-making which sets the pattern of our relationships with those now coming to the fore. Specifically, we as women must help re-order our national priorities so that there is less reason for the young to rebel and be discontented. We owe this to our children and to our nation's integrity.

Women should press for greater attention to our growing domestic needs in such fields as education, health, transportation, job-training, housing, and—yes—hunger of many people in the midst of our general affluence.

Mythology traces the heroic element in woman's character from early times. Have you ever stopped to notice that Justice is always and everywhere depicted in the form of a woman, why Freedom is so often symbolized in womanly form in statutory and other depictions, and why the ideal of Purity is likewise, and Peace, and so on. Going back as far as the beginnings of our civilization in Hellenic Greece and Imperial Rome, we encounter a rich and elaborate mythology, a pantheon of gods with human traits but nevertheless who represented great life forces such as light or darkness, the sun, the moon, the seasons, the controlling power of the sea, and the mysterious forces of the underworld. Women are duly recognized here, including Aurors of the dawn, Iris of the rainbow, Flora of the world of bloom, Ceres of the fruitful harvest, Minerva of the devotion of pure intellect to the control and guidance of the world's affairs.

This great heroic tradition of women lives on from mythology into history itself.

We can marvel at the courage and intellect of Anne Hutchinson of our colonial days and hundreds of other women who helped shape this nation's beginnings. In the Congress the woman pioneer was Miss Jeanette Rankin, elected to the House of Representatives in 1916 even before women's suffrage.

I think it is not only possible but necessary for women to help make our national decisions. As individuals we must do our share to resolve these problems at the same time that we meet our other obligations to our husbands, and our children.

As we shall not fall in our individual responsibilities, so we shall not fall as a group, for we have a great task to continue to mold our divided society into a united community dedicated to human dignity, to peace with justice.

You can lend your assistance to many local programs, and if not actively participate at least support our efforts to help improve the quality of life for all Americans. This again revolves around the question of national priorities, an area which sorely needs your judgment and advice. I am confident that you as Democratic women actively engaged in politics will do your part to support our vital effort to solve these domestic problems and to return us to a country of Peace and Tranquility. Your kindness and hospitality is deeply appreciated. As we say in Hawaii, Mahalo or thank you and Aloha.

ILL-ADVISED VIET MORATORIUM COULD SET A RISKY PRECEDENT

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, once again I find myself very much in agreement with a column by David S. Broder. This one appears in the Washington Post of Tuesday, October 14, 1969:

ILL-ADVISED VIET MORATORIUM COULD SET A RISKY PRECEDENT

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—The larger the plans for Wednesday's Vietnam moratorium, the

more the central message and tactic of the demonstration have been obscured. If the event is to be gauged properly, it is important to uncover its original premises from the debris of cliches and endorsements in which they have lately been buried.

A number of men active in the moratorium have taken time to point out what they consider the errors of the argument in this column last week that it is a plan for "the breaking of the President." With sincerity and conviction, they have asserted that, far from breaking the President, they are out to save him, by persuading him to make the peace the nation craves and, incidentally, to save the political system by keeping the antiwar movement out of the hands of the radicals and in control of those with a commitment to peaceful forms of protest.

Their conversations and correspondence have helped to define three questions which might be borne in mind by those planning to participate in the moratorium.

First, what is the target of this protest? Sam Brown, the able spokesman for the moratorium, says it is not an anti-Nixon move because "we learned in 1968 that what we must oppose are not personalities but policies."

But if the Nixon administration is following the very policies recommended in 1968 by the antiwar faction, as I believe, then their moratorium is mobilizing public opinion against its own policy recommendation to the President. The minority plank at the Democratic convention, endorsed by all the leading doves, called for a halt in the bombing of North Vietnam. This has been done. It recommended a reduction in offensive operations in South Vietnam. The President has ordered this and it is in effect.

It asked for "a phased withdrawal over a relatively short period of time" of all foreign troops. The Nixon administration has begun pulling Americans out of Vietnam without waiting for North Vietnam to agree to mutual withdrawals, as the doves thought necessary.

Finally, it recommended that the United States use the leverage of troop withdrawals to "encourage" the Saigon government "to negotiate a political reconciliation with the National Liberation Front" looking toward "a broadly representative government" but recognizing that "the specific shape of this reconciliation will be a matter for decision by the South Vietnamese."

If this is not precisely the policy of the current administration, as enunciated by the President and the Secretary of State, then words have lost their meaning. And if the moratorium sponsors want to argue—as some have—that the President is lying about his purpose, their suspicions must be weighed against the facts of reduced fighting, reduced troop levels and reduced casualties, which his policies have brought about.

Second, what is the alternative they recommend? It has been described in moratorium publicity as everything from a negotiated settlement to immediate, total American withdrawal from Vietnam, but Brown said Sunday on "Face the Nation" that it is the latter that the moratorium has "consistently" demanded.

If that is the case, then the elected officials, clergymen and educators who have lent their prestige to the moratorium can properly be asked if this is the program they endorse. Many of these sponsors were involved in the fight for the minority plank at the Chicago convention which specifically said the war "will not be ended by military victory, surrender or unilateral withdrawal by either side."

It might be well for those men to explain Wednesday when and why they concluded that their opposition to unilateral withdrawal was wrong. It would be even more useful if they could explain why a one-dimensional plan to pull out troops is any more likely to be wise policy than the one-dimensional plan that sent the troops in.

Have we not learned yet to examine the political consequences of military decisions?

Third, and most important, what about the method of the moratorium? Is it compatible with the maintenance of representative democracy or does it substitute the rule of the street?

The sponsors say the name "moratorium," rather than "strike," was chosen to emphasize that the protest is to be peaceful and noncoercive. It is a nice distinction. The noncoercive feature may be almost invisible to the thousands of students whose colleges will shut down Wednesday. If the moratorium continues, as planned, for two days in November, three days in December, and so on, it will more and more come to resemble the general strike so familiar to European politics.

And if it succeeds in its aim, what is to prevent other majorities or sizable minorities in the country from using the same technique to force their views on agencies of the government? The moratorium sponsors say Vietnam is an extraordinary issue, but they must know it is not the only issue which agitates millions of people.

One wonders what the moratorium sponsors would say if Billy Graham were to ask all the parents who want prayers restored to public schools to withdraw their children from school for one additional day each month until the Supreme Court reverses its school-prayer decision.

Suppose pro-prayer teachers agreed to meet the pupils in private homes on moratorium days to discuss "the overriding significance of religion in human life." Would the Vietnam moratorium sponsors cheer? What would they say if landlords and real estate men opposed to integrated housing declared a moratorium until Congress repeals the open-housing law?

My view, just to be clear, is not that the Vietnamese moratorium is un-American, illegitimate, meanly partisan or personally vindictive in its motivation. My view is that it is an ill-timed, misdirected protest, vague in its purpose and quite conceivably dangerous in its precedent.

As was said last week, its immediate result may be the breaking of the President. In the serious weakening of his power to negotiate peace or to achieve any of the other purposes for which he was elected, its longer term effects may be to subvert a system of democratic government I happen to believe is worth preserving.

ETHNIC SLURS FROM A CALIFORNIA JUDGE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, a key precept of our American system of law holds that any man is assured of free and unprejudiced judicial hearing.

While it is impossible to expect that any man can be completely unbiased, I certainly feel that a judge should be able to conduct himself and his duties with a minimum of intolerance.

Last month, an unfortunate incident occurred in a juvenile hearing before a San Jose, Calif., judge. Remarks by the judge constituted a vicious slur upon all Americans of Mexican descent.

None of us should stand for such impropriety by a man entrusted by the public with broad judicial powers. I have joined with many organizations and in-

dividuals—among them, the Community Advisory Council of the East Los Angeles Service Center, the California Rural Legal Assistance program, the Los Angeles League of United Latin American Citizens, and the Chicano Law Students Association—in demanding immediate intensive investigation of the judge's remarks. If it is proven that the remarks do slur the Mexican American community, then I hope that proper action can be initiated to remove the judge from the bench.

I am proud of the Mexican American heritage and their contributions to our society, and I feel that the judge's reprehensible outburst displays an extreme lack of judicial temperance and I seriously question his ability to handle the duties expected of a man in his position.

Mr. Speaker, I now place in the RECORD two articles from the Los Angeles Times relating to this matter:

A JUDGE WHO DISGRACED THE BENCH

"We ought to send you out of the country—send you back to Mexico . . . You ought to commit suicide."

"You are lower than animals and haven't the right to live in organized society—just miserable, lousy, rotten people."

"Maybe Hitler was right. The animals in our society probably ought to be destroyed because they have no right to live among human beings."

Were these the mouthings of a lynch mob or the taunts of a racist sheriff?

No. They were uttered by the Honorable Gerald S. Chargin, a judge of the Superior Court of the State of California, presiding at a juvenile hearing in San Jose.

The outrageously intemperate language used by Judge Chargin clearly requires that he be removed from the bench.

Before the judge on Sept. 2 was a 17-year-old Mexican-American youth accused of incest involving his 15-year-old sister. He had originally pleaded innocent but reportedly changed his plea.

In his diatribe against the young defendant, Judge Chargin broadened his remarks, including his gratuitous reference to the sister: "Well, probably she will have half a dozen children and three or four marriages before she is 18."

The judge's indictment of "miserable, lousy, rotten people" led Dep. Public Defender Fred Lucero to object that "The court is indicting the whole Mexican group . . . What appalls me is that the court is saying that Hitler was right in genocide."

To which Judge Chargin replied: "What are we going to do with the mad dogs of our society?"

"Either we have to kill them or send them to an institution or place them out of the hands of good people because that's the theory—one of the theories of punishment is if they get to the position that they want to act like mad dogs, then we have to separate them from society."

Although the judge told the defendant, "You will probably end up in the state's prison before you are 25, and that's where you belong anyhow," he finally ordered the youth released on probation.

Chargin excused his behavior by saying that "it is an accepted fact that these lectures are stated in harsh terms to impress upon the minds of the youth the seriousness of the situation in which they find themselves."

Nothing, however, can excuse language so harsh and so intemperate as to arouse an entire community to anger over such racial slurs.

The transcript of the Sept. 2 hearings has now been forwarded by the Attorney Gen-

eral's office to the Commission on Judicial Qualifications with a formal request to "expedite" an investigation.

There can be no other conclusion than that Judge Chargin is not qualified to sit on the bench. He stands convicted by his own words.

CHICANO STUDENTS IN THREE LAW SCHOOLS RAP JUDGE FOR SLUR

(By Ruben Salazar)

Chicano law students at UCLA, USC and Loyola University Tuesday publicly condemned a San Jose Superior Court judge who from the bench characterized Mexicans as "animals."

At a news conference at UCLA, the Chicano Law Students Assn., which represents 60 Mexican-American law students in the three universities, said it has "pledged itself to aid in the removal of Judge Gerald S. Chargin from the bench."

Guadalupe Martinez, chairman of the association, said Judge Chargin's remarks were filled with the racist hatred encountered daily by brown and black people in the United States.

While sentencing a Mexican-American youth who had pleaded guilty to incest, Judge Chargin, according to the court transcript, said that Mexican people after 13 years of age think "it's perfectly all right to go out and act like an animal."

REMOVAL TO BECOME GOAL

He then added that "Maybe Hitler was right. The animals in our society probably ought to be destroyed . . ."

Martinez said the Chicano Law Students Assn. has taken Chargin's removal as their cause.

The third year law student said he addressed a meeting of most of UCLA's law faculty and that at least 30 out of 48 members have pledged their support. UCLA law professor Michael Tigar is circulating a petition among his colleagues.

Judge Chargin, 65, has been transferred from his juvenile court to civil case duties in Palo Alto until the Commission on Judicial Qualifications makes a ruling on the incident.

The law students said they will work with Don B. Kates of the California Rural Legal Assistance in their effort to force the removal of Judge Chargin.

The association said "Kates will petition the California Supreme Court to consider the removal of Judge Chargin from the bench should the procedures followed by the Commission on Judicial Qualifications fail" to "effectuate the removal."

In San Jose, the City Council voted unanimously to censure Chargin and asked that an investigation be made of Chargin's fitness to serve on the bench.

SEEKS INCREASED TIMBER YIELDS

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the number of new housing starts today is down sharply because of tight monetary policy and high mortgage interest rates. But we must be ready to supply the housing needs of tomorrow when restrictions are eased. The demand for greatly expanded new housing programs clearly exists. Our national goal of building 26 million new houses over the next decade must be achieved.

We will be hampered in this effort by outmoded management concepts that

will limit our output of timber from our public and private forests. We must act now to improve our harvest techniques of this great natural resource to insure an adequate timber supply.

A bill awaiting action by the House Committee on Agriculture (H.R. 12025), of which I am a cosponsor, provides for more intensive management of our forest lands and promises increased timber yields. The bill offers the opportunity to meet all the demands made on our timber resources—economic and otherwise. Better management would insure broader development of the forests for recreation and wildlife purposes as well as commercial uses.

The Forest Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee has acted favorably on this bill. I strongly urge early consideration and approval by the full committee.

The executive president of Boise Cascade Corp., Stephen B. Moser, in a recent address to the American Forestry Association presented an excellent argument in favor of this legislation. A report of this address was published in one of my district's newspapers, and I commend this report to the attention of the House:

EXECUTIVE SAYS PUBLIC DENIED BENEFIT FROM FOREST

COLORADO SPRINGS.—"Philosophically, the nation's resources are owned by the people, and it would seem logical that the people are entitled to the best possible return for the sale and usage of what they own. Conflicting governmental policies and practices in the past may have prevented the public from realizing maximum economic benefits from the forest."

Stephen B. Moser, executive president of Boise Cascade Corporation, made these points in an address in Colorado Springs last week to the annual convention of the American Forestry Association.

"Any fair-minded person will recognize that these resources are being used to produce products and values needed by our society. Will not the extraction of 'top dollar' for raw materials run up the final cost so that the people in the end are forced to pay higher prices for the finished products of these resources?"

"COST IS PRIME FACTOR

"This may run directly counter to social programs initiated and administered by the government itself where low-finished cost is a prime requisite—housing for instance," Moser said.

"Government policy calls for building or rehabilitating an average of 2.6 million housing units a year for 10 years.

"This amount of housing each year will take a tremendous amount of materials, especially lumber and plywood. It is obvious that the increases are going to have to come substantially from the federally-managed forests which, after all, contain nearly two-thirds of all the softwood sawtimber in the country.

"Is the government, then, going to demand top dollar for the people's timber and force these same people to pay more for their housing as a result?"

"One part of our government has set an extremely high goal for housing production. Another part has set a policy of 'top dollar' for the sales from its forest resources. And a third has cracked down on the money markets with disastrous results for home-building, which is the principal single market for softwood lumber and plywood," Moser argued.

"PRODUCTION LOW

"Congressional investigations have illuminated a fact that has been familiar to the forest industries for a long time. They learned that the federal forests, with 60 percent of the inventory of softwood sawtimber are producing logs at far below their true capacity.

"Federal forest managers have been hampered by inadequate appropriations to finance the level of forest management they would really like to attain and by a lack of practical policies which would enable them quickly to adapt to changing markets. Private business could not operate under such restrictions.

"Federal forests are under-used. And under-use is a form of waste. Why, for instance, should billions of feet of salvageable timber, which has been damaged by blowdown, insects, fire or overmaturity, go unsalvaged? For the simple reason that the forest managers have been denied manpower and the funds to build the access roads necessary to get at that salvageable timber," Moser commented.

"The National Forest Conservation and Management Act of 1969, which was introduced under the sponsorship of some 60 representatives and 15 senators, may prove to be the most significant advance in forestry legislation in many decades.

"The act has as its major purpose the provision of funds so that more intensive management of the federal forests can be provided, while at the same time protecting and insuring other multiple-use benefits from these lands.

"TIMBER SALE FUND

"The Act would create a fund from federal forest timber sale receipts to be used for certain production-increasing timber management practices. It would enable the forest managers to increase skilled manpower and to set up provision of adequate access roads. It would give the managers the opportunity to do what private industry had done . . . to apply sales revenues to improvement of holdings and output. There are ample safeguards to conservation interests.

"There is also an additional need to revise current federal timber selling practices in order that the risks and uncertainties involved in dealing with a monopoly timber seller (the government) are minimized and that the new plant investments required to increase production of wood products are encouraged.

"It is time to take the wraps off the federal managers and let them do their job the way they would like to do it. The National Forest Conservation and Management Act will help accomplish this," Moser concluded.

REACHING FOR THE MOON**HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the weekend issue of the Christian Science Monitor, dated July 26, 1969, pointed to the need for continuing efforts to improve our life here on earth and the significance and importance of the Apollo 11 flight in the light of these needs. As this editorial so well points out the achievements of Apollo 11 and our national space program are indeed impor-

tant for the betterment of mankind not only in our country but throughout the world. I commend this article to the reading of my colleagues and the general public:

REACHING FOR THE MOON

Apollo 11 lifted men's eyes to the stars. We wonder if they saw the lesson this thrilling achievement wrote there.

Even as men gasped at the feat, they wondered if technology could help fulfill another dream—abolition of hunger and poverty from earth.

Engineers answer "yes." But they need a commitment from mankind comparable to that which enabled them to put men on the moon.

A group of scientists and engineers at the California Institute of Technology spelled this out a couple of years ago.

Man, they said, now does have the capacity to create more abundant living for all. Space-age engineering is one of his most potent tools. But the job demands three kinds of commitment without precedent in human history.

First, rich and poor countries need to recognize the problem as one of total economic development. Merely giving money to, say, India, merely giving technical advice or surplus food, won't do much good. The total economy of such a country has to be transformed to raise living standards even while trying to hold back population growth. A new kind of technology has to be created, a technology of decent living.

Having recognized this, richer countries would have to fund a development effort costing at least several times what they now spend on foreign aid. And they would have to sustain it for decades. That's the first unprecedented commitment.

Poor countries, for their part, would have to weed out traditions, entrenched greed, and other home-grown vices that inhibit development. That's commitment number two.

Finally, rich and poor alike would have to subordinate national rivalries to a common effort to pull the poor out of the slough of backward economies.

With such commitments, experts could identify specific goals in specific countries necessary to development and fulfill them. By the end of the century, the Cal Tech group said, this could give all men a richer life here on earth.

In today's atmosphere of nationalism, suspicion, and sometimes hate, to try for even a modicum of such global commitment seems like reaching for the moon. But, then, Apollo 11 has shown this no longer is synonymous with the unattainable.

ADMINISTRATION FAILS TO BACK NATIONAL PARKS**HON. JAMES G. O'HARA**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, for more than 9 months now, conservationists have been watching and waiting for the Nixon administration to demonstrate its interest in the preservation of wilderness and potential national parkland.

In order for the new administration to be permitted to develop policies and programs in an orderly fashion, without interruption by criticism, conservationists have remained silent observers.

But conservationists can wait and watch no longer.

Already, we have lost the opportunity to act this year on some of our most pressing conservation problems.

Recently the Sierra Club, a leading national organization of conservationists, assessed the administration's conservation inactivity and felt obliged to inform the Nation that the administration is doing little—if anything—to fulfill its earlier promises that national parks would receive high priority attention.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the Sierra Club press release, "Sierra Club urges Congress to assume leadership in park funding," issued September 30, in the RECORD:

SIERRA CLUB URGES CONGRESS TO ASSUME LEADERSHIP IN PARK FUNDING

The Sierra Club today urged Congress to take the initiative in providing the American people with an outstanding National Park System. Speaking for the Club, Vice-President Edgar Wayburn said "the Nixon Administration has given strong verbal assurances that the protection of our present and potential parklands is a matter of high priority. Unfortunately this commitment has remained simply words: official actions to date point in the opposite direction, and raises a credibility gap which is widening week by week."

As evidence to this contention, Wayburn pointed to a number of facts.

—The Nixon Administration has cut \$30 million off the outgoing Johnson Administration's budgetary request for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which is used for parkland acquisition. The Fund is authorized to have \$200 million for fiscal year 1970; President Johnson in January requested an appropriation of \$154 million, but the Nixon Administration is asking for only \$124 million.

—Since President Nixon took office last January, he has not recommended to Congress a single addition to the National Park System or the Wilderness System.

Although Secretary of the Interior Hickel recently unveiled a multi-million-dollar project for the creation of urban parklands, the Bureau of the Budget has made it clear that money for the proposal will simply not be forthcoming.

A recent Bureau of the Budget letter to Congressman Wayne Aspinall, Chairman, of the House Interior Committee, stresses that the Nixon Administration has no intentions of helping a program for funding National Parks. The letter stated, in part, "Thus, even without authorization of new areas and under optimistic assumptions about the stability of land prices, deferrals in the Park Service land acquisition program in recently authorized areas or a reduction in the amounts proposed for acquisition of inholdings in older areas, or both, will probably be necessary."

Conservationists throughout the country must respond to this statement in the strongest possible terms, Wayburn emphasized. "What does this message mean? It means the destruction of Point Reyes National Seashore where all authorized funds have been spent, and the Park remains a patchwork of Federal and private lands. It means further jeopardy for Everglades National Park, where large inholdings must be acquired and kept from development. It means loss of long standing park proposals, such as Michigan's Sleeping Bear Dunes Lakeshore, now near enactment. The destruction of priceless natural areas is threatened from Massachusetts to California and from Michigan to Texas. The pressure of development is hitting all of these areas now: we

cannot afford to wait for some hypothetical day when the state of the economy improves.

When Congress overwhelmingly passed the Land and Water Conservation Fund, it intended to create an automatic method of providing for needed parkland acquisition. The method could work well. It must be made perfectly clear that the problem is not one of lack of funds: the money is there. The problem is that the President has chosen to lock up about one-third of the available money, appropriating an inadequate \$124 million for park purposes, and permitting about \$76 million simply to lie fallow. Unused money in the Land and Water Conservation Fund cannot presently be used for any other purpose but Parks, Wilderness Areas, and Recreational Lands.

"The President's policy is not economical and it is not anti-inflationary. If he persists in it, the nation will soon face a choice of two alternatives: either we shall completely lose some of the most beautiful and naturally significant regions of America, or we shall buy them at a cost far higher than what we have to pay now, which will create an even greater inflationary impact. It must be remembered that land prices for park purposes are escalating at rates of 10 to 20 percent annually."

As an example of the consequences of the Administration's inaction Wayburn cited the case of Point Reyes National Seashore in California. This area, lying less than fifty miles from a metropolitan area of over four million people, was designated as a National Seashore in 1962. Since then the Park Service has committed all of the \$19 million authorized for land acquisition, but only a third of the full 53,000 acres have been acquired. Owners of the remaining land want to sell to the government, to relieve themselves of an enormous property tax burden, and still preserve the land they love. The Federal Government is forcing the owners to sell to developers. This will ruin any prospect for a decent Seashore."

"At this moment," Wayburn continued, "bulldozers are cutting roads and lots are being surveyed on the Lake Ranch, the key to a viable Point Reyes Seashore. The American people, now and forever, cannot afford to lose this area of forests, lakes, and beaches. President Nixon can avert the destruction of Point Reyes, but he must act promptly to do so." Wayburn pointed out that Nixon has been urged to save Point Reyes by conservation groups and by prominent political leaders of both parties. "I remind the President that the strongest and most eloquent pleas for an increased authorization to save Point Reyes has come from both Republicans and Democrats, notably from Senators George Murphy (R. Cal.) and Alan Cranston (D. Cal.). I ask the President why he ignores the advice of these men and maintains his intransigence on the matter of Point Reyes."

"The men in Congress most responsible for decisions on parks, Congressman Wayne Aspinall (D. Cal.) and Senators Henry Jackson (D. Wash.) and Alan Bible (D. Nev.), have played leading roles in developing the great surge of park legislation in the 1960's. They have more understanding of the nation's needs and experience with these programs than anyone now in control in the Administration. We are looking to them now to provide leadership in shaping the course ahead and in educating the new Administration. Congress has the authority to release the 'captured money' in the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to appropriate the full authorization of \$200 million for fiscal year 1970. We urge them to use this authority and to assume leadership."

"We urge every citizen in this nation who has ever enjoyed the wonders of a National Park to do his part to preserve and extend

the Park System. We urge them to write their representatives in Congress, and the President, today."

TESTIMONY ON TAX REFORM: PART III

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to insert the third article in a four-part series concerning the testimony on tax reform I submitted to the Senate Finance Committee.

This article is limited to my remarks on the proposed taxation of State and local bond interest. This is a subject of deep personal concern, for I believe the retention of the traditional tax exemption is as vital to balancing Federal-State relationships as it is to continuing the economic development of our communities.

Our Founding Fathers, in their wisdom, provided that governmental responsibility and policymaking to be shared between the Federal Government and the States. This delicate balance would be disrupted if not destroyed by Federal taxation of State and local bond interest. In fact, I believe that any encroachment by the Federal Government on the tax exemption of State and local securities would inevitably erode both State and local financing and State and local government. As we have learned from history, no government can maintain itself as an independent unit unless it controls its own financing.

Our States and municipalities must provide local securities financing for costly development projects. As we are all aware, the public pressure on State and local governments to furnish more and better services and facilities is enormous. Our citizens want their State and local governments to build schools, hospitals, highways, water and sewer facilities, and to provide all the other services that community-oriented governments are peculiarly qualified to provide. This trend should be encouraged.

I believe that our political structure should be ordered so that problems government can resolve are attacked at their source with local personnel and resources, rather than from afar by faceless and nameless bureaucrats for whom the people who have the problems are only statistics, and the communities where the problems lie are merely points on a map.

I insert in the RECORD that portion of my testimony to the Senate Finance Committee which deals with the taxation of State and local bond interest:

STATE AND LOCAL BOND INTEREST

The revised tax treatment of state and local bonds contained in H.R. 13270 is a matter of intense concern to our state and local officials throughout the country. I share this concern.

As we all are aware, the public pressure on state and local governments to furnish more and better services and facilities is enormous. I think this pressure is not only reasonable

but its intensification is foreseeable on the basis of forecasted increase in our population, its needs, and its expectations.

Our citizens want their state and local governments to build more and better schools, hospitals, highways, water and sewer facilities, to provide all the other services that community oriented governments are peculiarly qualified to provide. This trend should be encouraged. Our political structure should be ordered so that problems government can resolve are attacked at their source with local personnel, rather than from afar by faceless and nameless bureaucrats for whom the people who have the problems are merely statistics, and the communities where the problems lie are only points on a map.

In providing expanded services, state and local governments receive federal grants-in-aid. These grants represent national policy decisions made in Washington, D.C., that the federal government must help state and local governments meet their obligations to their citizenry. President Nixon has recognized the needs of state and local governments in this regard and has proposed a dynamic and expanded federal revenue sharing plan for the states, as well as other measures to streamline and decentralize federal operations.

To date, total federal grants-in-aid to the states total approximately \$25 billion. Grants for capital purpose will total about \$6.5 billion for the 1970 fiscal year. The federal grants must be matched by recipient state and local governments; if there is capital expenditures involved, bond financing is used in most instances, because there is simply a lack of funds to do otherwise.

Governments raise money by various means. Taxation is the largest single revenue producer, but borrowing is also of great significance. In 1968, state and local governments issued more than \$16 billion in debt instruments. Such a sum is evidence of the basic principle that the power to borrow is as essential to good government as is the power to tax.

If the Congress takes action to impair state and local capacity to borrow money, these governments will find their ability to raise capital funds, including those required to match federal grants greatly curtailed. This will mean that the costs for all public construction will be increased to the state or local government. As a result, the state or local tax burden of the people will be increased, and the construction of much needed public facilities could be slowed down or even halted. Eventually, of course, the facilities would be constructed. They would have to be paid for, however, out of increased sales and property taxes and utility fees. These taxes and fees, regressive though they may be, will have to be relied on even more heavily than at present in order to supply the necessary capital funds to state and local governments.

From a functional viewpoint, the effect of the tax reform bill is to tax the interest on state and local bonds in gradual stages. Within this context, the much discussed local choice to issue either tax exempt bonds or taxable bonds with an interest subsidy is an illusory choice. The illusion is created by the requirement that the Secretary of the Treasury fix the interest subsidy for fully taxable bonds each quarter on the basis of the difference between the interest yield on such full taxable bonds and the yield on "tax exempt" bonds as determined by the bond market at that time. It is thus apparent that this difference would gradually decline and the cost of borrowing to state and local governments even under the federal subsidy option would substantially increase.

From a philosophical viewpoint, I believe that the immunity of state and local governments in the exercise of their governmental functions from federal taxation is necessary for the preservation of our constitutionally delineated dual sovereignty

system of government. Within this context, it is no more right for the federal government to interfere with or impede the states in the performance of their governmental functions than it is for a state to interfere with or impede the federal government in the attainment of its governmental aims.

An even more fundamental objection I have to the proposed tax treatment is that if the federal government undertakes to encroach upon the tax exemption of state and local securities, it inevitably has the power to control state and local financing. As we have learned from history, without self-control of its own financing, no government can maintain itself as an independent and autonomous body.

CONCERNED CITIZENS BACK REPEAL OF EMERGENCY DETENTION ACT

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, a nation cannot function effectively as a democracy without the eternal vigilance of an informed and concerned citizenry. If the number of citizens across the Nation who have contacted me to express support for legislation pending in Congress to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 is any indication, we do indeed have an informed and concerned citizenry. They know, too, that so long as the specter of future American concentration camps casts its shadow, there is the danger that the shameful episode in our Nation's history of incarcerating 110,000 innocent Japanese Americans and their parents during World War II can be repeated.

As I have previously brought to the attention of the Congress, Mr. Speaker, more than one-fourth of the membership of the House has joined with me in cosponsoring a bipartisan measure to repeal title II of the Internal Security Act.

It is heartening, indeed, to know that our citizens are expressing their concern and support for early congressional approval of this legislation. As evidence of this growing concern, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following resolutions which I have recently received in support of the repeal of title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950: First, a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the general council of the American Baptist Convention; second, a resolution passed unanimously by the Salt Lake branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; and third, a resolution passed unanimously by the Salt Lake Chapter of the Spanish-Speaking Organization for Community Integrity and Opportunity. The resolutions follow:

A RESOLUTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE SALT LAKE CHAPTER OF THE SPANISH-SPEAKING ORGANIZATION FOR COMMUNITY INTEGRITY AND OPPORTUNITY (SOCIO)

Whereas, it is one of the goals of SOCIO to promote the dignity, integrity and freedom of all persons, and

Whereas, the arrest and detention of persons in places of confinement on the basis of suspicion and belief without due process of law and conviction for crime by a jury of their peers is contrary to the beliefs of and abhorrent to the members of SOCIO, and

Whereas, there now exists under the provisions of Public Law 831, 81 of Congress, Title II, Section 102, 103, 104, (The Emergency Detention Act of 1950) the possibility of just such arrest of persons and their confinement in detention camps, such camps having already been built, without conviction for crime or due process of law, and

Whereas, Senator Daniel K. Inouye and 22 co-sponsors have introduced Senate Bill 1872 in the United States Senate and Congressman Spark M. Matsunaga and Chet Hollifield have sponsored H.R. 11825 in the United States House of Representatives for the purpose of repealing the Emergency Detention Act of 1950,

Therefore, the Salt Lake Chapter of SOCIO unanimously resolves to give its wholehearted support to repeal of the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 and urges Senator Wallace F. Bennett, Senator Frank E. Moss, Congressman Lawrence Burton and Congressman Sherman P. Lloyd to work for and to vote for the repeal of an act so contrary to American belief in freedom and justice, and

Further resolves that a copy of this resolution be sent to each Utah Senator and Congressman, and to Senator Daniel K. Inouye and Congressmen Spark M. Matsunaga and Chet Hollifield to show our support for the repeal of the Emergency Detention Act of 1950, and further that a copy be sent to the Salt Lake Chapter of the Japanese American Citizens League that they may know we have committed ourselves to the campaign for repeal.

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the General Council held at Valley Forge on September 9, 1969, the following action was taken.

The action deals with a proposed resolution on Title 2 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 and is as follows:

"Because Title 2, Internal Security Act of 1950 (the emergency detention act) violates the constitutional rights of American citizens, by its provisions that: 'A citizen or citizens, during proclaimed periods of emergencies, may be detained because of suspicion that he, or they, may conspire to engage in treasonable acts or commit sabotage against the United States.'

"Because the measure contains no provision for trial by jury or a hearing before a judge but only a hearing before the departmental hearing officer, appointed by the Attorney General who ordered the arrest and detention.

"Because it does not require the government to present evidence as to why the accused has been detained.

"Because there is no provision for appeal to the courts, but only to a board appointed by the official who authorized detention in the first place.

"Because the one experience in the United States, to date, of such detention—evacuation of Americans of Japanese ancestry from the Pacific Coast and their detention in relocation centers, is now recognized as unnecessary, unfair, and contrary to American tradition.

"Therefore, we commend Senator Inouye of Hawaii and Senators Murphy and Cranston of California for introducing Senate Bill 1872, and Congressmen Matsunaga of Hawaii and Hollifield of California for introducing H.R. 12220, both of which provide for the repeal of the emergency act of 1950 otherwise known as Title 2, Internal Security Act.

"We urge Congress to give favorable con-

sideration for the passage of these acts during the current session."

A RESOLUTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE SALT LAKE BRANCH OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE (NAACP)

Whereas, the NAACP is long familiar with the tyranny that exists where the rights of man and due process of law do not, and

Whereas, the NAACP has long fought to establish the right of all persons to receive their fullest constitutional protection under law, and

Whereas, the arrest and detention of persons in places of confinement solely on the grounds of suspicion and belief without due process of law and without having been convicted of a crime by a jury of their peers is contrary to the beliefs of and abhorrent to the members of the NAACP, and

Whereas, there now exists under the provisions of Public Law 831, 81 of Congress, Title II, Section 102, 103, 104, (The Emergency Detention Act of 1950) the possibility of just such arrest of persons and their confinement in detention camps, such camps having already been built, without conviction for crime or due process of law, and

Whereas, Senator Daniel K. Inouye and 22 co-sponsors have introduced Senate Bill 1872 in the United States Senate and Congressman Spark M. Matsunaga and Chet Hollifield have sponsored H.R. 11825 in the United States House of Representatives for the purpose of repealing the Emergency Detention Act of 1950.

Therefore, the Salt Lake Branch of the NAACP unanimously resolves to give its wholehearted support to repeal of the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 and urges Senator Wallace F. Bennett, Senator Frank E. Moss, Congressman Lawrence Burton and Congressman Sherman P. Lloyd to work for and to vote for the repeal of an act so contrary to American belief in freedom and justice, and

Further resolves that a copy of this resolution be sent to each Utah Senator and Congressman, and to Senator Daniel K. Inouye and Congressman Spark M. Matsunaga and Chet Hollifield to show our support for the repeal of the Emergency Detention Act of 1950, and further that a copy be sent to the Salt Lake Branch of the Japanese American Citizens League that they may know we have committed ourselves to the campaign for repeal.

ALLIANCE FOR LABOR ACTION TAKES STAND FOR PEACE

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD an advertisement of the Alliance for Labor Action entitled "We Take Our Stand for Peace and an End to the War in Vietnam." The advertisement appeared on page A14 of the October 14, 1969, issue of the Washington Post.

The Alliance for Labor Action, in this advertisement, announces its support of the peaceful, lawful, nonviolent community activities of the October 15 Vietnam moratorium. That announcement is doubly significant; both because of its sponsor and its content.

The sponsor, the Alliance for Labor Action, represents about 4 million mem-

bers. When such a body of citizens voices support for a peaceful protest, no one can reasonably refuse to heed—or at least hear—their voices.

Moreover, it is not only the mere numbers that merit attention, but also the excellence and clarity of the statement. The union does not support irresponsible protest, but does properly recognize that unless the United States swiftly liquidates its tragic involvement in Vietnam, it will be unable to tackle such urgent problems as urban development, educational reform, and environmental protection.

The advertisement is as follows:

WE TAKE OUR STAND FOR PEACE AND AN END TO THE WAR IN VIETNAM

We take our stand with the millions of our fellow-Americans who call for an end to the war in Vietnam. We join the thousands of respected, responsible and patriotic national leaders in Congress, in the churches and synagogues, on campuses, in business, in civic organizations and in the professions in support of the peaceful, lawful, non-violent community activities of the October 15 Vietnam Moratorium.

We deplore the reprehensible activities of a small minority who burn the American flag and equate anti-Americanism with anti-war, for their actions are indefensible and counterproductive.

We call upon our government to face up to the reality that there is nothing to be won in Vietnam that is worth one more drop of American blood.

No responsible person believes that the United States will continue indefinitely to sacrifice American lives in Vietnam. The only question remaining is not whether we will withdraw our troops but how and when. We take our stand with those who are for getting out quickly and completely.

We take our stand with the millions of our fellow-Americans who share the view that the support of efforts to disengage America from Vietnam is an act of the highest patriotism and a distinct service to our country. For as long as we are involved in Vietnam:

America will be torn by serious division
Our youth will be alienated
Our urgent social problems will be neglected
Our resources will be wasted
Our moral credentials will be tarnished.

PEACE CAN UNITE AMERICA TO WAGE WAR AGAINST POVERTY, HUNGER, IGNORANCE, AND DISEASE

Peace can unite America and enable us to use the resources being wasted in Vietnam:
To rebuild our cities,
To solve the crisis in education,
To overcome the serious deficit in health care,

To provide security and dignity for our older citizens,

To deal effectively with the problems of air and water pollution and the deterioration of man's living environment.

Only peace will release the resources desperately needed to save America's cities.

**MAN HAS ALWAYS TAKEN RISKS IN WAR
IT IS TIME WE TAKE RISKS IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE**

Let us now put the sad Vietnamese chapter of our history behind us except to remember forever its lesson—that, of all political systems, democracy is the least capable of being transplanted at the point of a bayonet.

We call for bringing our troops home not only to save lives but in order to enable America to resume democracy's true work—to mobilize for peace and to turn our resources and the hearts, hands and minds of

our people to the fulfillment of the democratic promise of liberty, equality, justice and brotherhood for all. For the only way to make democracy safe in the world and to promote the spread of its blessings to those now denied them—by every form of totalitarianism, whether communist, fascist or military dictatorship—is to make democracy work, to translate democracy's ideals into meaningful reality in the lives of people.

We support the peaceful, lawful and non-violent activities of the October 15 Vietnam Moratorium as a step toward that end.

Alliance for labor action: International Union, UAW—Walter P. Reuther, President, Emil Mazey, Secretary Treasurer; International Brotherhood of Teamsters—Frank E. Fitzsimmons, General Vice President, Thomas E. Flynn, General Secretary Treasurer; International Chemical Workers Union—Thomas E. Boyle, President, Marshall Shafer, Secretary Treasurer.

SUCCESS IN THE SEABED TREATY

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on October 7 the United States and the Soviet Union announced their agreement on a treaty to prohibit the emplacement of weapons of mass destruction on the seabed.

This development followed weeks of intensive negotiations between the United States and the Russian delegations at the Geneva Disarmament Conference to resolve differences between their versions of a Seabed Arms Treaty.

While the treaty has been denigrated in some circles as not accomplishing anything very significant in controlling the arms race, this criticism is shortsighted. The seabed treaty is an important step, for several reasons.

First, it indicates the ability of the two great powers to come to an agreement on arms control when, in general, their interests coincide, without being deterred by ideologically based hostility.

Second, the draft seabed treaty, like the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, cuts off from nuclear rivalry one vast area which otherwise might have been the scene of an arms race.

Third, the success in reaching agreement on the seabed treaty demonstrates the utility of the multilateral context of the Geneva Disarmament Committee, sponsored by the United Nations. Now that the seabed treaty has been tabled for ratification, the Committee can move on to other arms-control issues.

For their part in achieving the seabed treaty, commendations are due officials of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Our delegation to the disarmament conference and those who performed "backup" functions in Washington demonstrated considerable intelligence and skill in the negotiation process.

A number of articles and editorials on the seabed treaty have appeared in the press in recent days. At this point I in-

sert several which have come to my attention:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 1969]

UNITED STATES JOINS RUSSIA IN SEA A-BAN

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The United States and the Soviet Union announced yesterday that they have agreed on a treaty to ban the placing of nuclear weapons on the world's seabeds.

The agreement, announced in Geneva, now will be discussed by the Geneva Disarmament Conference and later at the United Nations General Assembly. It is open to amendment by third nations' suggestions, but substantive changes are not expected.

The proposed treaty is akin to one now in effect that bans nuclear weapons in outer space. It is essentially preemptive since thus far no such weapons have been placed on the ocean floors.

The new treaty would come into effect when ratified by the United States, the Soviet Union and 20 other nations. That could come about in 1970.

Key elements of the joint draft, worked out in the past six months, are:

Signers agree "not to emplace or emplace on the seabed and the ocean floor and in the subsol thereof beyond the maximum contiguous zone provided for in the 1958 Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone any objects with nuclear weapons or any other types of weapons of mass destruction, as well as structures, launching installations or any other facilities specifically designed for storing, testing or using such weapons."

Signers agree "not to assist, encourage or induce" any other country to "commit actions prohibited" by the treaty and "not to participate in any other way in such actions."

The 1958 treaty referred to was a detailed convention defining what are considered territorial waters, bays, high seas and so on. These are rules generally accepted by maritime nations.

Since there are varying national claims to territorial waters, ranging from the old 3-mile limit to several hundred miles, the draft treaty contains an article saying that nothing in the treaty "shall be interpreted as supporting or prejudicing the position of any state" with respect to its "rights or claims" relating to off-coast waters.

Verification is left to any treaty signer "using its own means or with the assistance of any other state" that ratifies the treaty. It is assumed that probably the only two superpowers will check, chiefly on what each other is doing. There also is a clause pledging signers to "consult and cooperate with a view to removing doubts concerning fulfillment of the obligations" of the treaty.

The agreement was a compromise. The Soviets dropped earlier insistence on complete demilitarization of the seabed that would have banned American submarine detection devices now in place to check movements of Russian underwater craft.

In return, the United States withdrew its initial proposal that the ban apply beyond the 3-mile limit, instead of 12 miles as the Russians proposed. The draft does not specifically put the limit at 12 miles, but such an understanding was made clear by an official American statement in Geneva by American negotiator James F. Leonard.

Leonard said that the joint text "would prohibit the emplacement on the seabed, beyond the 12-mile coastal zone, of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction." It took a ruling by President Nixon to overcome internal administration opposition, partly from the Navy, to the 12-mile rule. Nonetheless, opponents managed to keep the 12-mile reference out of the text.

The treaty, like earlier Soviet-American arms control treaties, provides that any na-

tion can withdraw if it "decides that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of this treaty have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country." In such a case, three months' advance notice must be given to the U.N. Security Council including "a statement of the extraordinary events."

Leonard in Geneva said that the treaty would not prevent submarines from being anchored on, or resting on, the seabed. Soviet delegate Alexei A. Roschin commented that the treaty would exclude "two-thirds of the surface of the earth from the sphere of the arms race."

In Washington, Secretary of State William P. Rogers said, the agreement was "encouraging" in that it showed the two superpowers are able to reach agreement on arms control measures. There is no agreement yet on when to start the strategic arms limitation treaty talks, the most critical of all arms control measures yet to be attempted.

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 9, 1969]

FOR SEABED DISARMAMENT

It is a matter of no small importance that the United States and the Soviet Union have jointly presented to the Geneva Disarmament Conference a draft treaty to ban nuclear weapons and other instruments of mass destruction from the seabeds of the world. The news encourages the hope that the decades-long deadlock on bridling arms and armed forces of every type may yet be broken by patient, persistent and honest negotiation.

In any case, after months of effort, America and Russia have agreed on measures to prevent the establishment of deadly new armaments systems on the continental shelves, the continental slopes and the great farther-out depths of the vast oceanic domain that covers 70 percent of the earth's surface. Thus the proposed pact to be applicable off every coast beyond the 12-mile limit, would put in force verifiable arrangements outlawing the emplacement and use of "any objects of mass destruction, as well as structures, launching installations or any other facilities specifically designed for storing, testing or using such weapons."

Of course, since it would not bar nuclear submarines or put any restraint on land-based intercontinental weaponry, there may be those who will shrug off the Soviet-American draft as something that does not really add up to a great deal. What needs to be kept in mind, however, is that this projected undertaking—coupled with the test-ban treaty, the non-proliferation treaty and the treaties to keep atomic-hydrogen armaments out of the Antarctic and outer space—does constitute a definite and quite promising step forward. Certainly, by keeping the military atom off the ocean floor, it would remove a potentially very dangerous area from the arms race, and to that extent it would serve the safety of mankind.

Above all, if the seabed treaty were universally signed and ratified, America and Russia might well find it possible, in concert with other powers, to move ahead toward productive talks on one of the world's greatest needs: The limitation and control of the fearsome array of strategic arms already deployed on land for possible wars of mutual annihilation.

In its own way, this balance of terror, which grows steadily more delicate and more terrifying, ought to be impetus enough for urgent negotiations on disarmament of a kind that could make our world considerably saner and less dangerous than it now is.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Oct. 8, 1969]

A PREVENTIVE TREATY

The announcement at Geneva that the United States and the Soviet Union have agreed on a joint draft treaty prohibiting use of "the seabed, ocean floor and the subsoil thereof" for the emplacement of weap-

ons of mass destruction is a most welcome and encouraging piece of news.

For one thing, the accord is a new demonstration of the ability of the two great powers to negotiate successfully, to find common ground for reaching an understanding. (In this case, it is important to note how quickly mutually acceptable terms were worked out—only seven months were needed to reconcile the differences in Washington's and Moscow's original proposals.) For another, this success revives faith in the efficacy of the diplomatic process as a means of controlling the competition in arms. Finally, the draft treaty, like the 1967 treaty forbidding the use of outer space for nuclear and other mass destruction weapons, has the great value of closing off one vast area of possible rivalry before the race had spread to it.

While the pact will do nothing to reduce or limit armaments already in being, it will, if ratified, eliminate the threat of yet another extension of the contest in weaponry. Probably the agreement was easier to reach because the technology for turning the seabed into an arsenal had not developed; the fact remains that America and Russia foresaw the danger and together undertook to avert it.

Thus the decade now ending has brought the test-ban treaty of 1963, the space treaty, the non-proliferation treaty—though the last, regrettably, has not come into force—and now the ocean floor treaty. It is a good record. Not quite good enough, though, because the largest, hardest task still lies ahead—the talks with Russia on halting the growth of offensive and defensive nuclear arms systems. The latest achievement at Geneva should provide fresh impetus for beginning those discussions and strengthen the hope that they can be made productive.

STRENGTHENING OUR AIR DEFENSE NETWORK

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the recent landing of a Russian-made Mig 17 at the Homestead Air Force Base in Florida, serves as a grim reminder that Communist aggression lurks only minutes away from our mainland. That the Mig was piloted by a Cuban pilot who was risking his life to escape from the Communist stronghold is heartening, but the fact still remains that the jet penetrated our national defense system with alarming ease.

This incident points out the obvious need to strengthen our national defense network at this critical point. But for the motives of the pilot, the plan could have unleashed a nuclear holocaust at a time when the President was at nearby Key Biscayne, Fla. In one blow, Communist aggressors could have delivered a crippling blow to the Nation.

According to the Department of Defense, the Key West Naval Base complex comprised of Navy, Army, and Air Force detachments, constitutes the mainstay of the defense network which guards the southeastern approaches to the United States. This mainstay must be reinforced and revitalized. Our Nation must be secure from possible sneak enemy attacks emanating from the island of Cuba or any other Communist aggressor to the south.

I commend the President on his quick reinstatement of the picket plane warning system, and I urge the President and the Secretaries of the respective services to initiate whatever action, install whatever equipment, and deploy whatever personnel they deem necessary to fortify our coastal defense network at this vulnerable spot.

The cost of such added precautionary measures is more than outweighed by the increased security to the country it will bring. Our personal and national security must not be compromised by budgetary considerations.

WILLIAM J. MCCARTHY

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate and pay homage to a man who has been a dear and close personal friend of mine for the past 25 years, Mr. William J. McCarthy. A testimonial dinner was given in honor of Bill McCarthy on October 5 at the War Memorial Auditorium in Boston. In addition to his vast army of friends, many of Boston's most influential labor leaders and civil officials were present to pay tribute to this truly exceptional man. Seated with me at the head table were Joseph C. Conlon, secretary-treasurer, Teamsters Local 25; Fred J. Roberto, secretary-treasurer, Teamsters' Local 191, and president of Connecticut Joint Council No. 64; Mrs. James R. Hoffa; Mrs. John English; Father Kenneth Murphy; Hon. Maurice Donohue, president of Massachusetts Senate; Hon. Garrett Byrne, district attorney, Suffolk County; Hon. John Droney, district attorney, Middlesex County; Hon. Kevin H. White, mayor of the city of Boston; Representative Anthony Scall, chairman, Committee for Commerce and Labor; Rocco Alberto, commissioner of labor and industry, Commonwealth of Massachusetts and president, Massachusetts State Building and Construction Trades Council; Thomas Callahan, president, Massachusetts Motor Vehicle Inspectors Association; Albert A. DeVincentis, commissioner, Massachusetts Industrial Accident Board; Stephen J. D'Arcy, esquire; and John J. Sullivan, Commissioner, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. Among other notable guests at the head table were Frank E. Fitzsimmons, general vice president, International Brotherhood of Teamsters and the vice presidents and trustees of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

And who is this man to whom so many gathered to pay recognition?

Bill McCarthy is a man of varied and remarkable talents. He has been a member of Local 25 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters for 33 years, serving in an official capacity for 23 years. Five times elected president of Local 25, last February he was appointed 12th international vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and

assumed a seat on the general executive board.

Bill McCarthy was born in Charlestown, Mass., July 2, 1919, and was educated in the Boston public schools. At the age of 17 he became a teamster, joining local 25 and quickly worked his way through the ranks of the organization by demonstrating compassion, warmth, and the ability to develop innovative solutions to complex problems. In 1964 he was elected secretary-treasurer of Joint Council 10, an affiliation of all Teamster locals and 2 years ago he was named special general organizer for the international union. He is chairman of the New England Teamsters pension fund, a program initiated and expanded under his leadership and is secretary-treasurer of local 25 health and welfare fund, in addition to being a member of the policy committee of the Eastern Conference of Teamsters. Last month, he was named a member of the Governor's advisory committee on labor-management relations.

But Bill McCarthy's involvement does not stop here. This many-faceted man has somehow found the time to serve and enrich his community. He is a member of the board of directors of the Massachusetts Bay United Fund and the Greater Boston Chapter of the American National Red Cross to name just a few.

Bill McCarthy has brought to all these positions a high degree of competency and a deep and abiding commitment to improving the standards of the workingman. For more than 30 years, his service to his beloved union has been unflinching in its excellence and integrity, and he has worked diligently and effectively to generate pride in the Teamsters Union and particularly in local 25.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to honor this extraordinary citizen and distinguished servant, a man whose life has been dedicated to promoting the welfare of those whom he so ably represents.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN AT FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION BRIEFING CONFERENCE ON TRUTH IN LENDING

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Bar Association, a national association of members of the Federal judiciary and of men and women who are or who have been in the employ of the Federal Government as lawyers, has been sponsoring a series of briefing conferences under its continuing legal education program, covering the many activities and operations of the Federal Government. These conferences emphasize current problems and developments of interest to lawyers, to members of other professions, to industry, and to the public.

The 120th briefing conference in this series is taking place today and tomorrow, at the Mayflower Hotel, and is de-

voted to the Truth in Lending Act. Joining in sponsoring the conference are the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association, and the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., a private publishing firm specializing in legal, labor, and economic information. Chairman of the briefing conference program committee is Fredric T. Suss, formerly of the Small Business Administration.

WIDE RANGE OF ISSUES AND EXPERTS

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, where most of the provisions originated in the legislation which became the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968, I was pleased and honored to be asked to make a luncheon address today at this important and useful conference on the technical aspects of the Truth in Lending Act—title I of the Consumer Credit Protection Act. Speakers this morning included Lewis G. Odom, Jr., of Montgomery, Ala., former staff director of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, who discussed the legislative history and objectives of Public Law 90-321; and Milton W. Schober, assistant director of the Division of Supervision and Regulation of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, who discussed the law and regulation Z, issued by the Federal Reserve to carry out the objectives of truth in lending title of the legislation. This afternoon's session was devoted to a panel discussion on open-end credit, to be followed tomorrow morning by a briefing on advertising compliance, and a panel discussion on closed-end credit, with an afternoon session devoted to a panel discussion on real estate credit.

Participants, in addition to those I have mentioned, all from Washington, D.C., unless otherwise indicated, include:

This afternoon: Boris Auerbach, of Cincinnati, Ohio, associate counsel of Federated Department Stores, Inc.; Griffith L. Garwood, attorney for the Federal Reserve; Sheldon Feldman, acting chief of the Division of Consumer Credit of the Federal Trade Commission; James G. Michaux, Washington representative for Federated Department Stores, Inc.; J. W. Montgomery, Richmond, Va., assistant treasurer of Southern States Cooperative, Inc.; and Sarah H. Newman, general secretary, National Consumers League.

Tomorrow morning: Fred J. Zenl, Jr., Chicago, general attorney for Montgomery Ward & Co.; John F. Rolph III, associate counsel, American Bankers Association; Hugh A. Chairnoff, Philadelphia, economic consultant to the Philadelphia Federal Reserve Bank; John G. Cashman, Chicago, of the law department of Sears, Roebuck and Co.; W. A. Partee, assistant vice president, Riggs National Bank; and Benny L. Kass, chairman, Consumers Affairs Subcommittee of the Washington, D.C., Mayor's Economic Development Committee.

Tomorrow afternoon: Martin Atlas, executive vice president, Cafritz Co.; Nicholas J. Spiezo, assistant director-associate counsel, Mortgage Bankers Association; Jack E. Kahn, attorney, Federal Trade Commission; Robert E. Pick-

erel, assistant vice president, Riggs National Bank; and Louis H. Nevins, assistant director, National Association of Real Estate Boards.

PURPOSE OF THE CONFERENCE

The program of the briefing conference states:

The Federal Consumer Protection Act and its implementing Regulation Z are now fully in force, requiring sweeping changes in the business operations of banks, finance companies, mortgage bankers, retail stores, professional men, automobile and appliance dealers, farm cooperatives and all extenders of credit. It regulates credit advertising and garnishment of wages. It requires very particularized disclosure by creditors and provides for civil and criminal penalties for violation. Media advertisements themselves reveal daily violations of the Act by unwitting advertisers. This briefing conference addresses itself to compliance, enforcement, problems and remedies under the new law.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, the garnishment title does not take effect until next July. And in contrast to the statement in the program that media advertisements reveal daily violations—and, of course, there have been incomplete or inaccurate ads—I have been amazed at how good the advertising compliance has been. Certainly there can and will be improvements in that respect. The media, incidentally, are not required to assume responsibility for the technical compliance of any ad unless, of course, the newspaper or broadcasting station actually prepares the ad. But I have been truly impressed by the cooperation of the media in seeking voluntarily to make sure advertisers using specific credit terms in their copy include all of the necessary additional information required under the act.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS RECEIVING NUMEROUS INQUIRIES

Mr. Speaker, in view of the technical nature of the conference and in view of the familiarity of the audience with most of the provisions of the law and of regulation Z, my remarks were also somewhat technical. But I think they may be of interest to other Members of Congress who, I know, have received many inquiries from constituents and business firms about the applicability of the law to specific situations, inquiries which, in numerous instances, have been forwarded to me. Hence, I am submitting a copy of my remarks today, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MRS. SULLIVAN

(Luncheon address by Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan, Democrat, Missouri, Chairman, Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, House Committee on Banking and Currency, at Briefing Conference on Truth in Lending, Sponsored by the Federal Bar Association and Foundation and by the Bureau of National Affairs, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., Tuesday, October 14, 1969)

I am gratified to see the Federal Bar Association taking a leading role in seeking to broaden public understanding—and particularly business understanding—of the purpose and the requirements of the Federal Truth in Lending Act—Title I of the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968.

As the principal sponsor of the House bill which became Public Law 90-321 I know that there are many things in the law which will lead to legal controversy and undoubtedly to litigation. Even the simplest Federal law does that—with the courts eventually

telling us sometimes that while Congress may have said very directly what it intended a law to do, we either didn't mean it or *shouldn't* have meant it. And this law is certainly not a simple one. So I would hesitate to guess what the courts may some day decide about some of its provisions.

This briefing conference, as I understand its purpose, is not intended to pick the law over as an academic exercise in legal phraseology but rather is intended to help lawyers help businessmen and consumers to understand its requirements. And it is indeed proper that the Federal Bar is interesting itself in such a project. As is true in any far-reaching piece of national legislation, a lot of government lawyers are going to be involved in interpreting, administering and enforcing this one—but in this instance they will be lawyers from an unusually large number of Federal agencies. At least nine Federal agencies have specific assigned responsibilities under the Act for administration and enforcement of the Truth in Lending Title, which took effect July 1; a tenth has responsibility for Title II, which has been in effect since May 29, 1968, dealing with extortionate extension of credit; and an eleventh agency for Title III, the garnishment title, which does not take effect until next July 1. All of these titles of the law place the Federal Government into areas never before assigned to it, and the added responsibilities are extensive. Because of the scope of the Consumer Credit Protection Act in legal protections previously left entirely to the states, one could say that the law not only plows new ground, but also sows, irrigates, cultivates, weeds, reaps, bales and harvests that ground, all at the same time.

COMPREHENSIVE PACKAGE OF CONSUMER PROTECTIONS

Since your briefing conference today and tomorrow is devoted entirely to the Truth in Lending Act, I will limit my remarks generally to that title alone. I assume that in the morning session in which the legislative history and objectives of the Consumer Credit Protection Act were discussed, the other titles were also described at least in passing, so that it would not be necessary for me to go into them.

Now, I do want to say, though, that in contrast to the Senate-passed S. 5, which dealt exclusively with the information a seller or lender had to disclose to the buyer or borrower at the point of consummation of a credit transaction, the bill which became law is a comprehensive package of consumer protections in the use of credit, from the advertising of a credit offer through to the point of rescission of a contract, collection of a debt through garnishment, and even beyond that to the legal defenses by the ultimate holder of certain types of finance paper under the holder in due course doctrine.

And, by creating a National Commission on Consumer Finance in Title IV, we foreshadowed a possible future extension of Federal regulation of consumer credit over the whole field covered now by State laws, including direct supervision over rates charged—something that is certainly not imminent, in my opinion, but could flow from the work and recommendations of such a Commission; that is, if the Commission itself is ever made operative by President Nixon, who alone now has the power to enable it to function.

FORMER SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS MADE LAW POSSIBLE

While most of the things covered in Public Law 90-321 were never in the Douglas Truth in Lending bills during the six years former Senator Paul H. Douglas of Illinois propounded, expounded, dramatized and popularized the concept of Truth in Lending, Title I of the Act is certainly his idea and fundamentally, his achievement. By the time

we were able to take it up on the House side after seven years of waiting for the Senate to act, the originator of Truth in Lending was no longer a Senator.

He created the atmosphere, however, which made it possible for us not only to pass a Truth in Lending bill, but one which carried the idea far beyond his original—and in retrospect—relatively mild proposal that the consumer be enabled to know exactly what he was being charged for credit. I imagine that many of the firms forced to comply with this new law wish now that they had accepted the original Douglas bill, or one of the modifications of it which he had been willing to settle for during the long and dreary and often lonely battle he had waged for this concept over a six-year period.

PENALTIES FAR FROM WEAK

For the law as it now stands is a tough and powerful instrument of consumer protection, with both criminal and civil penalties which are far from weak. Loan-sharking has been made a Federal crime, with severe penalties. Even the respectable banker and businessman, who are under strict requirements to tell the whole truth about every charge which goes into a credit transaction, and to translate the credit costs into an annual percentage rate easily comparable to a competitor's charges for the same services, know that they face expensive penalties in the form of consumers' civil recovery actions if they violate the law—that is, twice the finance charge, or a minimum of \$100, up to \$1,000 plus reasonable attorney's fees, for failure to provide a customer with the information he is entitled to have.

No legitimate businessman wants to violate a Federal law, even if the penalty is minimal. But this law can be expensive to ignore or disobey. Thus, it is extremely important that honest businessmen know what is expected of them in complying with Truth in Lending, and conferences such as this one can be exceedingly helpful and productive.

Twenty years ago, a Truth in Lending law would have been useful, but hardly urgently needed. But in that interval, there has been a revolution in the use of credit in this country, and the wonder is how we have managed to get along so long without full disclosure and regulation of credit offers.

THE CASE OF THE VOLKSWAGEN AD

Let's take as an example what happened in one newspaper advertisement over a period of three days—June 30, July 1, and July 2. This was an ad for one-year-old Volkswagens, appearing in the Washington Star. The same story was undoubtedly duplicated in thousands of instances. This ad had been running for some time—\$1595 for the car, \$95 down and \$50 a month. That's the way the ad ran on June 30. For the July 1 issue, the copywriter was probably not yet certain of what he could say, so the ad merely stated the cash price, \$1595. But on July 2, it ran this way: \$1595—\$95 down, \$50 a month for 36 months. \$1800 total. Annual Percentage Rate of the Finance Charge 12%. Credit life insurance available.

The same car, the same deal as two days before. Only the law had changed.

What the ad told us on July 2 that it did not tell us on June 30 was that the terms \$95 down and \$50 a month were *customarily* offered to purchasers—not just to the dealer's brother-in-law; that there were no hidden charges or special fees; that credit life insurance, (usually about \$1 per hundred) was not a required tie-in purchase as part of the deal; and that the finance charges compared favorably with credit union rates. You knew even before you went to see the dealer that the car was going to cost \$300 to finance over a period of three years, not counting license plates, title fees, etc., or comprehensive fire, theft and collision or liability insurance, which you would un-

doubtedly be required to carry but which you did not have to buy from the dealer.

NOT JUST CROOKED DEALS INVOLVED

And all of that information could be conveyed in just one or two lines of a one-column ad, because what was NOT included was as informative as what had to be stated if the ad carried any specific credit terms at all.

This ad undoubtedly did not discourage buyers, because it continued to run long after the law took effect. But what a change it represented from the kind of used car advertising we used to see—and which we don't see any more—ads shouting "no downpayment" or "\$10 down" with no indication that when you signed up for the deal, the dealer would arrange a small loan for the downpayment, the finance charges would include credit life, casualty insurance, credit check, pre-paid repair charges, finders fee for obtaining the financing, executing papers, including a confession of judgment note and a balloon note, and whatever else the seller might load into the transaction while telling the customer it is "only" so-much a month, not even revealing how many months or the total charge or the astronomical percentage rate of the charges.

All right—in that kind of a deal, one was obviously dealing with a crook, or a sharper. The vast majority of credit transactions are honest and open ones, involving legitimate businessmen. Why must they be burdened down with paper work, and the danger of civil damages if not criminal penalties, for failure to include some minor detail in a sales or loan agreement where everything is above board?

The answer to that question was revealed right here in Washington in the most clear-cut manner, involving the biggest banks in the city. The District's usury law for generations has set an interest limit of 8% on loans. The banks had found this uneconomic for installment loans. Instead of getting the law changed, they developed an evasion technique: 8% "discount" loans, meaning they charged you \$8 in advance on a \$100 loan, giving you \$92 and you repaid the full \$100 over 12 months. The actual percentage rate of the credit charge in that type of transaction is not 8% at all—it is 15.75%. And that's what Truth in Lending now requires to be disclosed.

ENCOURAGING COMPARISON SHOPPING FOR CREDIT TERMS

This is still a better deal than the 18% nominal rate on department store revolving credit, or the 36% rate on small loans over the line in Maryland. It's not as good as the credit union's 12% actual rate, or the 9% rate on new car financing, but it's still about double the rate most consumers *thought* they were paying. Now they know. Now they can compare. And the bank rate stands up well competitively. Of course there are problems with the usury law, but we tried to cover that problem by describing the credit charge as a *finance* charge, rather than as an *interest* charge, under the Federal law, so if the transaction was legal in D.C. before July 1, it is still legal after July 1, by express direction of the Truth in Lending law itself.

Forcing the banks to disclose actual rates on installment loans is not going to cause much of a revolution in consumer borrowing habits—especially now, when interest rates are so high everywhere, for everything. But there is no reason to exempt banks or, as has been suggested, all other Federally regulated lending institutions, from the disclosure requirements of Truth in Lending. The whole idea is to encourage comparison shopping for credit, so that consumers can make informed judgments not previously available to them unless they were mathematics majors. Even William McChesney Martin, who is undoubtedly among the most knowledgeable money men alive, couldn't figure the percentage rate on some typical

used car transactions in testifying several years ago before Senator Douglas.

But now, thanks in part to the outstanding job done by his agency, the Federal Reserve System, in developing Regulation Z, any teen-ager buying a car knows more exact mathematical details about the credit charges than Federal Reserve Board Chairman Martin was able to figure out for himself before this law took effect.

TECHNICAL PROBLEMS? LOTS OF THEM

And that is the case now in every form of consumer, residential real estate, and agricultural credit. Technical problems? There are lots of them. I know of many of them, through correspondence from businessmen, bankers, ranchers, small loan firms, and others either forwarded to me by other Members of Congress or sent to me directly. As the people at the Fed and at the other regulatory agencies know, I have tried to help cut redtape and obtain amendments to Regulation Z, or clarifications or interpretations, whenever a legitimate problem has arisen under the Regulation. The Production Credit Associations—which are a type of credit union for farmers—had a difficult technical problem of computing the annual rate under the Actuarial Rule, so alternative methods were allowed, as the law permits, and I believe this problem is being solved and can be further simplified. The points paid by sellers on FHA or VA mortgages are another gray area needing clarification. The cash discounts traditionally allowed by merchants in rural areas caused a paperwork headache at first; that has been remedied, I believe. The rescission portion of Regulation Z has stirred up a hornet's nest. In all instances, the Fed has demonstrated a genuine desire to be helpful to business in overcoming technical difficulties.

It has done a good and conscientious job. But the problems will continue, I am sure—for instance, just what should we require the orthodontist to report to the parents about the prospective costs of his work, even though no credit charge is involved? The agencies can make these things reasonably simple and sensible, or be bureaucratic nit-pickers and make doctors and others not engaged in credit transactions as defined in the law nevertheless go through the same rigamarole as a used car dealer unloading some painted-over wreck on an unsuspecting youngster.

REGULATION Z CONTROLS ALL TYPES OF TRANSACTIONS UNIFORMLY

In enacting the law, we did not attempt to write the wording of the contract between buyer and seller or between lender and borrower, or specify the size of type of the key words in the contract or ads, or count off how many days make a month on a department store revolving credit account. We set down what we felt were reasonable policy guidelines. The Federal Reserve writes all of the regulations—there is central coordination and direction. The other agencies—Federal Trade, Home Loan Bank Board, Comptroller of the Currency, FDIC, and the rest—have day-to-day operating responsibilities for compliance by the business firms they normally supervise. So an agency with appropriate expertise does the actual supervision of any business which is covered by the act. But all businesses are subject to the same overall requirements, under Regulation Z.

"LOOPHOLES" IN THE LAW

There are some loopholes in the law—and we all knew when the law was enacted what some of them were. They were a price the House Conferees had to pay for the Senate Conferees' agreement to many far-reaching provisions which were never considered by that body. There is the "utility late-payment loophole"; there is the "first mortgage total cost loophole"; there is the "50-cents-per-month minimum charge loophole" for revolving credit, and the "\$7.50

minimum charge loophole" for installment credit, and so on. We are going to watch how those work out. We are also going to be studying numerous proposals for extending the scope of the law—such as the Proxmire-Hart bill to regulate credit life insurance rates, or the Zablocki bill dealing with credit reporting. But the important thing right now is not to figure out what could be done to strengthen the law as much as it is to make sure what we already have can work and does work effectively. Compliance so far has been remarkably good, particularly in advertising. I think honest, ethical businessmen eventually will find this law a great help, not a hindrance—by taking the razzle-dazzle and technical deceptiveness out of credit terminology and credit competition, so that the unfair techniques of the unscrupulous operators are eliminated.

CONSUMERS MUST LEARN TO MAKE INTELLIGENT USE OF INFORMATION

I don't look for an overnight miracle. Consumers must learn how to use intelligently the information they are now entitled to receive under Truth in Lending, so that when one store's 18% is different from another store's 18%, he can see the difference and make an informed judgment; and he can also compare 18% with 36%, or with 12%, knowing when these terms are exactly comparable, or on what basis they can be compared.

Out of this conference, I am sure there will be many suggestions for changes in Regulation Z or in the law. I am proud of this law, but by no means smug about its possible perfection. I will gladly consider any straightforward and legitimate suggestion for amendment or improvement—if the purpose is to achieve a more informed use of credit, rather than merely to eliminate some minor inconvenience. We were never under the delusion that this law would be easy for everyone to apply. But we were determined to make it fair—and have it apply with equal impact on all who are covered by it. Thank you.

MARYLAND VERY PROUD OF ERIC ANSCHUETZ—THE SPEAKER'S PAGE

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as one of the Representatives in the Congress from the State of Maryland it is a pleasure to report that the greater Baltimore area takes a great deal of justifiable pride in the fact that a very fine and promising young man, who lives in my congressional district, has the distinction and honor of having been selected by our distinguished and most able Speaker of the House of Representatives as the "Speaker's Page."

Eric Anschuetz is the young man I refer to. He is a 17-year-old senior in Catonsville High School, in suburban Baltimore, and is the first "Speaker's Page," ever from my district and the first from the State of Maryland in 40 years. Because of his position, he is very well known to my colleagues as well as in Washington circles and even to the President of the Nation. Needless to say I am very proud of him and feel he is a credit to my State.

Maryland Living, the weekly magazine of the News-American, a great Baltimore daily newspaper, in the Sunday, October

5, 1969, issue printed a very interesting article, written by Larry Lewis, about this appointment. Believing it to be an inspiration to other young men, I now include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A CAPITOL JOB—PAGE FOR SPEAKER JOHN MCCORMACK, ERIC ANSCHUETZ, OF CATONSVILLE, HAS A RINGSIDE SEAT IN U.S. CONGRESS

(By Larry Lewis)

When the silver-haired Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Massachusetts Democrat John W. McCormack, raps his gavel to call members into session, most schoolboys present are in the visitors' galleries rimming the history-adorned chamber on three sides.

However, Eric Anschuetz, 17-year-old high school senior whose family lives in Catonsville, has a better view of the proceedings from his seat than many Congressmen.

As the Speaker's page, he sits to Mr. McCormack's right, primed to carry out quickly any instructions, issued by the man recognized as the third most powerful figure in America's government.

The Maryland teenager's post when the House is meeting is within touching distance of the Speaker's bench, familiar to millions as the background to the dais used by the President when he addresses Congress or delivers the State of the Union message.

In the course of his duties, Eric can telephone the Secretary of Defense and get his party on the line. If he calls the White House, chances are excellent he will speak directly with President Nixon.

On network television newscasts taken at dignified government receptions, his face might pop up in the background at any time.

"Eric is the first Speaker's page ever from the Seventh District and the first from Maryland in 40 years," points out Congressman Samuel N. Friedel, who appointed the tall, well-tanned youth as a page June 18, 1968, and reappointed him on Jan. 2.

Selection of the young man who will fill the post, most prestigious height attainable for any of the 50 pages serving the House of Representatives, is made personally by Speaker McCormack.

The Speaker "observed him working" and was impressed by Eric's efficiency and attitude, Rep. Friedel points out.

"Nobody is as close to the Speaker as the page is. Many times I don't know where the Speaker is, so I call up Eric," admits Dr. Martin Sweig, Mr. McCormack's administrative assistant.

"It's a very difficult job," he continues. "They've got to be on the ball at all times. But it's a great honor for Eric, Congressman Friedel, his district and the state. All his life, Eric can put down on his employment resume that he was page to the Speaker of the House of Representatives."

Eric's achievement is also a source of great pride for his father, Ralph, who works for one of the country's largest department store chains, and mother, Louise, a medical secretary. Parental satisfaction shines through even when Mr. Anschuetz laughing-ly says, "I've lost a son."

"The other day Mr. and Mrs. Anschuetz came and sat in the gallery," says Dr. Sweig. "It's a pretty nice thing for them to see their son sitting next to the Speaker. Of course, in his position, he can also do little favors for his friends."

The Maryland teenager, who attended Catonsville High School while a sophomore, does not deny the attractiveness of the job's fringe benefits. "I was able to get two (free) tickets to the Democratic National Dinner—one for myself and one for a friend," he reveals. "They would have cost \$500 apiece."

When Speaker McCormack is invited to a government function, Eric is permitted to tag along. "I've put on a few pounds eating that fancy food," jokes the brown-haired,

brown-eyed youth, whose 180 pounds are well-proportioned on his six-foot frame.

The youth gets a special thrill from being present at state receptions for visiting dignitaries, but occasionally even he is stymied. "I missed one recently because the party traveled on the Presidential yacht. I couldn't get security clearance."

For Eric Anschuetz, sitting on the floor of the House of Representatives is the fulfillment of a long-held dream. He began writing letters to his Congressman when he was an eighth grader.

"I was interested in being a page in Washington, but I couldn't do it," says the youth, whose family lived in Pennsylvania until moving to Catonsville a little over a year ago. However, his persistence led to his appointment as a page in the Pennsylvania state senate at Harrisburg for the summer of 1967.

His first appointment by Congressman Friedel was as a bench page, or messenger, in the House.

As Dr. Sweig puts it, "He has to spend one year as a laborer, so to speak. He has to learn how the house is built."

The Speaker's page, normally a high school senior, must display good character, be an outstanding student and show enthusiasm for work of the House.

"Very seldom is politics involved in selecting the Speaker's page," emphasizes Dr. Sweig. "You have to earn it."

However, in deference to the party affiliations of Speaker McCormack and Congressman Friedel, the doctor of history ventures to say that Eric's loyal ties are "strictly Democratic."

Almost all young men who serve as Speaker's pages go on to college, many on scholarships. Occasionally, one will serve an apprenticeship in a legislative office, then run for Congress himself.

While the average Washington page earns \$6,022 a year, Eric's income is \$6,938. He must pay his own expenses, including food and lodging.

"The Speaker's page earns every blasted dime," says Dr. Sweig. "I don't think I could do it. Eric is working a fulltime job and going to high school."

While other pages are on vacation when Congress is not in session, the Maryland youth's job is year-around. A typical day during the summer months means reporting to work at 9 A.M. and remaining on duty until the Speaker leaves Capitol Hill, usually at 5 P.M. Eric spends the morning gathering copies of bills to be acted upon.

Since Congress goes into session at noon and there is no break for lunch, the youth takes time to eat between 11:05 and 11:45. Then he must make sure everything is in order on the Speaker's rostrum.

From 11:55 to 11:59, Speaker McCormack holds a press conference. Traditionally, it ends when Eric calls out, "Time, Mr. Speaker." Speaker and Speaker's page then walk to the House chamber for the day's business.

One of Eric's unofficial duties is keeping track of Mr. McCormack's cigar when the Speaker enters the chamber. Since smoking is not allowed, the page takes the cigar and secretes it on a small ledge near the rostrum. When Speaker McCormack exits, so does the cigar.

When the legislative body adjourns for the day, Eric must still prepare the mail for signature, file and perform other office chores.

For nine months of the year, he attends the Capitol Page School in the Library of Congress from six to 10 A.M., then studies at night. Last year, he helped revive the page school newspaper, "The Capitol Courier," and served as its editor.

Eric is candid about the disadvantages of his busy schedule. He says: "I really don't think too much of the social life here. You go to an all-boys school, and you don't get to meet any girls during the day."

Dr. Sweig, however, describes him as "a real operator" and his school yearbook is liberally inscribed with girls' names.

Most pages live in a specially designated apartment house on E. Capitol St., but, after school ended, Eric moved to Hyattsville to live with the family of a fellow page, Jim DiMeglio. The two drive to and from work in Jim's car.

"It's the sign of a substantial citizen that he can work around here and still laugh," philosophizes Dr. Sweig. "He has to take his job seriously, but not himself."

If Eric begins to show signs that he is becoming too impressed with the prestige of his position, the doctor has a special treatment in store.

"We have some files way downstairs," he says. "It's not too nice there. It's kind of dirty. If he gets a little out of hand, I'll send him down there to do some work. That usually brings a big head back to normal."

OUR NATO COMMITMENT

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER) for presenting this body with a very excellent report on the North Atlantic Assembly Tour of Allied Command Europe—RECORD, Monday, October 13, 1969, H9443.

The gentleman from California points out that the Russian threat to Western Europe is still very real and that the Soviets have superior military forces which could be directed against Europe. He asserts that the Russians would have a clear military advantage if they were to launch an invasion and we were to attempt a conventional military response.

We would therefore be left with the alternatives of either accepting the fact that Russia could overrun Europe, or resorting to the use of tactical nuclear weapons. The gentleman quite frankly admits that it is unlikely that our NATO partners will make greater contributions to bolster NATO forces. He concludes that without this commitment by our Western allies, "the tremendous U.S. presence and expense to the taxpayer is a waste." He therefore suggests that the U.S. flag can be shown with an Air Force wing and less than a division of troops and that the bulk of our force should be brought home. In the gentleman's words, "The time has come for a complete reassessment of our NATO military policy."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the findings of the gentleman of California. I would agree that we should reassess our NATO military policy with a view to reducing American troop levels in Western Europe. I think we can provide an adequate deterrent to aggression by maintaining a "symbolic presence" that would not be as costly and burdensome as our existing troop commitment.

I am reminded of a statement made by President Eisenhower which appeared in the December 6, 1966, edition of the International New York Herald Tribune:

I do not believe that today the common security requires in American ground strength the six divisions now present in Europe. A

fair and logical U.S. contribution would be no more than one Corps of two divisions with reinforcing artillery and a Reconnaissance Regiment.

I again congratulate the gentleman from California on the honesty with which he has addressed himself to the question of our NATO policy. I would commend his report to my colleagues and urge that they give it their studied attention.

A BLUEPRINT FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of this debate on Vietnam, the most appropriate remarks I could possibly make at this time, are those I have been making since 1965. They were appropriate then and they are appropriate now.

Before I do, however, let me say this. I believe President Nixon is on the right track in Vietnam and I further believe that a majority of the people in this country feel the same way. The President is trying desperately to end the war in Vietnam and achieve peace with freedom—not peace with surrender or peace at any price.

Therefore, at this point, I would like to again insert in the RECORD my concept of "A Blueprint for Peace in Vietnam" that first appeared in the RECORD last June. In addition, I offer a supporting editorial by one of the Nation's leading and most respected editors, William Randolph Hearst, Jr.

The material follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD,
June 3, 1969]

A BLUEPRINT FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, today President Nixon departs for Midway Island for a round of talks with President Thieu of South Vietnam. From these meetings could come new and innovative alternatives toward ending the war in Vietnam, and securing a viable and lasting peace throughout Southeast Asia.

Yesterday, I was privileged to communicate to the President some of the views of us in the Congress and throughout the Nation share regarding our over-involvement in Vietnam and the search for peace there that we all so diligently hope and pray will soon come to pass.

Today, I should like to share with my colleagues some of the thoughts and recommendations I have conveyed to the President on the eve of his departure for Midway.

One of the real agonies of Vietnam, which explains in part, not only our involvement in the war but much of the dissension, confusion, and misunderstanding that prevails over this question, has been the failure of the past to explain to the American people the historical background that led up to the deployment of U.S. fighting men in the Vietnam conflict.

The plain truth is, that the people in this country have never been told the full story or the complete truth about the virtual collapse of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization—SEATO—and its inability or refusal to respond and provide security for free people when aggression first "raised its head" in South Vietnam. Regrettably, SEATO, the

regional security organization, established under the U.N. Charter for the purpose of defending free people and free nations against aggression has flatly failed to effectively respond or "handle" the threat to these countries' internal security.

Another failure, with regard to informing the American people, has been to neglect "telling it like it is"—that this conflict in Vietnam is a "new kind of war" commonly known as "guerrilla warfare"—completely unlike the conventional wars of the past. In a conflict wherein unconventional strategy and tactics are employed by the enemy, many people are still trying to evaluate and make judgments on the conduct of the war using conventional terms.

Back in August of 1968, Candidate Nixon had this to say before the platform committee in Miami:

"The (Johnson) Administration has either not recognized that this is a new and more complex kind of war, or has not seen its significance. The result is that the old style, conventional military aspects have been over-emphasized, and its other dimensions—psychological, political, economic, even diplomatic—have gotten too little attention. . . . We need far greater and more urgent attention to training the South Vietnamese themselves, and equipping them with the best of modern weapons. As they are phased-in, American troops can and should be phased-out. This phasing-out will save American lives and cut American costs. Further, it is essential if South Vietnam is to develop both the military strength and the strength of spirit to survive now and in the future. It is a cruel irony that the American effort to safeguard the independence of South Vietnam has produced an ever-increasing dependency in our ally. If South Vietnam's future is to be secure, this process must now be reversed."

This is precisely why I have, since 1965, advanced the so-called phase-in/phase-out concept through the creation of a free Asian security force which would, on a carefully conceived realistic, and methodical timetable, phase-in motivated, trained, and properly equipped South Vietnamese and other Southeast Asian manpower as U.S. troops are phased out or phased back to the initially acceptable advisory and supporting role previously agreed upon as the U.S. commitment to those SEATO countries threatened with Communist subversion or aggression.

Such a security organization, in my judgment, is the only way in which free nations in Asia will be able to fill the security vacuum that was created around the free nations of Asia following the withdrawal of the French security forces from that part of the world and the subsequent reluctance on the part of SEATO to fulfill its defense obligation to the participating nations.

That the United States had to respond at all to the conflict in Vietnam is totally unrealistic when you stop to think of the 1 billion people in Southeast Asia who are perfectly capable of defending themselves.

This is why I firmly believe and strongly recommend that, if we are to prevent future Vietnams, SEATO must either be updated and revitalized—or replaced by a mutual and more viable security organization in Southeast Asia that would require a pro rata sharing of the manpower needed from each participating nation to provide the security that is now totally lacking in the Pacific Basin communities.

Since January of this year, a concerted effort has been underway to provide the training and modern equipment needed by South Vietnam's armed forces to permit them to assume their rightful burden and increased responsibilities for the actual conduct of the war until such time as a reasonable and honorable settlement of the conflict can be negotiated in Paris.

Thus, as I see it, the "phasing-in" stage is, in fact, well underway and this is the direction we must take.

In an editorial appearing in the Hearst newspaper in March 1968, Editor in Chief William Randolph Hearst, Jr., had this to say:

"Now here is the crux of my thinking. The U.S. has some 500,000 men over there fighting their war. This is about one man for every 400 of our total population. If the Asian countries only equalled this effort—and they should do more with the enemy at their borders—they could, and should, field an army of around a million. Besides this great numerical advantage, it would have a tremendous psychological effect. Right now, Ho Chi Minh has the advantage of being able to say he is fighting what he calls white imperialists. With a million or more Asians facing him on the battlefield, the picture would be put in proper perspective, to say the least."

Mr. Hearst and I have consistently agreed on this approach. Unbeknown to each other, Bill Hearst and I were publicly expressing similar points of disagreement and disenchantment with the conduct of the Vietnam war. He wrote an editorial, "Plugging the Dike in Vietnam," while I developed a "blueprint for peace"—the "phase-in, phase-out" concept through the creation of a free Asian security force.

Our suggestions were similar then, and if you read President Nixon's platform statement of 1968, you will note the same ring of similarity in his announced objectives and recommendations for a satisfactory solution to the Vietnam problem. I am pleased to see him following through on his previous position.

I am also pleased to see President Thieu traveling to and communicating with other Southeast Asian leaders. This is absolutely essential if we are ever going to develop the firmed-up SEATO or free Asian security organization required to help solve the Vietnam problem and prevent further Communist encroachment and/or subversion of the other free Asian countries of South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, Indonesia, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, Laos, Burma, Cambodia, Australia, and New Zealand.

We, in the States, have 200 million people. There are 1 billion people in Southeast Asia. Is it not far to expect that the prime source of manpower required for the "antiguerrilla" and "counterinsurgency" ground forces come from these countries that have the primary threat to their security?

I say absolutely, and it is this message I have asked President Nixon to convey to President Thieu and all the free Asian leaders:

As I said in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 18, 1968:

"My own judgment to that such a program is feasible—that the manpower is available, that the idea is practical, logical, and fair, and that the free Asian nations can be convinced of this diplomatically. . . . It suggests a broad but positive and orderly plan for reducing U.S. involvement in Vietnam without any sacrifice to our basic security requirements. Further, it would place the conduct of the war in the hands of the Asians themselves, who must now take a new look at the ground rules."

"With security as the key, I can foresee the Free Asian Security Force providing the type of security that SEATO and the U.N. were expected to provide."

"Eventually, however, there must emerge the kind of regional cooperation among the nations of the Pacific Basin that will promote economic growth through a type of Asian-Pacific Common Market. How can this be accomplished? Here we can export our free enterprise system in the same way we helped Japan recover from the ashes of World War II to become the strongest economic power in the Far East in less than 15 years."

As President Nixon has said:

"Vietnam does not exist in isolation. Around the world, we should mobilize our

diplomatic forces for peace. . . . We need such an effort not only to speed an end to the war in Vietnam, but also to lay the groundwork for the organization of a lasting and larger peace. Certainly one of the lessons from the agony of Vietnam is that we need a new diplomacy to prevent future Vietnams."

The potential for future Vietnams is all around us—in Laos, Thailand, Burma, South Korea, the Mideast, Eastern Europe, in Africa, and South and Central America.

If we are, in fact, going to avoid future entanglements such as Vietnam, then, certainly, a "new diplomacy" must now be forged out of the jungles and the graveyards of Vietnam. A diplomacy, I submit, that places far greater emphasis on political, diplomatic, and economic initiatives—rather than on military crusades. As there is, as President Nixon has said, no military solution to the conflict in Vietnam, neither is there a military solution to present or future foreign problems.

The world has grown weary of war and in our quest for peace, we have become embroiled in such national controversy as whether or not Saigon should have a so-called "coalition government." In the first place President Nixon has not suggested or proposed a U.S.-imposed "coalition government" on the people of South Vietnam. Instead, he talked of "free and open elections" by all the people of Vietnam and their right "to self-determination." Quite frankly, this is not a proper or fitting matter for the United States to determine and I believe the President has made this absolutely clear.

In this regard, I believe we should stop kidding ourselves. In Communist terminology, "coalition government" is a tool whereby the Communists are handed a tool for the complete domination and imposition of their will on the people concerned. We have seen this pattern develop not only in Eastern Europe after World War II, but more recently in Laos where the Communists are "using" Laos as part of the Ho Chi Minh Trail to ferret men and supplies to South Vietnam.

The key point I want to make is this:

Can you imagine the impact a strong free Asian security organization would have on the negotiators from Hanoi, the Soviet Union and Red China—North Vietnam's principle military equipment suppliers?

As Mr. Hearst stated:

"If the Asian countries equalled our effort, they could field an army of a million men."

If Hanoi and the Communist negotiators in Paris fully realized that they would have to face the manpower supplied from 1 billion Asians backed by our military and technical training programs, I think they would change their attitude and their "tune" at the negotiating table in Paris.

Simultaneous to this, however, we must demonstrate by deeds, not just words, our strong desire and intention to cooperate economically and diplomatically to help accelerate free nation building in their part of the world, with all of the associated benefits—the most important of which is a vastly improved standard of living.

[From the Hearst Newspapers, Mar. 24, 1968]

BLUEPRINT FOR PEACE

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor-in-chief, the Hearst newspapers)

Some kind of sympathetic chord appears to have been struck in this column two weeks ago, in which I offered a solution for our dilemma in Vietnam.

In essence it was that the free countries of Southeast Asia be made to pitch in and start doing their proper share of the fighting we are now doing to save them from Communist aggression.

Apparently a lot of other people think so, too, and I hereby renounce any claim to originality. In any event, ever since the

column appeared I have been swamped with letters, telegrams and phone calls—nearly all expressing enthusiastic support and some offering specific plans of action.

Today I am devoting this column to one of those action plans. It strikes me as the best blueprint for ending the war and winning the peace I have yet to encounter. It was contained in a long communication from Rep. Don H. Clausen (R., Calif.).

Rep. Clausen has just returned from an official, 33,000-mile fact-finding swing through eight nations in the war area, made during the first month of the enemy New Year offensive. His main conclusion (and mine):

"For too long now, we have been doing the job for the South Vietnamese and the other Asian nations which are threatened by what is happening in South Vietnam."

"Helping them is one thing, but carrying the overwhelming burden of combat for them is not now, and never has been the sole responsibility of the United States."

Having said this, Mr. Clausen proceeds to tell in detail exactly what he thinks we should do about it, and I am going to let him tell it as much as space permits in his own words.

What I want to emphasize in advance is that his thinking (and mine) involves no notion of deserting the South Vietnamese or failing to live up to our commitment. Mr. Clausen himself emphasizes this right off the bat.

"My basic proposal," the Congressman writes, "involves what I call the 'Phase-in—Phase-out Concept.' This is to avoid any connotation of unilateral withdrawal."

"Very briefly, it means redirecting the manpower emphasis in Vietnam whereby vastly more South Vietnamese and free Asian security forces would be injected into the ground war there and a like number of American fighting men withdrawn on a carefully conceived, methodical and realistic timetable basis."

"This could be done by creation of what I call a 'Free Asian Security Force' composed of regular military units of the countries of free Asia which are directly threatened by Communist expansion."

"I am sincerely advancing this concept to our nation's leaders, and I hope that every effort will be made to explore its feasibility. My own judgment is that such a program is feasible—that the manpower is available, that the idea is practical, logical and fair, that the free Asian nations can be convinced of this diplomatically, and that it can be put into effect logistically within a year."

"It suggests a broad but positive and orderly plan for reducing U.S. involvement in Vietnam without any sacrifice of our basic security requirements. Further, it would place the conduct of the war in the hands of Asians themselves."

The big stumbling block in all of this, of course, is how to get the free countries of Southeast Asia to unite for such an effort so long as we continue plugging the dike for them.

Mr. Clausen, a realist, is well aware of the chilly reception these countries late last year gave to Gen. Maxwell Taylor and now Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford when the Presidential envoys came asking them for more help.

Yet both of us feel that our reluctant Allies can be persuaded to recognize that taking over their own responsibility will be the best thing for them in the long run.

In the last analysis, the security vacuum which exists in Southeast Asia cannot be filled indefinitely by the U.S. It can be filled only when the free countries of the area set up their own common bulwark against the Communists.

To sell these countries on what obviously is essential for their future, Rep. Clausen declares, a dramatic diplomatic offensive by this country is required. Since this could

originate only in the White House, he writes as follows:

"I therefore urge President Johnson to call a summit conference of the non-Communist Far Eastern nations for the purpose of forming a Free Asian Security Force."

"Purpose of this force would not only be for the immediate future needs of Vietnam but to provide the organizational structure to guarantee lasting security for all peoples living in the Pacific basin countries."

"Our best diplomatic efforts must be used to this end. We must switch from defense to offense."

Mr. Clausen points out that such a diplomatic offensive would not involve a starting from scratch. Thus we already have the basis for a permanent free Asian security force now in Vietnam, consisting of fighting forces from various countries in the area in addition to the South Vietnamese.

We also have the basis for coordinated action to implement the Phase-in—Phase-out program. With SEATO in a state of virtual collapse, a natural coordinating vehicle is the association of Southeast Asian nations, or ASEAN.

Formed only last year to further mutual interests ASEAN at present is composed of Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. All these would be among the nations which President Johnson would summon to the proposed summit conference.

Rep. Clausen concludes his proposal with these remarks:

"I believe we have done more than our share in Vietnam, and we've paid an extremely high price in the process. In my judgment, Phase-in—Phase-out is the course we, as Americans, can and must now follow."

"We have much to gain through the formation of a free Asia security force for Vietnam to meet immediate needs—and the formation of a 'partnership of the Pacific' in the future, after Vietnam."

"Thus, in considering the Phase-in—Phase-out concept it is necessary to look beyond the war to find its true merits and potential value to the people of Asia and us here at home. Because whatever happens in Vietnam, we must be prepared to live not only with ourselves, but with the people of Asia and the free world in the future."

"What we're really seeking, I believe, is economic integration of the free Pacific Basin communities we can maximize co-operation and coordination in economic, political and security matters."

"What do we have to gain? Everything—but most important of all we will gain an additional and more viable security buffer against possible Red Chinese or even Soviet encroachment in the Pacific region, and a proper sharing of our heavy financial and manpower burden in Southeast Asia."

"What I have outlined is an action program aimed at these goals. It is a program all Americans can take pride and purpose in supporting."

So much for Congressman Clausen's most constructive improvements on what was already a pretty good idea.

We'd better get the big band wagon, because I think we're going to have lots of company on this one.

STATEMENT IN EIGHT IVY LEAGUE STUDENT NEWSPAPERS

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today a statement being

published in today's issues of eight Ivy League student newspapers regarding the war in Vietnam. The newspapers are the Brown Daily Herald, the Columbia Daily Spectator, the Cornell Daily Sun, the Dartmouth, the Harvard Crimson, the Daily Pennsylvanian, the Daily Princetonian, and the Yale Daily News.

This statement, in strong support of the Vietnam moratorium, represents the depth of concern felt by students all over the Nation. I call it to the attention of my colleagues, and I very much hope that it will be read and contemplated by the leaders of this country:

Over the past decade, the United States has waged a brutal and pointless war against the land and people of Vietnam, killing hundreds of thousands of Americans and Vietnamese and defending a series of repressive dictatorships. Now, it appears, the nightmare is beginning again in Laos and Thailand. The killing in Southeast Asia must be stopped.

President Nixon has violated his promise to the American people and chosen to pursue the discredited policies of Lyndon Johnson. We must stand together, he tells us, to secure an "honorable" peace.

In attempts to appease his opponents and buy time for his disastrous policies, the President has announced token troop withdrawals and illusory draft cuts. But we will not be fooled by these gestures so long as the war continues. It is too late to salvage honor in Vietnam.

We demand the immediate withdrawal of all American troops from Vietnam and the rest of Southeast Asia.

To this end, a national moratorium on "business as usual" has been called for October 15 and November 13-14, with a march on Washington scheduled for November 15. We will join our teachers and fellow students on those days for nation-wide demonstration of protest. We call on all Americans to join us.

SWEDISH GOVERNMENT OUT OF TUNE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, local press reports suggest the possibility that the Government of Sweden may not be entirely in tune with the Swedish people when it comes to choosing between Communist North Vietnam and the United States.

A dispatch from Stockholm tells us that 11 more deserters have been granted Swedish entry, bringing the official total to 292. Some 30 others have so far left the country, some with the encouragement of local Swedish police.

Another Stockholm story relates that these deserters have probably the highest crime rate of any small group in the world, one out of six being in trouble with the police. This is not surprising, since what the "left" pleases to call "young men with conscience" are in truth the misfits and problems found in any society, fleeing from discipline in the service or evading punishment for wrongdoings in the United States.

Sweden's double standard is pointed out in a letter to the editor of the Evening Star, in which the writer concisely

makes his point that refugees from the Baltic states were turned over promptly to Stalin, while Hitler's legions were assisted on their way to conquer Norway.

From Lisbon come reports that the Portuguese have followed the American example and recalled their ambassador to Sweden because of Swedish financial aid to the Communist guerrillas in Angola and Mozambique. Apparently this is the same type of aid which is contemplated for the North Vietnamese against Americans.

The concern of Swedish businessmen over the cancellation of free world orders may help the Swedish people solve their problem in Stockholm. In the USIA report to which I called attention yesterday, this concern seemed to be present. Perhaps American businessmen can convey to the Swedish Government, through Swedish businessmen, that anti-American programs will not serve Sweden's enlightened self interest.

Failing that, perhaps the solution lies in the suggestion that Swedish financial assistance to North Vietnam, a nation with which the United States is in armed combat, would disqualify Sweden from receiving Export-Import Bank credits.

News clippings follow:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 10, 1969]

ELEVEN MORE U.S. DESERTERS GRANTED SWEDISH ENTRY

STOCKHOLM.—Eleven more American military deserters have been granted residential permission in Sweden in recent weeks, bringing the official total to 292, the immigration office announced.

Some 30 other applications were being considered, the office said.

A total of 352 United States military deserters have so far contacted the Swedish authorities. At least 30 have since left the country.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 10, 1969]

PORTUGAL RECALLS ENVOY TO SWEDEN

LISBON, Oct. 10.—Portugal recalled its ambassador to Sweden yesterday amid reports of official Swedish support for guerrilla forces in Portuguese Africa.

Reports in the Portuguese press alleged the Swedish government was providing financial aid to guerrilla forces in Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Oct. 13, 1969]

THE SWEDES AND US

SIR: Olof Palme, 42-year-old apostle of the New Left, who has been chosen to be Sweden's prime minister, is reported to have said that the Swedes are not really anti-American. This, of course, is good news. Those Swedish demonstrations and U.S. flag desecrations are nothing more than exuberant expressions of disapproval of U.S. foreign policy. Mr. Palme, himself, owns to a warm feeling for some Americans, such as those who parrot the Hanoi line—he names —, —, —, —. The Swedes also show "compassion" for those inglorious samples of American manhood who have deserted our armed forces to take refuge in Sweden.

But the Swedes dispense compassion on a discriminating basis. None was in evidence when they rounded up hundreds of war refugees from the helpless Baltic democracies overrun by Stalin's armies and forcibly turned them over to Stalin's goon squads. Only a few years before that sad episode, the Swedes eased the way for Hitler's legions to transit Sweden during the Nazi conquest of neighboring Norway.

With effusive praise for the civilized quali-

ties of the Hanoi government that brutalizes its American war prisoners, Sweden proclaims a policy of extending recognition to de facto governments. But even this is discriminatory: North Vietnam basks in the light of Swedish recognition, but not East Germany. Why? Could it be that the Swedes tailor their diplomacy to protect the profits from their trade with West Germany?

Sweden is very neutral and very pacific—neutral enough to wax fat behind the NATO shield without contributing, but not pacifist enough to refrain from peddling Bofors guns in places such as Africa. If there were a Nobel prize for hypocrisy, Gunnar Myrdal could present it to Olof Palme for permanent enshrinement in Stockholm.

JOHN T. COLLIER.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 13, 1969]

GI DESERTERS BOOST CRIME IN SWEDEN

(By Dan Cook)

STOCKHOLM.—The number of deserters from the U.S. armed forces who have been given asylum in Sweden has passed the 300 mark, and about one out of every six has been in trouble with the Swedish police.

This probably constitutes one of the highest crime rates for a relatively small number of men anywhere in the world. The escapades occur at a rate of about one case a week—petty theft, assault with intent to commit violence, dope peddling, disorderly conduct, and, in one case, an attempted bank robbery for which the former GI is doing a year in jail.

The Swedish commission which rules on applications for residence permits has made no effort to differentiate between genuine conscientious deserters and those who are in trouble with the military. Asylum is virtually automatic.

RUN OUT OF SWEDEN

Two or three cases are known where asylum-seeking GIs have been put on ferryboats out of Sweden by local police. In general it seems to have been routine for arriving deserters to contact private Swedish organizations who prepare the documents needed for asylum.

Names and telephone numbers of these organizations are distributed in Germany. Once his application is in the works, a deserter must wait about a month before he obtains a ruling on asylum from the Swedish authorities.

Once armed with the right to remain in the country, a GI is entitled to the equivalent of \$18 a week indefinitely in government assistance. The Swedes also give deserters winter clothing allowances. Often, they are put up in private homes or with private organizations, free.

Others find girlfriends and move in. A Swedish landowner has donated a farm to one group of eight or 10 GIs who, according to local gossip, are doing fairly well and probably are as far along as any deserters in settling down for good in Sweden. The Swedish government has established a training center about 60 miles from Stockholm to offer language instruction and job training, but the maximum number who have used it at any one time appears to have been eight or 10.

SOME SEEK TO RETURN

The U.S. Embassy receives two or three queries a week from deserters about legal rights and problems of getting back. When a deserter arrives at the embassy, a consular official explains his legal rights and offers him a one-way air ticket back to his unit—charged against any military pay he may eventually have coming to him. Some deserters insist on returning to the United States in the hope of getting a better break from the authorities, and such passages are paid by the embassy on the same basis.

In general, the army has been moderate in its sentences on the deserters. A high proportion are regular enlisted men, as opposed

to draftees. The proportion of Negroes who have deserted to Sweden is lower than that of Negroes serving in the army.

The deserters are not even escorted to the airport. They travel on the honor system back to their unit, with instructions simply to report to the military police when they get off the plane.

How many will make it into permanent residence in Sweden is anybody's guess, but it probably will not be more than 25 or 30 when all is over.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 14, 1969]
UNITED STATES WEIGHS CREDIT CUTOFF FOR SWEDEN

The United States is studying whether to cut off export credits to Sweden because of its announced intention to give economic aid to North Vietnam, a State Department spokesman said yesterday.

The spokesman said Washington did not have full details of the decision by Sweden's socialist government to provide Hanoi more than \$40 million in aid and credits in the next three years.

He noted, however, that the U.S. Export-Import Bank cannot give credits to a nation whose government furnishes goods, supplies, manpower or advisers to a nation fighting American armed forces.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Oct. 14, 1969]

HINT OF HANOI AID OFFER BY SWEDEN WEIGHED BY UNITED STATES

A State Department spokesman says that "various agencies of the administration" are studying reports of a Swedish offer of financial aid to North Vietnam.

Also under study, spokesman Carl Barch said yesterday, is whether such a loan would disqualify Sweden from receiving Export-Import bank credits.

Barch emphasized that the administration has no firm information yet on whether Sweden will go ahead with a reported \$60 million loan offer to Communist North Vietnam.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune Oct. 15, 1969]

SWEDEN ON A TIGHTROPE

How far can Sweden go in its anti-Americanism and still be able to borrow money from the United States? The Swedish government seems determined to find out and, in accordance with current fashion, to force a "confrontation" in the process.

For a long time Sweden's socialist government has been cozying up to the Soviet Union, lecturing the United States on peace, and harboring American army deserters [more than 280 at the last count]. The only reaction from Washington has been to recall our ambassador for five weeks last year after Swedish government officials marched in a peace parade with an envoy from North Viet Nam.

Now the resignation of Tage Erlander has brought into office a new prime minister, Olof Palme, who is a good deal more critical of the United States than Erlander. No sooner was Palme chosen than he rewarded his left-wing backers by announcing plans to give 40 million dollars in economic aid to North Viet Nam over a three year period.

Sweden has been vague as to whether this aid is to be extended immediately or after the end of hostilities. And for an obvious reason: Sweden is part owner of Scandinavian Airlines System; S. A. S. wants to increase its loan from the American Export-Import bank by about 200 million dollars to buy Boeing 747s; and the bank is prohibited by law from lending money to a government that helps a country with which we are at war.

Norway and Denmark, Sweden's partners in S.A.S., have begged Sweden to quit meddling and not to jeopardize the loan. Palme,

however, seems unwilling to back down an inch more than necessary, if that. His equally left-wing foreign minister, Torstein Nilsson, is coming to Washington soon to look for some loophole which will enable Sweden to borrow money from us with one hand and give money to Hanoi with the other. The loophole path already has been blazed by Peru, which confiscated an American-owned oil company without compensation and thus disqualified itself under the Hickenlooper amendment for American aid. Washington squirmed uncomfortably, but the aid is still going thru.

Both the Export-Import loan restriction and the Hickenlooper amendment were passed for sound reasons, the one to keep American money from being funneled indirectly to our enemies and the other to encourage private investment in developing countries and thus take some of the burden off of the taxpayers.

[For the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Oct. 15, 1969]

SWEDISH PREMIER INSTALLED, SAYS HE FAVORS HANOI

STOCKHOLM—Olof Palme, Sweden's new prime minister, said in a press conference after being sworn in yesterday that he has "more sympathy" for the North Vietnamese than for the Saigon government.

He said Saigon is "not representative of the Vietnamese people, but speaks for a relatively small clique," while Hanoi "is a dictatorship and not a democracy in our sense, but representative of the people."

Palme said that Arne Geijer, head of the Swedish trade union confederation, would be visiting the United States this week and would explain "misunderstandings" about Swedish aid to Hanoi to U.S. labor leaders. The Swedish press has reported that Thomas Gleason, head of the International Longshoremen's Association, is considering a boycott of Swedish ships in East Coast ports unless Sweden changes its mind about aiding North Vietnam.

Palme said the decision to give \$40 million in aid was misinterpreted by the press and that until the fighting stops Sweden would only give "humanitarian aid."

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREES NEED FINANCIAL RELIEF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced two bills supported by the National Association of Retired Civil Employees, which was founded in 1921. Its organization was prompted by passage of the original civil service retirement law in 1920. From a small beginning, the association has grown in membership and importance. The membership of this organization exceeds 135,000 and there are over 1,100 local chapters chartered throughout the United States.

Its objectives are to serve civil service annuitants and their survivors, and potential annuitants and their survivors under retirement laws, to sponsor and support beneficial legislation, and to promote the general welfare of annuitants and their families. The association is also interested in preretirement programs, especially in Federal and District Government agencies, and in the broad field of the problems of the aged and aging.

Mr. Speaker, this organization is a dedicated, selfless group which has brightened, expanded, and enhanced the lives of those who formerly served their Government. We must pay special attention when organizations such as the National Association of Retired Civil Employees request and endorse legislation, and there can be little doubt that it is necessary to the lives of the more than 800,000 Federal retirees and their survivors that we give every consideration to their request for much-needed legislation to improve their benefits.

There are, in my own State of Maryland, 24,701 civil service annuitants and 9,571 survivor annuitants; in other words more than 34,000 persons in the State of Maryland are presently receiving a civil service annuity check from the Federal Government. The average monthly annuity of the retiree himself in Maryland is less than \$300, and the average check of a survivor annuitant less than \$145 per month.

These figures would certainly seem to substantiate the need for some financial relief for these retirees who have spent their working years in the service of the Federal Government, as \$3,000 per year has been cited as "poverty level" and there are clearly many of our annuitants and survivor annuitants existing on incomes well below this figure.

I am convinced that the two measures that I have introduced are worthy of our careful consideration and study.

While there has been an increase in the general standard of living and a rise in the general economy during the past several years, the standard of living for retired Federal employees has stood almost stationary in spite of the increases we have approved in recent years. This is so because inflation and increased taxes has taken more of the retirees' income than they have received in increases.

According to the 1967 report of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, Bureau of Retirement and Insurance, of an approximate 800,000 retired civil employees and their survivors, some 279,000 receive a monthly annuity of less than \$100, and over 500,000 receive less than \$200 per month. To correct this inequity, we must grant these former Federal employees a substantial annuity increase.

My bill, H.R. 14314, would give an increase to all Federal retirees and their survivors, with the largest increase going to those presently receiving the smallest annuities. These increases would be as follows: \$26 per month if they now receive less than \$200 per month; 13 percent if they now receive at least \$200 but less than \$300 per month, 9 percent if they now receive at least \$300 but less than \$400 per month; 7 percent if they now receive at least \$400 but less than \$500 per month; or 5 percent if they now receive at least \$500 per month.

My second bill, H.R. 14315 would correct a longstanding inequity in the retirement law. The present retirement law provides that a retiree at time of retirement may elect to take a reduced annuity to provide a survivor annuity for his spouse. This cost at the present time is 2½ percent on the first \$3,600 and 10 percent on the remainder, if any. The

law also states that only one election can be made, and that at time of retirement.

When a retiree is predeceased by the named spouse he must continue to pay the cost through a reduced annuity as long as he lives, although there never will be anyone who can receive the survivor annuity he is paying for, even though he remarries.

This bill provides for the restoration of the full annuity and/or permits the retiree to name his second spouse for a survivor annuity if the named survivor predeceases the retiree, and the second spouse has attained the age of 60.

Out of approximately 800,000 retirees and survivors there are several thousand who would benefit from such legislation.

My bill, when enacted into law, will correct some of these injustices and yet protect our older annuitants by providing that their second or third spouse must be at least 60 years of age in order to benefit from this legislation. I am sure that a good percentage of our colleagues are not fully aware of this great injustice that prevails in thousands of the homes of our retirees from the Federal service. I strongly urge that my colleagues give serious consideration to the legislation I have introduced and support these long overdue changes in the civil service retirement laws.

HAWAII—THE NATION'S OCEANOGRAPHIC FRONTIER

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, one of Hawaii's most fascinating tourist attractions is the 20-acre Sea Life Park, located at the base of a 1,000-foot lava cliff, near scenic Makapuu Beach on the island of Oahu.

In addition to being a popular tourist attraction, with nearly a half-million visitors to the park last year, there are also many important marine research programs underway at the Makapuu Oceanic Center.

Under the direction of Dr. Taylor Pryor, director of the Oceanic Institute, the first in what may be a series of adventures in hydrospace began on October 1 at the Makai Undersea Test Range with the testing by four aquanauts of a new 70-foot-long portable habitat, capable of supporting six diver-scientists for weeks at depths of up to 600 feet.

In reporting on this challenging experiment in marine science, Honolulu Star-Bulletin writer Richard Hoyt commented:

Watching the aquanauts through closed circuit television is much like the experience of watching Apollo astronauts on television.

In his interesting feature article on the undersea tests, Mr. Hoyt also noted that Dr. Pryor's portable habitat has the deepest diving capability of any similar machine in the world.

As we look to the 1970's and the concept of the International Decade of

Ocean Exploration, it is expected that marine scientists and engineers from all over the world will be studying the ocean space with the goal of deriving practical benefits from the seas for the good of all mankind. In this connection, I believe that my colleagues would wish to read more about the pioneer work being done in exploring our next frontier—oceanography—which is presently being conducted in the island State.

I am therefore pleased to submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article by Mr. Hoyt from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of Saturday, October 4, 1969, entitled "Undersea Habitat Tested by Four Off Waimanalo":

UNDERSEA HABITAT TESTED BY FOUR OFF
WAIMANALO

(By Richard Hoyt)

Four aquanauts in shorts and tee-shirts are in the first of what may be a series of adventures in hydrospace off the Makai Undersea Test Range at Waimanalo.

Taylor Pryor, the Makapuu Point ocean science entrepreneur, is putting his new undersea habitat through its paces for the first time.

The 70-foot long portable habitat is capable of supporting six diver-scientists for weeks at depths of up to 600-feet.

The habitat's life support equipment is being checked by four divers under controlled observation in shallow water off Pryor's research pier.

At 7:30 a.m., Wednesday, with no fuss or fanfare the yellow habitat was lowered into the water. There the interior pressure was increased to equal that of water 200-feet deep.

The divers are monitored 24-hours a day through closed circuit television.

They are now being depressurized from the 200-foot level by a rate equivalent to one foot of ocean depth every 15 minutes. Tomorrow morning they will again be at surface pressure.

Watching the aquanauts through closed circuit television is much like the experience of watching Apollo astronauts on television.

But there are some differences:

The aquanauts do not wear bulky suits. They wear aloha shorts and droopy tee-shirts.

The aquanauts do not eat soft food squeezed from tubes. They eat soggy bread and canned soup.

Worst of all for the aquanauts' image, they sound like Donald Duck when they talk.

The Donald Duck voice is the result of pressurized helium and oxygen. Regular air at that pressure would be dangerous.

Jon Pegg, a medical doctor who is keeping an eye on the divers' health, said the reason is jokingly called "Martini's Law."

At 50 feet, pressurized oxygen in normal amounts will have the effect of one dry martini on a dry stomach. At 100 feet this effect is doubled, and so on. At 200 feet an aquanaut would get drunk.

Pegg, who worked with habitats for the University of California, Berkeley, said Pryor's portable habitat has the deepest diving capability of any similar machine in the world.

The men inside: William Berryman, Charles Peterson, Richard Ellis, and Danny Kali, have to be kept very warm (85 degrees) for them not to get very cold.

This, also, is due to the strange atmosphere.

The aquanauts are doing "extremely well" according to Pegg, who is also pleased that the habitat is not leaking helium as most do.

The aquanauts each have a bunk. They have living quarters and working quarters complete with a kitchen and refrigerator.

So until tomorrow morning, all they have to do is sleep, eat and keep healthy, and maybe shoot the breeze . . . in Donald Duck voices.

THE EFFECT OF TAX REFORM LEGISLATION ON PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, one of the leading educators in America, the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame, testified recently before the Committee on Finance on the effect that certain provisions of H.R. 13270 are likely to have on the financing of higher education, most especially on medical education.

So that all Members of the Congress may have a chance to read this impressive testimony, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF THEODORE M. HESBURGH

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I am Theodore M. Hesburgh, president, since 1952, of the University of Notre Dame. With me today I have Dr. John Cooper, who is the president of the Association of American Medical Colleges; Mr. Frank Erwin, who is Chairman of the Board of Regents of the State Universities of Texas; and Dr. Felix Robb, who is the Director of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

The four of us appear before you this morning as representatives of institutions which are, in a sense, bystanders in the present controversy over legislation affecting private foundations. Although I am also a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation, neither I nor my colleagues are appearing here to represent a "private foundation," or a group of foundations. No matter what definition you finally settle upon for that key term, all of the institutions which we represent will fall beyond it. We will, therefore, be beyond the direct effect of whatever rules you prescribe for foundations.

If we are bystanders, though, we are intensely interested ones. We are, also, a good deal more familiar with the subject of the controversy than bystanders ordinarily are. For both our interest and our knowledge, we are indebted to the very close relationship which foundations have to the programs of the institutions which we represent. Our institutions receive vital support from foundations; they work continually with foundations; and, in doing so, they have developed a broad experience with foundations' functions and characteristics. Moreover, as individuals, we have served as members or trustees of a considerable variety of private and governmental organizations—ranging from the National Science Board and the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education to Governor Rockefeller's Select Committee studying private education in the state of New York—which are active in the fields in which foundations work.

Based upon our knowledge of private foundations—and the very considerable benefits which our institutions steadily derive from them—we are seriously concerned about certain aspects of the legislation proposed for foundations.

The four of us have observed the work of foundations from rather different points of view. In discussing the consequences of the proposed foundation legislation, I will draw upon my experience with private educational institutions. Representing the Association

of American Medical Colleges, Dr. Cooper will explain the role of foundations in medical education. Mr. Erwin will speak to you of the relationship of private foundations to colleges and universities which derive their principal support from states or local governments. Finally, on behalf of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools—an organization with 9,000 member and affiliated colleges, universities, secondary and elementary schools serving eleven Southern states from Virginia to Texas—Dr. Robb will speak to you of the place of foundations in education in the South.

From these varied points of view outside the foundation world, we would like to tell you what we know of that world; how it affects the institutions which we represent; and why we are disturbed about certain parts of the legislation proposed for foundations. As we proceed, we will document our observations with concrete examples and with general statistical data. We will not, however, enter upon an examination of the technical details or ramifications of the House bill, or other specific legislative proposals. Other witnesses are more qualified for those tasks than we are.

At the outset, we would like to make it clear that the four of us wholeheartedly support legislation aimed at the financial abuses in which a minority of private foundations are reported to have become involved. We pretend to no expertise on foundation abuses, because the foundations with which we are familiar have not engaged in them. On the other hand, we recognize that the 1965 Treasury Department Report on Private Foundations and witnesses who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee this spring have made out a strong case for legislative proscription of foundation-donor self-dealing, unwarranted accumulations of income, and certain other practices. To the extent that such practices exist, we share the concern of the Ways and Means Committee about them, and we urge you to deal decisively and effectively with them.

Beyond such steps, however, we are deeply disturbed about one aspect of the House bill and one additional proposal which, while not incorporated in the House bill, has been advocated by critics of foundations in recent years. In brief, the proposals which concern us are these:

The House bill would impose a 7½ per cent tax upon foundation investment income. The Ways and Means Committee Report estimates that this tax will produce \$65,000,000 of revenue in its first year of operation. According to the House estimates, the revenue effect of the tax would rise rapidly to an annual \$100,000,000. Furthermore, as the next group of witnesses will explain in greater detail, the precedent which the tax would establish for state and local governments seems likely to have an additional substantial monetary impact on foundations.

Several critics of foundations have recommended terminating the existence or exemption of foundations after a period of years. One proposal would fix a 25-year limit on foundations' tax exemption and qualification to receive deductible charitable contributions. Another would restrict the life of each private foundation to 25 years. Others would require foundations to distribute their assets at a sufficiently high rate to end their existence within a period of 10, 15, or 20 years.

We are deeply concerned both about the proposed tax on foundation investment income and about the adoption of any mechanism whose effect would be to terminate the existence or exemption of all foundations over a period of time. Our combined experience with foundations convinces us that their work has been of immense value to the classes of institutions which we represent and to American society. We are, therefore, strongly persuaded that any measure

which diminishes the current funds with which foundations carry on their work and with which they support the work of other charitable and educational institutions—by an annual \$65,000,000, \$100,000,000, or any like amount—will have major undesirable consequences. For the same reasons, we are convinced that an endeavor—direct or indirect—to curtail the existence or tax benefits of foundations would be thoroughly unfortunate.

To explain the grounds upon which we base these views, we should like to review briefly the work which foundations have done in the four areas with which we are familiar.

A. FOUNDATIONS AND PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES

During more than seventeen years as president of Notre Dame, I have found one of my great preoccupations to be the financing of the University's educational, research and service programs. The progress that my University has recorded during this period can be attributed in no small measure to the support of private philanthropic foundations. Indeed, one major philanthropic organization, the Ford Foundation, looms as the largest single benefactor in Notre Dame's 127-year history.

I shall not presume to speak for my fellow college and university presidents, although I can think of none whom I know personally who would favor the foundation tax which we are discussing. I would like to say a word about how one foundation, the Ford Foundation, is helping Notre Dame accomplish in ten years what normally would have required thirty years. With equal force I could document what has been accomplished on our campus with support from the Rockefeller Foundation, the Sloan Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation, and others.

Specifically, I shall speak about the Ford Foundation's Special Program in Education—perhaps the most magnificent philanthropic program in the history of American higher education—in which a significant number of colleges and universities have been helped to help themselves through challenging matching grants. In the case of Notre Dame, the whole vision of what the University might be has been startlingly, almost unbelievably, altered by two \$6 million matching Ford Foundation grants. With the incentive of these matching grants, between 1960 and 1966, we were able to double or triple the money normally contributed to the University. There is no question in my mind that this gigantic stride forward was made possible by the matching provision. So, aside from what the grants themselves helped underwrite—for example, the 13-story Notre Dame Memorial Library—they have helped generate many additional millions of dollars in support from alumni, from friends, from corporations, and even from other foundations.

The best thing about foundation support is, of course, that it is project-oriented for the most part and encourages a university to do new things, to undertake research and launch new educational programs that would be out of the question if one had to rely on operating income or even the gift support of alumni and friends. For example, the Carnegie Corporation made a capital grant to Notre Dame which underwrote the first national study of Catholic elementary and secondary education in the United States. Support from the Kellogg Foundation has made possible a program of continuing education that has touched the lives of tens of thousands involved in more than 300 campus conferences each year.

The aid which the major foundations have provided in the years since World War II has proved to be a life-line to the independent half of our nation's unique dual, private/governmental system of higher education. There is serious question whether the

independent sector can persevere and continue to provide an educational alternative. With inflation and the spiraling cost of living threatening to impair the philanthropic support of individuals, and with corporations, generally speaking, contributing less than 1 per cent of their profits to charitable organizations when they are entitled by law to contribute up to five percent, the proposed tax on foundations—or any general measure to end the existence or exemption of foundations—will have the plain and necessary effect of driving our independent colleges into the arms of the government at a time when many feel there is already too much government involvement on the campus. I cannot believe that this is a prospect welcomed by members of this Committee or the Congress.

To state the matter somewhat differently, a 7½ per cent tax levied on the investment income of foundations would, in effect, be a tax on Stanford and Johns Hopkins, Vanderbilt and Emory, Notre Dame and Denver and, indeed, on all the colleges and universities, great and small, in every part of this land, which benefit from the regular and substantial support of these foundations. It would result in less foundation support for the nation's colleges and universities at precisely the time when they are experiencing a financial crisis and need more. The revenue generated by the tax would be of little consequence to the government, but its collection would have the direct effect of reducing the funds normally available to colleges and universities by a similar amount, and the indirect effect of a proportional reduction of the individual contributions which these funds stimulate. Furthermore, it would seem inevitable, once the precedent is set, that the tax would be increased as the states and municipalities and future administrations seek much needed revenues, thereby further reducing the funds available to colleges and universities. Again I say that I cannot believe those results to be acceptable to this Committee or the Congress.

My plea, then, is to legislate against specific abuses which may have been discovered in the administration of certain foundations—but not to diminish the funds with which foundations make their vital contribution to the private sector's educational system. This is the time for the Congress to take steps to encourage even further private philanthropy to higher education. The proposals of which I have spoken would have exactly the opposite effect.

B. FOUNDATIONS AND MEDICAL EDUCATION

In the field of medical education, too, the resources of private foundations have been of critical importance. Review of the relevant data reveals that foundations provide a continuing flow of funds which, in absolute terms, makes significant contributions to the training of our doctors, research technicians, nurses, and other medical personnel. Even more important, foundation funds have been of vital assistance in certain special areas of medical education for which it has proved difficult or impossible to secure support from other sources.

The Association of American Medical Colleges conducts an annual survey of all medical schools in the United States to determine the sources of their funds and the purposes to which the funds are applied. In addition, to assist this Committee in its current inquiry, the Association has conducted a special canvass of several of the larger medical schools to obtain more detailed information on the amounts and purposes of foundation grants in recent years.

The data stemming from these investigations demonstrate convincingly that, overall, the contribution of private foundations to medical education and medical research has been an impressive one. Foundations have repeatedly granted funds to medical

schools for operating budgets and capital construction. Such grants for general purposes, however, present only a partial view of the importance of foundation support in the field of medical education. In several specific areas, foundation funds have been of special significance.

Faculty salaries

While the federal government annually appropriates large sums for medical research, it has proved exceedingly difficult to obtain government support for the maintenance and upgrading of medical school faculties. Plainly, funds committed to these purposes have major bearing upon the quality of medical practice and the state of medical knowledge throughout the United States. Yet, as a dean of the Harvard Medical School noted in a recent letter to the Association of American Medical Colleges, "We are especially dependent on foundations for teaching funds since the government has neglected this area."

Specific illustrations abound. In recent years the Mellon funds have made substantial grants for faculty support and expansion at Tulane, Vanderbilt, Northwestern, Chicago, Boston University, Brown, Case Western Reserve, Columbia, Cornell, Dartmouth, Duke, Emory, George Washington, Harvard, Temple, Tufts, Washington University (St. Louis), Yale, Johns Hopkins, Jefferson Medical College, Marquette, Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, the University of Rochester, the University of Southern California, and Stanford.

The comments of administrators at several of the recipient schools provide insight into the importance of the grants:

"Both the basic sciences and the teaching programs have been immeasurably improved by the infusion of funds. New appointments have been made and the entire faculty stabilized." (Tulane.)

"The grant has proved to be one of the most timely and beneficial ones we have ever been privileged to receive. It has made possible the strengthening of various departments where the need was pressing." (Vanderbilt.)

"To say that Mellon funds were invaluable to Northwestern University Medical School would be an understatement. They came at a time when personnel, particularly in the basic sciences, was in very short supply." (Northwestern.)

"The funds have been used to stabilize the position of several very promising young scientists, attract new ones, and to start new and important areas of teaching and research at a time when federal funds have become overly restrictive." (Johns Hopkins.)

"The assistance which we have received each year from the Mellon funds has enabled us to strengthen the faculties of the three departments which do most of the teaching in the first year of medical school." (Jefferson Medical College.)

"There would be literally no other way which faculty expansion and strengthening could have been financed." (Boston.)

"These funds have made it possible to bring in people who we would have found very difficult to support in any other way." (Case Western Reserve.)

"The grant has made it possible for us to maintain academic strength in all of our basic science departments." (George Washington.)

The Mellon grants have not been the only ones supporting the improvement of medical school faculties. During the period from June of 1962 through June of 1969, the Surdna Foundation made grants of \$3,300,000 to the Harvard Medical School for general faculty support. Of that total, \$2,500,000 was allocated to a fund which supports full-time faculty members in the basic medical science and clinical departments. Six hundred thousand dollars has been used to establish a new professorship in pediatrics. An additional \$200,000 has been used to com-

plete funding of a professorship of preventive medicine. The Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation has made annually-increasing grants to Washington University (St. Louis), Columbia, and Harvard to expand training in obstetrics. It has, in addition, established a major professorship in obstetrics and gynecology.

The examples could be multiplied at considerable length. Their point, however, should be evident: institutions of medical education are heavily dependent upon private foundations for the resources which support the faculties which train the nation's doctors and medical research personnel.

Establishment of new medical schools

As has been the case with the maintenance and improvement of the faculties of existing medical schools, in recent years the Federal Government has provided little operating support for the establishment of new medical schools. Here again, the need has been evident, and foundations have acted to close the financial gap. Moreover, in this area particularly, their action has carried an impact extending well beyond its immediate dollar effect; for foundation grants have stimulated contributions from a broad variety of other sources—both public and private, and often many times larger than the original foundation grant. In that way, foundation commitments have frequently had a plain and pronounced multiplier effect.

The Kellogg Foundation has given \$8.4 million over the past nine years to establish new medical schools at the University of Connecticut, Rutgers Medical School, Brown University, the University of Hawaii, the University of New Mexico, Michigan State, the University of Nevada.

Of the grant to Connecticut, the president of the university has said: "The foundation authorized a three-year grant to the University of Connecticut in the amount of \$1,037,500 to support the establishment of a school of the basic medical sciences. . . . It is no exaggeration to say that the foundation's grant has had an exciting catalytic effect upon our progress to date. . . . This grant is a classic example of what 'venture capital' assistance from a foundation can accomplish."

The business manager of the Rutgers Medical School has commented: "Without the stimulus of the foundation, Rutgers Medical School would still probably be a dream of the future."

Assistance to medical schools in financial difficulty

The demands upon our medical schools have been particularly great in the past several years. Financial pressures have increased correspondingly. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that a number of schools—particularly in the private sector—have come very close to financial collapse. Repeatedly, foundations have made timely grants to avert such failures.

One foundation has provided almost \$4,000,000 over the past five years to 10 schools which were experiencing severe fiscal difficulties. Included were such schools as Creighton University, in Omaha, Nebraska; the University of Utah; Meharry Medical College, in Nashville, Tennessee; and the University of Vermont. The dean of one of the recipient schools has said: "I should like to once again comment on the extraordinary value of the . . . award to our developing School of Medicine. The award permitted a continued growth of the school during an exceptionally critical period in which the program was expanding far more rapidly than the allocations to the School of Medicine from state appropriations. Indeed, I seriously question whether the school could have avoided a substantial collapse. . . ."

Development of new techniques

If foundation resources have afforded crucial support for medical school faculties, the establishment of new schools, and the assistance of schools in financial difficulty, they have performed services of at least equal value in a different class of endeavor. Nowhere have the innovative capacities of foundations been more evident than in the development of new systems and techniques of medical education, improved medical curricula, and new methods of relating medical facilities to the provision of health care for our citizens. Here again, reference to particular examples is useful.

The shape of modern medical education owes as much to Abraham Flexner's 1910 report on the subject as to any other single factor. Made possible by a Carnegie grant, the Flexner report advocated—and produced—fundamental revisions in a variety of facets of our system of developing and training doctors.

In the academic year 1955-1956 the Harvard Medical School utilized a \$1,000,000 grant from the Commonwealth Fund to test pioneering changes in medical curriculum. Based upon the knowledge developed in these initial experiments, major changes in the school's curriculum were adopted two years later. The innovations at Harvard were the basis for far-reaching changes in curriculum at Western Reserve—changes which were supported by the Commonwealth fund, and which have had great effects on medical education across the country.

Grants to Northwestern University by the John and Mary R. Markle Foundation and the Commonwealth Fund enabled the school to evolve a program which substantially diminishes the time required for the education of doctors. Under this program, Northwestern now admits students from high schools who are able to obtain M.D. degrees in a total of six years. Grants from the Commonwealth Fund to Boston University and Johns Hopkins University permitted the initiation of similar programs at those institutions.

The Rockefeller Foundation and the Macy Foundation provided the Harvard Medical School with funds to undertake the nation's first undergraduate program designed to assist members of minority groups to enhance their qualifications for graduate study in medicine and dentistry.

The Carnegie Corporation of New York has provided three-year funding for teaching, research, and administrative programs on the economics of health care.

The Ford, Rockefeller, and Avalon Foundations have committed themselves to provide a total of \$5,200,000 for the development of a unique laboratory studying human reproductive biology in conjunction with the existing Center for Population Studies at the Harvard School for Public Health. According to a recent Harvard report, "Together these two programs will represent one of the nation's primary concentrations of talent and competence."

The Commonwealth Fund and the Surdna Foundation have, together, provided funds for the creation and operation of a pilot university-sponsored community health plan. Drawing on the facilities and personnel of the university's medical school, the program will make comprehensive medical service and health care available to the residents of the surrounding community.

Conclusion

Year after year, foundation dollars afford vital support for the nation's medical schools. In a number of respects, they fulfill needs for which there are no other dollars. Further, by stimulating other support, foundation grants often generate resources which—even measured solely in monetary terms—are of far greater magnitude than the origi-

nal grant. Finally, in at least one area foundation support has produced results which can only be described as unique; for without the creative impetus supplied by foundations' experimental projects, their studies of system and technique, and their programs for change, many of the advances of modern medical education simply would not have occurred.

With increasing demands being placed on the medical schools for an increased production of health manpower and greater involvement in meeting the health service needs of the country in the face of ever less adequate support from local and federal sources, foundations are a critical part of our effort to meet the expectations of society for a healthier life.

C. FOUNDATIONS AND PUBLIC EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Nobody honestly concerned with American education condones illegality or irregularity in private philanthropy. Hence every representative of public higher education endorses all legislation assuring fairness and equity among taxpayers, donors, foundations, their institutional beneficiaries, and the government.

On the other hand, it is a simple historical fact that both established state universities and developing public institutions could not fulfill their missions without foundation support. Gifts, bequests, special grants under the law have enabled such institutions to grow, to increase their effectiveness, and to serve the whole population. By such means, private philanthropy has provided a tremendous variety of activities which often cannot be supported by government appropriations.

Thus foundations have encouraged innovation and experiment.

They have initiated creative work and kept it alive.

They have made possible new departures in multi-disciplinary study and research.

They have brought public and private institutions into practical cooperation.

They have broadened and strengthened activity aimed at the common welfare.

Drawn from the Southwest alone, the following examples are typical of thousands of similar projects in the United States. Each is recent. Each has the vitality to assure later effectiveness.

Innovation and experiment

In Texas, private foundations have brought engineering and medical schools to join in studies of the individual and his environment; numerous academic departments and business organizations to experiment with problems as different as beef production and mineral recovery; inventive skills and consumer needs; biological, mathematical, and space research opening new perspective on geophysics, the world and the solar system.

Creative work

By gifts of art and libraries, by support of humanities centers and the individuals working in them, foundations have brought to life creative work, which has involved both whole communities and smaller groups concerned with painting, music, and the theater, as well as general studies.

Interdisciplinary study

Private foundation gifts and grants have helped the scientific linguist and the classroom teacher to overcome the disadvantage of students with language handicaps; the biologist and the oceanographer to establish new methods in marine medicine; the engineer and the journalist to take advantage of modern communication; the computer scientist and scholars in a dozen fields to speed the acquisition and dissemination of knowledge.

Public and private institutions

In one state alone, more than thirty joint programs between privately-endowed and tax-assisted institutions have ranged from the single classroom to the whole region.

Common welfare

Where taxes were unavailable, private foundations have made possible the initial operation of two medical schools and continuing programs of a major teaching hospital. Without foundation grants, the Anderson Hospital and Tumor Institute, host to the next International Congress on Cancer, could not have begun its work or maintained its distinction.

Immediate benefits of such programs are manifest. Taxpayers have been saved money; they have also been given benefits which taxes could not provide. Still more important, however, is the fact that in every such phase of higher education, the university has been assisted in getting ready for the future. In that future, it is not the eminence of an institution which is at stake. It is the people's interest.

By relatively small sums afforded through tax relief this future prospect can be assisted. By depriving foundations of those funds—as the proposed tax would do—that prospect would be diminished or denied. In all institutions which are “public” in the broadest and truest sense, the present system of tax relief is essential to a base of planning now more than half a century old. To shut off or cut down that relatively modest independent funding would close innumerable doors on future educational progress.

D. THE SOUTH: FOUNDATIONS AND EDUCATION

This country desperately needs a strategy for expanding legitimate philanthropy as a vital component of free enterprise—and of the private-public balance in American life—not a precedent for reducing philanthropy through taxation or excessive regulation. If it is the will of Congress to equalize educational opportunity, then Congress should encourage and facilitate the work of reputable philanthropic foundations. Such encouragement is particularly important in the South.

The South lacks resources with which to provide adequate educational opportunity for its people. The entire nation has suffered as a consequence. But the gap between the South and other regions would be much wider except for the investment by national and regional philanthropic foundations in the development of human resources.

Any reduction in foundation support would be adversely felt in the South, with its huge number of children to educate and the fewest public dollars with which to do the job. Mississippi, which in proportion to income makes a greater per capita educational effort than any other state, spent only \$364 per pupil in public schools in 1967-68 compared to New York State's \$1,024. If the South is ever to catch up, it needs more private philanthropy—not less.

Economic limitations have prevented most Southern educational institutions from having enough funds for operation; they have fallen far short of having enough funds for innovation, experimentation, and improvement.

All educational institutions serve best when they are strong, venturesome and self-renewing. Consistently, ever since the Civil War, when we Southerners have had an educational problem requiring an innovative approach, we have sought and often received foundation support to test our idea, to demonstrate a new approach, or to finance needed research and programs. A substantial flow of money from large national foundations, along with our own regional philanthropies, continues to be essential to education in the South.

What would be the difference if a reduc-

tion of available foundation dollars were brought about through taxation?

1. It would tend to discourage new philanthropy just at the time when the South's improving economy is developing indigenous private wealth that is increasingly flowing back to the public through local philanthropy.

2. It would have serious impact upon at least two or three hundred key Southern colleges and universities—public and private—that look to foundations as their “margin for excellence,” plus a number of smaller, weaker colleges facing deficits for the first time this past year. To them foundation grants are crucial.

Vanderbilt University's rise to national stature results substantially from foundation grants that stimulated local effort. Emory's great medical center could not have functioned well without Woodruff Foundation money to cover its deficits. As recently as August 22, the Kresge Foundation gave \$1,500,000 to Meharry Medical College in Nashville for a badly needed library. This college—which has educated approximately half the Negro physicians in the United States—has been literally saved by foundation grants in the past decade.

Strategic grants are helping our colleges predominantly serving black students to improve their curricula, to develop their staffs, and thereby to move into the mainstream. The Carnegie Corporation of New York has underwritten one of these programs over a 5-year period and the Danforth Foundation committed \$5,000,000 over seven years to sustain the Southern Fellowships Fund.

3. Reducing foundation funds would curtail the only money we can get with long-term commitments sufficient to stay with projects and evaluate their results. For instance, over the past five years the cities of New Orleans, Atlanta, Nashville, Huntsville (Alabama), and Durham (North Carolina), have received approximately \$3,000,000 each from the Ford Foundation as “see money” for a world of educational improvements. In Nashville the first public kindergartens were started with new ways of teaching young children. In New Orleans, schools were designated to show what can be accomplished when resources and flexibility to teach individuals are combined. In Durham, research of enormous value about infant and very early child behavior and learning was conducted. In Atlanta, better ways to prepare teachers were discovered. At Huntsville, because of new programs started with foundation funds, that city's school system was recently chosen for participation in a major national educational program.

4. The Kellogg Foundation has done much to enrich life in Georgia through the creation of a dynamic continuing education center at the University of Georgia. The value of this program is incalculable, and it would not have been initiated without foundation funds.

5. Taxing foundation resources would reduce one of the chief means of attack on the problems of disadvantaged people in poverty-stricken rural areas. For instance, the Danforth Foundation has underwritten three pilot projects in rural counties of Florida, Georgia, and Tennessee for a 5-year interval in the amount of \$1,350,000. These counties—Wheeler, Overton, and Wewahatcha—would never have seen their educational potentiality for something better without foundation funds to show how teaching and learning can be improved with very few dollars.

6. Project Opportunity, operating in Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia, is already identifying, motivating, and propelling toward college and fulfillment of their highest potentiality 3,000 bright, academically talented high school youngsters whose record of poverty and deprivation was

pressing them into unproductive lives as public liabilities. This dramatic reversal, achieved largely through a system of testing and counseling, is producing constructive citizens who will, in turn, pay taxes. Ford and Danforth Foundations have invested approximately \$2,000,000 in this joint effort by eleven colleges, the College Entrance Examination Board, and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Dividends to the nation can be many times the money spent in the discovery and motivation of these young people. It would be a human tragedy of serious dimension to deny 7½ per cent, or any, of these youngsters their chance to succeed.

7. Regional foundations such as Z. Smith Reynolds, Mary Reynolds Babcock, Woodruff, Rich, Callaway, Stern, and the strategic Southern Education Foundation make an important difference in life in the South. They are taking a keen interest in elementary and secondary schools, and the aggregate of their support is a vital factor in the “growing edge” in Southern education. The public kindergarten movement in the South was initially fueled by foundations, as were many experiments on individualized instruction.

8. Especially in a time of escalating costs and inadequate tax revenues at the state and local levels, it would seem unwise to reduce educational resources of the kind used for stimulus of local effort, for matching purposes (required in many federal programs), and for the kinds of innovation and long-term search for solutions to problems for which public funds are insufficient.

9. In a dozen Southern cities, fine arts and music flourish precisely because of foundation support for our symphony orchestras, art museums, and concert halls. Without the help of national and local foundations, our cities would lose major cultural advantages.

The philanthropy of foundations operating in the South has been accomplished with competence, wisdom, and freedom to operate professionally once grants were made. Because these agencies have traditionally worked quietly, without fanfare, the American public is not fully aware of their great contribution. Thus it is necessary for those of us who live close to Southern education and who dream of its future to speak up and state how strongly we feel about our vulnerability to any change in public policy that—like the proposed tax on foundations—would limit the flow of private funds for education.

SUMMARY OF STATEMENT OF THEODORE M. HESBURGH

Representatives of a broad variety of institutions which derive support from foundations—including private colleges and universities, state and municipal universities, medical schools, and educational institutions in the South—are seriously concerned about two legislative proposals affecting private foundations. One, incorporated in the House tax bill, would impose a 7½ percent tax on foundation investment income. The other—not included in the House bill, but recommended by some critics of foundations—would terminate the existence or tax exemption of all foundations after a period of years.

The first of these measures would diminish the current funds with which foundations carry on their work—and with which they support the work of other charitable and educational institutions—by at least \$65,000,000 a year. The second would, over time, have even more drastic effects upon foundation functions. Because the accomplishments of private foundations have been of immense value to American society and, specifically, to the institutions which receive their financial support, representatives of those institutions strongly oppose both the proposals.

Review of the accomplishments of the foundations in several areas demonstrates the undesirable consequences which the proposals would have.

Foundations and private universities

Through a system of matching grants, the Ford Foundation's Special Program in Education has stimulated many colleges and universities to develop resources considerably in excess of the original grants. The Rockefeller Foundation, the Sloan Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation and many others have also made major contributions to our private educational system.

Without such assistance, there is serious question whether the independent sector of our dual, private/governmental system of higher education can survive. Yet a tax on foundation income would bring a major reduction of that assistance.

Congress should, then, legislate against any specific abuses in which certain foundations have become involved—but should take care not to diminish the funds with which foundations make their vital contribution to the private educational system.

Foundations and medical education

In the field of medical education, too, the resources of private foundations have been of critical importance. They provide a continuing flow of support which, in absolute terms, contributes substantially to the training of our doctors, research technicians, nurses and other medical personnel. Even more important, foundation funds have been of vital assistance in special areas of medical education for which it has proved difficult or impossible to obtain support from other sources.

Foundation support is, for example, of particular importance in sustaining and improving medical school faculties; in establishing new medical schools; in assisting schools which experience financial difficulties; and in developing new techniques of medical education, new curricula, and new methods of relating medical facilities to the provision of health care for our citizens.

Foundations and public educational institutions

Foundations have also afforded key support to state and municipal colleges and universities. In the Southwest, for example, they have enabled such institutions to experiment with problems as diverse as beef production and mineral recovery; to study inventive skills and consumer needs; to assist linguists and teachers to overcome language handicaps; and to develop new techniques of modern communication for engineers and journalists.

The South: Foundations and education

The South, with an enormous burden of children to educate and fewer dollars to do the job than any other region, is especially vulnerable to any change in public policy that would limit the flow of private funds for education and make equalization of educational opportunity more difficult. Philanthropic foundations provide a critical margin—either for excellence or for survival—in many Southern educational institutions.

The South's growing economy is beginning to produce indigenous wealth and a new surge of local philanthropic interest in education. Taxation or undue regulation of legitimate foundations will discourage this development at a crucial time.

Educational improvement, innovation, pioneering projects, and needed research funded by national and local foundations are helping the South catch up with the rest of the nation. Important new public kindergarten programs and continuing education are two products of foundation support.

Efforts to transform talented but underprivileged youth from public liabilities to productive, educated citizens provide further dramatic evidence of the dividends accruable from strategic foundation investment in human development.

MORATORIUM

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the so-called moratorium and its spokesmen have arrogated to themselves the right to speak on behalf of the Americans fighting in Vietnam and to parade around with the names of those who have fallen in battle. The time has come to allow our fighting men to speak for themselves. The moratorium will find a lot of dissent among Americans in Vietnam against the attempt to undermine the cause for which over 45,000 Americans have died.

I wish to invite attention of this House, Mr. Speaker, to a report on what our men in Vietnam are saying about the moratorium. It is their lives which are on the line. A Scripps-Howard dispatch from Saigon published October 14, 1969, in the Washington Daily News, quoted an American soldier. He said:

I'm tired of hearing what politicians who sound like Hanoi demand, what well-meaning but awfully uninformed students demand, what ivory-tower doves who wouldn't dirty their hands over here demand. I am weary of hearing how much Sen. Fulbright wants out. We all want out.

He added:

We all protest the war. We all want peace. But not by saying: "Here, Hanoi, take 17 million people. We'll pretend we were never involved. We quit."

Correspondent Don Tate reported that many soldiers in Vietnam "have become antiwar in the truest sense, but they have also become resolutely anti-BUGOUT."

I include the Saigon dispatch in the RECORD so that my colleagues may be informed of dissent from another quarter:

"OTHER WAR" IN UNITED STATES RILES GI'S
(By Don Tate)

SAIGON.—As tomorrow's war "moratorium" will demonstrate, there are two Vietnam wars—the one Americans fight in Vietnam, and the one Americans fight in the U.S. Observers here say the decisive battleground is in the U.S.

They point out that short of a highly successful Communist offensive, which is extremely unlikely, or a dramatic allied strategy change, such as renewed bombing of North Vietnam, the killing war in South Vietnam is apt to rock along in its fight-lull fight rhythm much as it has been, at least until many more U.S. troops are withdrawn.

Meanwhile, the war to win American public opinion and, particularly, the mind of Richard M. Nixon, is waxing hotter. What happens in the U.S. will determine what happens here. As the President warns Americans not to buckle and run, protesters prepare to hit the streets, many of them demanding immediate, unilateral withdrawal of all American troops. That translates here as "BUGOUT."

GI DISDAIN "BUGOUT"

It was difficult to find an American soldier here who wants to leave Vietnam that way, or as one GI put it, "with our tails dragging." It is difficult to find one—even among those most disgusted with the war—who wishes simply to abandon the South Vietnamese to a Communist bloodbath.

It is difficult to find one who thinks the value of the American word would be worth a dime anywhere in the world if they did, or that a humiliating U.S. defeat by a blustering Communist midget would do anybody but the Communists any good.

These consequences are apparent to most Americans here, and they are not acceptable. It is largely a matter of national backbone. Most express hope that President Nixon sticks to seeking a reasonable solution to the war.

There are, of course, many critics of war critics here. They charge that a number of war critics in the U.S. are using the same tactics Hanoi has shown—the more you give them the more they demand, and they both demand total, immediate and unconditional everything.

In the two wars—one group of Americans is convinced of the rightness and necessity of bringing this bitter war to a conclusion by presenting a united front to Hanoi, the other protesting group is more or less convinced the only way out of Vietnam is to get out fast regardless of consequences.

MYSTERY IN VIETNAM

There is often the feeling here that the war is only a secondary feature to the show of exposed nerves going on in the U.S. What the war has done to the U.S. is the biggest mystery of all here.

"It seems like any American who ever wanted to protest anything has found his cause in the Vietnam war", one veteran analyst contends, "and yet 95 per cent of them have suffered little direct personal hardship because of the war."

"You hear so much of the war-weary American, and how exhausted he is by the war. Yet this exhaustion of the mightiest power on earth is a relative thing. It hasn't been bombed, or invaded, or lived under the Communists a single day. It's manpower loss has been a drop in the bucket compared to that of either North or South Vietnam, and its suffering has been a thousand times less. Many Americans would hardly know the war was going on if it wasn't for newspapers and TV. Suppose Americans had to face what the South Vietnamese people have yet to face? American's exhaustion is a self-induced state of mind, composed mostly of confusion."

One rankled American, with invested years and effort in Vietnam, condemned some of the ranting protesters as the "most confused of all."

WEARY OF "POPPING OFF"

"Soldiers do the dying," he said, "and these others do the popping off. I'm tired of hearing these so-sure people who haven't shed a nosebleed in this war scream pig this and obscene that and run around protesting for the hell of it."

"I'm tired of hearing what politicians who sound like Hanoi radio demand, what well-meaning but awfully uninformed students demand, what ivory-tower doves who wouldn't dirty their hands over here demand. I'm weary of hearing how much Sen. (J. William) Fulbright, D., Ark. wants out. We all want out. We all protest the war. We all want peace. But not by saying: 'Here Hanoi, take 17 million people. We'll pretend we were never involved. We quit.'"

Many here feel that some of the protesters would do well to focus their moral wrath less on President Nixon and more on the Communists.

It is the Communists, they stress, who are killing Americans. It is the Communists who butchered, as a matter of policy, the civilians of Hue and so many other places, and it is the Communists who will murder methodically thousands more Vietnamese if the U.S. totally, immediately and unconditionally abandons them, as many protesters advocate.

To Americans who have put in their time

here, it is not good enough to dismiss blandly such realities with an: "Oh, well, it is up to the Vietnamese to work out their own problems."

Many here, eyewitnesses to the war, have become anti-war in the truest sense, but they have also become resolutely anti-bugout.

THE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH TAKES NOTE OF THE WORLD POPULATION CRISIS

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, we all know that the population of the world is projected to increase from 3 to 7 billion by the year 2,000. We are now confronted with a population crisis.

This crisis is interwoven in and a substantial cause of the pollution crisis and food crisis which are now beginning to become ominously apparent to all nations.

Recently I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 156, to establish an Inter-agency Commission on the Human Environment. This commission has the specific duty of planning for the U.S. participation in the 1972 U.N. Conference on World Pollution.

Man is becoming increasingly aware of the fact that unless he is able to bring the population explosion under control, pollution and food shortages are going to become critical.

Therefore, I was pleased to see the emphasis being placed upon the population issue by the Board of Christian Social Concerns of the United Methodist Church. It has designated "This Crowded World" as the theme for World Order Sunday, which is October 19, 1969. I have a letter from Herman Will, Jr., associate general secretary, Board of Christian Social Concerns, dated August 1969, relating why the United Methodist Church set the population issue as the theme of their World Order Sunday. I also have a leaflet which was enclosed with the letter. It discusses in detail "this crowded world" and the tremendous problems which have been generated by the population explosion. The letter and leaflet are worthy of the attention of my colleagues and I ask unanimous consent that both be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

AUGUST 1969.

DEAR PASTOR: "This Crowded World" is the theme for World Order Sunday, October 19, 1969. The pressures of rapidly increasing population have made many of the problems of the world—hunger, poverty, ignorance, pollution, crime—more desperate. Christians should take the lead in shaping policies for dealing with the crisis created by the surging numbers of humanity.

World Order Sunday comes near United Nations Day (October 24). Our theme is appropriate to the observance of both, for this subject is one of prime concern to the U.N. U Thant has stated that "the most urgent conflict confronting the world today is not

between nations or ideologies, but between the pace of growth of the human race and the insufficient increase in resources needed to support mankind in peace, prosperity and dignity."

We have prepared special materials to carry the message of "This Crowded World" and are enclosing samples for your use and for sharing with your Christian Social Concerns Work Area Chairman. We have also developed an action/discussion packet containing additional resources and suggestions for ways to follow up on the interest the World Order Sunday literature has stimulated.

We are besieged these days by problems labeled "urgent," but the crisis of explosive population growth with its attendant ills is truly one we cannot evade or postpone. Let us use this special day to affirm that we are ready, with God's guidance, to make the necessary decisions as a matter of Christian responsibility.

Sincerely yours,

HERMAN WILL, JR.,
Associate General Secretary, Board of
Christian Social Concerns, The United
Methodist Church.

THIS CROWDED WORLD

People, people all over the place. Bumper to bumper in the streets. Elbow to elbow in the parks and on the beaches. Where did they all come from?

At the beginning of history, it is estimated, man's numbers were growing at the rate of 2 percent every thousand years. Now the world's population is growing at a rate of 2 percent every single year! This fantastic change was not caused by each mother having more children but by the fact that more and more of those born survived to grow up and have children of their own—a process which continues to accelerate.

Famine and plague used to occur often enough to be accepted as a natural part of life and were highly efficient population controls. For instance, perhaps one-fourth of the European population died of the Black Plague in the fourteenth century. Now modern miracles of medicine and technology have eliminated many such natural controls, and population is soaring.

The 2 percent annual growth rate produces a doubling of the population every 35 years. Many of the less developed nations actually have higher growth rates of 3 and 3½ percent which means a doubling in 20 to 24 years. For example Mexico, with a current population of around 50 million growing by 3½ percent a year, would have 100 million people in 20 years, 200 million in 40 years, and in 124 years would have a population exceeding the present number of people in the entire world!

MORE PEOPLE, LESS PROGRESS

The effect of such pressures in many less developed nations is that, in spite of all efforts to expand their economies and raise the living standards of their peoples, the rise in gross national product is to a large extent eaten up simply by the basic needs of growing numbers.

Such countries can build thousands of schools only to see even more children than before still waiting outside. They build houses by the scores of thousands, only to see the millions living in poverty-ridden slums grow in number every year. New industries are established, but still more people stand unemployed, hungry, hopeless every day.

New seeds and techniques in food production give us only a temporary victory in the struggle to feed all humanity. Better food, more food, means more babies will survive and grow up—to have in turn more babies demanding still more food.

Some think the struggle is already lost. Dr. Paul Ehrlich, Stanford biologist, writes

that, sometime before 1985, "... the world will undergo vast famines. Hundreds of millions of people are going to starve to death. That is, they will starve unless plague, thermonuclear war or some other agent kills them first."

THREAT TO ENVIRONMENT

Furthermore, the all-out concentration on raising more food can wreak additional damage on the environment by upsetting the balance of nature. We increase the threat to survival by heavy use of pesticides and other chemicals which pollute our streams, linger in living tissues, and cause the extinction of wild-life species. The pollutants we pour into the air not only harm man's health directly, but also may change atmospheric conditions dangerously. Increased population pressures can only worsen environmental problems.

Our own population, though growing more slowly than the less developed nations, will double in 70 years. Think of our deteriorating transportation situation, our inability to solve problems of waste disposal, our noisy, dirty, crime-ridden cities. Are we confident we can make urban living bearable for twice the present numbers or for four times more?

Looking beyond our borders, how will we deal with political and military problems as desperate, starving masses press around us? What will be the moral effect of living in relative comfort while countless millions of our brothers are dehumanized by suffering, with their anguish spread on television screens?

TOWARD CEILING ZERO

Population growth results from excess of births over deaths. The choice before us is absolutely clear. Either we find and use the means to halt population growth or the relentless forces of famine, war, and pestilence will do the controlling by raising the death rate.

In the face of this crisis, only a handful of governments as yet have programs definitely designed to affect the rate of population growth. This whole effort is so new to man that we do not yet know what will succeed.

As a case in point, at the start of India's family-planning program, the Indian population growth rate was around 1.3 percent a year, with a population of some 370 million. But, after 16 years, the growth rate had reached 2.6 percent a year, and population had grown to over 500 million despite the program.

Family-planning services should be made universally available as quickly as possible. We already have enough experience in this area, however, to see that far more than family planning is needed. It is imperative that a major effort be made to find out precisely what is required. Then society must have the courage to adopt the necessary measures to move as rapidly as possible toward a zero growth rate in population.

QUANTITY VERSUS QUALITY OF LIFE

At the thought of this, something in the Christian conscience immediately rebels at involving in political decision-making the connection between the most intimate love relationship and the birth of a new life. And yet the birth of new life is not merely a private concern. Every birth affects the whole community.

Clearly we do not have a responsibility to bring into existence as many new lives as possible. For every baby born, countless billions of genetic possibilities never come into being. The quality of human life should be an important moral regulator of the quantity of human lives. Can we assume that individual families will understand and face up to the grave dangers in the present runaway growth of man's numbers? Can we depend on private decision and voluntary control to limit child-bearing in each family to two?

Under present circumstances, the answer would appear to be "no". Studies have shown that women around the world want an average of three to five children. So, if all couples had only the children they wanted and modern life-saving medicine were available to all, population pressures against our limited resources would continue to grow.

To save ourselves from the flood, therefore, we must accept the principle that quality is more important than quantity of life. We must be prepared to act within society to ensure a population level which makes possible a healthy environment and enough food and space for all.

OUR CHRISTIAN RESPONSIBILITY

Christians, as disciples of the Lord of Life, should take a serious, prayerful, and vigorous lead in thinking through the tough questions involved in restraining the quantity of life so as to increase the quality of life—indeed in many cases to preserve life at all.

What sort of economic inducements, political incentives, and educational programs can we adopt to encourage the two-child family? Can that goal be reached without allowing people the full rights of sterilization and abortion? Can society bring about cultural changes which would lower the birth rate, such as marriage at an older age or increased status for unmarried women? Are we willing now to see more research funds for studies of population regulation including contraceptive methods than for medical studies to lower the death rates?

What sort of influence do we think it right to bring to bear on other nations to encourage them to lower their population growth rates? How can we decide what is the optimum population for our nation, for the world?

These are incredibly complex questions, but we do not have much time to debate them. The unparalleled prosperity of our own nation gives us special responsibility before God. Let us act now, that children may not be a curse, born to suffering and despair, but rather still be the blessed fruit of love and the hope of mankind.

ON ESTABLISHMENT OF THE U.S. PEACE ACADEMY

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I call the attention of the House to a speech made recently by Thomas C. Westropp of my congressional district. Mr. Westropp has valiantly fought for betterment of our community by actively supporting vitally needed housing projects. In conjunction with the diocese of Greater Cleveland and under the patronage of the bishop of the Catholic diocese, his Excellency Clarence Issenmann, Mr. Westropp has pioneered support for community based, soundly financed low- and moderate-cost housing.

Mr. Westropp also addressed himself to the vital concern he has always had for the establishment of a meaningful peace in the world as well as our own Nation and its cities. I was so impressed with the section of Mr. Westropp's speech dealing with the need for the establishment of an academy for peace which would train people in the complicated nature of establishing and keeping the

peace that I have introduced a bill in the House of Representatives to establish such an academy.

As Mr. Westropp so rightly points out, we are fully prepared to wage war, but almost totally incapable of establishing and maintaining a lasting peace. Further, it has become clear that there are few avenues available to our Nation to train personnel in the methods which must be developed to carry forward an active program for peace. An academy such as I have today proposed would seek out the best talents in our land, and provide these young people with educational opportunity in this very special and sensitive field. This would significantly complement our existing highly intense training program for diplomats and allow many, who take that first step further, training for this specialized work.

I wish to include a complete text of Mr. Westropp's remarks which I commend to the attention of every Member of this House. The speech and the proposal are as follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT INFLATION

(By Thomas C. Westropp)

It's a real pleasure for me to meet with members of the American Business Women's Association, and I thank the Port of Cleveland Chapter for inviting me to speak here tonight. It gives me the opportunity to make some comment on women in business. . . .

I think it's fair to guess that nowhere in this city—or perhaps in any city—is there a businessman who has greater esteem for business women than I do.

May I boast that I feel somewhat more qualified than most in this respect. I've acquired this insight from experience in a rather unique business organization—a financial institution which owes much of its success to the talents of business women at every level, including key executive jobs.

However, I note that some of you have invited male bosses as your guests tonight. I must concede that their presence here indicates they, too, recognize feminine contributions to the vitality of American Business. Apparently they share my great regard for the American Business Woman.

So here we are—business men and business women. And what do business people talk about when they get together? Business, of course.

And what topic is uppermost in business talk these days? A one-word subject. Inflation. Inflation—and can it be stopped now! "Inflation" has been a bad word for years. Suddenly it has become a panic word.

We've been worrying about "creeping inflation" since the end of World War II. Then why the great alarm now? . . .

Simply because inflation has stopped creeping—and started leaping! It is leaping high enough, and fast enough, so that our ability to out-run it is in serious doubt.

. . . If this leaping monster, inflation, would confine itself to chasing rich businessmen around the block, I suppose the Great American Public might just sit back and enjoy the spectacle.

Unfortunately—or perhaps fortunately, depending on your point of view—the monster wants to swallow everybody.

It's true that inflation is vegetarian; it's no people-eater. But it does consume green stuff—paper money—with endless appetite. And since money is the life blood of our economy, the assault on the dollar can become a matter of national life or death.

Since the end of World War II, half the value of the dollar has been eaten away by inflation.

Just last month Treasury Secretary David M. Kennedy predicted that unless inflation

is checked, by 1980 what's left of our dollar will again be diminished by one-half!

And a twenty-five cent dollar is nothing to contemplate with joy. . . .

There can be little doubt that should inflation continue at its recent 6 or 7% rate of growth, the bubble must burst.

The economists say the ultimate result of continued inflation would be "a serious recession" sometime during the 1970's. Economists like to use cautious language. They hesitate to say "depression." But sometimes we have to call things by the name they deserve, in order to grasp their implications.

If another Great Depression should occur, what would happen in our troubled cities? . . . What chaos would there be throughout the world?

It's not a pleasing prospect, or one that any of us would care to witness, let alone endure.

Yet, what can you or I possibly do to combat inflation, and prevent the depression which ultimately would follow?

The first thing all Americans must do is recognize that a very grave danger confronts us.

Next, we must identify the true causes of this "intolerable inflation," as Secretary Kennedy calls it.

Then when we know what these causes really are, we can let our lawmakers and officials know what we want done. . . . And I'm convinced it will be essential for the people to make their will known.

And so tonight I would like to suggest to you what, in my judgment, is the source of "intolerable inflation." I'd like to examine with you how the problem is being handled now, and what other steps ought to be taken. . . .

What's causing inflation? Too much employment? High wages? Taxes too low—or high? Welfare spending? Or, perhaps, war in Vietnam?

People disagree on who or what's to blame, but we can agree on what has happened since the end of World War II.

We know that income has been going up, and prices even higher. While this has been rough on many Americans—retired folks, the unemployed, the underemployed—most of us have been earning enough to pay higher prices. More wives have been working to supplement family income—one out of three, in fact. And more people hold two jobs, to beat the money squeeze.

So inflation hasn't been "intolerable"—until 1965, and escalation in Vietnam.

Then something wild happened. Inflation leaped, prices soared, wage demands increased, to compensate for the preposterous prices. And a message got across: there was no place to go but "up." An inflationary psychology grasped business and consumers alike: "Buy now. Build now. Invest now. Next year it'll cost even more." The stock market started flying. Normally sensible savers looked for go-go equities and a pot of gold—not some year, but next week.

Just a coincidence that Vietnam escalation and inflation escalation occurred simultaneously? Maybe so.

One thing is clear: the government added fuel to the fires of inflation by avoiding pay-as-you-go financing for the Vietnam War.

Instead of raising taxes, the government relied on the Federal Reserve System to create bank reserves and the money to finance the war. After all, this was the most unpopular war in our national history. If the people might be willing to pay the cost in blood, it would be asking too much to add—just then—the cost in dollars.

It wasn't until three years after escalation in Vietnam that Congress raised taxes—partly to help pay the staggering cost of the fighting—and partly to "cool" the economy.

The philosophy seemed to be this: by putting a heavier burden of taxation on John and Jane Doe, the lower-income and middle-

income mass of American consumers—purchasing power would be cut and inflation would be controlled.

It didn't work.

The fact that it didn't work proves one of two things:

Either the average American still has too much money to spend,

Or, consumer buying isn't the critical factor in inflation, after all. And if not, what is?

The government, and most economists, for that matter, accept the theory that there has been too much money, too much spending by consumers.

In December of last year, the Federal Reserve Board took action and effected a "tight money" policy. Conservative economists are pleased with the course of action. They say "the Fed has drawn blood at last."

Maybe they're right, and bleeding is the very remedy we need. However, we might recall that in previous centuries, physicians would resort to drawing blood from the afflicted. We don't know how many patients recovered as a result of this practice, but we know there were some with relatively minor ailments who succumbed to the treatment.

In the present instance, some troublesome questions arise. One, will it reduce inflation to a tolerable level? Two, will it work too well, turn into a recession instead?

In answer to Question Number One: will it work?

By reducing the supply of money and encouraging high interest rates, the Federal Reserve Board seems to have achieved a certain restraining effect.

The stock market has lost some of its excessive exuberance.

Some big industries have canceled plans for capital expansion. Unfortunately, they've also announced higher prices for their 1970 lines of merchandise.

The building industry certainly has slowed to a near-halt in housing starts.

Whether this restraint has reduced inflation is another matter.

Interest rates are part of the cost of production, and become part of the price of goods and services. And scarcer money supply for business and industry make goods less available, therefore increasing prices.

But, according to economic theory, these higher prices should be temporary, and as demand for the goods declines, rate of growth of prices will be reduced.

Certainly we hope that the Fed policy will be successful.

It's disturbing, however, to note some puzzling contradictions in the evidence being presented.

A month ago the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board reported there is less inflation momentum than there was three months ago. And again, he said "the nation might be at the tail end" of the inflationary period. The White House reported a drop for business and industry make goods less available, therefore increasing prices.

But now it turns out the reported drop in wholesale prices didn't occur after all—it was a mistake in calculating, and the prices were just as high as in July. On this there was no comment from the White House, so we don't know how it rates in the economic news of the year.

Another confusing contradiction. The Federal Reserve, through its tight money policy, has discouraged plant expansion by industry. But now the President is asking Congress not to raise corporation taxes—because such taxes would discourage plant expansion, thus jeopardizing growth of the economy.

Well, what's going on here? Should the Federal Reserve, which is responsible for monetary policy, seek to slow expansion—while the government fiscal policy seeks to speed expansion?

It would do no harm, I suspect, if the left hand of government knew what the right hand is doing.

In any event, after nearly ten months of an arduous tight money policy by the Federal Reserve System, it is still too soon to say whether the anti-inflation measure is achieving its purpose.

The other big question, as I've mentioned, is whether this tight money policy—high interest rates, scarcity of borrowing funds—will bring on a recession.

It happened after Korea, when the Fed maintained a policy of monetary ease for a puzzling length of time—then decided on tight money.

At that time a friendly critic—an eminent Republican and publisher of *Business Week*—agreed that it was wise to apply brakes to the economy, then complained that "It's nice to know the brakes work, but we don't want to go through the windshield."

It happened again in 1955. The result of that tight money policy was the disastrous decline in housing in '56 and '57, which soon was felt throughout the economy.

Some observers are convinced that the Fed does have a tendency to jam down the brakes at the last minute, with predictable results. Professor Milton Friedman, most respected of the conservative economists and a believer in restraints, has asked why the Fed is so slow in applying controls, then holds them so long and so hard.

So it's fair to ask, Is the same mistake being made again? We can easily see the comparison to the late fifties. Once again, the home-building industry is being starved for credit, and it's predicted that we'll produce fewer housing units in 1969 than in any year since the end of World War II.

This seems to me shocking and dangerous.

Housing is the most critical need of our cities. We've declared a national goal of 26 million new homes in the next 10 years. Not only because of slum decay, but also because of our population growth—we need to produce in the next 40 years as much housing as we've built in the nation's history!

Yet, thanks to tight money, housing starts are down 30% since January. This shows a certain unawareness of critical national priorities, somewhere in government.

I think we can see some major doubts surround the use of "tight money" as a cure for inflation.

Perhaps it would be wise to consider other directions. Instead of either business or consumer spending, we might look at other causes of inflation—and their possible cure.

For years, business has been complaining about the wage-price spiral. Management blamed labor for demanding too many raises. And labor blamed business for raising prices beyond the increase in cost.

The funny thing is that neither side had any desire to discuss the wisdom of wage and price controls. It's really rather odd—since each claimed the only reason for asking an increase was because of what the other was doing.

Now, suddenly, we begin to hear top labor leaders say this may be the answer. Here and there, business indicates a willingness to listen. The business journals—*Dun's Review*, as an eminent example—actually intimate some limited controls wouldn't be too mad an idea after all.

Economists have had a failure of nerve in avoiding the subject in the past. They've more or less muttered, "Nobody would want them" and perhaps this has been a mistaken assumption.

The notable exception has been Professor John Kenneth Galbraith, whose book "The Affluent Society" actually made economics popular for a time. Two years ago Galbraith said controls would be inevitable in a couple of years—which brings us to the present.

If we're about ready to concede that inflation is a contagious wage-and-price disease, maybe we're ready to try the medicine.

I don't think it's necessary to over-dose ourselves with the medicine, any more than

it's wise to step too hard on the money brakes. The talk has been of "limited controls" and a flexible formula.

In my judgment, it should be tried at first as voluntary controls.

This would have to involve the efforts of labor, industry, the financial community—and government itself, which has exhibited an unfortunate tendency to give itself fat raises in certain categories.

I believe a voluntary system could work, if there is a widespread agreement throughout the major segments of the national structure.

We can recall the crisis during the Kennedy Administration, when the President persuaded labor to hold back its demands, and management raised the price of steel! Today, however, we can hope that the full import of runaway inflation is understood and all parties sense the need to hold the line.

If voluntary cooperation fails, controls could be imposed. But by far, a voluntary system would be the better way.

Yet, with all this, we've still to face the most difficult fact of our economic life.

We avoid confronting the fact, because we're afraid. We are willing—unhappy but willing—to pour out \$80 billion—80 billion dollars in one year!—because we are afraid of enemies who are, in turn, afraid of us.

Of the \$184 billion budget, \$80 is military spending, and we're promised that the end of our fighting in Vietnam will not decrease this budget.

Eighty billion is a powerful piece of inflationary spending. It is wasteful in many ways: wasteful because procurement procedures allow padding of costs, kiting of prices. Wasteful because the military buys more death-dealing capacity than world population can use: we've the ability to kill all the Earth's inhabitants many times over—which seems unnecessary, since most of us are capable of dying only once.

It is wasteful and inflationary because the worker who produces military hardware cannot consume what he produces. America is prosperous because the man who helps build a Ford can also own one; in Europe, the automobile factory worker arrives at the plant on a bike.

But a worker at General Dynamics, or Ling-Temco-Vought produces a product he prays will never have to be used. And he pays for its production through his taxes, and the high cost of living.

When it comes down to basics, war—and fear of war—is the primary cause of inflation. And if we want to cure inflation, we have to address ourselves to the primary cause.

If we look at the history of our middle-20th-century, we can see it all very clearly.

Before World War II, if you earned \$5,000-a-year, you were as well off as an American who earns nearly \$15,000-a-year in 1969.

During the war, government controls kept some hold over prices. In the post-war years, creeping inflation began. During the Korean War, it accelerated. It ran amok again with the escalation in Vietnam.

After each war, we've increased our standing armies. We have actually reduced the percentage of consumer spending. And as we know, there has been an increasing cost of goods.

Most of our national debt is related to war. We haven't yet finished paying for the Spanish-American War.

It seems only natural to inquire, "Can we afford it? Do we have the substance to rebuild our cities, to clean our polluted environment, to pay the armaments bill—and venture beyond the moon?"

Almost automatically, we say "yes, we're big enough and strong enough to do anything." We Americans have always had a magnificent faith in our capacities. There is a boundary line, however, where faith becomes self-deception.

The truth is that we are not big or strong enough to do everything; if we are, why do we neglect critical needs at home, in order to pay for arms and space?

It comes down to the bitter fact that we don't know how to maintain peace. Our principal policy is to arm ourselves to the eyeballs—and on occasion, engage in horrendous warfare in the name of peace. But the time has arrived when ignorance is no excuse. If human intelligence is capable of sending representatives to the moon, capable of investigating Mars, capable of creating water that won't freeze and countless other miracles of modern endeavor—we can't plead "not guilty by reason of stupidity."

It is appropriate to ask ourselves, "How were we able to perform all the other miracles of modern times?" They didn't happen through inspiration, they came about as a result of concerted study by trained men and women, students of the scientific disciplines.

Our military recognizes the need for this kind of education in its own particular "science"—and the War College, the various service academies and a number of university affiliations serve such a purpose.

Who studies Peace?

Why do we have no Peace Academy, where the rising generation can prepare to serve humanity's most urgent need? Is there nothing that can be learned about Peace, after thousands of years of human history?

Of course there is much that can be taught, much that can be learned—and God willing, much that can be discovered by dedicated intelligence.

To name a few practical and meaningful areas of study:

A farm program is needed to promote world peace. Hunger is a growing specter in the world. In 1958 our farmers produced huge surpluses to feed the world's hungry; this is no longer true. We need to know how we—and other nations—can multiply the world's food supply in the not so distant future.

Advanced technology is needed to promote world peace. Not only do we need this to assure life-giving food and water—at home, as well as abroad—we must also know how it can be used to help under-developed nations solve their own problems.

We need to know more about the psychology of other peoples, in countries where the rising nationalism and rising expectations conflict with our own goals.

We need to study disarmament. We must learn how to lead our military-aerospace industry into conversion for peaceful production.

There are some of the practical studies for a national Peace Academy. These are some of the basic factors in war or peace.

Such a Peace Academy would train young men and women, who would be selected by just as rigorous standards as those used by the military service academies, to work not only in government and other public authorities, but also in business and industry. The faculty of this academy would draw scholars from the universities and men and women who have first-hand experience from working on the new frontiers of science, technology and business.

There are those who feel, with considerable cause, that this government needs a new cabinet post with peace-keeping as its single purpose. They feel the State Department does not have this function, but rather must devote itself to a struggle for American power, peaceful or otherwise.

Senator Vance Hartke recently stated his intention to continue his drive on behalf of a new Peace Department in the federal government. If he succeeds in this, one wonders who will be ready to serve in such a department.

This is another indication that we must have a national Peace Academy.

Nobody could imagine that this would have immediate results. It certainly wouldn't end

the need for military spending next year—it could hardly end inflation in a hurry.

But we know that somehow, next year has a way of becoming tomorrow—and if we don't start long-range plans right now, the distant day arrives and nothing has been done.

If there were no other purpose than to save our economy in future decades, I would say that a national Peace Academy is the best investment we could make.

It seems to me especially appropriate to make these remarks to this particular audience. This is a gathering which includes many women who have a joint responsibility—as homemakers and business women.

In a way, the economy is more the concern of such an audience than any other. We say the business world is still a man's world. Yet, women own more of the wealth in this country. And in day-to-day life, women have to spend most of the money.

It's the woman who pays for groceries, family clothing and other needs. You must stretch the dollars and bring home whatever it can buy.

That's why I believe you have a special interest, since you live in both worlds—the business world, with its costs and profits; and the consumer's world of meeting the cost-of-living.

But even more important, I believe that you, as women, have the most passionate interest in the survival of future generations.

This is why I hope you will make establishment of a Peace Academy a determined purpose in your lives. It will be a single step, of course—one small step which may start us, finally, on the path of peace.

It's a path we must find, because all other roads lead endlessly nowhere.

Following is a copy of the bill I will introduce to establish a national peace academy:

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A U.S. PEACE ACADEMY

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "United States Peace Academy Act."

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to establish and maintain, in or near the District of Columbia, a United States Peace Academy (hereinafter referred to as the "Academy") for the instruction and training of students in preparation for service as personnel in the agencies of the United States which deal in the areas of Peace and International Relations.

SEC. 3. (a) The supervision and charge of the Academy shall be in the Department of State, under such officer or officers as the Secretary of State may appoint for or assign to that duty.

(b) The course of instruction and training for students at the Academy shall be prescribed by the Secretary of State, and shall be the equivalent of the curriculum prescribed by accredited colleges and universities and graduate schools as a prerequisite to the granting of the degree of bachelor of arts and master of arts in Peace. In prescribing such course of instruction and training, the Secretary of State shall provide that special emphasis be placed on the study of and field work in history, political science, international organizations, psychology, sociology, economics, and the application of technology and science to the solution of world tensions. Upon satisfactory completion of the prescribed course of instruction and training, students shall be granted the degree of bachelor of arts. Upon satisfactory completion of the prescribed course of advanced studies, students shall be granted the degree of master of arts in Peace.

SEC. 4. (a) Students shall consist of such individuals as may be selected and admitted to the Academy upon competitive entrance examinations as prescribed by the Secretary of State.

(b) Students while in attendance at the Academy shall be entitled to quarters and subsistence.

(c) Citizens of foreign nations shall be encouraged to attend the Academy for study, at an appropriate fee determined by the Secretary of State.

(d) The Secretary shall enter into agreements with foreign nations to provide for exchange teacher, student and employment programs involving the Peace Academy and the agencies of the United States which deal in the areas of Peace and International Relations.

SEC. 5. There shall be appointed each year a Board of Visitors to the Academy, which shall consist of five members from the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and five members from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the respective chairmen of such committees. The Board of Visitors shall exercise the same functions and be entitled to the same expense allowance as is provided in the case of the Board of Visitors to the United States service academies.

SEC. 6. Upon the graduation of the first class from the Academy and thereafter, in making original appointments of permanent officers in the Foreign Service and other agencies of the Federal government involved in international relations and the conduct of Peace, preference shall be given to graduates of the Academy.

THE ARMS TRADE—PART VII

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I think my colleagues will be interested in several sets of unclassified arms sales figures that I just received from the Department of Defense. It is important, I believe, to view these figures in print since they show in clear detail the size and range of our current arms sales program.

The first chart shows to whom we have sold arms from fiscal years 1962 through 1968 and part of 1969. These figures do not include our grant aid—or giveaway—arms program which, if included, would add approximately \$400-\$500 million to the fiscal year 1969 total.

To put the chart's figures in perspective, it must be recalled that since 1945, the United States has either sold or given away to more than 80 countries over \$50 billion in arms aid, of which the \$11.5 billion total below is only a part. The rest of the world, including the Communists, has pumped another \$16 to \$18 billion worth of arms into the international markets.

What bothers me about our arms sales program is the emphasis we have placed on its economic benefits. We no longer provide a nation with arms primarily because it is in either party's long-range national interest to do so.

We now sell arms as a short-range expedient to solve our balance-of-payments problem, to keep the munitions industry booming, and to appease temporarily the demands of other nations. Yet, as I have pointed out many times in the past, this arms sales program has also brought down friendly governments, bankrupted treasuries, and encouraged the outbreak of wars.

MILITARY EXPORT SALES, FISCAL YEARS, 1962-69

[In millions of dollars]

Country and region	Fiscal years 1962-68	Fiscal year 1969
Europe and Canada:		
Austria	58.2	1.5
Belgium	172.7	10.8
Denmark	91.4	11.4
France	403.6	25.2
West Germany	3,601.8	525.3
Italy	525.0	73.8
Luxembourg	1.6	.1
NATO/NAMSO	156.5	32.5
Netherlands	235.1	8.4
Norway	170.5	27.8
Portugal	6.4	1.0
Spain	199.0	29.7
Sweden	141.7	3.1
Switzerland	195.6	27.0
United Kingdom	1,743.8	27.7
Yugoslavia	4.4	.6
Canada	385.0	36.0
Subtotal	8,092.3	841.
Latin America:		
Argentina	55.0	19.0
Bahamas	2.4	
Bolivia	.5	.1
Brazil	91.7	9.9
Chile	19.7	12.6
Colombia	6.1	1.9
Dominican Republic	.9	
Ecuador	2.6	.3
El Salvador	1.3	1.1
Guatemala	2.7	.8
Honduras	.1	
Mexico	5.9	2.4
Nicaragua	.6	.2
Panama	.2	
Peru	19.2	1.1
Uruguay	.3	.4
Venezuela	59.8	1.6
Subtotal	269.0	51.4

MILITARY EXPORT SALES, FISCAL YEARS, 1962-69—Con.

[In millions of dollars]

Country and region	Fiscal years 1962-68	Fiscal year 1969
Near East and south Asia:		
Greece	24.1	33.5
India	98.7	1.7
Iran	515.4	183.7
Iraq	19.8	.2
Turkey	10.6	.6
Subtotal	668.6	219.7
Africa:		
Congo	1.7	.1
Liberia	.1	
Libya	48.9	2.7
Morocco	23.5	10.3
Nigeria	.4	.3
South Africa, Republic of	35.5	3.1
Sudan	2.0	
Tunisia	.2	.2
United Arab Republic	1.4	.3
Subtotal	113.7	17.0
East Asia and Pacific:		
Australia	797.7	34.2
China, Republic of	91.5	37.5
Indonesia	18.4	
Japan	365.9	81.4
Malaysia	18.4	.8
New Zealand	91.2	2.8
Philippines	1.5	.8
Singapore	14.9	6.9
Thailand	6.9	8.6
Vietnam	5.8	.4
Subtotal	1,413.2	173.4
Other	1.7	9.7
Classified countries	974.2	432.4
Total, worldwide	11,532.7	1,745.5

Several points are apparent from this chart. First, it is with some surprise that I see we are still selling arms to South Africa—in direct contravention of our own arms embargo imposed in 1963. A State Department spokesman told me that this ban is still rigidly enforced. Apparently the Defense Department has not been told.

Second, it is also of interest to note that our Government still sells arms to the United Arab Republic. I can only surmise that this equipment is being used against the Israelis, who we also equip with arms.

Third, our arms aid to the Greek dictatorship in fiscal year 1969 is almost 40 percent more than we sold in the previous 6 years. This equipment will no doubt be used to stamp out whatever voices of freedom remain at large.

Finally, it is fascinating to note the countries—namely Greece, Iran, Republic of China, Thailand, El Salvador, Chile and Morocco—where our level of aid in fiscal year 1969 has skyrocketed compared to the average of the previous 6-year period. Are we doing the same thing in Morocco, for example, that we did in Libya—deluging them with arms that will eventually be used against our own interests?

The second chart breaks down our arms sales in the last 7 years by type of order and region:

FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ORDERS—WORLDWIDE SUMMARY BY TYPE OF ORDER AND REGION

[In millions of dollars]

Type of order by regions	Projected orders		
	Actual orders, fiscal years 1962-68	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970
Commercial:			
Europe and Canada	2,399.4	238.6	333.4
Near East and south Asia	383.7	54.0	131.8
East Asia and Pacific	283.5	40.1	70.3
Africa	41.3	5.0	
Latin America	53.6	18.5	26.0
Subtotal	3,161.5	356.2	561.5
Foreign military sales cash:			
Europe and Canada	4,588.2	793.7	440.8
Near East and south Asia	439.2	326.0	123.0
East Asia and Pacific	411.8	43.7	44.4
Africa	50.6	14.0	5.7
Latin America	49.1	14.5	18.0
Subtotal	5,538.9	1,191.9	631.9
Eximbank/private credit:			
Europe and Canada	1,026.2	54.6	60.4
Near East and south Asia			
East Asia and Pacific	509.0	96.0	60.0
Africa			
Latin America			
Subtotal	1,535.2	150.6	120.4
Foreign military sales credit:			
Europe and Canada	80.4		
Near East and south Asia	816.7	223.3	226.0
East Asia and Pacific	211.9	26.0	41.0
Africa	21.8	4.5	16.0
Latin America	166.3	22.4	50.0
Contingency			17.0
Subtotal	1,297.1	281.2	350.0
Totals:			
Europe and Canada	8,094.2	1,086.9	834.6
Near East and south Asia	1,639.6	603.3	480.8
East Asia and Pacific	1,416.2	205.8	215.7
Africa	113.7	28.5	21.7
Latin America	269.0	55.4	94.0
Contingency			17.0
Grand total	11,532.7	1,979.9	1,663.8
Developed countries	10,447.3	1,417.8	1,193.3
Less developed countries	1,085.4	562.1	470.5
Grand total	11,532.7	1,979.9	1,663.8

This chart is also noteworthy. By comparing the regional subtotals of the first chart with those of the second, one can estimate with reasonable accuracy where the "classified countries," noted on the first chart, are located: namely, in the Near East and South Asia. Qualifying for prime consideration would be Pakistan, Jordan, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Abu Dhabi, Bahrain, Qatar and Iran—above what is unclassified. I do not see why we must hide the names of these countries and the true amount of arms each receives behind a government shield of secrecy when a cursory glance will indi-

cate where the aid is going. Our Government is not fooling the Soviets, only the American taxpayer who is not being told how and where his money is being spent.

It is also noteworthy that totals for Africa on both charts—\$113.7 million—are the same, yet nowhere is there any indication of the huge volume of weaponry we have supplied to Ethiopia—a quantity of arms valued in excess of our military aid to all other African nations combined.

More important, the Defense Department figures indicate that in the last 6 years only 9.4 percent of our arms sales,

or \$1,085.4 million—see bottom of second chart—has gone to "less developed countries." This does not seem to be borne out by the facts.

The Pentagon's definition of "less developed countries" comes from Executive Order 11285 of June 10, 1966, which reverses matter by listing only those free world countries that are not "economically less developed," specifically: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Kuwait-Saudi Arabia Neutral Zone, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg,

Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Union of South Africa, and United Kingdom. These countries supposedly get 89.6 percent of our arms aid, and the remaining non-Communist countries in the world—of which there are approximately 90—receive only 9.4 percent.

This list is obviously padded with four names: Kuwait-Saudi Arabia Neutral Zone—which is not even a country—Liechtenstein, Monaco, and San Marino. Our Government sells nothing worth mentioning to these areas.

Furthermore, according to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency's "World Wide Military Expenditures and Related Data, 1965," Iran, Iraq, Libya, Portugal, and Saudi Arabia have average per capita gross national products of, respectively, \$241, \$233, \$548, \$407 and \$354—all of which are well below the world average of \$641. Therefore, by any definition these five nations are economically less developed.

Thus, there remain 20 countries that qualify as "developed" and which also receive arms from the United States. From all indications it appears that these countries receive between 70 and 80 percent of all U.S. arms sales each year. The rest goes to the "economically less developed" non-Communist countries around the world. It seems that U.S. arms sales to Iran, Iraq, Libya, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, and Ethiopia alone account for between 10 and 15 percent of our arms sales each year.

Even if it were true, as the Pentagon claims, that only 9.4 percent of U.S. arms sales has gone to the less developed nations, it still loses some of its magic when compared to the fact that these same countries have only 18 percent of the world's gross national product but 71 percent of its population. In addition, there have been 56 wars in the world since 1945, all but two of which have been fought in the less developed areas.

Mr. Speaker, a nation that has spoken so passionately as the United States in favor of nuclear controls should also speak out in favor of conventional arms control. In our attempt to eliminate hunger, poverty and disease throughout the world, we must avoid providing the less developed nations with expensive and useless armaments.

It is for this reason that I once again call for our Government to seek to have the question of conventional arms control put on the agenda of the forthcoming Strategic Arms Limitation Talks in Geneva.

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

HON. WILLIAM O. COWGER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure of serving with my colleague from Kentucky, TIM LEE CARTER, since my coming to Congress. I have a great deal of respect for his legislative ability and for the great efforts he puts

forth for Kentucky's Fifth Congressional District.

These qualities are known among my colleagues, but all may not know of his outstanding career as a physician. He has exemplified his medical ability on this floor when our distinguished colleague Congressman Bow collapsed. And there have been other times when he attended to the wounds of a young Treasury agent gunned down on a Washington street.

Such examples as these have earned our recognition of his medical ability but recently Mr. CARTER was recognized by members of his own profession, the American Academy of General Practitioners, for his outstanding service. On September 28, at their annual convention, the American Academy of General Practitioners awarded the certificate of meritorious service to Dr. CARTER.

This is the governing body for the 31,000-member Academy of General Practitioners and in presenting this highest award to Dr. CARTER he was cited for his outstanding service in the practice of medicine and for his dedication to accomplishing more meaningful health legislation.

I join with the members of his profession and his friends in congratulating him for this most appropriate award.

CONCERNING CHANGING THE FISCAL YEAR

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the gentleman from Illinois, ROBERT MICHEL, for his support of a growing movement to change the Federal Government's fiscal year. I, too, have submitted a bill not unlike the one being introduced today. My distinguished colleague speaks to a great need when he asks this body to make a slight alteration in its procedure.

During the years since I first introduced a bill that would make the Federal Government's fiscal year coincide with the calendar year, more attention has been focused on the problems created by this condition. The developing complexity of the business of Congress is well known. The longer annual meetings that have been made necessary by the evolving complexity of congressional business are equally well known. The difficulties in the administration of federally funded programs that result from the increased complexity of Federal business are well known. Not as well known, is the degree to which the difficulties have been compounded by failure of this Congress to make necessary adjustments in procedure.

As I have pointed out on several occasions before this body, inefficiency is expensive. The present plan for the Federal fiscal year is very inefficient. Therefore, we can assume that the fiscal year arrangement is very expensive.

The deep concern I have been express-

ing over the failure of the old fiscal year to meet the needs of today has not fallen on deaf ears. There have now been more than 60 similar bills introduced in Congress. They do not vary to any significant degree. The change is coming soon but none too soon.

The problem is historic. By the time Congress has made its decisions and determined its priorities, the fiscal year is already well underway. The patch-work resolutions that allow the Government to function at all are misleading, do not reflect the desires of Congress and leave executive agencies feeling their way through the dark.

It is worthwhile to recall that the first Congress met in December to make and pass the appropriation bill for the following year. Following 1789, Congress passed its appropriation bill—and later appropriations bills—after the beginning of the fiscal year. This practice continued for over 50 years before the present plan was enacted. When the inability of Congress to pass appropriations bills in time for the beginning of the fiscal year first became critical in the 1820's, the financial dealings of the Federal Government were not nearly so complex as they are today nor did Federal spending and efficiency so universally affect the American people as it does today. From the time Secretary of the Navy Samuel Southard first noted the problem in 1825, it was 19 years before a change was made.

But the change certainly was made and it will be made again. The conditions are very different in 1969 even if the problem is much the same. In 1825, the delay in appropriations past the beginning of the fiscal year was described as a serious inconvenience by the Navy Secretary. In 1969, only stronger words would describe the difficulties which are being explained today. In 1825, the Federal Government spend \$15,857,000 and in 1969, we spent nearly \$200 billion.

This year, not one single appropriations bill was passed and signed at the beginning of the fiscal year. The problems grow more complex and the work becomes more demanding. We shall not assume a return to passing our appropriations bill on time. We must make adjustments in our system. I hope it does not take 19 years.

MORATORIUM DAY

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, today on the eve of what we all hope and pray will be a peaceful and meaningful day of debate and discussion about this Nation's involvement in Vietnam, I would like to present for the attention of my colleagues, a resolution that was sent to me by Mr. Jerry March, secretary of the Faculty-Student Senate of Adelphi University. This resolution, which was adopted by an overwhelming vote of 15 to 3 surely merits our consideration because it so clearly sets before us the

thinking of many of those in today's academic community.

As all of us go about our business tomorrow, whether as participants of "Moratorium Day" activities or not, I feel we can best serve the cause of peace by calmly and rationally addressing ourselves to the alternatives available to our Government in the present situation. May I therefore, respectfully submit the following resolution of the Faculty-Student Senate of Adelphi for the thoughtful consideration of each of you?

Resolved, the Faculty-Student Senate expresses its opposition to the war in Vietnam. While as individuals we differ in detail, this body agrees that the most reasonable plan for peace is the immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops. We join in a united and continuous national effort to bring our troops home.

THE ROAD TO PEACE

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, the most immediate pressing issue of these days so far as America's international involvement is concerned is how to achieve an early and sound peace in Vietnam. Certainly almost everyone in America wants peace. The real question is not one of goal or objective, but rather one of method of achieving peace in such a way that the long-run dangers and damages will not outweigh any short-run advantages.

It is against this background that we should view the idea of the October 15 moratorium. The basic question to ask is what it will contribute to bringing about an early and sound peace. Will it help or will it hurt?

I am personally convinced that permanent peace in the world will not be achieved through military means. Constant building of new weapons systems or actual outright conflict are merely way stations to deeper and more serious problems. The only chance for permanent peace in the world lies down the road of sincere meaningful negotiations which result in binding agreements between the major nations of the world. The only man who can negotiate peace for the United States is the President. The present occupant of that office will remain therein for more than 3 additional years. If he is successful in his negotiations, each American is better off. If he is unsuccessful, each of us is the loser. It is of vital importance at this time that he not be discredited or his flexibility eliminated in this field of international relations.

As important as ending the conflict in Vietnam is, in and by itself, of equal importance is the manner in which it is ended. For if it is ended in a way that, in the long run, contributes to the enhanced arms race or in a way that leads to additional conflicts of a similar nature elsewhere in the world, then the price paid for temporary peace in Vietnam will have been prohibitively high. If it is

ended in a way that will materially reduce the tempo of the arms race and drastically reduce the possibilities of conflicts of a similar nature elsewhere in the world, then each sacrifice of an American life in Vietnam will have been an important part of a major contribution to permanent worldwide peace.

The present occupant of the Presidency of the United States has committed himself to a policy of deescalation and Vietnamization of the Vietnam war. He has not only proclaimed these as his goals, but his actions have consistently backed up his pronouncements. So long as he moves steadily and soundly in the directions which he has announced as his goals and which he has followed faithfully so far, the course of wisdom for every American is to continue to stand firmly behind him. To do anything else would, while perhaps appearing temporarily desirable or politically advantageous, be short sighted and calculated to do injury to the cause of worldwide peace.

Certainly ours is a nation which has long prized freedom of speech. Every American has the right on October 15, or any other day, to speak his mind, so long as the speech remains lawful and does not call for action of a violent or unlawful nature. Some of us may disagree with what others say, but I think that it would be a most serious wrong for us to attempt to muzzle someone merely because he would say things with which we personally might disagree.

But I sadly fear that much of what may be said or done on October 15 will not lead this Nation or the world any closer to permanent peace. Indeed I believe that in fact in many places that which is said or done this day may be misinterpreted and will take us further from permanent worldwide peace. This is to be most seriously regretted.

For myself, I express my deep gratitude to each of those persons who has sacrificed in Vietnam for the sake of this Nation and of the world. I reaffirm my deep dedication to peace, and I reaffirm my intention to support the President in the course of action which he has initiated to bring about permanent peace for the world as rapidly as possible.

FUND AND FINISH CANAL

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my regret that on October 8, 1969, we were unable to write into H.R. 14159 at least \$9 million for the construction of the Florida Cross-State Barge Canal. Six million dollars is simply not enough to move construction of the canal along at a reasonable pace.

The canal project calls for public recreation areas, pleasure boating, as well as establishment of businesses along its route. While I opposed certain routes of the canal because of a desire to preserve

wildlife habitats and the natural beauty of many sections, I realize the canal was already under construction before I was elected to Congress and that it is now simply a matter of time until it is completed.

Since the plans for the canal have already been made—since the canal is to be built—it seems to me that we ought to properly fund it and finish it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge that we include \$9 million in this bill for the Cross-State Barge Canal.

NEW MEXICO IS U.S. CHILI CAPITAL

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, those of us from the Southwest have a variety of favorite foods. However, chili-flavored dishes are certainly No. 1 on our list. The popularity of chili is growing rapidly nationwide as the rest of the United States acquires taste for a food that has been popular in the Rio Grande Valley for hundreds of years.

Thirty percent of all the chili grown in the United States is raised in New Mexico. A great future is foreseen for the New Mexico chili industry.

In the October 9, 1969, edition of the Herald, a Truth or Consequences, N. Mex., newspaper, Mr. Everett Reb has reported on the future of this important New Mexico crop. Mr. Speaker, this article is worthy of the attention of the Members and will, I am sure, be of interest to them. The article follows:

NEW MEXICO IS U.S. CHILI CAPITAL— EXPANDING MARKETS FORECAST (By Everett Reb)

New Mexico produced 30% of all chili grown in the United States last year with production up 50% over the last five years as the popularity of so-called "Mexican" dishes have grown by leaps and bounds in many parts of the country and abroad.

Reflecting this growth, in popularity, new processing plants have been built in one of the country's leading chili producing areas in the Rio Grande Valley south of Truth or Consequences. More than 2,000 acres of chili were planted this year in Sierra County alone.

In line with the increased interest in the chili-flavored dishes among "yankees", many of the producers have switched to the milder varieties of chili preferred by those who are not "natives" of the Southwest.

Many major food companies and restaurant chains are engaged in promoting Mexican styled foods into Eastern U.S. markets, and market testing shows that they are meeting with great success, especially among the "younger" set. A Gallup poll prepared for a national food magazine revealed that 46% of the 21-34 age group (expected to total 50.7 million by 1975) preferred Mexican food as their number-one "foreign" food choice. Of all age groups nationwide, 32% chose Mexican food over Italian and Chinese food.

A great future for the chili industry in New Mexico is seen in the processing plants that are being developed in the Rio Grande Valley near Truth or Consequences, which use modern technology to move this distinctive product from the growing fields to the market.

A DAY OF PEACE

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, Richard M. Nixon said upon assuming the Presidency:

The greatest honor history can bestow is the title of "peacemaker."

Indeed he eloquently stated our objective to be "where peace is unknown to make it strong; where peace is temporary, to make it permanent."

After several months on the job, the President has taken great strides toward reaching his objective. Indeed, I heartily subscribe to his efforts toward deescalating the war in Vietnam. This is a peace initiative in the right direction and it is most commendable.

His forthright action to withdraw thousands of American troops from Vietnam is a long step forward from the previous policy. The President, like all of us, deplors the killing of our youth. He also deplors the slaughter of human beings in Southeast Asia, or anywhere that war rears its ugly head.

I envision the vigils and the prayers and today's debate as a basis for strengthening, rather than weakening, the President's hand. I feel dialog is essential. I feel the President should look at it as a buttress to his efforts toward peace. There is no question but that the majority of the American people want peace and want it at the earliest possible time. That is why the call for meaningful steps toward this goal will serve to assure Hanoi's negotiators that this administration is ready and willing to act for an immediate solution to the holocaust.

On the eve of the moratorium then, a solemn, dignified expression of citizen concern that the United States must extricate itself from the anguish of the war in Vietnam, I can think of nothing more patriotic for Americans to do than to register their feelings to the President that we support every effort for the quickest possible end to the war.

To suggest that what we are doing in this august Chamber this evening will undermine the President's peace initiatives is absurd. I see it as a buttress and strengthening of his position at the bargaining table, and dramatizes what Defense Secretary Melvin Laird just the other day described as the irreversible Vietnamization of the war.

For indeed, the pressures President Nixon and his advisers must carry are enormous, and if I was in his position, I would welcome every source of information, every suggestion, every proposal that could mean one less American life will be wasted in this tragic Southeast Asian conflict. This is why I am participating in this dialog tonight, for if I suggest one new thought, one new insight into the public debate on Vietnam, I will be serving my country.

Understandably, vigilance is the eternal price of freedom, and it is my firm conviction that I would be negligent in my duty as a U.S. Congressman to stand by in silence as the Nation struggles to

halt the war. I can think of no higher perception of my role as a legislator than to partake in this debate. For me, to do otherwise, would be unpatriotic.

And I do not wish to imply that I disagree with the administration's approach to resolving the war. To the contrary. I hail the steps the President has been taking to reduce American participation and to call for an enforceable, meaningful peace. In my prerogative as a Member of Congress, I feel that as a matter of policy, de-Americanizing the war should proceed at a faster pace. This will show that we mean business. As a practical, administrative reality, what I am advocating, of course, will take a little time. And President Nixon's careful, prudent first steps toward deescalation recognize this reality. No one is suggesting, even remotely, that the United States suddenly pull out of Vietnam, leaving American soldiers exposed to enemy attack. What is being suggested is that our troops withdraw as expeditiously as possible, protecting human life in the process.

I want to again commend the President's peace efforts. They are a move in the right direction. Surely they are a long, forward thrust from the previous, discredited policy of total Americanization of the war. Certainly the President deplors the killing of Americans and Vietnamese as vehemently as the most ardent antiwar advocate does. And it is also understandable that after previous administrations were slowly sucked into the quagmire of Southeast Asia, despite our impatience, the President does need time to maneuver and establish his priorities.

As I said in my opening thought, I do not see the moratorium as disrupting the President's peace initiatives. I would want the dialog to complement his position. Indeed, it dramatizes to Hanoi that this Nation is ready and willing to negotiate and enforce a peaceful solution to Vietnam.

It is my feeling that we also use this time during the moratorium to pay tribute to the gallant young men who have sacrificed their lives in Vietnam. The list of fatalities is staggering, and has tragically robbed America of the talents of thousands of young men. This year alone, the war list reads as follows:

	Dead	Wounded
January.....	745	5,569
February.....	1,073	5,966
March.....	1,316	7,904
April.....	847	9,726
May.....	1,209	7,635
June.....	1,100	7,631
July.....	638	5,999
August.....	795	5,291

The young Americans represented by these figures are the Nation's youth: senselessly removed from their families, friends, and community.

How many of them were cut down in the brilliance of their youth? How many of them would have been tomorrow's doctors, tomorrow's builders of our cities, and the teachers of yet unborn generations of Americans?

The late John F. Kennedy once said at a war memorial:

While less picturesque than the traditional methods of hanging ripe red pods in ristras along the wall of homes or spreading them in huge sheets on the ground, the new techniques achieve a much higher standard of sanitation. They also assure a better and more uniform product reaching the market.

Such new methods eliminate possible sources of contamination which exist when it is sun-dried out in the open, exposed to dust and to insects.

Just as research has improved the quality of chili by developing new varieties, so have changes in processing, packaging, and storing chili resulted in a product that has a wider variety of uses and appeals to an expanding market.

At the processing plants, new mechanical equipment for washing, drying and packaging can accomplish the entire process within eight hours. Under the old method, sun-drying took about two weeks alone.

New methods of freezing chili, at temperatures set at 30 below, again permit rapid processing and new and expanded markets for chili.

Chili reaches the market in a variety of ways. Green fresh chili in southern New Mexico is ready to market by mid or late July and remains on the market shelves and roadside stands until frost comes in November. The season for fresh red chili is naturally shorter since the chili remains in the field longer than when picked green.

Chili also is canned in whole pods, usually packed in 4-oz., 10-oz., and No. 2½ cans. They are usually labeled hot or mild. Four and 10-oz. cans of chopped chili are also common, as are red and green chili sauces.

A staple item in markets throughout the state are dried red chili sold whole or ground into powder. Dried red chili is packaged in a variety of ways.

Green and red chili sauces are available in most frozen food cabinets at local markets. Ready-to-use frozen chopped or whole chili are available in some markets, as are such frozen specialty items as cocktail tacos and burritos. Combination dishes may include chili along with beef or cheese in tortillas or spaghetti. Green and red enchiladas are popular. An increasing number of TV dinners, sometimes called "Mexican dinners," are appearing on the market.

VIETNAM MORATORIUM

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues might not have been in favor of my actions last night which brought an end to the moratorium speeches in this Chamber. But I did not want to give the American people the impression that these efforts were being supported by a majority of the Members of this body. I am afraid if we had continued the marathon session that is exactly the impression they would have received. I believe by the fact that a quorum was not present at the time of the last quorum call and that a majority of those remaining voted for adjournment dispels any impression that the so-called moratorium has the wholehearted support of this body. I too fear that some people have reversed the old adage of President Teddy Roosevelt to walk softly and carry a big stick. Instead, they are walking loudly and carrying only a small and broken twig of commonsense and intelligence.

It is against the law of nature for parents to bury their children—a son with all of his life before him.

These young men are "selected" by a system whose inequities are notorious. Indeed, the draft is a device difficult to justify under any circumstances, but when it operates to send American boys to die in a war in which many of them do not believe in or do not understand—a war in which our official aim has never been clarified, then it becomes a great tragedy.

This explains to a large degree why our youth today is rebelling against the draft, against the war, against the society which produced both and sent them to fight without convincing them of its reasons.

Not claiming to be an expert on defense strategy, I would now like to explain the consequence of the Vietnam war on my constituents in Queens County, N.Y.—what it has meant to their lives as individuals, their ability to live a decent, modest life and provide for their families.

For Vietnam has had a disastrous effect on our economy, and is considered one of the major causes of today's runaway inflation.

This was reflected in the testimony of J. Sinclair Armstrong, a prominent Republican financier, before the Senate Appropriations Committee:

As financiers, we see the destabilization of our domestic and international finance that it (Vietnam) has brought about. As citizens in our home communities, we see the blight that its excess visits on us in curtailment of resources for housing, education, health facilities, mass transport and productive employment. As taxpayers, we feel the burden of its cost—the surtax recently re-enacted, and the proposed repeal of the tax credit for investment in capital equipment by which goods are produced and America is kept modern. We see the enormous cost of restrictive monetary and fiscal measures and the record high interest rates, 7½ percent on U.S. Treasury notes, and the curtailment of availability of credit, with the resulting drastic curtailment of vital housing and other construction. We feel the inflation, the monthly increases in the cost of living, steadily up one-half of one percent, with no end in sight.

Indeed, our Vietnam-induced war inflation is depressing consumer buying power. Wages are at new highs in many industries, but consumer prices are rising faster and salary increases are not keeping pace. This past year the cost of living rose 5.1 percent—the biggest jump in 17 years. And based on current estimates, prices will rise 10 percent in 1969.

For bankers and Government bureaucrats, the wave of Vietnam-caused inflation means continuing the 10-percent income tax surcharge and increased Federal Reserve requirements.

While the average family in Queens is suspicious of this fiscal medicine for curbing inflation in this period and at best bewildered by the statistics behind the Consumer Price Index, in every day terms inflation expresses itself in dollars and cents. It now takes almost \$12.50 to buy what \$10 bought a decade ago.

In Queens, a housewife wrote me last week saying she could not afford to feed her children fresh vegetables this winter.

In Jamaica, a section of my district, a worker I know reduced the number of nights he bowls each month. A family man in Little Neck complains that a year ago his wife spent \$20 a week for groceries; now she needs \$35. A year passed while a couple raised enough money for a downpayment on their dream house; in that time the price rose \$6,000, closing costs increased 5 percent, and monthly mortgage payments were now more than they anticipated because building costs have skyrocketed due to increased Vietnam construction.

And stories abound of how Vietnam-caused inflation is nibbling at the fixed incomes of retirees, those living on pensions, savings, and social security. Even the more affluent in my district feel the pinch.

Indeed, a recent study indicates that in two dozen major industries, workers received anywhere from \$8 to \$30 in weekly wage increases during the height of the Vietnam war—but rising taxes shrunk actual take-home increases some 50 percent and rising prices sapped another 50 percent from purchasing power.

Taxes drained \$4.78 from the weekly \$8 increases, and when inflation's effect is considered, the worker actually had a net weekly loss of \$6.32. And taxes siphoned off \$11.13 of the \$30 weekly increase, with spiraling prices reducing the net gain to only \$4.93 weekly.

What's wrong? During a war, everything soars in cost, and somebody must pay for it—usually the taxpayer.

"Taxes are like a pregnant woman," a customer in a Jamaica store said to me recently. "Once they get started, they stay with you."

Total taxes now gouge about 35 percent of the average family's salary. Federal income taxes take the lion's share, but the Federal tax rate has not changed since the Korean war. It is State and local taxes that have skyrocketed during the Vietnam war—to pay the cost of education, highways, and escalating social needs, while Federal dollars went to pay for a war in Asia.

Unfortunately, unless the war ends soon, the future looks bleak for taxpayers—new schools, safe streets, and improved municipal services cost money. When the Vietnam war ends, if the military drain on the Federal budget is curbed, many economists predict that within a few years Uncle Sam will have a "fiscal dividend" of \$30 to \$40 billion—enough to relieve the burden of local spending for social needs while cutting taxes.

While the American consumer has paid dearly for the Vietnam war, in terms of reduced buying power, American business has benefited from war profits.

Business Week reports:

At the peak of war in 1968, U.S. corporations earned more money than they ever did before in a single year—thanks in good part to sharply rising prices and continued war expansion of industry.

Here are the facts: Since the war began through last year, after-tax corporate profits soared 95.5 percent and dividend checks to stockholders increased 73.1 percent—while the average weekly after-tax earnings for nonsupervisory

employees went up only 26.6 percent and in terms of buying power, increased merely 11 percent.

What can be done about this wave of spiraling inflation during a war? The American economy is prospering because workers spend their wages to buy new products—despite Vietnam. The more workers buy, the more jobs there are. And so on. The same holds true for the government. The more it spends on schools and social needs, the more jobs there are for workers.

But when Government imposes taxes, it denies workers money they might spend on consumer needs. Economists believe when the economy is balanced, Government revenue should equal Government expenditures. But if unemployment exists—as it now does during a war—and the economy is not operating at full capacity, if the Government spends more than it receives in taxes, borrowing the rest, total spending increases, stimulating economic growth and new job opportunities.

But if Government reduces expenditures and increases taxation simultaneously, it dampens or slows down economic growth during a war-inflated period—cutting its own expenses and reducing consumer buying power. This is just what is being urged now by the administration. This policy may or may not work, but it has to be carefully controlled to be successful.

The Federal Reserve Board raised interest rates to their highest level in a century this year, also hurting consumer purchasing power. This means home mortgage payments, auto installment payments, and interest on time-payment plans and revolving department-store charge accounts are escalating.

What this means to the average family in my district is tough to swallow. In 1950, a Government-guaranteed FHA mortgage cost 4¼ percent with premium charges. On a \$20,000 mortgage for 30 years, this meant total interest payments of \$17,584 in addition to principal.

Under the new rates FHA interest now totals 8 percent with a premium charge. Now a 30-year, \$20,000 mortgage requires total interest payments of \$33,387, in addition to principal. The interest has practically doubled in 20 years.

The other most commonly sought loans in Queens are for automobiles. Interest rates for auto payments have also increased. Five years ago banks charged 4½ percent per \$100, discounted in advance. That meant a worker who bought a \$2,000 car had to borrow \$2,312 on a 3-year loan, for an effective interest rate of 10.1 percent.

Today rates are up to 6 percent per \$100. This means it now takes \$2,439 to finance a \$2,000 car, for an effective interest rate of 14.2 percent.

Let us face it, the demand for war profit is not about to vanish, but consumers should not pay for someone else's greed while soldiers die in Vietnam.

War profits must be limited. Corporations could easily limit their war profits while satisfying their need to maintain their growth. Prices would then be

stabilized during this war period and the consumer's dollar would have more value.

Indeed, corporations that share in the Vietnam economy should be accountable to public agencies, with reasonable price ranges established.

The time has clearly arrived then, to curb war profits while American boys fight under the American flag.

The Vietnam tragedy, then, has had a disastrous effect on American society—the sad waste of human resources and the American dollar can never be replaced. And it is my feeling that unless we reduce the scope of our military involvement, we may be contributing to the destruction of the Vietnamese society we are trying to save.

Some wise thought and counsel has been given to our policy objectives in Vietnam by a former aide to President Eisenhower, Emmet John Hughes. He makes a lot of sense. I would like to read from these writings now:

All the bleak choices (in Vietnam) rather inexorably dissolve toward one. As a wise and sympathetic statesman of Southeast Asia stated to me: "You are going to leave Vietnam. You are not going to be routed or humiliated: Your armadas and your bombers make you the greatest power even in the South Pacific. But you are going to leave because the earth-bound politics of Vietnam cannot be solved by the airborne cavalry of America.

"You now have probably a last decision to make. You may try to smother all forces in Vietnam seeking compromise and peace—thus pitting them all against you. Or you may try to work with the best of these forces in their confused attempts at negotiation, so that the very imperfect end of it all still will allow you to leave with dignity. Your last choice, then, is clear: Either you will one day withdraw because you shrewdly appear to want to—or because it plainly appears you have to. Is this really so hard a choice?"

It may not seem a hard choice in abstract logic, but it is a stern choice in American politics. It would require of Washington almost a convulsion of candor and a revolution of courage. This means the courage to concede, after all, that the present hope of history for Vietnam has never been more, in truth than a nation dealing with Peking, much as Poland deals with Moscow. It means the resolve to ignore all zealots who still shout their preposterous prescription that a little more military medicine can cure political sickness. And it means the wisdom to sense that American repute in Asia is not dignified but diminished by untiring war for the unattainable victory and American honor is not tarnished but brightened when so great a power can say, with quiet assurance: we have judged poorly, fought splendidly, and survive confidently.

I can think of no other way that the leaders of the United States might match the courage of the soldiers they have dispatched.

BIG TRUCK BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my editorial for today is from the July 21, 1969, State Journal of Topeka, Kans. The editorial follows:

CCV—1907—Part 22

TRUCKS WANT MORE HIGHWAY ROOM

Millions of motorists take to the Interstate Highway System wherever possible on their journeys, for the safety the better-engineered and wider roadways provide.

Through their gasoline taxes they are paying for them, and generally consider it money well spent.

Now the big trucks, limited by federal law to 8 feet wide and 32,000 pounds tandem axle weight, want to be allowed an extra half-foot in width and another ton on the axles.

The American Automobile Assn. has taken up the fight against the proposal in Congress, calling it an "anti-safety bill" almost identical with the one which failed of passage last year.

Not only are there traffic hazards to consider, an AAA official testified before the House roads subcommittee. He quoted figures to show that the heavier trucks would necessitate the expenditure of billions of dollars for reconstruction of older pavements and additional costs in highways yet to be built.

Effects of allowing wider, heavier vehicles on the Interstates would be felt on most other roads, according to AAA executive vice president George F. Kachlein Jr., who added:

"Since truck bodies are not made to operate exclusively on the Interstate System, the wider truck will be found on all of our highways where trucking operations are carried on. Neither will the 8½-foot width be confined to the big cargo carrier. We can be sure that the smaller trucks will be manufactured to take advantage of the greater cube capacity. With a half-foot added to every truck, it would be like cutting a foot in width from every two-lane highway in the country."

Seriousness of accidents involving big trucks already on the highways is a major consideration.

Trucking industry statistics were quoted by Kachlein, showing that while trucks over 26,000 pounds comprised only 1.54 per cent of total vehicle registration, and drove only 5.33 per cent of all vehicle mileage, they were involved in 11.6 per cent of fatal accidents.

The Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety reported that half of the accidents of carriers reporting to it involve collision with a passenger car.

How does truck size affect death rate in crashes?

An AAA study found there are 0.3 fatal injuries per 100 persons in collisions between passenger cars and pickup trucks. When a tractor-trailer truck is involved the rate is 7.1. With a tractor-two-trailer combination fatal injuries jump to 13.3 per 100 persons involved.

Congress must consider the lives and property of over 100 million little drivers in deciding whether the big trucks will be permitted to shrink our highways.

EXCHANGE CLUB HONORS "GENERAL" EAGLE

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, as a tribute to a fine American and citizen of my district, I would like to place in the Record a news story from the Knoxville, Tenn., Journal of October 10.

This story really needs no introduction, and I only wish to add, "Hats off to General Eagle."

The news story follows:

EXCHANGE CLUB HONORS GENERAL

WILLIAM EAGLE

(By Pat Fields)

Praises such as few men hear in a lifetime were heaped upon William H. Eagle at Knoxville Exchange Club's "Gen'l Eagle Day" observances Thursday in S&W Cafeteria.

Sam E. Young, a 50-year Kiwanian scheduled to be honored at his own club for half-century membership, gave up that meeting to reminisce with many others on long friendships with the 82-year-old former Tennessee assistant attorney general and recently retired Supreme Court clerk here.

"It was 45 years ago when Bill and I paced the corridors of Fort Sanders Presbyterian Hospital together while our daughters were being born," said Young. "Neither of us ever had to go through that again."

Retired Criminal Court Judge J. Fred Bibb came to tell of his early membership in Exchange, which he called "an organization with a solid foundation built by men like Bill Eagle . . . We had a great time meeting in the basement of the Chamber of Commerce Building, then at Church and State streets where, like so many other landmark sites, a parking lot now operates . . . Bill and I were said to be look-alikes in those days, when I was fatter and he was skinnier than we are today . . . I had to give up the club in 1926, but Bill has lived the life of a true Exchangite (Motto: Unity for Service)."

Attorney Ray Jenkins, a friend and associate for 50 years, sent a letter to be read by Exchange President Grover Boyd: "There is no finer man than Gen'l William H. Eagle . . . warm of heart, sympathetic in his outlook, tolerant in his judgments, charitable in his decisions, forgiving in his nature . . ."

H. D. Swanson, chairman of the committee charged with putting together the Exchange Club's "Book of Golden Deeds Award," called the task "a pleasure" and gave the honor of its presentation—for the first time to an Exchange Club member—to H. A. (Hat) Tiller, who has been an Eagle friend for 60 years. "In fact, he was best man at my second marriage a few years ago, and my wife still thinks he is," said Tiller.

The honoree accepted the gilded book, filled with pictures and testimonials to his life of service, with in his own words "a full heart," thanked all who had spoken so highly of him, and in response to Swanson's expressed wish that you live just as long as you want to! said: "I can't possibly live that long, but it has been a wonderful life so far, especially the 56 years of it I've spent with the little lady back there—my wife."

As a surprise to the "Gen'l" his daughter, Mrs. George (Mary Eagle) Keith of Nashville and granddaughter Ann 4, youngest of the five Keith grandchildren, were here to attend the luncheon in his honor.

Gen'l Eagle seemed especially touched by remarks volunteered by the younger generations of Exchangites, citing his inspiration to them in joining the organization and making its motto their own.

OUR HIGH SCHOOLS MUST NOT BECOME ARMED COMPOUNDS

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, there is growing concern over violence and

vandalism in our high schools. Hardly a day goes by in the Washington area without reports in the news media of teachers and students being assaulted, of armed robberies in classrooms and of school property being damaged and destroyed.

My esteemed colleague, Representative LAWRENCE J. HOGAN, of Maryland, recently gave a talk on this most serious problem. He outlined with considerable skill, clarity, and courage some of the steps which must be taken if our high schools are not to become guarded compounds where students and teachers can function in safety only behind a cordon of armed police.

Because of the pertinence of his remarks, I should like to insert his most perceptive speech in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN LAWRENCE J. HOGAN
BEFORE THE COLMAR MANOR-COTTAGE CITY
PARENT-TEACHER ASSOCIATION, OCTOBER 7,
1969

As I understand it, my address here this evening is to center on the theme of the PTA as a communicative organ for schoolchildren and their community. I hope that my remarks will not stray too far from this avenue, but I ask you as parents to look ahead to the time when your children, who are now in elementary school, are teenagers in high school.

You have probably guessed my intent, because the situation at Bladensburg High School in your community, and the similar problems at Duval High School, have been constantly pressing for attention during the last few weeks. I would like to spend this evening presenting my views and then soliciting your opinions and your aid in seeking some kind of solution. Many of you, as parents of elementary schoolchildren in Colmar Manor, also have older sons and daughters who attend Bladensburg Junior and Senior High School and can therefore offer my insights into the problems and turmoil that have occurred there in recent weeks.

Let me begin by reiterating the position that I first enunciated during the 1968 congressional campaign, that is, that Government officials—among whom I must now include myself—do a disservice to all citizens when they fail to vigorously enforce all breaches of law. It is now time to broaden that statement to include educators, civil leaders, and parents.

It will take the combined efforts of all of us to tackle the problem we face in our high schools. Yes, high schools—this sounds strange to our ears because we've only now become accustomed to the thought of dealing with dissension and disruption on our college campuses. But it is true—today's youth are no better and no worse than any other generation of young people, but they are more intelligent, better educated, more mature, more aware of social injustices, more motivated by conscience than any generation we have ever produced.

Unfortunately, however, in too many instances—such as those we have witnessed recently in our own community—this social awareness has caused total rejection of the system by some, rather than total commitment to the betterment of the system. Even worse than this is the fact that, while some students are voicing their intent simply to take over the educational process from administrators and faculty—and this is bad enough—they are in effect destroying the educational process. This we cannot allow to happen.

When I returned from a tour of college campuses last spring, the one conclusion which received the overwhelming support of all the congressmen who participated in

that study mission, was that violence in any form, in any measure, under any circumstances, is not a legitimate means of protest or mode of expression. It can no more be tolerated in the educational community than in the community at large. If there is to be orderly progress and a redress of legitimate student grievances, student violence must be averted.

I have said before, and I will say over and over again, that lawlessness cannot be tolerated. Laws are the very fibers which hold a civilized society together and, while everyone has the right to try to change the laws through the prescribed legislative process, until they are changed they must be obeyed by all citizens.

This is a point of view which, I believe, is shared by all concerned residents of this area, as well as the students and parents who are directly involved. Over and over again these past weeks, I have received telephone calls and letters from parents, students, and educators and in every case, without exception, the same point was made. Let me quote from the letters of some Bladensburg parents—perhaps your neighbors and friends—

"We, as concerned parents, are writing to demand that immediate action be taken to eliminate the lawlessness and disruption of classes.

"Action must be taken—and taken soon—or we will see our educational system taken over by a group of hoodlums who want no part of education, nor do they want to allow anyone else the right and privilege to be educated.

"I hope that you will agree with me that action in this regard should be immediate. Too long have we hesitated to deal with troublemakers—something must be done now—before much of our freedom is lost to us forever."

I wholeheartedly agree with these observations but the question still remains, "What can be done?" To answer this query, I solicit your opinions and aid tonight.

It is clear that this problem is no longer only a question of black and white, or of student demands again a repressive faculty or administration. There are established proper channels where student grievances can be aired and redressed and it is a relatively simple matter to make known to students what those proper methods are and who the proper authorities are. This is a communications problem which can and must be solved.

But the real problem here is much deeper. We have an underlying race relations problem, but more importantly we are confronted with the ugly specter of violence. Assault, disruption of the educational process, and the closing of schools are violent acts. They must be responded to as such. I believe that at Bladensburg the response to the disruption was in the right direction. I commend Principal David Dean for calling in police to restore order because it is the responsibility of the schools to educate our children and unless there is order, there can be no education.

Allow me to relate an incident which occurred on the morning that I visited Bladensburg, during the height of the turmoil. While there, I observed two groups of roving students—one black, one white—who were roaming on the school grounds, wrapping belts around their fists, and actively seeking a confrontation with each other. Had it not been for the cool manner in which the policemen conducted themselves and handled these students—thereby completely defusing the tense atmosphere—there would surely have been a race riot at Bladensburg that morning.

I am not alone in my praise of Principal David Dean and of the Prince George's Police who were assigned to Bladensburg High School. The Executive Committee of the Bladensburg PTA sent a petition to my office expressing their gratitude for Principal

Dean's handling of the disturbances. In addition, WTOP Radio and Television broadcast an editorial on September 29 and 30 which followed in the same vein:

"... Thanks partly to the police, Bladensburg High has had several days of quiet. Some adults, both inside and outside the school, are working hard for a resolution of the racial conflicts which have led to trouble. Other adults are out looking for scapegoats.

The Bladensburg principal, David Dean, is a convenient target. The local NAACP chapter wants him fired, but Dean is not the villain. Close observers of the recent strife credit him with a cool head and a firm hand which kept the lid on more serious outbreaks.

The real villains, if there are any, are scattered among the homes and apartments which surround Bladensburg High and which feed young people into it. With lusty cheers from the sidelines and with subtle instruction at the dinner table, many mothers and fathers have encouraged prejudice and mistrust. Racial slurs and animosity come in all colors, and their origins are not too hard to find.

For many, the social changes taking place just across the District line in Prince George's County seem overwhelming. But the Bladensburg area is not the only place in Washington where blacks and whites are living shoulder-to-shoulder. In numerous places they have learned—if not to like each other—to get along with each other.

Bladensburg has to learn that, too. The alternative is more police—more often. Real education cannot possibly take place within such a climate of fear."

But tonight I would like to spend some time discussing parental leadership and responsibility. As the father of a 21-year-old daughter and a 13-year-old son, I, too, am faced with these same problems.

In fact, because of my rather hectic schedule which requires speechmaking or appearances such as this almost every night of the week, I am unable to spend as much time as I should with my children. We parents must make the effort to communicate more often and more meaningfully with our offspring. We must pass on to them respect for authority and for society—its laws and its institutions. Too many of our youngsters are not sold on our system of government.

Much of the crisis of the generation gap results from the ever-growing trend in our society to turn over more and more of the parental role to various institutions and agencies. Intentionally or perhaps unintentionally, the child has been removed from the home the greater part of the day. Nursery school or preschool begins the exodus, then K through 6; until, finally, the child is a teenager in junior and senior high school. We hardly know him or her anymore because in addition to the 9-3 school day, we've found time to send the child to cub scouts and brownies, to camp for vacations, and on and on. We provide these opportunities, feeling that we are making great sacrifices for our children; but, in reality, we are simply reducing the amount of time spent at home together. We've delegated the responsibility for rearing our children to others and in too many cases their influence on our children has been harmful.

I started this evening speaking of leadership and communication and this is where I would like to conclude. I hope I haven't just given the impression of being down on parents as a result of the turmoil in our high schools and colleges; but, my real point is this: we have a deep-seated societal problem which has no easy solutions and no ready-made answers.

However, I was assured this morning by several County officials that the following measures have been taken to quell any future disruption of the educational process in County schools:

The School Board has instructed all principals to call the Prince George's Police Department immediately when trouble erupts;

Principals have in turn instructed all teachers to report all incidents immediately; Chief of Police Vincent Free said that the Police Department would immediately respond to all violations of trespass laws and enforce those laws;

Student troublemakers will be suspended and/or expelled;

State's Attorney Arthur Marshall has assured that his office will vigorously prosecute violators of the laws in the courts, or if necessary, in Juvenile Court.

Finally, I will urge the Department of Justice to prosecute interstate people who incite trouble in our school system.

These enumerated guidelines are the constructive reactions of officials but, on reflection, it seems to me that we, as parents have an obligation to make a beginning through better communication, particularly between the generations.

I have made some efforts in this regard by introducing a joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim a National Adult-Youth Communications Week. This measure was signed into law and President Nixon proclaimed last week—September 28th—October 4th—National Adult-Youth Communications Week. In addition, I have established a task force on youth—composed of students representing every high school and college in the fifth district—to advise me on matters which are under discussion for possible legislative action.

Therefore, we cannot say that communication between the generations is an impossible task in our hectic, busy world because meaningful communication is not a matter of time but of quality. I hope now to have an opportunity to sample that quality by opening the floor to communication from you to me because I have spoken long enough.

PENNSYLVANIA AMONG 10 LOWEST STATES IN LOCAL AND STATE TAXES

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article: "Finance Week—Where Taxes Are Highest, Lowest," from U.S. News & World Report edition of October 20, 1969.

Pennsylvania has an excellent record on low State and local taxes.

The article follows:

FINANCE WEEK—WHERE TAXES ARE HIGHEST, LOWEST

State, local taxes per \$1,000 of income range from \$105.40 in Illinois to \$190.96 in North Dakota, a new report shows.

Consolation for higher-tax States: Proposed plans offer them proportionately larger slices of revenue-sharing funds.

People groaning under an ever-increasing burden of taxes can get an idea how heavy their load really is from a new survey by the Census Bureau. What is disclosed:

When it comes to tax loads related to personal incomes, the variations among the 50 States are quite extreme.

These relative tax burdens are growing much more rapidly in some States than in others—and actually shrinking in some.

The basic figures, set out in the chart on this page, have recently taken on added significance for all taxpayers. As one result, the figures now offer a clue to tax-relief prospects.

The reason: Tax burdens related to incomes have come to be accepted as the main measure of "tax effort"—the degree to which each State and locality is willing to tax itself to solve its problems. A high rating for tax effort, in turn, means a bigger chunk of money from virtually all federal revenue-sharing plans that have been proposed, including the one sent to Congress by President Nixon.

The promise is that States shouldering the heaviest tax burdens in relation to incomes will get proportionately larger slices of revenue-sharing money. They, thus, have the strongest hope for relief from their own State and local taxes.

On the average, across the country, the total of State and local revenue collections amounts to \$134.51 for each \$1,000 of personal income.

The range among the States is from a low of \$105.40 in Illinois to a high of \$190.96 in North Dakota.

Washington: special. The District of Columbia is a special case. With so much of its real estate owned by the federal and foreign governments, a large part of the District's money is provided by the Treasury to compensate for lost property taxes.

Most of the industrial States rank low on the tax-burden—or tax-effort—list. Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Connecticut—all are in the bottom 10.

New York and California are the stand-out exceptions in that group. Both stand among the 10 States in which tax burdens are heaviest in relation to income.

The majority of the Mountain States, along with Alaska, are in a special group. Their ranking in the top group is due in large part to the taxes they collect on the extraction of minerals within their borders.

Those taxes are, in major degree, "exported" to other States. One result is that these States can expect something of a windfall when, or if, federal revenue sharing begins.

The new figures explode a widely held idea that most of the Southern States actually are carrying some of the heaviest tax burdens if their relatively low incomes are taken into account.

Only one Southern State, Louisiana, now ranks close to the top 10 in that respect. In nearly all Southern States, taxes related to personal incomes are well below the national average.

Midwestern farm States tend to rank in the middle third for tax loads. North Dakota, Minnesota and South Dakota, all high up on the scale, are exceptions.

Pacific Coast States are all above average for tax loads. California stands in eighth place now.

Shifting loads. Tax collections are rising nearly everywhere. Tax rates are being raised and new levies imposed by deliberate actions. Even without that, continuing prosperity and inflation swell the inflow of revenues.

In most areas, that rise has been outstripping the growth of incomes. Thus, relative tax burdens have been getting heavier and heavier.

For the U.S. as a whole, the increase in the latest year was 2.6 per cent.

In two States, Nebraska and Alaska, the one-year jump was more than 10 per cent. In nine others, the rise exceeded 5 per cent.

Loudest groans from taxpayers, however, are heard in States that show little or no increase in the latest year counted. The reason is that there are States in which sizable increases have occurred over several years. In the country as a whole, State and local revenues related to incomes have risen 6.2 per cent in a four-year period.

For Alaska, the comparable rise has been more than 34 per cent.

In four States—Delaware, Maryland, Nevada and Wyoming—the increase in that period has been from 18 to 23 per cent.

The four-year increases have exceeded 10 per cent in 10 other States—Hawaii, Idaho, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, North Dakota, Utah, Virginia and West Virginia.

In only six States—Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Mississippi and Texas—did taxes decline in relation to incomes in the latest span of four years.

STATE-LOCAL TAX BURDENS—HOW STATES RANK

	Revenue collections in 1968 per \$1,000 of personal income	Percent change from 1967
U.S. average.....	\$134.51	Up 2.6.
North Dakota.....	190.96	Up 5.8.
Wyoming.....	185.89	Up 2.3.
New Mexico.....	170.59	Up 1.3.
Alaska.....	169.79	Up 10.4.
Hawaii.....	165.66	Up 2.5.
Minnesota.....	162.69	Up 3.7.
Nevada.....	162.19	Up 8.4.
California.....	160.84	Up 7.8.
Arizona.....	159.26	Down 1.5.
New York.....	158.21	Up 0.9.
Louisiana.....	157.88	Up 1.3.
South Dakota.....	157.62	Up 3.3.
Idaho.....	156.59	Down 0.5.
Montana.....	155.89	Up 6.3.
Utah.....	153.72	Up 3.1.
Vermont.....	150.61	Up 5.5.
Colorado.....	150.12	Down 3.5.
Washington.....	149.43	Up 3.1.
Wisconsin.....	148.82	Up 3.5.
Iowa.....	143.99	Up 5.1.
Mississippi.....	143.56	Down 4.5.
Oklahoma.....	142.45	Down 0.3.
Oregon.....	140.66	Down 3.2.
Florida.....	138.13	Down 3.1.
Michigan.....	138.13	Up 9.0.
West Virginia.....	136.14	Up 6.4.
Delaware.....	135.50	No change.
Nebraska.....	135.38	Up 10.5.
Kansas.....	134.35	Down 2.5.
Georgia.....	132.80	Up 4.9.
Alabama.....	130.79	Up 3.8.
Maryland.....	129.96	Up 3.6.
Massachusetts.....	129.26	Up 0.2.
Kentucky.....	126.25	Down 0.7.
North Carolina.....	125.13	Up 1.2.
Maine.....	123.71	Down 3.7.
Tennessee.....	123.57	Up 1.5.
South Carolina.....	123.17	Up 0.7.
Arkansas.....	122.93	Down 3.0.
Indiana.....	122.42	Down 2.7.
Virginia.....	120.82	Up 4.7.
Texas.....	118.74	Down 1.1.
Rhode Island.....	118.48	Up 3.3.
New Jersey.....	114.13	Up 3.0.
Pennsylvania.....	113.38	Up 0.1.
Missouri.....	112.72	Down 2.7.
Ohio.....	111.99	Up 6.2.
New Hampshire.....	111.59	Down 0.8.
Connecticut.....	107.31	Down 0.4.
Illinois.....	105.40	Up 3.2.
District of Columbia.....	105.13	Up 6.9.

Note: Figures are for States' fiscal years that ended in 1968.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned with the plight of our older citizens, many of whom have no income other than social security payments. Much of my mail from the elderly has been heartbreaking, and their tremendous needs have prompted me to introduce a bill calling for a 15-percent increase in social security payments and

a 45-percent increase in minimum benefits. I recently received a very touching letter from a Maryland resident in response to my legislation, and I would like to share this letter with my colleagues today. The difficulty this man is having in making ends meet points up the necessity of acting on social security legislation in this session:

PASADENA, Md.

DEAR FRIEND MR. CLARENCE LONG: Dear Sir and Friend, I am sending you this letter because I listened to you speak on the radio about the elderly people and that is the reason I am sending this letter to you. I am 82 years of age and only receive \$51.00 a month old age pension. I live along Cocky Creek in an old shack along the river and have a very hard time trying to live. I don't receive any Welfare money or food. I make the 51 dollars do all the work. I was born November 14, 1887 in Philadelphia, Pa. but lived in Baltimore 55 years. I enjoyed hearing you speak on the air. If we old people had more like you, we old people could live a more happier life and eat like other people do. I got a medicare card but I can't eat that. I am not well and depend on other people to bring me food from the store and if no one comes, I don't eat much. I can't walk far. I got a very bad leg. I go to the doctor once a month.

Try to live on 51 dollars a month. Electric bill, food, kerosene bill, clothing, tobacco to roll my own cigarettes . . . I don't have much company.

When you have nothing, no one wants you. Well, I wish you all the luck in the world to get us old people to live and get a good meal once in a while.

Thank you and God bless you.

MR. JOHN W. MATT,

P.S.—Please answer if you can and care.

VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

MR. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Vietnam moratorium on October 15 will reflect the deep concern of millions of Americans over the tragic war in Vietnam and their determination that it be brought to a prompt conclusion. As the Gallup poll reported on October 11, a majority of citizens sampled throughout the Nation—57 percent—support the withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Vietnam by 1970 and 58 percent believe it was a mistake to have involved American troops in Vietnam.

In the face of this public opinion survey, it is incredible that the President would say he would not be affected by the moratorium and that "there is nothing new we can learn from the demonstrations." It is incredible that the Vice President would dismiss the moratorium as absurd. As WCBS radio in New York commented editorially these statements "reflect contempt for a substantial body of public opinion which cuts across age and party."

I include in the RECORD the WCBS News Radio 88 editorial which was broadcast on October 13 and 14:

VIETNAM

Vice President Spiro Agnew has done it again. This time, one of his utterances con-

cerns the forthcoming Vietnam Moratorium. It seems destined to join the declaration "If you've seen one ghetto, you've seen them all" as another classic example of insensitivity.

Seventeen United States Senators and 47 members of the House have endorsed the planned non-violent protest by students opposed to the Vietnam war. Leaders of all religious faiths, including Cardinal Richard Cushing, have given the demonstration their blessing. So have the trustees of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the Senate of Columbia University and the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of Harvard University.

Yet—Vice President Agnew has dismissed the student protest set for Wednesday as "ironic and absurd". Previously, in discussing the Vietnam Moratorium, President Nixon had assured a White House news conference: "Under no circumstances whatever, will I be affected by it."

Both statements apparently proceed from the same tunnel vision that afflicted the previous Administration concerning American involvement in Vietnam. They reflect contempt for a substantial body of public opinion which cuts across age and party.

Informed national policy demands that leaders listen carefully to dissent, from whatever quarter it comes and however unwelcome. It is precisely the conviction that theirs are voices in the wilderness, dismissed as of no political consequence, that has brought a great many thoughtful students to the point of desperation and alienation.

The peaceful demonstration of opposition which has been planned is an essentially constructive and moral action. It is intended to bear public witness to the belief of millions of Americans that President Nixon must take the initiative in ending, speedily, this disastrous and divisive war. It is a war which has for too long ravaged the spirit and the resources of this nation.

VIETNAM

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

MR. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, we meet here tonight laden with heavy responsibilities. We seek a proper way to extricate our country from one of the longest, bloodiest, and most costly wars of her history. It is an undeclared war, despite a constitutional provision indicating that this kind of a war was never conceived by the founders of our Nation. It is a war during which the U.S. Congress, especially the House of Representatives, has consistently failed to exercise its full constitutional responsibilities.

But, we are here tonight to help rectify past omission. We gather to rethink and rediscuss our involvement in the Vietnam conflict, and to aid our colleagues and our President in the unanimous quest for peace. For joining me in this effort, I salute and thank you. Though our numbers are few, I firmly believe our contribution will be substantial.

I would be remiss if I did not also preliminarily salute the millions of Americans of all vocations, races, economic statuses, and hair styles who will join together tomorrow in a peaceful demonstration on behalf of a rapid resolution to this war. Their request for a cessation of the killing, whatever its form so

long as it be nonviolent, will be an exhibition of good citizenship in its highest form, and should serve as an inspiration and example to those of us charged with the responsibilities of determining our country's policies.

In this vein, it seems highly regrettable to me that the one man who bears the greatest of these responsibilities has already indicated that he will pay no heed to tomorrow's events. How the President of the United States can publicly prejudge and ignore such manifestations of the national conscience escapes me completely. Certainly he does so at his own political peril and at the peril of thousands of brave young American men now prosecuting this war half a world away. I would hope that the President would carefully reexamine this rather extraordinary position and acknowledge that all citizens of this Nation have not only a right to petition their Government, but also the concomitant right to be heard and respected in their opinions.

An examination of our present policies in Vietnam must begin with a look at the premises upon which these policies have rested during the 5 years of our active involvement in that conflict. This is obviously necessary, for if our policies are based upon anything but realities, we are engaged in self-delusion of the first order and are embarked on an extremely dangerous course of action. Unfortunately, a careful scrutiny of our Vietnam policies reveals that most, if not all, of those premises were indeed not realities, but myths—military myths, diplomatic myths, and political myths.

Militarily, it was once assumed that the bombing of the bridges, factories, and cities of the north would destroy the fighting capability and break the spirit of the North Vietnamese people. It did not work, and this particular myth was destroyed. Others, however, have persisted.

It was assumed, for example, that bombing the Ho Chi Minh Trail would stop the infiltration of men and materiel from the north. It has not done so. It has naturally had some inhibiting impact, but basically infiltration proceeds as the north chooses.

It was assumed that "pacification" and "search and destroy" missions would gradually erode the strength of the Vietcong and bring ever increasing amounts of territory under the aegis of Saigon. It has not done so. The political map of South Vietnam is still polka-dotted with spheres of influence and has undergone little change since 1965.

It was assumed that our forces could flush out the enemy and destroy them through means of conventional warfare. They have not done so. Indeed, whenever the strategy did work, our fighting-men performed admirably and almost always won smashing victories. But the adversary, with both time and terrain on his side, has usually successfully avoided direct confrontation, and there is every reason to believe he will continue to do so in the future.

Finally, it was assumed that the tenacity, will to win, and strength of belief of our small, yellow adversary was less than that of our own "revolutionaries"

who fought to free us from foreign domination 2 centuries ago. Nothing could have been farther from the truth. For a quarter of a century the Vietnamese people have fought against corrupt rule from within and colonial rule from without. Their dedication to their concept of freedom is precisely that of Patrick Henry's "Liberty or Death."

On the diplomatic front, more myths abound. It was assumed that by raising the hue and cry of "international Communist aggression" we would rally a great majority of the non-Communist world to our side in Vietnam. They have not come. While South Korea has sent a substantial number of troops, and Australia and New Zealand have offered token forces, none of our traditional allies and leaders of the free world have responded to this all-too-familiar shibboleth.

It was assumed that we could convince world opinion that the Vietnamese conflict was not a civil war, but a matter of flagrant aggression from the north. We have not done so. Indeed, world opinion has become increasingly critical of our presence in what most nations now clearly see as an internal affair.

It was assumed that our intervention in Vietnam would deter future "wars of liberation." It has not, and will not, do so. In fact, it has probably had the opposite effect. Buoyed by the success of the Vietcong and the dejected spirit of the American people, guerrilla fighters throughout the world are likely to be encouraged to action.

It was assumed that we could foist a corrupt, unresponsive, militaristic government upon the world as a potential bastion of freedom. It has not worked. Far too many leaders around the globe know of the distasteful record of underhandedness and political repression compiled by the Thieu-Ky regime to be so easily duped.

And only recently we have arrived at final, fallacious diplomatic assumption—that men closely tied to past policies of military intervention can now be our harbingers of peace. This can never succeed. Men like Ellsworth Bunker—wedded steadfastly to the Saigon generals—and Henry Cabot Lodge—who, a year and a half ago, predicted that if we were just patient the Vietcong would disappear into the earth, never to be heard from again—cannot be expected to inspire the requisite confidence in our foes to make them want meaningfully to talk of peace.

Lastly, myths have also been abundant on the home political front. As in the international arena, it was here assumed that the words "communism" and "aggression" would evoke a unanimous knee-jerk response to a position solidly behind our policy. This did not succeed. The American people were far too thoughtful and independent to be herded blindly down the path of war by Pentagon terminology.

It was assumed that the antiwar movement was made up of perennial left-wingers, hippies, and assorted ne'er-do-wells. If the 1968 Democratic primaries did not disprove this, tomorrow certainly

will. I hope the President will be paying attention.

It was assumed that the term "commitment" could be used as a talismanic phrase which would mesmerize our citizenry into lulled support for our policies. For a while this did succeed, but after \$100 billion, 40,000 deaths, and a quarter of a million casualties, an overwhelming number of people are beginning to feel that whatever commitment existed has been amply fulfilled.

Finally, it was assumed that our people would idly stand by, watching their schools and homes deteriorate, their transportation system break down, their air and water become even more polluted, and their children go hungry to pay for this war. This was the most pernicious assumption of all, and we have reaped the consequences, therefore, in Watts, Hough, Washington, D.C., and Chicago; and at San Francisco State, Harvard, and Cornell.

HISTORY NEGLECTED

How could our Government have made so many crucial errors in determining our Vietnam policy? That is a question more and more of our fellow Americans should and do ask every day.

I am neither a psychologist nor historian. It seems apparently, however, that the great majority of those myths were spawned by an unseeing devotion by the White House and the Congress to the idea of America's military and moral superiority. Fresh from victories in two major world wars and from spearheading the unsanctioned repulsion of North Korean aggression—a young nation, proud of its acknowledged role as leader of the Western World—we grossly deluded ourselves into the invincibility of our military strength and the righteousness of our every cause. In doing so, we overlooked several immensely significant historical facts.

It was forgotten, for instance, that the centuries-old antipathy of the people of Vietnam for their Chinese, Laotian, and Cambodian neighbors strongly militated against both the popular "domino theory" and the possibility of Vietnam ending up as a puppet of Chairman Mao.

No heed was paid those who warned that it would take 15 men well trained in counterinsurgency to counterbalance a single guerrilla.

Little note was given that despite very favorable "kill ratios" and incredible expenditures of time, money, and men, the French were forced to abandon their colonial dreams in Indochina.

Incredibly, no thought was apparently given to the drums of nationalism that had been beating throughout the world since the Second World War.

No regard was offered those here at home who saw the beginnings of ferment and disruption within our Nation's ghettos and universities.

And finally, and most essentially, few of those in power remembered the warning of the late President Kennedy, who in 1963, while speaking of our relationship with the Saigon government and the conflict in general, stated that in the last analysis it was "their war" and they "are the ones who must win or lose

it." Tens of thousands of lives, and tens of billions of dollars later, we have still not fully comprehended that fact.

DISENGAGEMENT AND WITHDRAWAL

But our chief purpose this evening is not review. As the distinguished Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) recently said in a brilliant statement on the situation:

There will be time enough, when peace is restored, to contemplate the "lessons of Vietnam."

Tonight we should seek not recrimination, but resolution on the eve of the country's greatest outpouring of sentiment against the war in our history, our question must not be why or how we began that war, but how we can most honorably and expeditiously terminate it.

After a complete review of our present status in Vietnam, it seems to me that we must take five key steps to accomplish those goals.

First. As a preliminary measure, the President should immediately recall Ambassador Bunker from Saigon and Chief Negotiator Lodge from Paris.

Bunker, while a distinguished and rightfully respected diplomat, has always been, and continues to be, an inflexible, wholehearted supporter of the present Saigon regime and the militaristic clique which surrounds them. Whatever the pros and cons of that regime—a topic I shall discuss forthwith—there is absolutely no doubt that it is loathed by the Vietcong and mistrusted by a substantial number of South Vietnamese loyalists. Ambassador Bunker's presence, therefore, and his well-advertised enthusiasm for Messrs. Thieu and Ky only serve as a symbol of intransigent support for the present Saigon government by Washington, and consequently constitutes a significant impediment to any efforts aimed at erecting a provisional and/or coalition regime in that country.

Similarly, Ambassador Lodge was long President Johnson's emissary of escalation in Saigon. Moreover, he was often prone to unguarded asides in which he disclaimed the fighting prowess and will to succeed of the Vietcong. Unquestionably, the Vietcong were aware of these facts, and in light thereof it is difficult to believe that they have a great deal of respect for either his opinions or his veracity. Yet now he sits next to them as the chief negotiator for a peaceful solution.

Surely there are many persons not so inexorably tied to the failures of the past whom the President could appoint in lieu of these men. Former Ambassador to the United Nations, Arthur Goldberg, is a name which comes immediately to mind. As President Johnson once crossed party lines to appoint Ambassador Lodge, so should President Nixon be willing to do so. Surely the issue of successfully effecting the negotiations for peace is far above partisan politics. I would defer, of course, to the President's choice in the matter, but firmly believe that a change must be made and made soon.

Second. We should immediately stop all offensive actions in South Vietnam, and pull those troops currently being

used for those purposes back to the areas we now hold secure. For 5 long years our courageous young men have roamed the Vietnamese countryside on pacification and search-and-destroy missions. Yet, a brief glance at the maps of South Vietnam then and now reveal a painfully small amount of progress for the lives and dollars expended. Moreover, many areas taken over by the United States or the ARVN and under their protectorate by day, revert to the Vietcong by night. This cannot continue—at least not with American troops. The price per square foot is far too dear.

Not only should the pullback greatly reduce American casualties, but there is a substantial possibility that such a move could lead to a marked winding down of all hostilities. Both the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese have shown a definite proclivity for avoiding direct engagement with our forces. If we retreated to areas already firmly secure, therefore, it is quite likely to result in an overall deescalation. In addition, by removing the outposts and other units from some of the far north recesses, a great number of the North Vietnamese troops will no longer be necessary to defend the Vietcong territory, and well might return to their side of the DMZ.

Third. If these pullbacks result in some reduction of the fighting level—as they almost assuredly will—all of the units currently used for offensive maneuvers should be withdrawn as soon as possible. At a minimum, this should mean another 200,000 men brought home by the first of the year. In other words, unless it becomes obvious that our adversary will take advantage of the pullbacks to prepare all-out assaults on our now secure territories, all offensive troops should be removed. Our days of the offensive in South Vietnam should be over. We must admit that they are basically ineffective and are too costly in terms of human lives to continue. Thus, unless removal of the offensive troops from the secure areas would clearly endanger the defensive troops remaining there, they should be removed immediately. The net result of this action will be to reduce by half our forces in Vietnam by January 1, 1970.

Fourth. After the offensive troops are gone, we should make clear to the Saigon government that the remainder of our forces will be withdrawn by December 1, 1970. This action would be advantageous for several reasons. First, it would assure total withdrawal of all forces by the announced date. All Americans would know that the war would soon be over for their fathers and sons. Second, it would put the Saigon government on final definite notice that as of that date, the Vietnam war was once again, as President Kennedy said it should be, theirs. The importance of this cannot be overemphasized. It is only natural that Thieu and Ky will take their own sweet time about training the ARVN and substituting them for American units as long as we remain there to assure the safety of their Government. If faced with the prospect of protecting their own necks, however, I think a great change of speed and attitude would be perceptible.

A third advantage of this plan of action is that by leaving a substantial number of American forces in our secure areas for several months, we would insure that the bloodbath which many predict the Vietcong would precipitate upon South Vietnam peasants and villagers who had been friendly to us would not occur. By the specified cutoff date, however, the ARVN forces should be ready to hold these positions.

Finally, by pulling over half our troops out by January 1, 1970, with a commitment to remove the remainder by December 1 of that year, we should have both the time and bargaining position to assure the release of all U.S. prisoners of war. Once the opposition sees the sincerity of our efforts to withdraw completely, they ought to be more than willing to meet this demand. Certainly the demand should be the sole non-negotiable condition to the removal of our defensive troops. The point is, whatever be the Vietcong and North Vietnamese initial reaction to this proposal, there will be ample time before we are committed to remove our forces to work out the details of this transfer.

Fifth. Throughout this entire process we should make every effort to encourage the Thieu-Ky government to greatly broaden its base of support. Our troops would be gone by December 1, 1970, but all of us realize that we have sacrificed too much to see South Vietnam end up in the hands of a dictatorship of any stripe. Even more importantly, we would like to see an end to all belligerency in that country. It is quite apparent, however, that neither of these goals will be realized unless and until the Saigon regime takes a more conciliatory approach toward both dissidents loyal to the government and the Vietcong.

A first step would be to cease the unacceptable amount of political repression presently being employed by the Saigon government. The report on political repression in South Vietnam prepared by my distinguished colleague from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and several other prominent religious and civic leaders last summer, clearly indicated that all elements not absolutely supportive of Thieu, Ky, and their ruling elite, were being subjected to constant and severe harassment. That is not the way to unify a country.

Similarly, the pronouncements of the Saigon machine about never accepting a coalition government must be ceased. The Vietcong control more territory—though fewer people—in South Vietnam than Saigon does. Thus, to expect to negotiate a peace settlement without a provision for substantial Communist representation in the ensuing government is pure folly. The only alternative for Saigon is to continue the fighting until all vestiges of the guerillas are wiped out—a task we know for a fact to be an impossible one.

Those are the steps. Replace Lodge and Bunker; retrench American troops in secure positions; pull out 200,000 offensive troops by January 1, 1970; withdraw all remaining forces by December 1, 1970; and put all possible pressure on the Saigon government to become a force of reconciliation and peace. It is,

in my estimation, a workable blueprint. I hope the President and the Congress will take heed of it and accept it.

RESTRUCTURE PRIORITIES

If we can accept it, maybe we will be able to at last return our thoughts to where they should have been all along—with the critical domestic problems facing this Nation. The war has been costly in many ways. Over \$225 million in Federal tax money has been spent on the war from my district alone. We could have used that money in Cleveland, Mr. Speaker—used it for food, schools, clothing, homes, transportation, and to combat the poisoning of our environment. The only memorial to that money now is several hundred Cleveland boys dead or maimed, and a few burned-out villages. It was not worth it.

The important task now, however, is to build on the past, confess the error in our policies, and begin working toward restructuring our national priorities. Our national spirit has been badly demoralized by this war. It has alienated parents from children, students from universities, neighbors from neighbors. It has exacerbated the growing racial crisis, and has impeded social progress on all fronts.

But Americans are a resilient lot. Just as they can be demoralized, they can be revitalized. Their moral energies can once again be harnessed and guided to the betterment of the Nation. To provide this leadership will be our responsibility. It will be our job to see that henceforth our Government will buy bread before bombers, homes before howitzers, and schools before submarines. If we are successful in this effort, America will have turned the corner to world leadership in the coming decades and taken a giant step toward the creation of a peaceful and just society at home.

MAN IN THE BALANCE OF NATURE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Royal Bank of Canada devoted its monthly letter of February 1969, to a discussion of man and his environment. So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read this article, entitled "Man in the Balance of Nature," I include its text at this point in the RECORD:

MAN IN THE BALANCE OF NATURE

Why are people so disturbed about pollution of air and water? It is not simply because they have become more refined and aesthetic, but because they begin to realize that we have reached a critical point in human habitation of the earth.

As far back as 1947 the question before a conference at Princeton University was "the fate of man". Would he go the way of the dodo and the dinosaur? Or would he take his destiny in his own hands and make a better creature of himself? Opinion was divided.

There was no split of opinion at the UNESCO headquarters in Paris last year when more than two hundred experts from fifty countries met in conference. Within twenty

years, they decided, life on our planet will be showing the first signs of succumbing to pollution: the atmosphere will become unbreathable for men and animals; life will cease in rivers and lakes; plants will wither from poisoning.

This opinion was made public following the Inter-Governmental Conference of Experts on the Scientific Bases for the Rational Utilization and Conservation of Biospheric Resources.

The biosphere is the part of the earth and its atmosphere which contains living things. In this layer, only a few miles thick, man is creating far-reaching imbalances. He threatens the stability of his own ecology by destroying resources and burdening his environment with the waste products of his own activities.

The biosphere is so immensely complicated that its workings are imperfectly understood, but it is known that any interaction of factors, however insignificant, can produce repercussions whose chains often span continents or even girdle the earth.

After commenting on the damage done by swift depletion of minerals and forests, the report of the UNESCO Conference in the *Manchester Guardian* goes on: "As cities spread in monstrous fashion the problem of refuse inherent in urban life attains the size of an insoluble problem. Carbon dioxide and all the host of air-borne industrial wastes are fouling the atmosphere and poisoning fresh water. In the last twenty years the whole process has been accelerating at a crazy speed."

WHAT SHALL WE DO?

We must be willing to ask such questions as "What is the meaning of life? What is our relationship with everything around us? What shall we do in the short stretch between birth and death to preserve and improve our inheritance?" We need the courage to ask such questions—as the UNESCO Conference did—with respect and seriousness, and the gumption to do what the answers tell us to do.

There is no better way of giving our lives the dimension of depth than by identifying ourselves as important factors in the balance of nature and putting our weight on the side of conserving what is good, correcting what is wrong, and progressing to something higher in the scale. We were put upon Earth, according to the Book of Genesis, "to dress it and to keep it."

But man has become a prober and a meddler. Fire, the axe, the plow, fire-arms and the bulldozer have been the fundamental tools of our modern culture. We have spurned the fact that Nature is a total of the conditions and principles which influence the existence of living things. Her laws were so contrived that land, water, plants and animals should, and under natural conditions do, exist in harmony and interdependence for perpetual productiveness.

Nature has been at work for a great many millions of years to get things as they are. Cause and effect are tied together like stones in a well-built wall. Without careful investigation you never can tell which is a keystone, the removal of which will bring down a large section of the structure in ruin.

Man is only a comparatively small element in this massive system. As Anthony Tucker put it in his report of the UNESCO Conference: "The system developed without him, determined his evolution, and shaped his dependence on life cycles which in turn were already dependent upon complex living and chemical relationship in a relatively stable environment." It is imperative to his survival that man should recognize his animal nature and live within the boundaries set by his organic world.

Throughout history one species after another of animal and plant has disappeared from the earth, and one culture after an-

other has passed to oblivion, because of inability to adjust to environmental change.

NATURE'S LAWS

We are, then, an integral part of our environment. "Nature" embraces all existing things—fields, oceans, mountains, forests, deserts, the wild creatures . . . and human beings. We are part of it, and we must live in concert with it.

Our discovery of nature's laws does not mean entering a state of slavery. On the contrary, once we know what they are we can learn to co-operate with them, and by so co-operating increase our own freedom within them. Take fire as an example: we learned far back in our aboriginal state that fire burns you if you touch it, not to punish you, but because that is the natural law of fire. From there we went on to use fire for our useful purposes within the bounds of its law.

Ecology is the science concerned with the relation of living things to their environment, and with the factors which influence that environment. It is an expression of the realization that man must give over trying to mould the rest of the natural world to his wishes without adequate understanding of the laws that govern it.

What are some of the things needful to know? The subject is so vast that no human mind has ever fathomed all its secrets, but the basic principles are becoming known. First and foremost is the lesson so hard to learn: that Nature is the expression of a definite order with which nothing interferes successfully, and that the chief business of men is to learn that order and govern themselves accordingly.

Consider our disregard for plant life. The green leaf pigment, called chlorophyll, is the sole link between the sun and life: it is the conduit of energy to our frail organisms. Every plant, even the most humble, even algae, the simplest form in the vegetable kingdom, is a specialist, adapted by its habit of growth and its special requirement for light and moisture, to grow best in its preferred environment, and there to fulfill its destiny in serving Nature's purpose.

Let disaster strike the microscopic plants upon which the tier of life is built, and whole organizations will come tumbling down. The forces we set in motion to carry out our great projects move out to affect the lives of other creatures, and come back to act upon us.

Our worst conservation problems owe their existence largely to our short-sighted preoccupation with our immediate affairs, our personal lives, our ignorance of our place in the balance of nature. A person who has once perceived the greatness of nature's smallest creature or flower, can no longer be happy if he allows himself to be petty, self-seeking, and greedy in his dealing with Nature.

Because there are men and women who have not received this vision, it is necessary to have man-made laws to enforce the laws of nature.

Why should anti-pollution regulations raise objections? Do they restrict our freedom, that word so cherished in democracies? So do traffic laws and signals, which limit the freedom of action of the driver of the automobile. None the less, intelligent drivers gladly obey the regulations, even when there is no policeman at the corner to enforce them, because they know that in the absence of such organization of traffic their freedom to move in a chosen direction would be enormously more impeded by traffic jams and accidents.

On a higher scale than enforcement by law is the self-regulation taught to Boy Scouts: always leave the camping ground better than you find it. There are unwritten laws observed by woodsmen and mountain climbers: not to kill a porcupine or a fool hen unless there is no other food to be had; al-

ways replenish the wood-pile at a shelter hut to at least the size it was when you took shelter there.

SOMETHING ABOUT MEDDLING

Meddling with small parts of a related whole produces evil consequences. Whatever we do in altering nature must be done in full awareness of Nature's reactions to and on ourselves.

For lack of adequate knowledge, much of our manipulation is based on technological criteria without thought of its over-all biological results. Some of this tampering starts a chain of events that upsets the balance of nature with destructive effects.

Consider the undisputed facts of life in the soil. These facts were studied by the UNESCO Conference and reported by Mr. Tucker. Something like forty billion tons of vegetable material are made and destroyed on the earth every year. The mass of land animals and smaller organisms amounts to less than one per cent of the vegetation. Of this tiny "zoomass" (which includes man) some 95 per cent consists of invertebrate organisms with crucial roles in the decomposition processes of the life cycle. Since they form an essential part of the natural capital it is utterly profligate to bring about their mass destruction through indiscriminate use of such things as nonselective pesticides.

Irresponsible chemical eradication of weed and insect pests presents not only a serious threat to wildlife conservation but holds out the danger of contamination to human beings. A pesticide, possibly used to kill rats in a wheat field, was blamed for the death of seventeen children in Mexico. Alfalfa that had been sprayed with DDT was fed to cows by scientists. The cream was churned to butter, the butter was fed to rats, and the still toxic DDT was found in their body fat in substantial amounts.

OUR POISONED WATER

What use is it to make a fetish of cleanliness of the body, of hair, of teeth, if we continue to pour sewage into rivers, thence to be carried inside our bodies?

In one midwestern city in the United States, as John H. Storer tells us in *The Web of Life*, tests of the city's water showed that during the period of low water in the winter it was one-half straight sewage.

Water, the most important natural resource, can be the medium for the transmission of germs and toxic substances. The World Health Organization reports that about five million children die every year from intestinal diseases caused by water.

There is a point at which the rivers themselves rebel. The load of poisons from city sewers, factories, slaughter-houses and farm lands becomes unsupportable. These kill the cleansing plants, use up the purifying oxygen in the water, and clog up the filtering gravel.

Once the mass of pollution exceeds a certain amount, animal and vegetable life disappears; the river dies.

To clean up our lakes and rivers we must deal with many types of man-made pollutants: detergents, fertilizers, insecticides, weed-killers, sewage, industrial waste, and hundreds of other products. This clean-up does not involve primarily treatment, but prevention, and some movement is being made in that direction by municipalities and industries.

Our lakes are dying. The United States public health service has warned shippers in Lake Erie that water within five miles of the shoreline should not be used for drinking or cooking. This stretch of near-shore water is so polluted that even boiling or chlorination will not remove the contamination. Farther out, pollution has stimulated the growth of vegetation, using up oxygen, so that a large expanse of dead water has developed.

In 1965, Dr. G. B. Langford, F.R.S.C., Director of the Great Lakes Institute, University

of Toronto, concluded a report *The Great Lakes and Their Problems* in this way: "Governments in the United States are facing up to the situation much more realistically than are those in Canada. The insignificant support of research in the Great Lakes by the governments of Canada stands in sharp contrast to what our neighbours are doing. An unbiased observer would wonder if we actually share these lakes, for we do not share the responsibility of saving them from the pending disaster."

OUR POLLUTED AIR

Hamlet put it this way: "This most excellent canopy, the air, this brave o'erhanging firmament . . . appeareth nothing to me but a foul and pestilent congregation of vapours."

Today we seem to look upon smog and air pollution as incidents of urban life, until a public health disaster such as the death of 4,000 people in London's smog in 1952 calls our attention to the fact that this can be a killing negligence.

At least a hundred air pollutants have been identified, and their interaction produces others.

The cost of air pollution in Canada has been estimated at from \$20 to \$65 per person, depending on where he lives. This is for laundering, painting, cleaning of buildings, filtering of air, and doctors' bills.

But cost and loss in dollars and cents do not tell the whole story. Air pollution constitutes a serious hazard to health. Atmosphere pollution has been found to lower resistance to disease, to reduce vitality, and to increase sickness. Relatively low levels of air pollution may be involved in the development of chronic degenerative diseases, including skin and lung cancer, heart and vascular disorders, and chronic bronchitis. Paul Kotin, of the University of California, has established that several of the organic compounds produced by the combustion of gasoline and diesel oil are carcinogenic.

The best means of preventing combustion-caused pollution is simple: use better combustion equipment. This improvement should be insisted upon by those who have the responsibility for community welfare and hold the legal power to enforce it.

RESTORING THE BALANCE

Some people who have not thought seriously about the matter shy away from the word "conservation" under the misapprehension that it means "stop using". Resource conservation is fundamentally nothing more than wise use of our resources in accordance with the laws of nature.

Personal conscience is the beginning of any effective conservation effort. A Washington State Supreme Court decision reads: "An unwritten compact between the dead, the living, and the unborn requires that we leave the unborn something more than debts and depleted natural resources."

Nature maintained her balance for millions of years, but she is now up against something new. All other participants in nature live by habit and instinct but men try to manage things, to force things into new ways. Their conceited and arrogant interference has brought about the deterioration in living conditions which alarms us, the extinction of many animals and plants, and the defilement of air and water.

Now that their continued existence is shown to be at stake men are called upon to rethink many things, to relearn lessons long forgotten, and to get back on the right road.

Our research and its findings and the lessons it teaches give hope to a world as yet largely unconscious of the gravity of its situation. Scientists and research people do not make laws, but discover them. The laws of nature are there, and scientists find them so that we may obey them.

This involves a new duty: communication. The facts of the balance of nature and

man's part in it must be presented to the people of all countries in understandable terms. By this means scientists can place the decision about these grave issues in the proper hands.

No municipal, provincial or national effort to preserve the balance of nature can be effective unless it is pressed for and adequately supported by informed public opinion. Every citizen need not be an expert in this or that branch of science, but he should know what the scientists are talking about, what the technicians are doing, and what his elected governments should be doing.

What could be a higher ideal than that of an intelligent informed citizenry with an attitude toward nature that is based upon an understanding and knowledge of man's dependence on his total environment? An effective programme with this end in view is being carried out by the 4-H Clubs in Canada. By intelligent and sympathetic guidance, these young people are learning conservation as a way of life.

REDEMPTION

We have disregarded our place in the balance of nature for long enough, and we are face to face with our man-made conflict between the principle of freedom to use up and the principle of husbandry to use wisely and replenish. We can imagine the trees and the wild creatures and the earth itself watching and listening, alive and aware, holding their breaths in anticipation of what their human neighbours will do with their common heritage.

We face the hard task of putting natural forces to work in restoration and redemption. We need to deal with the necessary steps one at a time and with reasonable judgment.

Government programmes are being established, but at a snail's pace. They cannot succeed until they are enlarged to match the size of the problems, and until citizens are ready to pay the huge bill which we have already incurred by our assaults on the quality of our environment.

Political and geographical boundaries must not be allowed to impede the national effort. The first conservation duty of a city is to clean itself, and fastidious citizens will see that it does so. Then it must work hand-in-hand with adjoining municipalities, for how can people close their minds to the fact that much of the water flowing from their kitchen taps has already passed through other people's drains? Counties and townships and provinces are interlinked in any honest attempt to restore the balance of nature.

All of these divisions need to give attention to another aspect of nature. Our country-side is becoming wearied with the constant encroachment of factories and housing developments. Men pleading specious needs violate parks, forests and wildernesses. They ruin for all time what the time of man on earth cannot replace.

We need people rich enough in understanding and imagination, and strong enough in fibre, to insist that adequate forests and outdoor space be left to be admired, not destroyed. Unless natural outdoor spaces remain, young people are denied their instinctive wanderings. Trapped in city corridors, enmeshed in sprawling suburbs, empty of heart, mind and hand, cheated of experiences that are by nature necessary to them, they will turn their energies to protest and to evil.

When a young person goes for a stroll or paddles his canoe in a nature park he realizes that he is not merely an observer of nature, but a part of nature. His troubles grow petty, not because they are unreal, but because they dissolve within the larger plan.

A VALUE JUDGMENT

Man, part of nature, has become enticed into a nearly fatal illusion: that his skills in

science and technology make him independent of the laws of nature.

He spread insecticides without examining into whether they would be fatal to birds and beneficial insects and might kill people. He poured millions of pounds of detergents into rivers before learning that they polluted the water. He allowed lakes to die of oxygen starvation. He contributed to the deadliness of smog by floating noxious substances into the air.

What is required is a value judgment which compares the known risks with the anticipated benefits. This is where conscience and intelligence enter the scene. Said Barry Commoner in his powerful article entitled "Pollution: Time to Face the Consequences" in the mid-summer 1968 *Think*: "No scientific procedure can tell us how many defective births from fallout radiation we ought to tolerate for the sake of a new nuclear weapon. . . . No scientific principle can tell us how to make the choice—which may be forced upon us by the insecticide problem—between the shade of the elm tree and the song of the robin. . . . The necessary judgments are therefore the responsibility, not of scientists and technologists alone, but of all citizens."

Man emerged on this space ship Earth and is biologically bound to it forever. The message from the UNESCO Conference to world governments and people is that either they keep the space ship healthy or we die with it.

What is the paramount thing? To come to nature with clean hands, unsoiled by spoilage, destruction and waste. This involves a great deal of governmental wisdom, a lot of scientific research, and a lot of engineering ingenuity. Behind all these must be the pressure of public demand.

BANKING INSTITUTIONS IN THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, on September 23, 1969, I introduced H.R. 13928, a bill addressed to the problems faced by banking institutions in the National Capital region. This bill is identical to S. 2569 introduced by Senators SPARKMAN and BENNETT. Hearings were held by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee last week on S. 2569. The Federal Reserve Board reported on these hearings.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly impressed by the thoughtful report submitted by the Federal Reserve Board in support of this legislation. I would like to share this report with my colleagues. I am therefore inserting it at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM MCC. MARTIN, JR.,
CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS
OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

I appreciate your invitation to present the views of the Board of Governors on S. 2569, which would amend section 3(d) of the Bank Holding Company Act to allow bank holding companies in the District of Columbia to expand into the suburbs, and grant reciprocal privileges to Maryland and Virginia holding companies.

Section 3(d) prohibits the Board from approving an acquisition by a bank holding company of a bank located outside the State in which the holding company's banking operations are principally conducted, unless the

acquisition is specifically authorized by State statute. S. 2569 would add two exceptions to section 3(d). Under the first, a holding company whose banking operations are principally conducted in the District of Columbia on the date of enactment (or when it becomes a holding company if that is later) might acquire, with the Board's approval, banks located in Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland and in Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun, and Prince William Counties and the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church in Virginia. Under the second, a holding company whose banking operations are principally conducted in either Maryland or Virginia on the date of enactment (or when it becomes a holding company if that is later) might acquire banks located in the District of Columbia. However, the authority of a holding company to expand the scope of its operations across State lines might be affected by State laws in view of section 7 of the Act, which reserves to the States their rights with respect to banks, bank holding companies, and subsidiaries thereof.

The Board believes that the unique situation in Washington merits special consideration. In its application to the District of Columbia section 3(d) is obviously far more restrictive than it is with respect to any other area. A rule adopted with States like California in mind is unrealistic as applied to an area of 61 square miles that is entirely metropolitan and entirely surrounded by expanding suburbs. The inequity of the situation with respect to the City of Washington is more apparent now than it was when section 3(d) was enacted in 1956. The two States that surround Washington permit banks located therein to expand State-wide, and State-wide banking organizations have become prevalent in recent years in both States. Several of such organizations have offices located in the Washington metropolitan area.

The Board believes that permitting banking organizations in the District of Columbia to establish offices in the suburbs and vice versa would be beneficial to the community interest by promoting competition and facilitating the allocation of resources in meeting credit demands.

Other provisions of section 3 of the Act afford protection against abuses of the proposed new authority. Under section 3(b) of the Act, the Board is required, upon receipt of an application for its approval of a proposed acquisition by a holding company of a State-chartered bank, to inform the appropriate supervisory authority of the interested State. If such authority opposes approval of the application, the Board must order a hearing and permit all interested parties to testify on the proposed transaction.

Protection against potentially anticompetitive effects arising from enactment of S. 2569 is provided by section 3(c) of the Act and the antitrust laws. Under section 3(c) the Board may not approve an acquisition that would have serious anticompetitive effects, unless it finds that such effects are clearly outweighed in the public interest by the probable effect of the transaction in meeting the convenience and needs of the community to be served. And section 11 of the Act requires the Board to notify the Attorney General of its approval of any acquisition, and establishes procedures under which the Attorney General may invoke the antitrust laws to prevent the consummation of the transaction, despite the Board's approval.

A possible alternative approach to accomplish the purposes of S. 2569 would be to modify the Federal branch banking law (12 U.S.C. 36) to permit national banks (and State member banks so far as Federal law is concerned) with offices located in the Washington metropolitan area to establish new

banking offices throughout such area, with the approval of the appropriate Federal supervisory agency and, in the case of a State-chartered bank, with the approval of its State supervisor. This new-branch alternative might tend to minimize any potentially anti-competitive effects in removing the barrier of political boundaries to the expansion of banking organizations.

A third approach by which District banks might appropriately be permitted to enter the suburbs and suburban banks to enter the District would be by direct acquisition of an existing banking office through purchase of assets, merger, or consolidation. Federal law provides the same kind of protection against harmful consequences resulting from such direct acquisitions as it does for bank acquisitions by a bank holding company.

In the Board's judgment, each of these approaches has merit. However, under the approach of S. 2569, approval of entry by District bank holding companies into the suburbs and Maryland or Virginia holding companies into the District would be centralized in the Board. Although such centralization of authority is not critical to appropriate expansion of banking offices, it would assure that the relevant considerations in expanding banking offices across State lines to the limited extent permitted by the bill are considered on a uniform basis, which would seem to be desirable in departing from the rules based on political boundaries.

In one respect the provisions of S. 2569 may go further than necessary. If a District of Columbia based holding company acquired a bank in the Maryland suburbs, there is nothing in the bill as introduced to prevent the subsidiary Maryland bank from establishing branches throughout the State. We question whether the new authority to expand in the metropolitan area should be used to expand throughout Maryland and Virginia. Accordingly, the bill should provide that a Virginia or Maryland bank acquired by a District of Columbia based holding company may not have a banking office outside the metropolitan area.

The Board recommends enactment of S. 2569 with an amendment as suggested in the immediately preceding paragraph.

My State of California has lived with the problem of large credit demands for many, many years. It seems to me that California has so approached its public policies as to meet these demands promptly and adequately. I am pleased to see this imaginative approach adopted by the Federal Reserve Board to meet the large credit demands that loom ahead for the National Capital region.

LABELING OF FOODS CONTAINING HIGH CHOLESTEROL CONTENT

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I had previously placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies of my correspondence with the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I pointed out at that time that the question of proper labeling was "a matter of some urgency to people who are on anti-cholesterol diets," which usually are rec-

ommended by their physicians to minimize possible incidence of heart disease.

In furtherance of my campaign for proper labeling of foods to reflect their fat content, I am attaching copies of letters which I have mailed to and received from Dr. Campbell Moses, medical director of the American Heart Association. I also am attaching hereto, Mr. Speaker, a copy of my letter of October 10 to Dr. Herbert L. Ley, Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand why Dr. Ley continues to procrastinate in coming to a decision in this important matter. He has the authority to require labeling which will protect the public in this very important respect and I trust he will be moved to take action on the matter promptly.

OCTOBER 1, 1969.

DR. CAMPBELL MOSES,
Medical Director, American Heart Association, New York, N.Y.

DEAR DR. MOSES: Mr. Merliss of the Public Health Service said that you may be interested in the fight I am having with the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to properly label foods containing high cholesterol content. I am enclosing a copy of the Congressional Record for September 29 and invite your attention to my comments beginning on page 27398.

I would appreciate any comments you care to make on the point I have made.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, N.Y., October 8, 1969.

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. YATES: In support of your efforts to have the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service insist on proper labeling of foods, I am enclosing the statement of the American Heart Association on Diet and Heart Disease and copies of our recent correspondence with Dr. Herbert L. Ley, Jr. in this matter.

If you can move this labeling problem off dead center, we will all be in your debt.

Very truly yours,

CAMPBELL MOSES, M.D.,
Medical Director.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., January 23, 1969.

CAMPBELL MOSES, M.D.,
Medical Director,
American Heart Association, Inc.,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR DR. MOSES: This letter responds to your inquiry of January 14, 1969, concerning the labeling of foods with respect to fat content and composition.

We have before us proposals for labeling foods with information about their saturated and polyunsaturated fat content. These proposals are currently under extensive study, and we have made no commitment as to the course which we will take in this important matter.

You may be assured that if the conclusion is reached that a final regulation or statement of policy should be issued in this area, such a step will not be taken without ample opportunity for comment and discussion on the part of all who may be interested.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT L. LEY, JR., M.D.,
Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

JANUARY 14, 1969.

HERBERT L. LEY, M.D.,
Commissioner,
Food and Drug Administration,
Arlington, Va.

DEAR DOCTOR LEY: As the problem of permissive labeling of the fat content and composition of foods has been bubbling up and down for a long time, I would appreciate word from your office as to the present status.

Thank you for past courtesies and for this present one.

Very truly yours,

CAMPBELL MOSES, M.D.,
Medical Director.

DIET AND HEART DISEASE

(This statement was developed by the Committee on Nutrition and authorized for release by the Central Committee for Medical and Community Program of the American Heart Association)

The development of atherosclerotic coronary artery disease is influenced by many factors; among the factors associated with an increase in this disease are:

1. A familial history of coronary heart disease; the presence of diabetes mellitus, hyperlipidemia, gout, hypertension, obesity, and certain personality characteristics.
2. Sex and age: Men are generally more susceptible than women and both become increasingly susceptible with advancing years.
3. Environmental factors such as a diet rich in saturated fat and cholesterol, cigarette smoking, and habitual physical inactivity.

There is growing evidence that the early identification and correction of these risk factors may favorably influence the course of coronary disease. For this reason, the American Heart Association has urged the implementation of risk factor identification programs (Risk Factors and Coronary Disease; a Statement for Physicians, A.H.A. 1968).

The fact that control of diet is one method of correcting or modifying some of these risk factors led the American Heart Association to release two previous reports (1961 and 1965) on the relationships between diet and atherosclerosis. Since that time, additional supporting data have been accumulated, particularly on the effects of diet on the occurrence rate of myocardial infarction.¹⁻⁵ Accordingly, the American Heart Association, through its advisors, has revised its Statement on Diet and Heart Disease to include these reports.⁶

It is most important to note that much of the data currently available on the relationship of diet to coronary artery disease are from studies using subjects unusually susceptible to coronary disease or atypical of the general population of the United States. There is an urgent need for more tightly designed, prospective studies involving larger numbers of healthy subjects so as to provide an unequivocal answer. A report on the feasibility of the dietary modifications for such a study has been published.⁷

It has been repeatedly documented that in populations with high concentrations of serum cholesterol, the frequency of atherosclerotic coronary heart disease is high, whereas in populations with lower concentrations of cholesterol in their serum, the frequency of coronary disease is lower. The evidence now indicates that avoidance of prolonged elevations of serum cholesterol can decrease the hazard of developing premature coronary disease.

It has already been shown that in most (but not all) persons, elevated concentrations of cholesterol in the serum can be decreased significantly and can be maintained at a lower level by conscientious and sustained adherence to a nutritionally sound

modified fat diet.^{8,9} It has been suggested, but it has not been proven, that this type of diet will minimize the progressive rise in serum cholesterol concentration that generally occurs in most adults.

DIETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Although the dietary recommendations in this statement are designed for "healthy" individuals to reduce the risk factors influenced by diet, they are particularly applicable to individuals who are shown to have increased risk as determined by plasma lipid or lipoprotein concentrations.⁷ In general, a diet designed to decrease the risk of coronary heart disease involves the following recommendations:

1. A caloric intake adjusted to achieve and maintain proper weight. Obesity is statistically associated with both hypertension and diabetes, and secondarily, with coronary heart disease. Correction of obesity may also reduce elevated serum lipid concentrations.
2. A decrease in the intake of saturated fats, and an increase in the intake of polyunsaturated fats. This will lower increased concentrations of cholesterol in the serum of most people. The ideal quantity of fat needed in the diet is not known, but an intake of less than 40% of calories from fat is considered desirable. Of this total, polyunsaturated fats should probably comprise twice the quantity of saturated fats. Many studies have shown that saturated fats elevate the serum cholesterol of man and that polyunsaturated fats lower serum cholesterol. The cholesterol-elevating effect of saturated fats is about twice as great as the cholesterol-lowering effect of polyunsaturated fats.

Considerable confusion has resulted from the regulation forbidding manufacturers to label vegetable oil products with their actual polyunsaturated fatty acid content. This has made it difficult to distinguish between a product "made with vegetable oil," but heavily hydrogenated (saturated) in manufacture, and one retaining a high content of polyunsaturates in the final product. Since 1961, many manufacturers have made a substantial effort to increase the polyunsaturate content of vegetable oil shortenings, the lightly-hydrogenated salad and cooking oils, and especially, the tub-type margarines. Accurate labeling would make it possible to identify the brands with a high-polyunsaturated fat content. For the present, margarines that are high in polyunsaturates usually can be identified by the listing of a "liquid oil" first among the ingredients. Margarines and shortenings that are heavily hydrogenated or contain coconut oil, which is quite saturated, are ineffective in lowering the serum cholesterol.

It should be noted that quite commonly, diets severely restricted in fats, with carbohydrate filling out the caloric requirement, may accentuate hypertriglyceridemia. Although the exact role of the triglycerides in atherogenesis is not clearly established, there is increasing evidence that hypertriglyceridemia is associated with an increased incidence of coronary disease in younger men.

3. A substantial reduction of cholesterol in diet. The average daily diet in the United States contains approximately 600 mg. of cholesterol. Sharp reduction in the amount of cholesterol in the diet has been found to lower the concentration of cholesterol in the serum of most people.^{8,10} In hypercholesterolemic individuals, reduction of dietary cholesterol to less than 300 mg. daily is recommended. Because cholesterol is abundant in many protein foods of high biological quality, careful planning is necessary to lower the intake of cholesterol without impairing the intake of foods high in protein.

Other dietary factors: Although there is a great deal of interest in the possible role of other dietary factors^{9,10,11} (simple sugars vs. complex carbohydrates, alcohol, coffee and

artificial sweeteners, such as the cyclamates and saccharin) in the development of coronary heart disease, the available evidence is incomplete. Dependence on foods such as vegetables, cereals and fruits to supply most of the dietary carbohydrates is preferable to excessive use of sugar including candy, soft drinks and other sweets.

In the application of these recommendations to family groups with a high incidence of coronary disease and/or with risk factors, any change in the diet must preserve the principles of good nutrition. Although nutritional requirements differ during certain periods of the normal life cycle, the demands for optimal nutrition during periods of growth and development of infants, children and adolescents, and of pregnant and lactating women can be met by appropriate modifications of the recommendations under these dietary principles.¹⁰ Dietary habits which are formed during the developing years may continue life-long and influence the severity of atherosclerosis in later life. Diets similar to those recommended herein have been consumed by many persons for periods of more than ten years without any evidence, clinical or biochemical, of deleterious effects.

As already mentioned, coronary heart disease is a result of many factors. Diets rich in saturated fat and cholesterol represent one important risk factor that can be safely modified. Dietary management does not exclude appropriate use of drugs and other measures for control of risk factors.

This statement is designed primarily for the scientific community. A more detailed discussion of this subject is contained in "Modern Concepts of Cardiovascular Disease" for September-October, 1968.⁷ The American Heart Association has translated these dietary recommendations into several publications which are available to the general public and to patients through local Heart Associations and the AHA:

FOR PATIENTS, ON A DOCTOR'S PRESCRIPTION ONLY

Planning Fat-controlled meals for 1200-1800 calories (Em 288).

Planning Fat-Controlled Meals for Approximately 2000-2600 Calories (Em 288A).

FOR THE GENERAL PUBLIC, NO PRESCRIPTION REQUIRED

Two companion booklets, The Way To a Man's Heart (Em 455) and Recipes for Fat-Controlled, Low Cholesterol Meals (Em 455A).

All of the publications listed above are available to physicians, dietitians and others in related professions.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Stamler, J., et al: Coronary risk factors. Their impact and their therapy in the prevention of coronary artery disease. Med. Clin. N. Amer. 50: 229-254, (Jan.) 1966.

² Stamler, J., et al: Epidemiological studies on atherosclerotic coronary heart disease: causative factors and consequent preventive approaches. Progress in Biochemical Pharmacology 4: 30-49, 1968.

³ Turpeinen, O., et al: Dietary prevention of coronary heart disease; long-term experiment. Am. J. Clin. Nutrition 21: 255-276, (April) 1968.

⁴ Loren, P.: Effect of plasma cholesterol lowering diet in male survivors of myocardial infarction, a controlled clinical trial. Oslo, Universitets forlaget, 1966, 92 pp. Also published as Acta Med. Scandinav. suppl 466/1966.

⁵ Christakis, George, and Rinzler, S. H.: Diet. Section C, chapt. 10 in Schettler, G., and Boyd, G., ed. Arteriosclerosis: Pathology, Physiology, Actiology, Diagnosis and Clinical Management. Amsterdam, Elsevier Publishing Company. In preparation.

⁶ National Diet-Heart Study Research Group: National Diet-Heart Study: final re-

port, N.Y., American Heart Association, 1968, 428 pp. (AHA Monograph no. 18) originally published as Circulation 37 suppl. 1 (Mar.) 1968.

⁷ Page, I. H., and Stamler, J.: Diet and coronary heart disease, Parts I and II, Modern Concepts of Cardiovascular Disease; 27: 119-123; 125-128, (Sept.-Oct.), 1968.

⁸ Connor, W. E., Stone, D. B., and Hodges, R. E.: Interrelated effects of dietary cholesterol and fat upon human serum lipid levels. J. Clin. Invest. 43: 1691-1696 (Aug.) 1964.

⁹ Hodges, R. E., Krehl, W. A., Stone, D. B., and Lopez, A.: Dietary carbohydrates, and low cholesterol diets: effects on serum lipids of man. Am. J. Clin. Nutrition 20: 198-208 (Feb.) 1967.

¹⁰ National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, Food and Nutrition Board. Recommended Dietary Allowances 6th rev. ed. Washington, D.C., The Council, 1964. (NAS-NRC publication no. 1146.) 7th ed. in press.

¹¹ McGandy, R. B., Hegstedt, D. M., Myers, M. I., and Stare, F. J.: Dietary carbohydrate and serum cholesterol levels in man. Am. J. Clin. Nutrition 18: 237-242 (April) 1966.

OCTOBER 10, 1969.

DR. HERBERT L. LEY, JR.,
Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration,
Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service,
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. LEY: I am enclosing the Congressional Record for September 29 which contains my correspondence with the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I call your attention to the letters I have received from the National Heart Institute and the pamphlet I am enclosing from the American Heart Association. You apparently have had this matter under consideration for more than nine months. How long must it take for your Service to come to a decision on such an important matter?

Sincerely,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

A PERUVIAN MISINTERPRETATION OF HOUSE ACTION ON FISHERIES

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, my position, and indeed that of the majority of the Members of the House of Representatives, has been misinterpreted by a Peruvian magazine regarding the fisheries dispute between our two countries.

The magazine Pesca in the July 1969, edition, carried an article entitled, "Our Fishing Industry Confronting 'Amendments,'" and in it a rather nationalistic view is cast toward actions of this body that have been taken as measures to get the issues dividing our countries to the negotiating table.

Mr. Speaker, as everyone here knows, what is needed is traditional friendliness between our countries both during the negotiations and following them. These four-party talks between the United States, Chile, Ecuador, and Peru already have begun and hopefully the next round will be conducted before the end of the year.

Again I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that there is no need for a fight over the claim of 200-mile jurisdiction by these Latin American countries. To me, that is not a negotiable issue anymore than is our 12-mile limit. What I reiterate is that settlement be made on the basis of historical fishing rights to the sea, for this is an area of the Eastern Pacific historically fished by Americans and agreement should be reached as has been the case with Canada and Mexico in this regard. Once historic rights are given American fishermen, then we can get down to discussions of more and better trade between our nations and the serious matter of conservation. Any good farmer never takes more out of his soil than he puts in it, and this is the same way the resources of Peru should be treated. And, frankly, the United States has not followed such a policy in Latin America.

It is my sincere desire, Mr. Speaker, that future articles will appear in Pesca about the great contributions that are being made to the economies of Peru and the United States as a result of resolving disputes including the fisheries matters.

For the information of my colleagues, under unanimous consent, the translation of the aforementioned article appears at this point in the RECORD:

[From Pesca (Fishing), a Peruvian magazine of worldwide circulation, Vol. XIX, July 1969, No. 1]

OUR FISHING INDUSTRY CONFRONTING "AMENDMENTS"

We have to admit under duress that in the Peru-U.S. controversy over the extension of the territorial waters and the proposal to reduce the two hundred miles of the Peruvian Sea to twelve miles, the representatives of the State of California in the U.S. Congress are winning the battle thanks to Representative Pelly, the Republican from the State of Washington and those instigated by the influential "pressure group" composed of the tuna fish canning manufacturers and the shipowners of San Pedro and San Diego, California.

They are winning because of their expeditious way of cutting the Gordian knot in this dispute in favor of the above industrialists. The "Pelly amendments" and their system of sanctions and reprisals tend to impose as a legitimate "right" the demand that nobody in the territorial waters of the South Pacific must hinder the acts of piracy of the California tuna boats carried out by these stubborn clandestine robbers of the Peruvian fishing grounds. In order to overcome the resistance of the seashore states in the defense of their sovereign rights, the "amendments" provide for the application of measures of economic aggression which, in an effort to protect the impunity of the acts of piracy, are a revival of the imperialist "Big Stick" policy, the old and ominous U.S. policy of this club.

But since Peru does not have to yield to threats and compulsion, this can only be a Pyrrhic victory, as it could, at the same time, bring about a U.S. defeat. The most shameful defeat, indeed, caused by the rejection and the bankruptcy of the principles and statements on U.S. international policy that had forged the false image of an Uncle Sam, professing to be a cooperator and friend of Latin America, the promoter of its development without ulterior imperialist motives, and a state that had respected the sovereignty and rights of the Latin American countries. It will put an end to the friendly inter-Americanism that had started with the "good neighbor" policy and which allowed the building of the bridges of cordial under-

standing and cooperation between North and South America, which Representative Pelly is dynamiting now.

He now seeks to obtain approval of his third constitutional amendment against the Peruvian fishing industry and economy. As a reprisal against the detention of U.S. fishing boats, which operate without a license within the 200 miles, the amendment provides that the U.S. market will be closed to imports of fish flour and fishery products (bonito canned goods) from Peru.

The United States buys from us approximately half a million tons of fish flour which is, more and less, the quantity produced by the U.S.-funded enterprises that operate in our shore areas. The remaining million and a half tons of the national production (a little more than two million tons in 1968) find a ready market in the European, Asian and Latin American countries.

If the third Pelly amendment will be approved and applied to our country, then it appears fair to demand that in such an emergency the exclusively Peruvian production be given export priority to the available ultra-continental markets. This means: that the flour export licenses to these markets be given only to Peruvian-funded enterprises and not to the U.S.-funded fishing industries which must look for new markets for their products or else suffer themselves the economic damage which their fellow countryman Pelly intends to inflict on Peru.

In view of the third "amendment" proposed in the House by U.S. Representative Thomas Pelly, Republican from the State of Washington and as an antidote against his poisonous proposals—poisonous for the economy of our country and its fishing industries—the following "Quispe" Amendment has been conceived in Peru.

"Quispe" in this case is a purely symbolic name, standing for the Peruvian fisherman, this half-breed of European and Indian parentage of the Peruvian coast who by vocation and heritage is the representative of a thousand-year-old fishing tradition, a natural born sailor who likes the hard work at sea. Since the Peruvian fishermen would be the ones Mr. Pelly's sanctions would hit most, it only appears fair that the Peruvian reply carry this symbolic name.

The "Quispe Amendment" has been devised and prepared for execution, in the event the third amendment should be approved by the U.S. Congress, promulgated by the Washington Government and applied to Peru. If, for some reason, said amendment will not be approved—which appears to be probable now for the reasons we will give later—the "Quispe Amendment" logically will not be carried out either.

The U.S. legislative amendment is a law that has the character of a constitutional mandate that will force the Chief Executive to comply. This is not the case with the "Quispe Amendment" which is only a measure of protection and defense against a U.S. Congressional decision that would amount to an act of economic aggression against Peru.

"QUISPE" VERSUS PELLY

Acting as the spokesman and forceful representative of interests that are not those of the State he represents, but clearly the interests of the tuna canning manufacturers and the tuna ship owners of San Pedro and San Diego, California—in whose service he has placed his influence as a legislator of great prestige and of high Congressional seniority—Thomas Pelly has attacked our country like a bulldog his prey.

His vigorous bites are visible in three successive amendments:

The first of these amendments—already being applied to Peru—prohibits the sale of firearms and military equipment (for the continental defense), to the countries that prevent fishing boats flying the U.S. flag from fishing in those waters which these

countries consider to be territorial waters and which the United States is determined to consider as international waters where fishing is free.

The second amendment, already approved but not yet put into force, strictly applies to the fishing problem of one of the Hickenlooper amendments. It provides that the fines, a country imposes on U.S. fishing boats, be deducted from the foreign aid given to that country.

The third of the Pelly amendments—which at the time of this writing has been under consideration by the U.S. House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee whose preliminary sessions were temporarily suspended—closes the U.S. market to the Peruvian fish flour, Peruvian bonito canned goods and frozen tuna.

The proposed measure is decidedly a sanction and a reprisal against the detention of California fishing boats which operate without license in the Peruvian Pacific area. Authentically, however, it is an act of compulsion applied to assure the impunity of the tuna piracy carried out by these vessels in Peruvian waters; a new "Big Stick" policy which instead of debarking marines for the purpose of taking possession of foreign territory, now uses economic aggression as a means of intimidation for the purpose of taking possession of fish and other resources—the tuna fish of the Peruvian Sea. According to a statement made in Washington by a spokesman of Pelly, it, hypocritically, is not interpreted to be a "punitive measure" but a "method of compelling Peru to start negotiating with the United States" on the two hundred mile issue and the common exploitation of its fish resources. Unfortunately for Pelly, there is not and there will not be a "Big Stick" of any sort, no matter how drastic, that would force Peru to negotiate under compulsion and intimidation threats.

As a countermeasure against this third amendment the "Quispe Amendment" has been devised with the general consensus of the fishing industry. It will be applied—we repeat—only in the event the third amendment should be approved and applied to our country.

With regard to the proposed close of the U.S. markets to the fish flour, the "Quispe Amendment", on its part, proposes the close of the other markets for this product (the markets of Europe, Asia and Latin America) that is, for the fish flour produced by the U.S. fishing industry in our coastal areas.

In order to carry out the close of the other available markets to the "United States" fish flour production in Peru, the "Quispe Amendment" recommends the following expeditious procedure: Export licenses—without which products cannot be shipped from Peruvian ports—would be only granted to the exclusively Peruvian fishing enterprises which are entirely funded by national capital. In the case of mixed enterprises (Peruvian-U.S.), [licenses would be granted] to that part of the production carried out by the associated Peruvian enterprise.

The export licenses, of course, would not be granted to the U.S.-funded "flour" enterprises that operate in our country. Likewise, in the case of mixed enterprises, [licenses would not be granted] to that part of the production carried out by the U.S. enterprise. Furthermore, such licenses would not be granted as long as no new markets will be open to the sale of the tonnage immobilized by the close of the U.S. markets.

This tonnage and the one produced by the U.S.-funded enterprises in our coastal areas are more or less the same.

In 1968, the United States bought from Peru 550,418 metric tons of fish flour which represents 25 percent of last year's "fish flour" production valued at \$55,041,300. The U.S. likewise, bought 20,000 boxes of canned

bonito (there are 48—7 oz. cans to a box) for \$159,000 and 432 tons of mainly frozen tuna for \$330,000.

Meanwhile, the total output of the U.S.-funded fishing enterprises in our coastal areas amount to approximately half a million tons of fish flour. American-owned is likewise the only enterprise that uses tuna ships for the export of frozen tuna to California.

CENTENNIAL OF THE VILLAGE OF GARDEN CITY

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, this year the village of Garden City, N.Y., is celebrating its 100th anniversary. This is a great event in the history of the village which still stands as a model community and an example of what the suburban way of life can mean to those who enjoy its benefits.

On October 23, a time capsule is to be buried adjacent to a recently erected statue of the founder of the village of Garden City, Mr. Alexander Turney Stewart. I am placing a history of the village in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the purpose of having a copy of the RECORD buried in the time capsule. This worthy project is being sponsored by the Garden City Kiwanis Club and I congratulate them for their efforts. The history follows:

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF GARDEN CITY

Garden City, roughly nineteen miles from New York City, is located in the western section of central Nassau County in the Township of Hempstead. It is ninety feet above sea level and covers 3,390 acres, or approximately 5.3 square miles. On the north it is bounded by New Hyde Park, Garden City Park, Mineola and Carle Place; on the east by the unincorporated areas of the Town of Hempstead, comprising Roosevelt Field Shopping Center and what was once Mitchel Field; on the south by Hempstead, West Hempstead, Munson and Franklin Square; and on the west by Stewart Manor and New Hyde Park. It is basically coterminous with School District No. 18.

The Village owes its origin to Alexander Turney Stewart, multimillionaire merchant of New York of a century ago, who in 1869 purchased for 55 dollars an acre, 7,170 acres of the treeless Hempstead Plains from the Township of Hempstead, and in the next seven years planned, laid out and built Garden City on the western end of this tract, between Mineola and Hempstead Village. The first dwelling completed was on Rockaway Road, corner of First Street and cost about \$12,000. This house was used as a temporary office by John Kellum who with Mr. Stewart was in charge of the development and planning of the new village.

On his death in 1876, the little Village, now central Garden City, could boast of broad dignified streets, parks, a small artificial lake, a large mansard-roofed hotel, stores, stables, an estate manager's building, a great well and waterworks, a gas plant, sixty attractive Victorian houses and thousands of newly planted trees and shrubs. Beside this Mr. Stewart had built his own railroad, the Central Railroad Company of Long Island, which ran from Flushing through Floral Park to Garden City, and from there out through

the length of his purchase to Bethpage, with a spur from Garden City to Hempstead as well.

As the sole heir to the estate, Mrs. Stewart not only continued work on the Village, but built the Cathedral of the Incarnation as a memorial to her husband; built St. Paul's School and the Bishop's House; provided for the future building of St. Mary's School and for the endowment of the Diocesan Centre as a whole.

She died in 1886, and after some years of litigation and the settlement of the estate, her heirs formed The Garden City Company for the purpose of continuing the development of the Village and selling off the empty Plain lands to the east. A general manager was essential for this purpose, and in 1897, after a successful career with the Long Island Railroad, George L. Hubbell accepted this position and retained it until 1919, when the Village was incorporated.

In spite of being operated for over twenty years by a corporation, the Village grew from a small struggling Cathedral town to a well-run, carefully developed and successful suburb. This was due to the steadfast desire of the heirs to continue the high standards set by Mr. Stewart, and to the far sighted interest and energies of their resident manager, Mr. Hubbell. During these years the hotel was greatly enlarged and modernized by the firm of McKim, Mead and White, the Casino rebuilt, a gun club and two golf courses organized, public schools built, all public services improved, and one of Long Island's earliest air fields developed east of Washington Avenue. It was from this field that Glenn Curtiss flew in 1909 to win the Scientific American trophy.

It was also during these years that suburban growth spread east and west of the original Village. In 1907 the Garden City Company sold a one-square mile tract of land west of St. Paul's School to a responsible and wealthy corporation for \$1,500,000, which developed it as a separate entity to be called Garden City Estates. Copying the best features of "Old Garden City," the Corporation mapped out equally wide streets, desirable lot patterns, and park areas, and provided for expensive planting. Since the new development coincided with the completion of the tunnel to New York and the electrification of the Hempstead Branch of the railroad it flourished from the start. A second airfield, the Nassau Boulevard Field, sponsored by the Corporation was chosen in 1911 for the Second International Air Meet in America. It was during this meet that the first air-mail flight in the United States was made.

Encouraged by the success of the Garden City Estates, The Garden City Company decided in 1910 to develop its land east of the Village along similar lines. An investment of \$1,000,000 resulted in a large, beautifully planned and planted area which became equally popular. The Vanderbilt Motor Parkway, with its Toll House on Clinton Road provided an added attraction, as did the new air field developed east of Clinton Road in 1912 to take the place of the two earlier fields to the west. Originally called the Hempstead Plains Aerodrome, it was renamed Hazelhurst Field during World War I, and a year later Roosevelt Field. The war also brought Camp Mills to the Eastern Section when the War Department established that great Embarkation Center on a large tract south of the Motor Parkway, east of Clinton Road to Meadow Street. It was here that the famous Rainbow Division was assembled.

After the war, the three sections, now well developed, struggled to adjust to the divided control of the two corporations. It became increasingly evident that some form of joint government by the residents was the only

solution. On September 30, 1919, the Village of Garden City, consisting of 535 families and with a population of 2140, was officially incorporated, thus ending the control of the Garden City Company and the Garden City Estates Corporation over community government. Property Owners' Associations were organized in the East, Central, Estates, and later the Western sections of the Village, and a "Gentlemen's (or Community) Agreement" was effected which provided that each section select its own representative on the Village Board of Trustees—the office of president or mayor to rotate to each section in turn. (Mr. Hubbell, incidentally, was elected first president, and served for years in other capacities). All trustees were to serve without salary. Only employees with full-time jobs were to be paid.

This democratic and disinterested form of government is still in force and has done much to keep partisan politics out of Village affairs, and to preserve the character of Garden City. Strict enforcement of the Zoning Ordinance, largely compiled through the civic zeal of the Property Owners' Associations, has also been a big factor in preserving the property values of Garden City and its desirability as a residential community.

The Village is now almost at its growth capacity, having an estimated population of 25,000 and about 6,000 homes. In the last fifteen years, during its greatest concentrated growth, a great deal of municipal building has been done and the public works program has been stepped up and modernized. There is a handsome new Village Hall; new parks dot the Village; parking facilities have been vastly increased; and water, disposal, and other services improved. Many new houses and a few apartments have been built privately; the School Board has seen to it that a new high school, an enlarged junior high school and three new K3 neighborhood schools have been built to meet the growing demand; and the Village of Garden City has met cultural and recreational needs by providing a permanent home for its Library and constructing and operating a model swimming pool in the Community Park. Business is inevitably increasing in such a Village, and Franklin Avenue has become one of the important quality shopping centers of the Island.

Throughout both the business and the residential areas, the Village has maintained that neatness and immaculate grooming which makes it unique. Always blessed with trees and shrubs, it has constantly added to the planting and general beautification of its public areas, so that in spite of modern growth and change it still remains a true Garden City and a credit to its founder.

REVENUE CRISIS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Public Works Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations is holding hearings on the proposed Intergovernmental Revenue Act. Two distinguished St. Louis area officials, the Honorable Alfonso J. Cervantes, mayor of the city of St. Louis and the Honorable Lawrence K. Roos, St. Louis County supervisor have appeared before the subcommittee to urge substantial Federal effort in reducing the present revenue crisis of local governments.

I feel their statements enumerate the plight of many of our Nation's urban areas and the potential contribution of a revenue sharing program to the solution of these problems. I commend their remarks to you and include them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows:

REMARKS BY MAYOR ALFONSO J. CERVANTES

Senator Muskie and Members of the Advisory Commission: Last week the House passed a \$21,350,000,000 military spending package. This package included initial funds for the ABM system; it included \$481 million for 23 more of the controversial C-5A super cargo planes, and \$1 billion more for ships.

Tragically, no revenue sharing legislation has yet been adopted to help resolve the urban financial crisis. Even a small portion of \$21 billion would at least give us a start in solving what I believe is the nation's number one crisis—the bankruptcy of our cities.

Is it too much to ask our national leadership to allocate this same level of resources to solution of our urban problems, which undoubtedly are the most severe of all domestic problems?

I submit that historically great nations have succumbed not from enemies without but from weaknesses within. Objectively, the urban crisis is the greatest threat to this country. Any other funding priorities are false and defeating. We must put first things first: Congressional funding priority must follow this country's problem priority.

TAX SHARING

The case for federal tax sharing is relatively simple.

In the past 36 years an intolerable "fiscal imbalance" or "fiscal mismatch" has developed. In 1932 city tax revenues accounted for 52% of our nation's governmental tax revenues. By 1966 city revenues accounted for only 7% of all government tax revenues while the Federal government was collecting two-thirds of the tax revenues.

The General Electric *Tempo* study pointed out that the cities of the United States are caught in a ten-year \$262 billion revenue gap while the Federal government during the same decade (1967-1977) without a tax increase will have a revenue increase of \$356 billion. Ever higher Federal income and local deficits constitute the mismatch.

To put these fiscal facts in another way: During the past 36 years, the revenues of the Federal government have increased 90-fold; the revenues of the state government—as my own State of Missouri—have increased 20-fold; the revenues of the central cities of the metropolitan areas—as my own City of St. Louis—have increased less than five-fold.

To this fiscal mismatch has the Federal tax sharing concept addressed itself: the Federal government's income has multiplied 90-fold while the central cities' comparatively stagnant income can no longer cope with its multiplying problems. If this municipal overburden is allowed to continue unchecked, riots, rebellion, revolution, a state of siege, urban military repression, and the dissolution of the American dream are inevitable.

TAX SHARING FORMULA

Eight weeks ago, President Nixon delivered to Congress his message on Federal Revenue Sharing. The all but universal reaction to the proposal was that Federal Revenue Sharing is a step in the right direction—albeit, an inadequate step. Bankrupt cities frantically point out that even if the concept is reduced to viable legislation, it will be too little and too late.

Let me give you the example of the State of Missouri and the City of St. Louis. The distribution formula of the President's tax sharing proposal as presently envisioned is based primarily on the population of the state with a bonus for the state's "tax

effort" and with a substantial percentage earmarked for the state's cities, counties and townships.

Preliminary calculations indicate that Missouri would receive \$20,400,000 out of each billion dollars in the Federal Sharing Fund. Of this, 24% or \$4,896,000 would go to Missouri's cities, counties and townships.

This would mean that on the first distribution date of January 1, 1971, St. Louis would receive about \$750,000. By fiscal year 1976, when the Federal fund would reach its peak of 1% of the total taxable, personal income, the St. Louis share would be about \$8,500,000.

But this tax sharing amount is utterly inadequate to cope with the urban crisis. In order to avoid bankruptcy, St. Louis needs \$10 million more revenue by May 1, 1970, and it has no legal and feasible way to raise such revenue. It cannot wait for the too little and too late Federal tax share of \$750,000 that may be forthcoming in 1971.

An independent professional study by the Gladstone Company indicates that St. Louis will need \$20 million more revenue by 1972 even to meet its curtailed basic needs. Here again it is obvious that about \$8½ million that we may receive through Federal revenue sharing in 1977 is far too little and much too late.

THE MISSOURI MUNICIPAL LEAGUE EXPERIENCE

A realistic tax sharing program by the Federal government with the states and local governments must take into consideration three bases of distribution: the population, the tax effort, and the need.

Our own experience with the Missouri Municipal League indicates that when representatives of even smaller cities come to realize the gravity of the urban crisis in major cities many are willing to agree to a formula of distribution which includes these three factors. They agree despite the fact that such a formula means that more money per capita will be given to those major central cities where the urban crisis problems are more pressing. Funding priorities must follow problem priorities. Such is the democratic American commitment of both the state and Federal constitutions which demand that governments provide "for the common welfare."

In Missouri we have formed the Missouri Urban Coalition to sell the idea of revenue sharing on the part of the state. We have traveled across the length and width of our state—large cities, middle-sized cities, small towns, and even rural areas. We have received sympathy from all quarters, but little help. We are confident that we will eventually win our fight for a more equitable share of state revenue.

It is my sincere hope that some Federal program to meet the crisis by meaningful legislation rather than just a patchwork, piecemeal group of measures which carry inadequate financing will be adopted.

We are convinced that Senate Bill 2483, proposed by Senator Muskie, comes the nearest to giving us the kind of assistance we need in these troubled times. I urge your favorable consideration of this measure.

STATEMENT OF LAWRENCE K. ROOS, COUNTY SUPERVISOR, ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MO.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: I am Lawrence K. Roos, Supervisor of St. Louis County, Missouri.

It is an honor and a privilege to appear before you as chief executive of a large urban county to discuss proposals pending before you for the sharing of federal revenues with states and localities.

I am the elected chief executive of St. Louis County, Missouri, a county of approximately one million citizens. Our county has experienced, and is experiencing, a dramatic growth, the consequences of which simply outstrip the capacity of traditional local

sources of revenue. Thirty years ago, ours was a quiet residential community of 270,000 people; today we have a population of one million, and if present forecasts are accurate, an additional 700,000 citizens will move into St. Louis County within the next 15-20 years.

The property tax which has been the principal source of revenue for our county and most other local governments, is increasingly incapable of supporting the service demands resulting from growth. For in addition to providing traditional county services on a progressively larger scale, the governments of urban counties such as ours are now being called upon to provide innovative area-wide services such as police, public health, welfare, parks and recreation, as well as other functions which were never conceived as county responsibilities when our forefathers originally allocated limited sources of revenue to local governments.

A healthy federal system demands an intergovernmental revenue arrangement that is capable of delivering an adequate supply of revenue to each major level of government. Our present system which forces local governments to rely on regressive local property taxes, while at the same time giving the federal government easy access to the rapidly expanding federal income tax poses a clear and present danger to the balance in our federal system. The automatic revenue growth capability of the federal income tax contrasts too sharply with the third rate revenue generating systems of state and local governments. If states, cities and counties continue to be relegated to the short end of the fiscal stick, they will necessarily become increasingly dependent on federal aid with its maze of confusing and often irritating expenditure strings, and as an official of local government who has experienced the difficulty of cutting through the jungle of federal categorical grants, I can say from personal experience that most of our local problems will remain unsolved if we must rely on solutions administered from the federal level.

There are those who express skepticism concerning the ability of local government efficiently and effectively to employ increased financial resources if these are allocated. If the experience of St. Louis County is any criterion, I submit that local government can be placed on a professionalized basis capable of administering effectively to local needs. Within the past several years, our County has demonstrated that through the recruitment of experienced executives from private business, the extension of the merit system throughout the government, the extensive use of modern data processing techniques, and a willingness to accept area-wide responsibility for certain basic services, we can perform our mission effectively. A new generation of local officials has emerged which is both capable and willing to meet the needs of our states, cities and counties if the Congress will only grant us the necessary revenues with which to do the job.

I will not presume upon your time to discuss in detail the relative merits of those revenue sharing proposals which have been suggested, as I know this Subcommittee has already heard comprehensive testimony from the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and representatives of the Nixon Administration concerning this subject. I have confidence that your deliberations will result in agreement on a system of revenue sharing based on those broad areas of agreement that exist in the present bills, and that a reconciliation of the minor disagreements that exist will be achieved. I would, however, urge that whatever proposal this Subcommittee recommends include the following basic principles:

1. The establishment of a trust fund which will assure continuing support of any revenue sharing program which is adopted.
2. That all revenues be channeled initially to state governments with provision

that a proportionate share of revenues so distributed be passed on to *general purpose* units of local government.

3. That revenues be distributed to states and localities on a no-strings-attached basis.

4. A distribution formula which will provide special help for those states and local governments most willing to help themselves. This can be achieved by rewarding those governments that make the greatest tax effort with relation to total personal income within their jurisdictions.

5. A maximum financial commitment to revenue sharing by the Federal Government consistent with other financial demands on the Federal Treasury.

These factors are basic to the success of any system of federal revenue sharing. I feel certain that details can be worked out if agreement is reached on these fundamental principles.

An early start on federal revenue sharing is the best possible means of re-emphasizing our Nation's traditional dedication to a federal system in which the federal, state and local levels of government work as partners in performing those functions for which each is best suited. Adoption of federal revenue sharing does not mean the total elimination of the use of categorical grants in aid. Rather, it would reduce the present confusing and overlapping grants in aid programs into larger and broader functional packages geared to demonstration programs in specific areas of national interest. Likewise, federal revenue sharing with no strings attached would not mean the elimination of block grants designed to meet broad functional purposes. What we are seeking, and what we would achieve through federal revenue sharing would be a broadened fiscal mix, combining categorical grants in aid to stimulate and support programs in specific areas of national interest, block grants to give states and localities greater flexibility in meeting needs in broad functional areas, and, no-strings-attached revenue sharing to provide a means whereby states, cities and counties may devise their own programs and set their own priorities in the ways best suited to the solution of their unique and most crucial problems.

This is what we at the local level are seeking. This is what we respectfully urge you to provide.

THE MORATORIUM AND A REBUTTAL

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing two items into the RECORD as a conclusion to my remarks upon which I wish to briefly comment. The first is an editorial from the Monday, October 13 edition of the *Hatchet*, the student publication at George Washington University, which I feel can properly be described as typical of the distorted and illogical views of students who were lured into participating in the so-called moratorium. It is tragic that their belligerent efforts are probably resulting in a continuation of the conflict in South Vietnam.

It is, however, with pride that I point to the second item that I am inserting which is a rebuttal to the editorial written by Mr. Paul Zeman, a senior at George Washington, a constituent, and a part-time staff member of mine during

his collegiate career. I believe Mr. Zeman's views reflect the thinking of a clear majority of students and are in keeping with the objective and responsible mentality that we expect of the present student generation that will hopefully provide constructive leaders in the years to come.

The editorial and the rebuttal, I believe, both speak for themselves.

[From the *Hatchet*, Oct. 13, 1969]

THE MORATORIUM

This Nation and its people will be challenged Wednesday for Oct. 15 is a test which will be watched by millions around the world.

Oct. 15 asks each and every one of us if we are willing to contemplate our country's policies, formulate and express our opinions and convince others of their worth. It asks our country, through our elected officials, if it is willing to act in accordance with the wishes of its citizenry, or if it is too proud to admit a colossal mistake.

We have been too selfish all too long and have been unwilling to face the challenge. Many who read this editorial today have yet to spend any of their time seriously questioning this nation's policy in Vietnam. They have abrogated their obligation as citizens in a democracy. Some will go to classes or to their offices on Wednesday, not because they are in favor of this miserable war, but because they are too selfish to sacrifice part of themselves. We respect those who go to class Wednesday because they want consciously and symbolically to show their support for the war, however misguided they may be.

We deplore those who follow their normal day's activities because they don't know where they stand or aren't willing to let others know where they stand. The Vietnam record is clear and is there for all to see, if you're willing to make the effort. The facts speak for themselves, and would motivate you to express yourself Wednesday, if you care. Sen. Harrison Williams (D.-N.J.) said Saturday that participation in the Moratorium is a privilege. He's wrong; it is an obligation.

Oct. 15 is a constructive alternative to radical destructive tactics which were used in Chicago this past weekend, and to continued indifference to the consequences of Vietnam policy. There is no choice. We must express ourselves. We must march in peace for peace.

THE MORATORIUM II

(By Paul Zeman)

Last Monday's *Hatchet* devoted all of its editorials, three columns and several news articles to Wednesday's Vietnam Moratorium. I have chosen to respond to the lead editorial that day, from which I have borrowed this column's title, because it represents as well as any other statement made with regard to the Moratorium the dangers involved when commitment outpaces responsibility.

"The Vietnam record," said the *Hatchet*, "is clear and is there for all to see, if you're willing to make the effort. The facts speak for themselves. . . ." Even on the very tenuous assumption that the facts are clear on Vietnam, they certainly do not speak for themselves. Facts do not run headlong into conclusions. Facts must be interpreted, and this process is deeply colored by the interpreter's moral and political orientations. Vietnam is controversial precisely because the myriad of facts available is subject to widely divergent interpretations.

In assuming the substantive issue at hand—the merits and demerits of The War—to be so clear as to be dismissed with a summary assertion that "the facts speak for themselves," the *Hatchet* displayed a lack of insight and perspective into the complexity of Vietnam which typifies the way in which

many well-intentioned students have come to approach this national problem. It is this lack of appreciation for the complexity of the problem which may explain the *Hatchet's* intolerance for those who have not or will not take a definitive position on The War. ("We deplore those who follow their normal day's activities because they don't know where they stand. . . .")

"There is no choice," declared the *Hatchet*. "We must express ourselves. We must march in peace for peace." If any one statement could be singled out as indicative of the editorial's general theme, it would probably be this: "There is no choice." This brings to mind the observation of Columbia Sociology Professor Allan Silver following the disturbances at Columbia: "Their moral arrogance is incredible. These students would exact a conformity that makes Joe McCarthy look like a civil libertarian." The language is too extreme for this case, but the thrust of the comment is still quite applicable.

It is imperative in a free thought society (campus or country) that one grasp that the freedom to choose among various systems and beliefs necessarily involves the corollary freedom not to choose at all. In choosing not to choose, one *does* express himself (something the editorial did not appear to note). It is an expression either of indecision or of disenchantment with the available alternatives. It is true that in choosing not to choose one effectively disfranchises himself and leaves the determination of events largely in the hands of others, but this is itself an important and meaningful decision. It was, in fact, the course chosen by many conscientious Americans in the last Presidential election.

Aside from the substantive issues, there is a legitimate question of tactics employed in the Moratorium. In July of this year, I received a letter from the Washington office of the newly organized Vietnam Moratorium Committee. In it the following aim was set forth: "The basic idea is to set aside October 15 for a one day moratorium on 'business as usual' in order that students, faculty members and concerned citizens can spend the day working in the larger community to end the war." This was a worthy objective and would have, I believe, received my support.

I am writing this the day before the Moratorium, but it appears that somewhere along the line community involvement has fallen by the wayside. One need only look at the schedule for Wednesday to realize that there will be no forages outside the university community.

Earlier in this decade, hundreds of students responded to the call to work for civil rights. Last summer, thousands responded to the call to stomp the country in behalf of an obscure Junior Senator from Minnesota. These efforts had a profound influence on our political and social attitudes as a nation. They were essentially student efforts in the beginning, but because they reached into the community-at-large on a person to person basis, they eventually transcended student involvement.

Yesterday, we were asked to "work for peace." How? By broadening the base of popular opposition to The War? By carrying our convictions outside the campus and into the homes? Not really. The protest remains internalized in the university community. What "community involvement" there was undoubtedly came at six and seven o'clock last night when Americans were grouped around their respective tubes after a hard day at work. The opportunity to confront citizens of the community-at-large as individuals rather than as images on a screen was not in the script for yesterday. The program involved a lot more talking at than talking with. In fact, it appeared to this observer to be aimed more at reinforcing the

attitudes of those assembled in protest of the war than of winning over any substantial new segment of the community. Whatever the relative success or failure of yesterday's Moratorium, it was a student demonstration, and it is here that I think the organizers have missed the boat.

Meanwhile, this opponent to our continued military presence in Vietnam was attending PSC 105 about the time the first speaker rose to the rostrum yesterday behind the library. I was thinking how interesting it was that in order for this column to appear in today's *Hatchet*, business would have to proceed as usual in the Student Union Annex and at the printing firm on Wednesday, October 15.

VIETNAM MORATORIUM

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, this is the day of the moratorium. To President Nixon, there is nothing new to be learned from this demonstration of intense national feeling. To me, the moratorium symbolizes the national desire and even insistence on peace now.

Below is an article by Nicholas von Hoffman, in which he describes what the moratorium means to him. He eloquently expresses and captures the thoughts of all of us who believe in the moratorium and its goals. The article, entitled "End the War or We Will" appeared in the Washington Post today, October 15.

The article follows:

END THE WAR OR WE WILL

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

(NOTE.—I've been asked to make speeches at a number of places today. I can't because I have to work. I think that everyone should refrain from working if he can; the two exceptions should be medical personnel and newsmen. If I had spoken, this is what I would have said:.)

The moratorium isn't a protest. It's an ultimatum by an enormous section of the population laid down to its politicians. That ultimatum says there is no time left. It says there's no more credibility gap because there's no more credibility. It's an ultimatum that says either end the war forthwith or we will stop it ourselves.

That's not what the politicians want to make of this day. A man like Congressman Rogers C. B. Morton, the Republican national chairman, would have you believe, "I'm for the moratorium as part of our right to assemble." That's not what the moratorium is about. The right to petition a government that rejects petitions before they're laid before it is a sterile right. It's using the forms of political process to frustrate their purpose. It's a con, a fancy way of saying, "You go ahead and exercise your god-given constitutional rights to be ineffectual while we go ahead and run the war."

THE RIGHT OF PETITION

Even before the McCarthy campaign, hope in the right of petition died. On its better days the government rejected politics with the contention that the Rostows and Kissingers knew more and knew better. They know nothing, but that's another story. On its worst and more ordinary days, the government responded by tricks and falsifications. . . . Pull out 3,000 men here, hide them under palm trees there, don't bomb this but bomb that, invent another round of fictitious

secret peace talks, run and cry on U Thant's shoulder, get the Pope to hold your hand.

Now comes Sen. Fred Harris, the Democratic chairman, saying, "It's time to take the gloves off on the Vietnam war issue. It's nine months since the President took office." It was time to do that in Chicago, August 1968, when the Senator and his friends kept the Democrats a war party and drove the Clean Gene kids and a lot of other people out of electoral politics. Today he wants to be a peacenik because he has a dawning fear that the people have had it up to the geuzik with this perpetual tragedy.

Every aspect of government, all three branches, have failed but not all men in government. Former Senators Morse and Gruening are charter members of the opposition. Fulbright may have helped vote us into this war and into the set of policies which make such conflicts as inevitable as they are recurring, but he's said he was wrong, unthinking and gulled. We must accept that. This is no longer a small protest movement, and it's bad to get into the silly, purist radical bag of refusing to associate with anybody whose antiwar credentials are dated after 1964. This war has taught all of us many awful things about ourselves and our country. It's not just Sen. Fulbright who had to learn the hard way.

WHO SHOULD LEAD?

But if the few respectable men in high office could make such terrible mistakes, then the question is who should lead? Many speakers today will say the politicians, chastened, humbled, made honest and sensitive to the death of their constituents' sons and the voters' high taxes. Don't you believe it. Don't let them steal the movement away.

The strength of the peace movement is its leaderlessness, the way it can survive and grow on a consensual process which is as easy to see as it's hard to describe with exactitude. Let the movement continue to be led as it has, by its adherents, by small groups of people proposing an idea and testing it by seeing who and how many will come in with them on it. That's how this moratorium was started. Six months ago a few of the former McCarthy people anticipated that whoziz was as trustworthy as his predecessor when he said he had a plan for ending the war. They judged that by October we would be ready for the moratorium. They were right. Today we put black crepe on our arms and refrain from work.

That will not be enough to end the war. We may get something out of it. Hershey's already been tossed to us, although what we're supposed to do with the old flesh trader is a puzzle. Maybe Hoover'll be given to us next, but these ancient bonbons have lost their sweetness. If we're very lucky, they'll give us some tinsily cease-fire while they sneak a secret war in Laos. The government should not be permitted to keep a single soldier in those parts, but to get them out we must do more than today.

MORE TO COME

In fact today is a preparation for more. November the 15th is already being planned as a march on Washington. Today is a day of accustoming great numbers of people to the anxiety of standing up to their government. Even in a country like ours where there are civil liberties, great strain still attaches to exercising them. We were all brought up trusting the government; it's hard to shake off the feeling that resistance to it, especially about a war, is a form of social treason. The moratorium will make people comfortable in their new roles of resistance. It will make opposition socially acceptable, perhaps even stylish.

This isn't by design but is dictated by the probable course of events. Either the war must end or the resistance must grow and take tougher forms. The fact will not be clear

in most of the talks given today because they'll be given by summer-soldier politicians who will want to flatter everyone on their orderly, good conduct; they will praise their audiences for the lawful and constitutional manner by which they express their hatred of this lousy war. That's all right. Only imbeciles prefer street brawling and law breaking to orderly political process, but that's not the point.

The point is that there would never have been a Peace Movement if it had remained law abiding in the government's eyes. The Peace Movement is where it is because people broke into draft boards and threw blood on the files or got their heads beaten standing in front of induction centers or, like Capt. Howard Levy, took a court martial and a jail sentence.

CHECKING THE RECORD

They dramatized the war's nature. They forced the rest of us to go back over the record and check to be sure there was some plausible justification for taking human lives as we were doing. They did more. When they faced their judges and pleaded innocent by virtue of Nuremberg, they reminded us that we're individually responsible for what's done in our names. Our government, our armies, our taxes, our napalm, our soldiers, our young men.

These law breakers planted in us the bad dream that there could be the Cincinnati War Crimes Trials of 1971 in which we would have to stand before the bar and plead we were good Americans. The Spocks, the Muhammad Alis, the Father Berrigans, the David Harrises, they did that to us, gave us the bad dream of the good American.

Their example shows that an action like the moratorium isn't an event in itself but the preparation and the threat of more and wider action. Even now what started out to be a sedate moratorium is inching in the direction of a general strike. It hasn't reached that point yet, but it will unless the government capitulates to its citizens.

But what's-his-face, the furtive and fugitive president who darts from TV station to armed compound, doesn't know that; he doesn't know that if he keeps it up, by spring the country may be ungovernable. He says he won't be the first American president to lose a war, when what he risks is becoming the first president to lose America.

Maybe today he will read the ultimatum correctly and understand that playtime is over. That there is no patience left for Henry Cabot Lodge, Ellsworth Bunker and more diddlybop about bugging out, leaving allies in the lurch or saving the State Department's accidental face. People don't care if we bug out, run out, march out, stumble out, crawl out or fade out as long as we get out now. They've had it, and the tumult and anger is spreading everywhere. Even the federal bureaucracy is threatening to take to the streets. It's no longer students or blacks; it's older people, businessmen, conservatives, liberals, anti-Communists, pro-Communists; it's everybody who knows that a perennial war that we have no will to win or even fight is insanity, that a democracy which carries on a war that 40 or 50 per cent of the population detests risks destroying itself.

NEBRASKA MORATORIUM

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, many words have been exchanged in this Chamber on the Vietnam moratorium. I would urge each of you to read and med-

itate just a bit on the following telegram. This is how most Nebraskans feel. I am intensely proud. I include it herewith:

BELLEVUE, NEBR.

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Across the nation many people will be demonstrating against the war in Vietnam. I am not joining this protest. I am flying my flag in support of my Government and my President. I know my Government will do all in its power to bring this war to an honorable end as quickly as possible. My undying support to the American system and personal support to the Republican Party.

Respectfully,

LLOYD DOWDING.

A TIME FOR PRAYER IN QUEST OF PEACE

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, of the thousands of articles and millions of words written about the Vietnam war moratorium, the following column in the October 14, 1969, issue of Detroit Free Press by Judd Arnett seems particularly significant to me:

A TIME FOR PRAYER IN QUEST OF PEACE

(By Judd Arnett)

The Rt. Rev. Richard S. Emrich, Episcopal Bishop of Michigan, writer, lecturer, mediator—a man for all seasons, you might say—stood on the front steps of one of his churches Sunday morning and delivered a short oration on the forthcoming Vietnam Moratorium.

The people, Bishop Emrich said, should pray for their President, their nation, the dead and wounded of the war—and for peace. Thus in a few well-chosen words did a good man bring into focus what Wednesday's national outpouring should be about.

Let us start with the President . . .

As persistent readers of this pillar may have noted from time to time, Richard Nixon does not always bring joy and warmth into your commentator's life. (There will now be a brief time out while the gentleman in the rear of the hall rises to ask: "Who does?")

But it has never been assumed for a second in this quarter that our President does not want peace, and it has likewise never been accepted that he was not doing everything in his power to achieve it. To believe otherwise would be to indict Richard Nixon as a huckster of American blood, and there is not a shred of evidence to support such a terrible offense against humanity.

Well, then, why hasn't the President succeeded in his search for peace? There are a number of reasons and it seems to me that Sen. George D. Aiken of Vermont handled them well a few days ago in a lecture to the students of Norwich University in Vermont.

Some of you may recall that it was Sen. Aiken who first suggested last May that the President begin an "orderly withdrawal" of our troops. At Norwich, however, he insisted that "The President needs time and I, for one, will do my best to see that he gets it."

In support of his position, the Senator said this:

"Those who are so anxious now to spur the President into a pell-mell retreat, even to set deadlines for him, should pause to consider the likely consequences of their exhortations.

"The South Vietnamese are bound to think sooner or later that we are simply preparing a case against them to cover our own errors. That is the worst of alternatives.

"It could lead to a breakdown of order in South Vietnam and ultimately to a wholesale massacre of those, who for good reasons or bad, put their faith in the United States Government . . ."

Now . . . Why should we pray for the nation, as Bishop Emrich has suggested? . . .

This question scarcely deserves an answer. The United States needs more help than it has been getting. The problem is: Do we deserve it?

The dead and the wounded . . .

When the definitive history of this war has been written, one shining fact will stand clear of controversy: Never has any nation been served in the field by men who gave more in anticipation of such small reward.

The heroes who have fought, bled and died in Vietnam knew in advance that this war was different, that out of it would come little gratitude for their sacrifice. It must be an awful thing to be called upon to risk life and limb while dissent rages among those you are representing, yet these men have done it, day after day, with bravery, with honor, with a degree of courage, all things considered, unexcelled in our history.

It is not common these days to be proud of our military prowess, but for the men who have served in Vietnam there should be no stinting of respect. They did not start the war; but gallantly they have carried the burden of it. Brave Americans, these.

And now let us pray for peace . . .

Blessed be the peacemakers, it was said. Blessed be the meek, who shall inherit the earth. Eternally, man has had no more splendid dream than that of peace. But man has not been able to bring it off, probably because even in the search for peace his heart has not been pure.

But pray for peace, nonetheless; and for Richard Nixon; and for those who have given so much; and for these United States, torn and troubled.

TALLAHASSEE COMMISSION SUPPORTS PRESIDENT

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and will be said about the moratorium observance.

Free speech is the most priceless of heritages for a free society and the city commission of Tallahassee, Fla., saw fit to pass the following resolution at this time. I think it expresses the sentiments of a great many Americans who are deeply concerned about the war in Vietnam, and I include it herewith:

RESOLUTION OF TALLAHASSEE CITY COMMISSION

A resolution commending and supporting the position taken by the President of the United States of America in relation to the Vietnam Moratorium observances scheduled by certain organizations for October 15, 1969

Whereas, the City Commission of the City of Tallahassee, Florida, is confident that the President of the United States of America has access to the most reliable information available concerning the best method to appropriately resolve the problems with which the nation is confronted in Vietnam, and

Whereas, the City Commission of the City of Tallahassee believes that it is in the best interest of the country to refrain from bringing pressure to bear upon the President of the United States of America which would tend to influence him to take a course of action other than that which would be reasonable as based upon the most reliable information available to the President;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the city commission of the city of Tallahassee, Florida, as follows:

1. That the city commission of the city of Tallahassee hereby expresses its confidence in the capability and good faith of the President of the United States to formulate, on the basis of the most reliable information obtainable, policies designed to resolve the many sided and serious problems with which the nation is confronted in Vietnam.

2. That the city commission of the city of Tallahassee hereby expresses its support of the action of the President of the United States in refusing to be swayed from his policies, based upon the most reliable information available, by the Vietnam moratorium observances scheduled by certain organizations for October 15, 1969.

3. That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the city commission of the city of Tallahassee and the copies hereof be furnished to the President of the United States, U.S. Senator Spessard L. Holland, U.S. Senator Edward J. Gurney, and U.S. Congressman Don Fuqua.

Introduced and passed the city commission this 14th day of October, A.D. 1969.

SPURGEON CAMP,
Mayor.

Attest:

LOUIS H. COOK,
City Auditor and Clerk.

THE AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY GETS A BREAK AT THE EXPENSE OF THE PEOPLE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, according to the National Center for Air Pollution Control, New York City has the highest concentration of pollution of any American city—higher even than smog-ridden Los Angeles.

Medical research has linked air pollution to the cause and aggravation of many serious illnesses including lung cancer, emphysema, chronic bronchitis, asthma, and heart disease.

High concentrations of pollution have already triggered several major citywide catastrophes. The most recent—the inversion of Thanksgiving Day 1966—was linked directly to the deaths of nearly 100 persons, and is presumed to be responsible for many more.

In addition, it is estimated that New York City residents, are paying nearly \$½ billion per year in added expenses for the cleaning and upkeep of clothes and property and for the repair and protection of possessions against deterioration.

In spite of this staggering toll, the Justice Department has agreed to accept a consent decree in its case against four major automobile manufacturers charged with a conspiracy to delay the development of effective air pollution control devices.

As a result, I and 24 other Members of Congress have filed a brief challenging the action of the Justice Department because we consider it a flagrant disregard for the rights and welfare of 8½ million New York City residents and all Americans suffering from a daily bombardment of health-damaging, noxious emissions from automobile engines. We are seeking a 60-day delay in the signing of the consent decree in order to permit a congressional investigation before the Justice Department terminates the proceedings against the automobile companies. Oral arguments will be heard by Federal Judge Jesse Curtis on October 28.

The acceptance of a consent decree by the Justice Department would mean that the charges of collusion among automobile manufacturers would never be tested in open court. Consequently, the responsibility for the continued failure to develop badly needed antipollution devices would not be made clear to the American public.

Further, the opportunity to acquire evidence from the Justice Department would be lost to municipalities and private citizens wishing to file suits for damages. Such suits against the drug industry recently netted \$120 million in damages.

Efforts to solve the air pollution problem would suffer a serious setback if the Justice Department succeeds in burying evidence that it spent 2 years collecting. It is apparent that the automotive industry would not have chosen to hide behind a consent decree if the evidence against it was not damaging.

On behalf of all New Yorkers and countless other Americans suffering from the perils of air pollution, I strongly deplore the action of the Justice Department. It serves only the automotive industry—not the people.

I hope this Congress exhausts every means to prevent this kind of business.

GOLDWATER CONDEMNS MORATORIUM

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of antiwar demonstrations such as the one occurring today, as well as resolutions which seek to impose an arbitrary time limit on troop withdrawals, is that rather than hastening an end to the war in Vietnam they only prolong the bloody conflict.

Thousands of idealistic Americans are, at this very moment, participating in a cause which they sincerely believe will bring about peace, when in actuality their actions are only encouraging the North Vietnamese Communists to continue their war of aggression.

Now, I realize that the charge of giving aid and comfort to the enemy is a serious one indeed. But in light of recent news stories, it is impossible to conclude otherwise.

A wire story last week quoted the Vietnamese chief negotiator, Mrs. Nguyen Thi Binh as saying, and I quote:

The Vietnamese people warmly acclaim this movement of the American people who demand the Nixon Administration to put an end to the war of aggression in Vietnam, and withdraw rapidly and totally American troops. This movement tightens the solidarity between the Vietnamese people and the progressive people in the U.S.

Hanoi's deputy chief negotiator, Col. Ha Van Lao, also appealed to American citizens to increase their resistance and force the Nixon administration to accept Communist demands.

As recently as this past Monday, an Associated Press dispatch again quoted Mrs. Binh as saying that the antiwar forces in this country fighting the Nixon policies have the Vietcong blessings.

Echoing the red line in this country, the New York based Communist paper, the "Daily World," endorsed what they called the "groundswell in Congress for the withdrawal of our GI's from Vietnam." The paper said:

Mass nationwide rallies for a speedy and total pull-out of U.S. forces from Vietnam are scheduled during the next two months. Every American tax-paying wage earner has a vital bread and butter interest in joining and supporting them.

Just exactly what the antiwar moratorium is supposed to accomplish, is not clear, Mr. Speaker.

Their literature speaks of "going door to door to talk about the madness of Vietnam, leafletting public places, holding meetings, vigils and organizing against elected officials who support the war."

What more they want President Nixon to do, short of unconditional surrender, is not clear either.

Since taking office, President Nixon has made every effort humanly possible to bring the war in Vietnam to an honorable conclusion:

He has renounced an imposed military solution to the conflict.

He has proposed free elections organized by a joint committee under international supervision.

He has offered the withdrawal of United States and allied forces over a 12-month period.

He has declared that the United States seeks no military bases in Vietnam.

He has offered to negotiate supervised cease-fires under international supervision to facilitate mutual troop withdrawals.

He has said that both the United States and South Vietnamese Governments are willing to accept any results of a free election.

He has exhibited a willingness to discuss the 10-point program of the other side, along with plans put forth by any other parties.

He has begun the process of Vietnamization, that is, the process of turning the war over to the South Vietnamese to handle both Vietcong insurgency and North Vietnamese armed forces, regardless of the outcome in Paris.

He has announced plans to withdraw 60,000 American troops from Vietnam.

The only thing the President has refused to make negotiable, and I support him 100 percent on this, is the right of the South Vietnamese people to deter-

mine their own future free of outside interference.

And what has been the response of Hanoi to all these proposals? Nothing, Mr. Speaker, nothing at all. Only more personal abuse, vilification, and propagandizing.

Perhaps there was a time when public demonstrations against the war served a purpose, but now the American people should unite behind their President in his efforts to bring America's longest war to an honorable conclusion. To do otherwise is to encourage the hawks in Hanoi to continue the fighting.

As British Communist affairs specialist, Victor Zorza, wrote recently in the Baltimore Sun newspaper:

The American anti-war students' one day strike on October 15 . . . is precisely what Hanoi hawks have in mind when they argue that the U.S. cannot hold out much longer. . . . The stronger the protest movement in the United States now, the less chance Hanoi's own doves have to persuade the hawks that the time has come to stop fighting.

FINALLY—I SPEAK ON THE WAR MORATORIUM

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to make this speech earlier this day—and had planned to take the podium of the House at approximately 1 a.m. this morning. The purpose of my remarks and of delivering them at that time—was to state my support for the moratorium on war being observed across the country—and to offer my observations and views on Vietnam.

Part of what I have to say concerns the freedom of the American people to voice their view and to be heard by their Government. It is my thought that the prolonged and tragic nature of the Vietnam war is directly related to the unwillingness of our national leadership to reflect the will of the people in their war policies. The people seek peace—and the Government continues war.

Consequently—while planning my address on the precepts of democracy which must always recognize the freedom of the people and the obligation of government to serve the people—imagine my dismay when my own freedom of speech was denied. If what I have to say so frightens the leadership of this country that I, as a Member of the Congress, should be regarded as a threat merely because I speak my views—then there is truly more reason for me to speak than I initially realized.

The 20 Members of the House of Representatives who sought only to speak on the subject of Vietnam and war on the day of this "moratorium on war"—were cut off by panic-driven war supporters who feel American citizens, even American leaders, have no right to question a policy which has laid 45,000 Americans dead and drained our country of its money, unity, democratic char-

acter, social and economic progress. I must believe I correctly assume that they still have no answers for the American if they fear and resent so much our questions.

I was not able to speak this morning—but I shall speak now, and I shall continue to speak and to exercise the freedoms and responsibilities of citizenship.

Today, I associate myself with the millions of Americans who are arming themselves for peace. The October 15 moratorium on war, in my opinion, must serve to convince our stubborn leadership that the majority of Americans are determined to end this war.

"Work for Peace" has become our slogan. It is a great slogan, since it is clearly not enough to hope for peace, pray for peace, or to speak for peace. Those of us dedicated and committed to peace must be committed at all cost. We must be as willing to make as great a sacrifice for peace—as some would have us sacrifice for war.

It is unfortunate, but true, that the leadership of this country resents our move for immediate peace. They tell us we do not understand. They are right—we demonstrate today, tomorrow, and the next—to show them we do not understand—nor will we tolerate further their belligerence in pursuit of an immoral war.

I know why I am here today—and I dare say, the leadership of this Government and the world—knows not why we are in Vietnam. Eight hundred and fifty-nine of my fellow Missourians have fallen in Vietnam and still our Government cannot tell us why.

I stand here today—because my patience have been exhausted and my faith in this country demands I work for peace. I am here today because 45,000 of my fellow countrymen have fallen in battle for a cause that does not exist. I am here today, for a mother who returned the flag of her dead son to the President—saying he died in vain. I am here today, because I still have hope that this Government of the people—will eventually respond to the will of the people. My active support for this moratorium on war does not come from a lack of understanding—but from a clear understanding of what this war means to the American people.

Our land is in turmoil. Our people cry for peace. While our leaders place the emphasis on honor, there can be no honor in a dishonorable act. The war in Vietnam is unjust, illegal, and immoral. Our continued involvement will not bring honor but disgrace. A nation which claims to be conceived in liberty and justice cannot long survive by condoning repression or aggression.

The statement of the President that he will not hear the voices of the demonstrators does not serve to achieve peace in Vietnam—but does add fire to the burning conflict in America. It is because he does not sense our presence, that we gather in great numbers across the country today. It is because he does not hear our cries—that we join together today to amplify our voices. If the President does not see us, does not hear us, does not respond to the prevailing will

of our people—then let history record that this President put his concern for pride above his concern for people—let history record that this President by his own volition set a tragic course for American democracy that may well cause the destruction of that democracy.

The President and his spokesmen have stated that we do a great disservice to our country today—that we should demonstrate against the North Vietnamese and not against our own Government.

What is at stake in the world today—in Vietnam and in this country—is freedom, the right of people to govern themselves. Our very presence in Vietnam in such great numbers and with such awesome weaponry acts to deny freedom and self-determination for the people of Vietnam. Our military forces have kept in office in Vietnam a corrupt group of gangsters who refuse to call for free elections in that country and consistently oppress the freedoms of speech and action of the Vietnamese people.

Our Government professes to fight for freedom of the Vietnamese people to voice their views and work their will upon their government—and at the same time embraces a dictatorship which denies that same freedom to those who view legitimate, peaceful protest as a disservice to our country—I would say if they are committed to the principle that Americans must sing the same verse of the same song in order to serve their country—then they are in the wrong country. Those who would muzzle free speech demonstrate to North Vietnam that freedom in America is a principle but not a practice.

The Government was formed to serve the people. When the people march for peace they do no disservice. The responsibility for service is on the foot of the Government—and it is the Government which does disservice when it does not respond to the people. Our Government was so formed and can be sustained only by maintaining that posture.

The war has taken a devastating toll on the American people. It has tested our nature, our tolerance, and our way of life. Look across the country today and you see revolt—not just among the young, not just among those of extreme persuasion, but among the rank and file American citizens who are opposed to the senseless slaughter of human beings. These are not hippies, these are not drug addicts—these are not Communists. The people who have come out of their homes and their offices on this day of moratorium are American citizens—who deserve the respect and the ear of their Government.

These people are the peacemakers and they shall inherit the earth. There is no doubt but that the warmakers have degraded the character and quality of American citizenship. They have distorted the principles of justice and peace. They attempt to portray the peacemakers as villains. Those who kill and maim are projected as crusaders and freedom fighters.

There are now 3.5 million men in the armed services, 500,000 of them are in Vietnam, another 300,000 in support in the Pacific. Maintaining so large a stand-

ing army is not in preparation for peace, but in anticipation of war. The President has stated a policy which says that Asian problems must be solved by Asian people. He told the Government of the Philippines not to look to us for protection. If the President intends to follow that policy in Asia or in any part of the world, America should and must disarm.

As long as this country maintains an eye-catching ready army of 3.5 million men and continues to expend more than 50 percent of its total budget for defense—we will be called upon for defense. A nation which seeks not to be the policeman of the world should not attire itself in the policeman's uniform.

This Nation's claim to greatness will not be realized through military muscle. A country founded on democratic principles can realize greatness only in the success of democracy. When democratic precepts are overcome and overwhelmed by military rule, the greatness claimed does not relate to the greatness sought. History records that of the 21 nations who sought and became number one militarily in the world, 19 were destroyed from within. The lessons of history did not keep us out of Vietnam—but the lessons of history support our call for withdrawal from Vietnam.

The adverse social, economic and political impact of this war is a most cruel result of our involvement.

America is suffering from a loss of identity—from men who have mistaken our identity. It is not American to spend \$77 billion on defense and only \$3 billion on education. It is not American to spend \$5 billion on the C-5A airplane and less than \$2 billion on poverty programs. It is not American to spend \$40 billion to explore space and only \$186 million to research one of the greatest killers of Americans—cancer. It is not American to insist upon another \$16 billion for an anti-ballistic-missile system when we have already spent \$23 billion American dollars on missiles which are now obsolete. It is not American when we can spend \$20,000 for ammunition for every Vietcong we kill—and only \$44 a year to educate one American child. Those who pursue destruction through war are un-American. Those who support excessive military expenditures at expense of necessary domestic programs—are the un-Americans in America, not the citizens protesting the war.

Since 1959, the United States has spent more than \$551 billion in direct military outlays. This is twice the amount spent for new private and public housing over the same decade—and nearly twice as much as Federal, State, and local governments allocated to all education. Over this past decade, \$30 billion has been spent for agricultural subsidies and \$35 billion for space exploration. At the same time, only \$4 billion was spent for Federal low- and middle-income housing programs—only an eighth of the amount spent to guarantee income to rich farmers. Just this month, the President committed this Nation to finance a supersonic transport airplane—at an estimated completed cost of \$895 million—but just last week, the House of Representatives could not get \$1 billion just to

clean up the dirty water in America. Military related spending in this fiscal year alone is more than all Federal expenditures on health, hospitals, education, old-age benefits, low- and middle-income housing, welfare, unemployment, and agriculture.

The American people are finding out that their tax money is not going to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to house the homeless, to educate the ignorant, to medicate the sick—the American people know that their tax dollars are being gobbled up by profiteering defense contractors and armament producers.

The way the war is viewed depends in some measure on a person's position in life. If you are standing in the Pentagon, I am sure you can sing the Star Spangled Banner, better, louder, and more enthusiastically than from anywhere else in the Nation. But if you are standing in line for lunch in a university cafeteria, your uncertain draft status has a tendency to discolor the glory of battle. If you are sitting on a corner in a ghetto, your spirit for patriotism may diminish in inverse proportion to the growing extent of your deprivation. If you are manufacturing planes, tanks, and shells, your view may well be shaped by the size of your contract. If you are a banker collecting spiraling interest rates caused by war spending, your view may differ sharply from the workingman earning less than \$10,000 who cannot afford to buy a decent house.

The position that black Americans find themselves in is even more uncompromising than that of whites who oppose the war. Blacks are forced to travel 10,000 miles from home to fight in Vietnam to extend rights for yellow people that black people themselves do not enjoy here in America.

This war has had a severe effect on black people. Most blacks see the war in Vietnam as one more act of aggression on the part of the United States.

The plight of the black man in America has been to endure one crisis after another. This plight has culminated in the restlessness, the suspicion, and the frustration which so clearly shows itself in the black community today. Black men have lived with pent-up feelings for too long. Blacks no longer feel compelled to nurture these frustrations in silent obedience.

The war in Vietnam constitutes an overt display of hypocrisy in and by this government. Black Americans have tried, often in vain, to unveil Government hypocrisy which shows itself in discriminatory activities against minorities. The Vietnam war became a focal point—because it is a clear testimony to the heights of hypocrisy to which this Government will go. It is this hypocrisy and double standard which is tearing our society apart. The hypocrisy of the law and of the conduct of this Government has been exposed to the masses of the American public.

The issues have become clear. If the social problems of the day are to be solved, this war must stop now. This government cannot go about insisting on

social order on the one hand while ignoring social justice on the other.

The young are asking questions. Why fight to free the Vietnamese and resist freedom for black Americans. Why should poor youth be drafted to fight this war while certain rich or athletically gifted youth are exempted from military service.

President Nixon has cut back expenditures for every domestic program aimed at people with the greatest need—and has won. Instead, an initial \$6 billion expenditures for an anti-ballistic system.

Those of us who ask when we will have a commitment to domestic programs are told to wait until the war is over. When we ask "When will the war be over?" we are told to wait for an "honorable peace" which will allow us to save face with the Asian people.

Why is there so much concern for saving face in Southeast Asia when at home we show no concern for facing people who still live without the protection and guarantees of the law. If the policy of this Government shall be to save face—that policy must start at home.

Until the causes of widespread discontent in this Nation are addressed, President Nixon makes a mockery of his office by his pleas for unity and peace.

If I read the signs of the time correctly, our Nation is in serious danger. The signs of student unrest, the riots in the cities, the emergence of a new violent militant black group, the demands for repressive legislation to combat crime in the street, and disrespect for law and order. These signs point to a crossroads for this Nation—where a choice must be made.

The speeches we are getting from the leadership of this country are too closely reminiscent of speeches recorded 30 years ago when a tyrant whipped his nation into line for world domination.

This Nation must state and pursue objectives which are consistent with the needs in the country. We must either extend full citizenship rights and individual freedom to all Americans or pursue a course which will assuredly deny it to a certain group and eventually to all.

The question is whether the people of this country will use their energies to rise to the challenges of a maturing nation—or whether we will use our energies to fight each other in the streets to mark the fall of democracy.

If we were ever under seige, we are today. If ever there were a need for understanding, it is today. If ever we have needed to concern ourselves with service for unselfish considerations—we need to do so today.

If these great social problems are to be solved, the resources of the Nation and the resolve of the Nation must be directed toward them—with full force. Steps must be taken to do away with the underlying causes of the widespread discontent in the Nation. The first and most important must be to pull American forces out of Vietnam.

Where we have had programs aimed at domestic problems, we have not had funds. Money may be the single most important reason for failures in the poverty program where they have occurred.

Money has not been available to implement model cities programs, to clean up our air or our water. Money has not been available for job training, for employment counseling, for advanced food programs, for rehabilitating buildings, or even for law-enforcement programs set out by the 90th Congress.

Law can be nullified by the absence of money for its implementation. Laws written by the past two Congresses, noteworthy innovative laws, have been invalidated by the lack of funds for objectives they set out.

Federal money is drained first by the military-industrial complex and only that which is left over is divided among all remaining domestic programs—education, housing, urban development, job training, land and resource conservation.

To date, in this administration, there are more spokesmen for the continuance of present fiscal policy imbalance than there are spokesmen for domestic priorities. Once again we come to the importance of communication and the need for effective spokesmen for domestic problems, minority interests, and for unpopular causes. Once again we come to the importance of the observance of this moratorium on war—which is the attempt of the American public to communicate their deep and distressed concern.

Many of the people participating in our moratorium on war have nothing to lose. Too many cannot find hope in tomorrow. They did not share Mr. Nixon's enthusiasm for "man's greatest day on the moon" since they still await man's greatest day here on earth.

They listen to President Nixon tell them he will not listen—and conclude that any act is justified to vent their frustration. This administration and its attitude reinforce the desperation of black people, poor people, students, mothers, and other marchers for peace.

Look at the record of our President. He took the spotlight and presented us with his solution to poverty—and apologized profusely because it might cost \$4 billion.

At the same time, the Senate hunger committee told us it would take at least \$5 billion just to feed the poor—but the President apologizes for the expensive nature of a program which falls miles short of the need.

The President does not apologize for pacification programs in Vietnam where our troops have torn up the land and run millions of Vietnamese citizens from their homes—but here in the United States, the need for housing, food, clothing, and education—does not warrant sufficient expenditures.

We spend \$3 million an hour in Vietnam for 16 million people—while 25 million poverty-stricken Americans cry for help in our own country.

When this war began, there was lots of talk about "guns and butter"—and whether or not the Nation could have both. The Nation bought its guns and the people of the Nation who had been enjoying the butter—have kept their butter. The Nation has maintained a "guns and butter" policy with great success—in those terms—but it has not addressed a single domestic problem with success

since great sums of money started flowing into Asia.

The American tragedy is—Vietnam. The objectives were contrived and the rationale for our presence was not and is not related to American security. This war has dragged on—draining our land of its manpower, resources, goals, and of our resolve for perfecting America for Americans.

Because of the war, the American people have been subjected to outright lies by those who attempt to justify our presence and our continued involvement. Truth has been sacrificed to buy time for those who sought a military victory in Vietnam. No longer can truth be secondary—it must be the primary consideration in policy determinations from this point forward.

People who do not know the facts about Vietnam have stood in this past week to assert that if the rest of us knew the facts about this war, we would not participate in this moratorium. I must weigh their suggestion with statements from men who are in a position to know.

For example, Gen. David M. Shoup, former Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps and Congressional Medal of Honor winner who says,

I want to tell you that I don't think the whole of Southeast Asia is related to the present and future safety and freedom of the people of this country, is worth the life or limb of a single American . . . I believe that if we had and would keep our dirty, bloody, dollar-crooked fingers out of the business of these nations so full of depressed, exploited people, they will arrive at a solution of their own.

Another military leader, Brig. Gen. Hugh B. Hester, a veteran of MacArthur's command in the Pacific tells us:

I think we ought to get out the way we went in—unilaterally. And then we should do what we can to help rebuild their economy. That would be the way to restore the respect we had after World War II as a moral nation. We are in the wrong in Vietnam morally and from a military standpoint. It is against interests of the United States.

The Secretary General of the United Nations, Secretary U Thant stated:

I am sure that the great American people, if only they knew the true facts and the background of the development in Vietnam, will agree with me that further bloodshed is unnecessary.

Today, we have not solved anything in Vietnam. There is no evidence to show that the conflict of North and South Vietnam is any further toward resolution than it was when we entered. If anything, our presence has deepened the extent of the gap between north and south. We have served a puppet government which is clearly not representative of the people whose free choice we proclaim to fight for. Instead, the South Vietnamese have been flushed from their homes, hunger and war-panic driven. The Vietnamese people are worse off now in a bomb destroyed land than they were when we arrived.

The South Vietnamese maintain now a fighting force of 1,500,000 men. The fighting force of the Vietcong is 135,000 and with 900,000 North Vietnamese in

arms—the opposing sides are relatively equal militarily. They are relatively equal in resources. What is at question is will-power.

In Paris, the North Vietnamese cannot negotiate with us what we cannot obtain from the South Vietnamese Government. The matters for discussion clearly cannot be solved while we stand in as "big brother" for the South Vietnamese. Commonsense dictates that knowledge.

Commonsense also dictates that President Nixon could not support a coalition government in Vietnam, when in his own country he failed to establish one. How could he possibly know how to incorporate a concern for diverse interests or to advise the Vietnamese?

If the President's aim is to save face and to preserve his own honor, he can do so, both at home and abroad, by deferring now to the judgment of the people on Vietnam. He can exemplify democracy by a clear and concise statement to Vietnam and to the world that the people of the United States have chosen to leave Vietnam to the Vietnamese. This is truly where the question of honor rests—upon the ability of a free nation to direct its policy to conform to present day issues and demands of its people.

There is no greatness in a nation who sees its policy, whatever policy, as irreversible. That is not greatness—but narrowness of mind. It is not admission of failure to withdraw our forces from Vietnam—but admission that a better course for Vietnam and for the United States lies in such a withdrawal. It should not be difficult—even for this administration—to build a defense for its action when its action is based on truth.

Through the years with Vietnam, American people have been made to sacrifice truth as they see it for a policy in which they had no voice.

Through the years in Vietnam, our fight for freedom in Vietnam has been accompanied with a constant and increasing repression of freedom in the United States. Through the years with Vietnam, the apathy of our people has been turned to action—to the surprise and dismay of this Government. Citizenship has taken on new dimensions of responsibility—of crisp proportions.

Consider the slightly frightened lady who dropped by my office today—to deliver an American flag-draped casket.

"Sometimes," she said, "we must be morbid to make our point." A representative for only one of the hundreds of organizations working for peace, she pleaded that I do whatever I can—in position, to reflect this concern for peace. She was not a student tired of classes, nor was she a hippie, nor was she a rioter; nor, I dare say, does her concern for peace make her a Communist?

Consider the mother from St. Louis, Mrs. Patricia H. Reither, who sent me today a simple black bordered card on which she hand wrote:

Dear Representative Clay, think of young Phil, Vietnam, on Wednesday. Peace.

With the card came a printed prayer with her son's name at the top—"Phil H. Reither, Jr.: June 22, 1947–Sept. 30, 1969."

These people, like the middle-aged lady working for her peace organization, like Phil's mother, like five blackcloaked mothers from St. Louis who stopped by my office 2 weeks ago during their march for peace—like the Quakers who were arrested on the steps of the Capitol—these are citizens whose commitment to peace and truth motivates them to march, to speak, to act, to sacrifice, to place themselves on the line for peace in spite of the misplaced criticism and degradation to which they are subjected—all their efforts—just to stop the war in Vietnam.

I can do no less than to join my colleagues who are observing this first official day of moratorium by varying our "business as usual" conduct. Instead, we have come to the Halls of the Congress at an hour when our presence in these Chambers is not required nor sought for official business. We have come to join these peacemakers who seek a non-violent and peaceful demonstration for peace. We come to show that we have not lost faith in democracy—that we have not lost faith in the ultimate impact of the people of this Nation upon their Government.

Stop the war, Mr. President—for God's sake, bring American forces home immediately. This country has evaded its own "business as usual" responsibilities far too long in favor of "war as usual."

VIETNAM MORATORIUM

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, we gather tonight in this Chamber to exchange ideas about the future course of the U.S. military involvement in Vietnam.

It is altogether fitting and proper that we do so because by so doing and particularly in connection with the Vietnam moratorium we convey to the people of America and particularly to the young people of America that we are listening to them—that we are a responsive and responsible legislative body.

For that reason I take the floor tonight to exchange with my colleagues my opinion as to our future course of action in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that we have lost sight of the reason—right or wrong—for our original intervention in Vietnam.

We entered Vietnam in 1965 to prevent an overthrow of the South by the North and to give the elected government of South Vietnam time to build so that it could become strong enough to defend itself from the North or make a political arrangement with the north.

Mr. Speaker, we have accomplished that objective.

We did not enter Vietnam to inflict a defeat on North Vietnam; we entered to prevent a defeat of South Vietnam.

We have accomplished that objective. I believe we could have accomplished that objective with fewer than the more than 500,000 troops we have in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the time has long passed when we should have been withdrawing our troops.

In the fall of 1966, in a letter to my constituents, I said:

The conflict in South Vietnam is, in the long run, primarily an Asian problem, and I have been working to secure its eventual settlement by the peoples of free Asia. They should not ask us to defend their region alone indefinitely.

The following year in summer of 1967, I said:

The war in Vietnam continues and past escalation has not achieved our hope of bringing the other side to the negotiating table. The South Vietnamese will elect a new government in the fall. After those elections, it seems to me we should say to the new government: "We have accomplished the mission we set for ourselves in 1965. We have prevented the forceful overthrow of your government by armies from the North. The primary job of fighting the Viet Cong guerrillas or negotiating with them must be yours."

My suggestion did not meet with favor, and we continued our escalation of the war in Vietnam until on March 10, 1968, a story in the New York Times wrote the fact that the military were asking for an additional 206,000 troops for Vietnam.

As has been ably described in the October issue of Atlantic magazine by former Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Townsend W. Hoopes, this was the turning point in our policy of continual escalation of the war in Vietnam.

On March 12, 1968, I introduced a very brief resolution which provided as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of Congress that the United States should not increase its military involvement in Vietnam.

Within a few days there were 37 cosponsors of this resolution. At the time of the introduction of this resolution on March 11, I said:

Mr. Speaker, we are at a crossroads in the war in Vietnam. We can either maintain our present objectives, which apparently require increased military involvement, or we can change our objectives and reduce or at least contain our military involvement.

Our military leaders are asking the President for 206,000 more troops for Vietnam. Apparently they want more troops to continue to do more of what we have been doing for the past few years.

Others urge that what is needed is not more troops and more casualties but new and different strategies and tactics which will mean no more American troops and fewer American casualties.

This is a basic and fundamental policy decision about war and peace in which the American people through their elected representatives should participate. Not since the Gulf of Tonkin resolution in August 1964 has Congress been given a chance to participate in similar fundamental decisions about Vietnam.

Under our Constitution, I believe that Congress should participate in these decisions.

In my opinion our strategy of positioning American forces in the uninhabited border areas of Vietnam and leaving the defense of the cities and towns to the South Vietnamese has not worked.

Even with more troops I am not sure it will work.

However, if we decide that this is a war for people, and not for geography—if we pull back from the border areas, our present troops can join with the South Vietnamese in defending the people.

We should position our troops deep enough within South Vietnam so that when the enemy attacks he would not have border sanctuaries at his rear but could be surrounded by our highly mobile troops.

This strategy, some military planners believe, would cut the recent United States casualty rate in half yet permit more progress in pacification, an objective that has far more to do with success in Vietnam than casualties inflicted on Communist troops.

At any rate, this strategy should be considered by the President and the Congress before there is any further escalation of the war in Vietnam.

So that the Congress can effectively participate in this decision, I have today introduced a very brief Resolution which provides as follows: "Resolved . . . that it is the sense of Congress that the United States should not increase its military involvement in Vietnam."

I invite all members who question further escalation of our military involvement in Vietnam to join with me in introducing similar resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, the 206,000 additional troops were not sent to Vietnam, and it is just barely possible that House Congressional Resolution 683 played a part in this decision.

By September 1968 I thought that the Congress was ready for a more drastic position and accordingly I proposed a resolution which provided as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the United States should begin to liquidate its military involvement in Vietnam.

In my letter to the cosponsors of the March resolution seeking their cosponsorship of this resolution, I said:

This resolution, I believe, will make it clear that Congress wishes not merely to limit American military involvement in Vietnam, but to begin to liquidate it entirely.

This language must have been too strong because only eight Members of the House joined me in cosponsoring this resolution.

Accordingly, on March 26, 1969, I introduced a resolution which expressed the same idea but with more acceptable wording, because there were 38 cosponsors of this resolution, which provides that:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the United States should begin to reduce its military involvement in Vietnam.

Therefore, I applaud the fact that the President has begun the withdrawal of troops from Vietnam.

However, I deplore the fact that the withdrawal has proceeded at such a slow pace.

Richard Nixon, the man who promised Americans last November that if they elected him President, he would get them out of Vietnam, has not done enough to honor that promise.

Richard Nixon, swept into office by something less than a massive popu-

larity, campaigned on his will to end the war.

He has forsaken many opportunities to initiate significant U.S. withdrawals and seems content that the war will go away with the ascendancy of his three points; namely, the demonstrated ability of the South Vietnamese Army to defend the country, reduced infiltration by the North Vietnamese, and clear progress at the Paris peace talks.

In the meantime, while pledging his fervent desire for peace, he boldly claims that renewed student demonstrations for peace will have no effect on him.

His stalking horses, Secretary of State Rogers, Secretary Laird at Defense, and on occasion the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, HUGH SCOTT, proclaim the virtues of the Nixon stubbornness to relinquish the three-point demand and even said a possible answer may be further military actions.

Added to the disappointing behavior of the Administration are statements emanating from its spokesmen that ring strangely of past oratory.

Just last week the new minority leader in the other body, said the "enemy has about one offensive left in him. After that, the enemy is a defeated enemy."

On the heels of General Wheeler's statement that he expects a new winter offensive by the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong, Scott's statement sounds a bit like General Westmoreland on April 10, 1968, when he said:

The enemy has many problems: He is losing control of the scattered population under his influence . . . He sees the strength of his forces steadily declining . . . His monsoon offensives have been failures. He was dealt a mortal blow by the installation of a freely elected representative government . . . the enemy hopes are bankrupt.

Ten thousand American soldiers and untold numbers of allied soldiers and Vietnamese civilians have lost their lives since Westmoreland calmed us with his prognosis.

Yet his statement came 4 years after Gen. Paul D. Harkins, Commander of the Military Assistance Command in Saigon joyously claimed "victory is just months away, and the reduction of American advisers can begin any time now. I can safely say the end of the war is in sight." That proclamation was made 35,000 American deaths ago.

But even 1 year before Harkins' statement, on March 8, 1963, an Assistant Secretary of Defense, could look at the situation and safely state, "The corner has definitely been turned toward victory in Vietnam."

Probably the supreme optimist of this entire group was the French commander in chief who on January 2, 1954, when Vietnam was still called Indo-China, waxed eloquently, "I fully expect only 6 more months of hard fighting."

Well, roughly, 190 months of hard fighting and dying followed the French general's victory preview and American troops are still losing their lives, for what?

Why are we still there when we have achieved our original objective?

This is what I, and thousands of others, have asked and are asking.

Why are we still in Vietnam? Whose interests are served by our being there?

These are the questions the President cannot or will not answer to the satisfaction of most Americans. And these are the issues which bring us here tonight and this morning—and will bring us here many more mornings I hope if the administration does not begin to heed the voice of the American people. A voice that asks for peace. A voice that says let the young men stop dying for nothing. There are no Hitlers or Stalins in Vietnam. The domino theory has been disproved and we are tired. Let us rid ourselves of this thorn which threatens to poison our whole fabric of life.

The distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, introduced a new perspective into the Vietnam debate the other day when he offered for the RECORD a comparison of the casualties incurred in this war during the service of Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon.

I would like to quote Senator FULBRIGHT on those statistics:

The average monthly total of dead during the Kennedy administration was 4.97; in the Johnson administration, 592.4; and in the Nixon administration, it has been 992.57. That is not quite double the average monthly total of dead in the Johnson administration.

The monthly average totals of the number of wounded are similar. In the Kennedy administration, it was 13.66 per month; in the Johnson administration, 3,201.5; and in the Nixon administration thus far, it is 6,131.59. Again, that is almost twice—almost 100 percent—the total number of wounded in the Johnson administration, monthly.

Senator FULBRIGHT finished by saying:

These figures graphically show, it seems to me, that the level of fighting instead of having declined during the last 9 months, has substantially increased, both with respect to the wounded and the dead. It is true that in the last 2 or 3 weeks there has been a decline, but these figures are the averages since the beginning of the war.

The thrust of my argument is, contrary to what President Nixon would like us to believe and the few concessions to doves aside, the war has continued unabated under his administration.

President Nixon toured Asia last summer making statements concerning the folly of Vietnam-like adventure.

If indeed Mr. Nixon had seen the light—as he would have so many of us believe—he would have seen clearly the tie between the Vietnam morass and every major problem confronting the United States today. The balance of these challenges are coming from within—mainly they are thrown at us from the young and the black, those who suffer most when military ranks must be filled and domestic programs shunned.

If the United States is to continue in its role as a world leader, as innovator and guide, the ideals of the young—which many find easy to scoff at—must find a commanding place in national thought and action.

These hundreds of thousands of young people are thoughtful enough to know the good and evil in national actions.

Today's youth are probably the best educated, informed, and sensitive gen-

eration to ever grace our land. It ranks as pure stupidity to ignore their appeal for peace and close one's ears to their cries.

The popular will for change is there—we have merely to look around us today for evidence of that. And the previous policies ripe for a change are there, too—and nobody can doubt that a new Chief Executive exists to make those changes. But the missing factor is the firm resolve on the President's part to step in, grasp the old programs, shift them around and slowly but obviously, and minus obfuscation, get this country out of that mess.

Instead, he seems content to try to pacify the world—with appropriate utterances about peace and troop withdrawals and all the while fiddle, press, and rummage for a plan.

Where is your plan, Mr. President? Where is the design that was to have taken us from the despair of Vietnam and restore the national pride soiled by our belligerent presence in South Vietnam?

I am sure every waking hour presents the President with ample reminder that the office he now holds was won mainly on the promise to end the agony and the shame of Vietnam.

Let me quote from a recent Democratic National Committee release which discussed a trip to Vietnam made by Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Wheeler:

Wheeler took a mid-July trip to Vietnam which was supposed to reorient the fighting tactics, but the Washington Post reporter David Hoffman in Saigon said that as of July 31 there was no discussionable change on New Washington orders. According to this report, most U.S. Commanders insist there is no casualty-reducing alternative to the strategy being followed. Yet Secretary Laird, on July 27, said a new approach called "protective reaction" will replace maximum pressure.

How do you explain the differences between "protective reaction" and "maximum pressure," to Mrs. Albert Colletto of Pittsburgh?

Mrs. Colletto had a son killed in Vietnam shortly after he participated in the onslaught against Hamburger Hill. That was the strategic hill which this administration felt was so vital it chastised those critics who protested sending American boys six times up its treacherous slopes until they finally subdued it.

This administration leaped on Senator KENNEDY and others who called that campaign senseless.

Yet Hamburger quickly lost its value because we abandoned it days after Pvt. Albert Colletto and others captured it.

Private Colletto died engaging in "protective reaction" somewhere in the Vietnam jungles. But before his life was snuffed out he managed to pen the following lines.

They were given to me by his aunt, emblazoned on the back of a prayer card.

IN MEMORY OF HAMBURGER HILL

(By Pfc. Albert V. Colletto, Jr., U.S. 52-839-565, 101 A. B. Inf.—Co. C 1/506—Died 1969)

As I lie here among the trees,
the smell of the dying is in the breeze.
A Soldier cried out, Come to me please,

there was no need, he ceased to breathe. The wounded laid dying, and the dead already gone, a Sergeant yelled, get up, drive on. With the lead flying in from every way, I didn't expect to last the day. We fought hard trying to win, but at last we stopped, as night set in. Dig in deep was the word, to those who were left it didn't seem absurd. They called our assault Hamburger Hill, a name well put, but will you remember it, as always I will. Ask the lame, they can tell you it wasn't a game. You can ask the dead, but remember their aim. Peace is golden and may be achieved, if men would learn to love, the burden of war would be relieved. This is a true story, it is no lie, give credit to the dead, because of the hill they died.

The mother of Private Colletto would have difficulty in understanding the difference between "protective reaction" and "maximum pressure." But I am sure if before he was killed Private Colletto was consulted about the difference he would have known. I think he might have said that there is small difference between the two. It may extend past the name but little else.

I wish that President Nixon had more than chagrin on his mind when he vowed, in reaction to former Defense Secretary Clark Clifford's suggestion to remove 100,000 troops by 1970, "I hope to beat Mr. Clifford's timetable."

Now there are two and a half months remaining in this year for the President to follow through on that hope.

I, for one, would not fancy imposing on the President an exact date—or rigid timetable.

Thus far, I have spoken on the war which has continued day in and day out, interminably. Even as I am speaking to you at this late hour, while most of the Nation sleeps, there will be several more of America's youth who will join the legion that will not see their homes again. It is this tragedy that confronts us as a nation. It is this tragedy that haunts the Nation's leaders. They continue to search for an honorable way to extricate the Nation from the agony that it now finds itself locked within. They look backwards into our history and forlornly try to draw comparisons. Our people shed their blood during the Revolutionary War which was fought to create our Nation. These men did not die in vain. Our anguished Nation sent its sons into battle during the Civil War and they did not die in vain for the Union was preserved. In 1918 and again in 1941 this country helped to fight cataclysmic wars which were supposed to make the world safe for democracy and in the 1950's at the request of the United Nations we again shed our blood in Korea.

Now, however, we find ourselves in this horrible nightmare—like none this Nation has ever faced before, yet still our leaders continue to search for a noble rationale, as in the past conflicts throughout our history. They dare not let loose because to do so would be to admit defeat and if defeated our youth that we have committed to battle will have died in vain. President Nixon has

stated this in so many words when he said he did not intend to preside over the first defeat this Nation has ever faced.

My friends, to borrow the phrase from a modern folk song—When will they ever learn? When will they ever learn? This war in Southeast Asia is not the American Revolution and it is not the Civil War or the World Wars I or II. It is an Asian war which Asians should fight. It is a ghastly mistake; it has been and it will continue to be as long as Americans shed their blood.

Our men that we have sent into battle and who have died—will have died in vain. Unless and until we the living rededicate ourselves to them—we must admit our mistake and we must reorder ourselves and our Nation along a course which does in fact preserve, promote, and demonstrate the ideals on which the Nation was founded. It has not been a traditional war, it has not been an idealistic war. It has been a war entered into by a nation—a great nation—but one which for a brief period has become separated from its true path.

Therefore, let us admit this and rededicate ourselves in the name of those who will not come home—to the task of righting the course of our Nation. It has fallen into disrepair from neglect, and all of us must share the blame—from the most humble of us to those in the highest stations and offices in the land. Look about you—not just at the physical disrepair of the country—its cities, its lakes and rivers, its schools and highways and air, though they all suffer sadly from neglect. Look also if you will at the more basic problem—the cynicism and self-serving interest and lack of true responsibility on the part of everyone—from officials of Government to large segments of our population. Is not this the true underlying cause of both our domestic neglect and our international pomposity that could beguile us into a conflict such as Vietnam? We are not imperial Rome and we are not the policemen of the world.

The analogy of Rome is significant in another respect—close to me and my duties as a Congressman. Rome became an imperial state and extended its sway across Europe and the Mediterranean as its senate bit by bit lost the powers that it had originally assumed.

The parallel is significant. The Congress of the United States over the past several decades has shirked a number of the responsibilities bestowed upon it by the Constitution, and in many ways these responsibilities that we have not faced are bound up in our national dilemma of Vietnam, our national priorities, and a military establishment of the size and makeup that have permitted us as a Nation to embark upon adventures which upon sober reflection are not truly in our Nation's interests.

CONGRESSIONAL CONSTITUTIONAL DUTIES

What we have witnessed this year in the debate in both the House and the Senate over the military procurement bill and equally the debate on the ABM and MIRV is a democracy making a valiant attempt to assert effective control over a military-industrial complex in an age of relentless technology.

Phrased another way, we are today watching a constitutional crisis of historic proportions in which the Congress is attempting to reassert its constitutional powers and carry out its constitutional obligations.

Of late much has been said and written about clause 1 of section 2 of article II of the Constitution which provides that "the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States."

Under the Constitution the President commands whatever Armed Forces are provided to him but the decision as to the number of soldiers and sailors and whether they shall be equipped with ABM's and MIRV's, under our Constitution, is not his to make.

The so-called war power clauses of the Constitution are clauses 11, 12, 13, and 14 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

These clauses provide that Congress has power to declare war, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a Navy, to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

The clauses of the Constitution which give Congress authority to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a Navy, and so forth, were not inserted for the purpose of endowing the National Government with power to do these things, but rather to designate the branch of Government which should exercise such powers.

These provisions grew out of the conviction that the Executive should be deprived of the "sole power of raising and regulating fleets and armies" which Blackstone attributed to the King under the British Constitution. Justice Story in his "Commentaries" wrote:

Our notions, indeed, of the dangers of standing armies, in time of peace, are derived in a great measure from the principles and examples of our English ancestors. In England, the King possessed the power of raising armies in the time of peace according to his own good pleasure. And this prerogative was justly esteemed dangerous to the public liberties. Upon the revolution of 1688, Parliament wisely insisted upon a bill of rights, which should furnish an adequate security for the future. But how was this done? Not by prohibiting standing armies altogether in time of peace; but (as has been already seen) by prohibiting them *without the consent of Parliament*. This is the very proposition contained in the Constitution; for Congress can alone raise armies; and may put them down, whenever they choose.

Unquestionably, therefore, the Founding Fathers intended to give Congress the primary role in establishing and equipping the military.

The question arises, however, given the highly technological nature of modern military hardware, is Congress still the proper department of government to exercise these powers?

As a Member of Congress for 10 years, I have not questioned the wisdom of the Founding Fathers in imposing this duty on us, but I have questioned recently whether we adequately have carried out our constitutional responsibilities.

Congress is inhibited in two ways from carrying out its constitutional duties,

but both of these could be overcome by an informed public.

The first inhibition is the lack of adequate staff and supporting resources to examine the military budget properly. Second is the inherent problems of the committee system.

Because Congress has the unpopular task of imposing taxes, Congress is reluctant to spend money on its own operations even when such expenditures could save the taxpayers many times the initial investment. The result is that in terms of staffing and backup resources available for analyzing the military budget the Congress is wholly inadequate to the task.

The committee that directly handles the military budget in the House are the Armed Services Committee and the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. Armed Services analyzes the posture statement and authorizes force levels and weapons systems. The Defense Appropriations Subcommittee then appropriates funds for support of these programs.

The amount of justification material that both of these staffs has to analyze is incredible. However, there is a professional staff of only nine in Armed Services and only five in Defense Appropriations that handles this task. And I had the temerity to criticize the Budget Bureau with a staff of 31 assigned to the Defense budget.

Another example of inadequate backup resources, the Congress has provided over 4,300 computers for the executive branch and none, except for housekeeping chores, for the legislative branch.

Under these conditions, when the military budget totaling over \$80 billion comes before the Congress for authorization and appropriation, it can readily be seen that Congress is almost hopelessly handicapped in obtaining a thoroughgoing independent analysis of the Pentagon's proposals.

I propose that we in the Congress start considering seriously our own allocation of resources. I would contend that one of the best investments we could make is in the expansion and upgrading of our committee staffs and a substantial but reasonable investment in terms of backup resources.

Obviously, all of this is going to cost money, and it is the natural reaction of appropriations committees to be somewhat wary of new expenditures. But one system analyst, or one budgetary expert, who draws a salary of \$20,000 a year, may, in the end, save the Government a million dollars. That is the kind of investment that all of us in Congress should be able to endorse.

The second inhibition is the congressional committee system. If a Member comes from a city district, he seeks to serve on the Housing Committee. If he comes from a rural district, he seeks to serve on the Agriculture Committee. In time, he becomes, not a judge of, but an advocate for, housing or farm programs.

Similarly, if he comes from a district with military establishments, he seeks membership on Armed Services or Defense Appropriations and becomes, not a judge of, but an advocate for, military programs.

The difference is that Congress as a whole can and does provide a check on any excesses in programs reported by Housing or Agriculture Committees, but when a military program is reported it is shrouded in secrecy and complexity and wrapped in the flag so that any questioning of it is close to being unpatriotic.

It may be that the creation of an overview committee to debate priorities among civilian programs and between civilian and military programs is necessary. Such a joint committee, similar to the Joint Economic Committee, would review annually the basic foreign and military postures of the Nation and consider budget alternatives. No members of the Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, or Appropriations Committees ought to serve on this joint committee. Furthermore, membership on it should be for no more than 4 to 6 years.

With the studies and reports of such a joint overview committee the level of debate in the Congress over national priorities could be elevated to the point contemplated by the framers of the Constitution. In economic affairs this was one result of the creation of the Joint Economic Committee.

Without the creation of this special oversight committee, it may be that the Joint Economic Committee which has been doing a similar job this year, should continue to do so.

However it is done, it is important that Congress, which is a many-purpose institution, do the job.

Civilians in the Defense Department, no matter how dedicated and intelligent, are still assigned a single purpose—the protection of national security through military means.

The Constitution gives to Congress the responsibility for considering all the needs of the Nation, not merely the military. The first clause of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution expresses this idea very succinctly.

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to Pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States;

The Congress must balance the demand for defense dollars with the demand of taxpayers for tax cuts and the demands of the poor for poverty programs.

To enable Congress to do this job properly, it was necessary that there be a change in public opinion. So long as the people thought it unpatriotic to question the military budget, no committee of Congress and no Member of Congress would do so.

This year the time seemed right for the development of the kind of public climate in which Congress could properly exercise its constitutional duties.

This year, I decided to do something to help develop this kind of a climate.

I looked into the budget interplay between the Defense Department and the Bureau of the Budget and came to the shocking conclusion that the Bureau of the Budget does not give the Defense Department the same kind or degree of scrutiny that it gives to nondefense spending.

On March 20, 1969, at a hearing before the Military Operations Subcommittee, I made this charge:

Domestic agency budgets are given different and more intense scrutiny than the defense budget. In all departments of government, except for the Defense Department, budget examiners conduct an independent analysis and review which is submitted to the Director of the Budget. In Defense, budget examiners work not independently, but with their defense counterparts, and the analysis and review are submitted first to the Secretary of Defense rather than to the Budget Director. Only after the Secretary of Defense has approved it, is the review submitted to the Budget Director. The result of this procedure is that whereas other Secretaries must go to the President to have him overrule the Budget Director, in the case of Defense, the Budget Director must go to the President to overrule the Secretary of Defense.

This process, of course, shifts the whole budget process power structure and renders the Bureau almost impotent as a force for independent analysis of military procurement programs.

The Bureau of the Budget at that time did not admit to the process I have just described. But in those hearings the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Hughes, did admit that the "climate" was substantially different in the examination of defense requests.

Referring to the "power relationships" in Washington, Mr. Hughes conceded that the Defense Department has both political power and muscle. And that "in this power-oriented town," these two attributes give it an advantage in dealing with the Budget Bureau.

Defense Secretary McNamara in his inimitable way made his opinion of the Budget Bureau's role in defense budget-making very clear when he told the Congress:

I will be quite frank with you, I can't remember a single instance in which the Bureau of the Budget and I differed on a recommendation in which the President accepted the Bureau of the Budget view. There may have been one in 4 years, but I can't remember a single one.

On June 3, 1969, at a hearing before the Joint Economic Committee Mr. Charles Schultze, the former Budget Director, in answer to my questioning agreed that the Budget Bureau procedure in handling the Defense budget was indeed as I had described it.

The point I was making was the need for an institution with a variety of responsibilities to review the military budget as a part of the overall budgetary needs of the Nation.

On June 12, 1969, Mr. Robert Mayo, the present Budget Director, appeared before the Joint Economic Committee and testified that he had received new instructions from President Nixon. He said:

I reiterate, Mr. Moorhead, that our policy with regard to defense . . . there have been differences before, and that it is our position that there are no differences now.

He then proceeded to read into the record a memorandum from the President directing the Bureau of the Budget to give the same treatment to all departments of Government.

I do not know if we really will see a change, but if we can keep up the pres-

sure the public will become aroused and if the public does become aroused the Congress and the President and the Bureau of the Budget will respond.

But merely improving Budget Bureau procedures does not fulfill the constitutional duties of Congress to control the military.

However, before congressional control could be asserted, it was necessary to end the myth of the infallibility of the military in which the American people and the Congress had come to believe.

Our military men are able, intelligent and dedicated, but they are not infallible and Congress should not abdicate to them the decisionmaking powers which the Constitution bestowed upon Congress.

To develop a climate of healthy skepticism I started with an area in which people of all political philosophies could agree—the need to eliminate waste and inefficiency.

This was step No. 1.

On April 29, 1969, the case of the C-5A came before the Military Operations Subcommittee.

The fact of a \$2 billion overrun was shocking enough but I had in my possession documents which revealed the even more shocking fact that the existence of these overruns was being deleted from official Air Force reports "on the direction of higher authorities."

When asked why this was done the Systems Program Director, in a very dramatic moment, revealed that this concealment was not for the benefit of the Government or the taxpayer, but to protect "Lockheed's position in the common stock market."

On May 14, 1969, the case of the Sheridan tank, or more accurately its infamous turret and caseless cartridge, came before the subcommittee.

It was revealed that the Army rushed into production with this \$1.3 billion vehicle to avoid "adverse political and budgetary impacts," even though it was clear the ammunition for the vehicle's gun would not work.

On May 15, 1969, the case of the Army's Cheyenne helicopter came before the subcommittee.

One of the many troubles with this helicopter, we were told, was that the newly developed rigid rotor blade "oscillated." This seemed mild enough until it was brought out that it "oscillated" so much that one time it amputated the canopy in which the pilot would sit. The officer testifying protested and said, "But, sir, that was not planned."

The primary purpose of these procurement horror stories was to lay the groundwork for improvement in procurement policies but they also served to develop a climate in which Congress could question other defense decisions.

This is important because even with perfect procurement we would still have a military budget out of control.

Having established a platform and credibility through step No. 1, the procurement horror stories, the time had come for step No. 2, which was to question the need for certain conventional weapons systems not involved in the direct security of the United States, but

more involved in our commitments overseas and based on certain threat assumptions.

It is now politically possible to discuss in Congress whether we need each and every one of our highly vulnerable 15 attack aircraft carriers when the Communist nations have none.

On June 3, 1969, in hearings before the Joint Economic Committee, I was able to ask former Budget Director Charles Schultze about our eight antisubmarine carrier task forces, and he said, referring to Secretary McNamara's 1968 posture statement, that if "these antisubmarine warfare carriers were substantially equipped with new planes, they might be marginally effective," and he suggested that this might be a good place to look into reduction of the budget.

Congress should take a hard look at our general purpose conventional forces because these items involve over 60 percent of the Defense Department's budget.

The Constitution directs the Congress to provide not only for "the common defense" but also for the "general welfare" of the United States. If we are to provide the funds for housing, education and so forth which the "general welfare" requires, the best source of additional funds seems to be those conventional forces which are not needed or which are only "marginally" needed for the "common defense."

The other way to obtain funds for the urgent domestic needs of our "general welfare" is to begin to question the assumption on which our conventional force levels are predicted. This would be step No. 3 in the progression of our reassertion of congressional control over the military budget.

For years we have directed our military forces to be ready to fight simultaneously—simultaneously, mind you—a major conventional land war in Europe against the Soviets, and a major conventional land war in Asia against the Chinese, and a minor brush-fire war elsewhere in the world. Before the Sino-Soviet split this policy may have been rational—after the split it was questionable—now after the Ussuri River fights it is clearly nonsense.

In the Joint Economic Committee hearings Dr. Karl Kaysen projected a greatly reduced military budget by changing the two-war-plus policy and that we should "maintain no continuing ground force commitment in Asia."

The first three steps were important laying of a political basis which does not involve the direct safety of American citizens—all of us could sleep just as well if the ratio of U.S. attack aircraft carriers over the Communists went down from 15-0 to 12-0.

The fourth step is to have rational congressional and public debate over strategic weapons systems where the more immediate and direct security of the United States may be involved.

This involves the debate in the Senate over the deployment of the anti-ballistic missile system—ABM—and in the House over the continued testing and production of the multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles—MIRV.

The debate over ABM is an encouraging sign that Congress does intend to

perform its constitutional duties over the military.

As Senator FULBRIGHT said in testimony before the Joint Economic Committee on June 4 of this year about the ABM:

The first time in the 25 years I have been in the Senate that there has appeared to be an opportunity to change in any substantial way at all a program affecting the military has been the ABM. And I don't know whether it can succeed or not. We are told in the press that it is close. That is the only time I have ever heard of a vote being close on a matter affecting a major military program.

The story with respect to MIRV is different. It shows how the Pentagon can flaunt the will of a majority of Congress.

On July 10, 1968, the Pentagon entered into a letter contract with General Electric Co. for the production of 68 Mark 12 reentry vehicles and announced it in such a way that it attracted no attention in the press or in Congress.

On June 19 of this year, President Nixon told the country that he was considering asking the Russians to agree to a moratorium on further MIRV testing. Forty-one Senators lined up behind a "sense-of-the-Senate" resolution proposed by Senator BROOKE, supporting a mutual test moratorium. Similar resolutions had over 100 cosponsors in the House. But in the meantime, in April and May of this year, the Pentagon was engaged in negotiations with General Electric to definitize the July 1968 letter of intent. At that time, according to the Department of Defense, authorization was given to proceed with the actual production of the deployment model of the Mark 12. This process was completed and the contract was signed on June 19—the very day on which Mr. Nixon was informing the reporters that he was considering trying to work out a standstill with the Russians. Contrary to its usual practice, the Pentagon did not announce the award.

On June 24, 1969, by accident my office learned of the existence of the production contract.

On June 26, 1969, I called a press conference and blasted this dangerous concealment from the Congress.

As the Detroit Free Press said on June 30:

Representative William S. Moorhead of Pennsylvania could do worse than to ask President Nixon one simple question: "Who the hell is conducting foreign policy, the President, with the advice and consent of Congress, or the Pentagon?"

I am not concerned about who is at fault.

I am concerned about jeopardizing the impending strategic arms limitation talks—SALT.

As the St. Louis Post-Dispatch said on June 29:

It is quite true, as Mr. Moorhead says, that the start of MIRV production, implying a vast multiplication of our offensive nuclear capability, may impel the Soviets to respond in kind and thus touch off a new round of the arms race. We agree with him that production should be postponed and tests suspended. The arms talks should have a chance to succeed before we begin proliferating an already excessive nuclear arsenal.

I think we may be at a historic fork in the road in the history of the arms race.

Because of fear of the Chinese, the Soviets may want an agreement with us.

Gromyko's speech last week certainly sounded like a thaw in the cold war.

I think it is possible that the Soviets want strategic arms limitation and want to avoid another escalation of the arms race if we do not force it on them.

Continued flight testing and production of MIRV may torpedo the SALT talks and force escalation on them.

I am convinced that we are far enough ahead of the Soviets that we can call a temporary halt to production and testing of MIRV to see if there is any hope of an enforceable agreement with the Soviets.

As Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, President Eisenhower's science adviser, told a House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee yesterday:

Because we are somewhat ahead of the Soviet Union in MIRV development, because our total strategic forces . . . are somewhat larger than those of the U.S.S.R. and because a very large fraction of our retaliatory force would not be imperiled by MIRV development, we could risk without undue danger to our national security initiation of such a moratorium pending a prompt and symmetric response from the U.S.S.R.

It appears impossible—politically at least—to halt both the MIRV and the ABM.

In my opinion, MIRV is far more destabilizing strategically, but ABM is more important politically.

Strategically, ABM could be deployed and we could still enter into an arms limitation agreement enforceable by spy satellites, on the number of ABM launchers deployed. However, once MIRV is deployable an enforceable agreement with the Soviets on MIRV is rendered far more difficult if not almost impossible.

On the political front, the Nixon administration is risking a very embarrassing defeat when the best they can hope for is a hairline victory on ABM which would not enhance the standing and prestige of the administration.

The logical solution both strategically and politically is for those Senators who oppose ABM and MIRV to agree to support some form of an ABM system in return for the administration's agreement to halt, for a limited period of time, the production and flight testing of MIRV.

Whatever the outcome of the debate this year, I think that you and I as taxpayers, whose dollars are involved, and we as citizens, whose lives are involved, must endeavor to restore to Congress its constitutional responsibility to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

WHICH WAY AMERICA?

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, out of this national debate and moratorium on the war in Vietnam, a notion

is merging that disturbs me greatly, and one that I trust will be heeded not only in this great body today, but throughout the Nation today and in the days to come.

That notion, as I see it, is that, unless you support this moratorium, you are not in favor of ending the war in Vietnam. This is a completely ridiculous notion, of course, but its impact is being felt, and underneath it all, we as a people are beginning to "choose sides"—not on the question of how to end the war in Vietnam—but rather, over whether or not we support the moratorium.

I relate this view only to point up something that I believe has been going on in this country for several years. In my judgment, we are rapidly becoming the dis-United States of America. We are unwittingly desecrating our national confidence and our national will that have long been the hallmark of America's internal fiber. And, history tells us that "a nation divided against itself cannot stand."

The constitutional right of the American people to peaceably express their dissent is unquestioned. It is a precious right that must be defended at all costs, and practiced whenever the need arises. But, what kind of a moratorium is it, pray tell, when there are no voices to be heard calling on all sides of the conflict in Vietnam to expedite an end to the war.

I seriously question the validity of any moratorium on the war in Vietnam that does not place at least a fair share of the blame on North Vietnam for the continuance of this miserable war and the farce now underway in Paris, wherein nothing concrete has yet been accomplished.

And, I seriously question the objectivity of any moratorium on the war in Vietnam that does not even suggest the need for any withdrawal of North Vietnamese troops from South Vietnam.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that in his "Dear American Friends" letter, Premier Pham Van Dong of North Vietnam gave his wholehearted acclaim and approval of today's antiwar demonstrations. With this in mind, it is not too difficult to comprehend why he should describe the moratorium as "a worthy and timely rebuff to the obstinate attitude of the U.S. administration in intensifying and prolonging the aggressive war in Vietnam," and to wish the demonstrators well in their "fall offensive."

Well, just for the record and, as one Member of Congress, I want to be recorded here today as saying that I believe Pham Van Dong is on the wrong track—and that President Richard M. Nixon is on the right track.

President Nixon is our President and he is working for an end to the war in Vietnam and for peace with freedom—not peace with surrender, or "peace at any price." And I honestly and wholeheartedly support the President in these efforts.

Some people today are asking: "What has President Nixon done in 9 months?"

He has reversed the policy of previous administrations with regard to the war in Vietnam. Rather than sending in more troops or escalating that war, he has reduced the level of fighting and

started to bring the boys home. Now, if that is not progress, I wish someone would tell me what is?

President Nixon's "phase-in phase-out" policy in Vietnam was advanced to the American people something over a year ago. During the past 8 months, it has been implemented and is now underway. It offers a positive solution to America's vast overinvolvement in Southeast Asia, and is a fair, practical and reasonable means to an end as far as the war itself is concerned.

But, how many in the streets today are recognizing, or even acknowledging these basic facts? How much can a President do in 8 or 9 months—about a mess that was 8 or 9 years in the making? And, what has happened to the American sense of openmindedness and fair-play?

Too many Americans, I fear, are pinning all their hopes on negotiations as the road to disengagement from the war in Vietnam. How short our memories become in the flood of rhetoric that is now underway. We tend to forget that the war in Korea was negotiated for 3 years, and we tend to overlook the fact that, as a result of those negotiations, 50,000 American troops remain in Korea today. Is this what we want in Vietnam? Is it what the war-weary people of Vietnam want?

Freedom, as we all know, is not free. The Communists have mounted an ideological offensive of aggression. And all we need to do is to look at the recent attempts at freedom of expression in Czechoslovakia, to see that their offensive is still very much alive. What we need to counter that, I submit, is an ideological offensive of our own—a freedom ideological offensive, if you will, that matches their idea with a bigger and better idea.

That, I believe, is the direction President Nixon is going.

But, he cannot go it alone. So in closing, I ask—which side are we on, anyway? The side of freedom and free nation building, or the side that yesterday called on the American people to mount a "fall offensive" against our country, against our President, and against the cause of freedom?

Which way, America?

ONE WAY TO EASE THE BURDEN FOR TENANTS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today that would require the payment of interest on the rent security deposits of tenants living in federally assisted apartment complexes. It is grossly unfair that tenants do not presently receive the benefit of interest payments on their money that is generally left in the possession of their landlords for long periods of time.

In my own Bronx, N.Y., district, for example, 12,000 families living in an apartment complex known as Parkchester are not receiving 1 cent in in-

terest on rent security deposits totaling \$1.2 million. The landlord-corporation, on the other hand, is the custodian of this money and is deriving investment benefits from revenue that rightfully belongs to the tenants.

In this instance alone, the deposit of rent security funds of \$1.2 million in a simple 5-percent interest-bearing bank account, would yield a return of \$60,000 annually.

In New York City and across the Nation, thousands upon thousands of tenants—many of them struggling middle-income families—are the victims of the same kind of unfairness experienced by the residents of Parkchester.

These tenants do not have the right to share in the profits that might accrue to their landlords from property investments. While I do not fault this particular area of free enterprise or even mean to imply that changes are necessary, I do not understand why tenants should be denied the most minimal investment benefits from money that belongs to them.

Rent security funds are intended only as a guarantee that tenants will adhere to the conditions of occupancy. If they do this, that money must be refunded to them when they move from the premises. Right from the very beginning, the element of protection favors the landlord who becomes both the custodian and controller of the rent security funds.

Under the circumstances, I know of no sound or valid reason for depriving tenants of simple interest payments on rent security deposits.

In the case of apartment complexes which are devoid of Federal assistance, it is my hope that State governing bodies throughout the Nation become increasingly aware of the unfairness of the present situation and enact remedial legislation similar to the bill I am offering here.

In this era of high taxes and inflation, the average American family is constantly struggling to make ends meet. My bill, therefore, simply offers one means of lightening their burden a bit in a way that is only proper and fitting. On that basis, I ask your support of this measure.

OF STRENGTH AND HONOR

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I was privileged to hear the words of Lt. Gen. Richard G. Stilwell, Deputy Chief for Military Operations, address a distinguished gathering of Medal of Honor recipients. Daily we read criticism and condemnation of the military and its needs in the present day and age. It is important to be aware of the views of the silent majority on this issue. General Stilwell's remarks should be of great interest to all Americans as to the need for a continuation of a strong and well-equipped military force:

OF STRENGTH AND HONOR

(Address by Lt. Gen. Richard G. Stilwell)

I know members of the society we honor tonight will agree that the locale is most appropriate to the occasion; that there is a special affinity between Texas and courage, both individual and collective. The history of this great state is studied with heroism, self-sacrifice, communal responsibility—with feats of men (and women) standing tall in crises. The Alamo has particular meaning for every American, from earliest school days on. The legendary exploits of that band of heroes—Travis, Crockett, Bowie and 184 others—at the cost of their precious lives—is a universal symbol of duty to country and faith in its future. So too the memory of Sam Houston, the derring-do at San Jacinto and the Independence thereby gained.

As one of these United States, the Texan heritage has been continuously enriched—in the course of taming its vast expanses, harnessing its resources, providing its sons when America was imperiled. Texans—in great numbers—have served valiantly and uncomplainingly on battlefields beyond count. Fifty-four have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Today, Texas is home to a new breed of heroes—some in uniform, some not. They, and this magnificent city, have captured the hearts and admiration of all the world with their giant steps on the last and greatest frontier: The Universe.

The unseen dangers they braved, the ultimate risks they faced met all the criteria for the coveted Medal of Honor save one—the environment, the hell of war alone was missing.

War is a special arena in which the Gods of Chance rise to full stature. Confusion is the concomitant of combat. The unknown is the first-born son of battle, and uncertainty is his shadow. The fighting man lives under the constant tension of being face to face with the unexpected, hour after hour, and days on end. He knows the violent, pounding heart, the sickening feeling in the pit of stomach. He knows cold sweat, unsteady hands, trembling knees.

In the arena of war, man must meet these challenges alone. Even in the midst of his comrades, he develops an inner loneliness—his innate confidence in personal survival sapped by realization that, in battle, death stalks unrelentingly.

The man of combat finds himself in a world that differs—in a thousand ways—from all that he has known before. That world shrinks enormously in time and space to immediate imperatives: defeating the foe; staying alive, God willing; and helping his buddies stay alive.

Believe me, countless members of the brotherhood of combat veterans have gone through this kind of hell.

We are assembled tonight to pay homage to an elite segment of that brotherhood of combat veterans: the handful, from among untold tens of thousands, who hold the coveted Medal of Honor.

This prized fraternity encompasses all ranks. Its members constitute a true cross-section of America: the roll includes men of every color, creed, race, and social strata. The Medal of Honor knows no prejudices.

To understand the criteria on which award of the Medal of Honor is based, one need go no further than the first paragraph of each citation: "For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of life above and beyond the call of duty, in actions involving actual conflict with an enemy." Thus it is reserved—not for presidents, statesmen, generals, and others of high station—but for those in the forefront of battle.

The words "conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of life" are significant. Every man is marked by a love of life and a natural instinct for self-preservation which normally surpass all other human motiva-

tions. To risk life for one's buddies, one's unit, one's country is the supreme expression of selflessness. In war, acts of courage are legion; personal sacrifice is a way of life. In these circumstances, the man singled out for recognition must be of a special mold, truly a hero among heroes. Though the magnificent heroes here this night are too modest to recount their deeds, each of their stories would thrill you to the marrow. They have earned the everlasting gratitude of this nation and we salute them therefore.

America was created, expanded, and since sustained by the inner courage and physical strength of such men—men who have accepted all challenges, at home and abroad—men who have defended this nation's security and honor during the 193 years of her existence.

Our national power is the product of a vibrant citizenry. From active, responsible citizens comes the willingness to toll, sweat, and fight—if necessary—for our basic values, for that which is just, and decent. The overwhelming majority of Americans are such citizens.

But history records that Americans have been slow to awaken to external danger. We have rallied in time of emergency, but we have also allowed our military strength to atrophy when the most immediate threat receded, however slightly.

This is an old story. We have seen it happen again and again—the unpreparedness, the crisis, the frantic build-up, then off to war. Thus far at least, we have always made it—but just in the nick of time.

Before World War I—for reasons well known—the dark happenings in the Old World interested Americans only casually and only from a distance. So, too, the Guns of August, 1914. Then, suddenly a German torpedo sank the Lusitania with fearsome loss of passengers, including Americans. Never again would we find security in mere geographic isolation.

The United States was ill-prepared for the conflict it entered. But we had the leisure to mobilize the nation and we eventually saved the day. Our soldiers came home from France to great celebrations. America was proud of her victory and even prouder of the men who had fought so bravely to win it for her.

But all too soon America wanted to forget. Having won the "war to end all wars," the public clamored for a return to the warm security of isolationism. The mantle of world leadership was too heavy a burden. The Armed Forces were allowed to deteriorate. By 1939, the Army's strength was lower than before World War I.

Then came the attack on Pearl Harbor, galvanizing the American people into action again. The torpedoes and bombs that sank American battleships also sank "American Firstism." Congress, responding to the overwhelming National cry for action, speedily declared war.

Once again we mobilized while others carried the main brunt of the war. It took four hard years to achieve victory.

And yet we still had not learned. While the conflict raged the military was a "Hall of Heroes." After World War II, the Armed Forces were drastically reduced; the need for military readiness largely ignored. President Kennedy used to quote from an old British barracks ballad:

"God and the Soldier we adore,
In time of danger, not before.
The danger gone, and all things righted,
God is forgotten, the Soldier slighted."

In a few short years we were swept into the Korean War and emerged in the same pattern—eager to reduce our Armed Forces, and lessen our military might. This time we would not stand behind the shield of our oceans or other nations, but rather behind the single shield of massive nuclear retaliation. As conventional warfare was reckoned unlikely, the soldier was considered obsolete.

Vietnam has, of course, disproved the rationale of this philosophy. It has also pointed up most dramatically the need for strong, balanced forces, capable of meeting all kinds of threats on many levels of involvement, and without delay.

After Vietnam, there will be pressures—even now apparent—against the maintenance of such strength in being. Even now there are attacks on the military. An active campaign is being waged against ROTC. Young men are being urged to resist the draft. Heavy criticism is being directed against defense spending. The evidence suggests recurrence of the cyclic pattern witnessed seven times in our country's history.

But would this dismantling square with the shape of the 1970's, 80's and beyond?

Looking backward 20 years, one is struck by the chronology of conflict. Twenty—count them—20 wars and insurrections, ranging from Asia through the Middle East to Europe and Latin America. Each carried seeds of grave danger to our beloved Country, our ideals, and all that we hold dear. Ahead—as far as the eye can reach—one sees high promise of social, economic and technological advance. But one also sees international turbulence and stresses more potentially violent and explosive than in the recent past. The realities of the nuclear age will press more strongly from all sides as our arch rivals on the world scene enhance their missile, navy and armies. In a globe fantastically compressed by electronics and jets and rocket propulsion, there is no shield of time or space. Conversely, it will take increasingly long to forge a military machine from a meager base. In any case, the defeat of aggression once launched is no longer the best strategy.

Today and forever forward the American military—of the people, for the people—will have as its supreme task the prevention of war at any level. This fighting man will fulfill the noblest measure of his responsibilities by countering external dangers, gaining our Country's objectives, without recourse to bloodshed. But to prevent war one must be fully prepared for war.

It is in vogue to quote the late President Eisenhower—albeit out of context—on the military-industrial complex. My counter is a segment of his Farewell Address. He said: "A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction."

Members of the Congressional Medal of Honor Society, you have already done far more for your country than could be possibly expected of any group of men. But your patriotism and unswerving dedication to the national welfare are still at test. With the horrors of war indelibly etched in your memory, you understand the meaning of peace as few others can. Significantly, you also know the preconditions for ensuring that peace will endure through the lifetime of your children and your children's children. May your voices—heroic and respected—always support the maintenance of our national strength, our national faith and our national honor.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I thank you most humbly for listening.

MICHIGAN PESTICIDES COUNCIL

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Michigan Pesticides Council performs a continuing service to the citizens of Michigan and to the population of this coun-

try, generally, through its dedication to the protection of our environment.

The council's chairman, Mrs. Willard E. Wolfe, recently presented a statement to the Senate Commerce Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and the Environment at a meeting in Muskegon, Mich., under the chairmanship of Senator PHILIP A. HART. So that my colleagues may be aware of the council's views on pesticides, I include the text of Mrs. Wolfe's statement at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STATEMENT BY MRS. WILLARD E. WOLFE, CHAIRMAN, MICHIGAN PESTICIDES COUNCIL, SEPTEMBER 30, 1969, IN MUSKEGON, MICH.

Senator Hart, members of the subcommittee, my name is Mrs. Willard E. Wolfe. I am chairman of and speaking for the Michigan Pesticides Council, a council composed of organizations and individuals concerned with the present and future quality of our environment. We represent about 300,000 people through our member organizations, and our individual members include medical doctors, biologists and professional conservationists as well as the lay public. I am also chairman of the West Michigan Environmental Action Council, which will also be represented today.

We very much appreciate this opportunity to speak to your distinguished committee.

We first wish to emphasize that our Council is not opposed to all pesticides. We are opposed to the use of persistent, toxic insecticides such as DDT and Dieldrin in the outdoor environment. We are totally in sympathy with our farmers who are producing our food and battling with all the forces of nature. We feel that the farmer has been the victim of chemical company propaganda through his farm programs and literature, the victim of lack of research into less expensive and less harmful means to meet his problems, the victim of policies which have increased his insect problems, and the victim of agricultural schools which have been more responsive to the hucksters of chemicals than they have to scientific information.

Our organization is frankly and honestly outraged by policies which have resulted in persistent pesticide assault on our environment, since these results were almost wholly predictable. It is therefore our wish today to put on record what has brought us to this sorry day when coho cannot be marketed, many gulls, eagles and osprey suffer reproductive failure because they consume contaminated fish, and the entire biological life of our Great Lakes—as well as our oceans—is threatened by persistent pesticides. Indeed, important protein resources throughout the world may well be endangered.

In 1962 *Silent Spring* was published to alert the public to the consequences of certain pesticide use. The reaction of the public, as well as President Kennedy's own perusal of the book, led to the President's Science Advisory Committee examination of pesticides. Their conclusion—over seven years ago—was that "the elimination of the use of persistent toxic pesticides should be the goal," and that "accretion of residues in the environment be controlled by the orderly reduction in the use of persistent pesticides." Despite this report, last year the total United States production of persistent insecticides was approximately 225 million pounds, up from 150 million in 1962. DDT production had gone up from about 64 million pounds in 1962 to 103½ million pounds in 1968. We are now exporting more DDT than we manufactured in 1962.

Why has this happened? It happened because two other reactions to the public outcry took place: that of the chemical industry and that of the economic entomologists and agricultural leaders who had sincerely thought they had been doing good and now

felt they were being chastised as purveyors of poisons. An unholy alliance even predating 1962 affects us today—and without legislation to protect us—will continue to affect us for years to come.

We contend that information has been suppressed, scientists have been intimidated, and the public has been misguided by a fact-sorting process and by ridicule of factual information. We present the following examples as evidence:

1. Lack of independence of many of our nation's scientists.

The Natural Resources Departments in many or all of our land grant colleges are under the Schools of Agriculture. Any research or statements made by any member of those natural resources departments, therefore, are subject to the scrutiny of the Agriculture Schools under which they exist. We can be very grateful for the tremendous courage of some faculty members who have existed under these arrangements.

The highly-publicized pesticides research center at Michigan State University is an example of the preponderance of men, research and money devoted to virtually every pesticide question except what harm persistent pesticides may be doing to our environment. We can assume that under existing means of obtaining research money, much pesticide research is paid for by our chemical companies.

2. Biased news releases.

The Michigan State Agriculture Extension Service press releases pour out stories such as research on insects which break down persistent pesticides in the soil, or how cows may take charcoal and phenobarbital to prevent pesticide contaminated milk. I do not notice that they describe research on the heavily contaminated muds in our lakes, biological magnification of persistent pesticides in food chains, or facts such as tons of DDT circulating in our atmosphere. They do not admit that soil insects can do nothing about most of the contamination in the world, nor do they mention that some DDT breakdown products are also harming our environment. They have not mentioned the fact that mothers' milk has such a high level of DDT and Dieldrin that if bottled it could not be marketed. Obviously they can't very well suggest that Mothers should be taking charcoal laced with phenobarbital. Most of the press releases give the impression that research will eventually take care of all our problems.

The news release by the Michigan State University Department of Information Services, on a prestigious conference on man and his environment, was a good example of managed news. Despite the fact that several subjects were covered at the conference, including one by our governor's wife, and that pesticides were discussed from different points of view by more than one person, the only news release by the University was State Director of Agriculture Ball's defense of his pesticide policies. I submit the news release, the speech by Secretary Ball, and an opposing view by David Jenkins of the Department of Natural Resources, for the record.

Other press releases coming from both the Agriculture Department and our Michigan State University Extension Service have pointed the finger at cities for the most DDT found in rivers nearby. These press releases never included the fact that it was Michigan State University Extension Service entomologists and the Michigan Agriculture Department which were responsible for recommending and approving the use of DDT by the cities for Dutch Elm Disease control and other urban uses.

3. Ridicule, intimidation and suppression of information of our scientists by the unholy alliance.

One of the first scientists to report on harm done to the environment by persistent pesticides was Dr. George Wallace, of the Michigan

State University Zoology Department. He had discovered that the DDT used for Dutch Elm Disease control at the University campus was killing robins and other bird species, primarily insect eaters. His findings were eventually duplicated at other universities. After Dr. Wallace made his reports publicly known, attempts were made to discredit him. Two horticulture department professors made public statements about "spectacular half-truths coming from two or three small groups who like to make noise." After he testified on DDT in Washington—and this is a matter of public record—a member of the United States Department of Agriculture tried and almost succeeded in getting him fired. Such degrading statements and events stifled freedom of discussion on all our campuses.

In 1962 Dr. E. W. Roeloffs, fisheries professor, and Charles Shick, a biologist, prepared a publication entitled "Spray Programs and Wildlife." The information bulletin was reviewed by 11 other Michigan State University staff members, and after their approval 15,000 copies were printed. About two weeks after initial distribution the publication was removed from circulation following the objection of three Wayne County agriculture agents. The publication was withdrawn over the vigorous protests of the two authors and the chairman of the MSU Fisheries and Wildlife Department. Nearly eight years have gone by and the publication has neither been reprinted nor replaced. When I once mentioned that I had a copy and wanted more, I was ruefully told that I should keep it as a collector's item. However, I would like to offer it for the record.

Perhaps the most extravagant attempt at ridicule and intimidation was an article written by a chemical company spokesman and printed in a major science magazine. He theorized that those who are concerned about pesticides and their harmful effects are in actuality preoccupied with the subject of their lack of sexual potency. I have the feeling that to some extent this absurdity backfired.

4. Use of spurious propaganda techniques.

One often-used tactic is to mislead by charging us with emotionalism—while we talk facts and they make emotional and non-factual statements. The alliance infers that we are opposed to all pesticides instead of just toxic persistent insecticides used in the outdoor environment. They prevent the farmer from remaining objective by making him feel that there is an effort on the part of a hostile public to hurt him. A typical example is the poem by Professor John Carew, chairman of the Horticulture Department at Michigan State University. The poem was first published in the American Vegetable Grower, and was reprinted with his permission this summer in the National Agriculture Chemical Association News and Pesticide Review.

He refers to—and I quote: "Certain well-fed members of Society who 'disapproved of the farmer using science' . . . 'They spoke harshly of his techniques for feeding, protecting and preserving plants and animals.' He goes on to say that this had emotional appeal . . . and said that Society gave the farmer the title Unimportant minority, and passed laws abolishing pesticides (note that he didn't say persistent pesticides) fertilizers and food preservatives . . . and then of course he ends his gem of scientific objectivity and unemotionality by telling how crops and animals died and finally millions of people were exterminated.

I would like to have the entire poem included in the Record.

Another very new tactic of some spokesmen for the chemical and agriculture alliance is to call themselves ecologists. Please note, however, that the Michigan Association of Conservation Ecologists has recommended stringent restrictions of all the persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides. Last year's president of the Ecological So-

ciety of America and now provost of Michigan State University, Dr. John Canton, speaking in Grand Rapids last year, called persistent pesticide programs such as the Dieldrin spray program in the Lake Michigan watershed "morally indefensible."

The constant flow of misleading propaganda coming from the chemical-agriculture alliance has promoted the idea that it is protecting the public when it tells us we can use pesticides safely if we follow directions on the label. One cannot, however, use a product safely if it is going to turn up in creatures all over the globe, even thousands of miles from the nearest use. Another propaganda tactic is to rebut information on environmental damage to carnivorous birds by talking about the huge number of black birds we have today, or research done on chickens. They neglect to admit that they are talking about seed eating birds. They also neglect to admit that part of our problem with nuisance birds is because our predator birds which helped control blackbird numbers have been decimated by pesticides, and also that blackbirds and English sparrows are filling an ecological vacuum formerly filled by insect-eating birds killed by persistent pesticides.

Still another tactic is to refer to the need for more research. If they have their way, we will research for 7 more years, and 7 more, and 7 more . . . during which we will add many more tons of persistent pesticides to the living environment.

Typical of the arrogance, and part of the propaganda, of the people responsible for pesticide decisions is what has happened in Michigan. They must really feel that the public is stupid. The day before the Michigan hearings on a bill to give pesticide registration control to a broader-based agency than just the Agriculture Department, Director Ball announced that DDT was no longer to be registered for mosquito control, on the basis that the Michigan State University extension service suddenly no longer recommended it. This was supposed to be an example of how well we were already protected.

Almost immediately after the coho were taken off the market the Michigan Department of Agriculture withdrew registration of DDT. We are certainly delighted that it did, but we are not impressed, in view of the public outcry and the fact that there is now so much insect resistance to DDT.

Another example of the terrible arrogance on the part of Director Ball and the Agriculture Commission was the Dieldrin spray program already mentioned. Organizations throughout the state petitioned for a hearing so that they could plead that state scientists be given a chance to review the problem. Director Ball gave the hearing and granted the scientists the chance to make their review. Two days later, however . . . weeks before the spray program needed to begin, and before the scientists could make their report, he announced that the Dieldrin spraying would begin. In view of this action in September of 1968, it is notable that only 11 months later, in August 1969, after reviewing their programs on persistent insecticides, the United States Department of Agriculture forbade the use of Dieldrin in joint Federal-State programs for control of the Japanese beetle.

Despite protestations to the contrary, MSU doesn't always follow its own advice, and the Michigan Agriculture Department doesn't always follow MSU's recommendations. Despite the fact that in 1963 the United States Forest Service had reported that methoxychlor—a less persistent insecticide—was a safe and effective substitute for DDT in Dutch Elm Disease control, and despite the fact that MSU claimed to recommend that people use the least persistent material, it took about 6 years for the entomology department to switch its recommendations from DDT to methoxychlor. Today the entomology department no longer recommends

persistent pesticides for most problems, yet the Michigan Department of Agriculture continues to register these persistent insecticides (except DDT of course) for virtually everything, and we don't hear any protests coming from the entomology department.

Today Chairman Dr. Gordon Guyer publicly talks about the Pesticides Research Center, tells us that we will soon be using even more pesticides (because, say some entomologists, our pesticides have increased the insect problems) and he expresses sympathy for the inner city dweller's need to save his elm trees. At a hearing last year Black legislator Cartright expressed the wish that the sympathy and money would be for rat control instead. In any case, I have heard Dr. Guyer several times, and I have never heard him express distress that his belated recommendations are not being followed by the Agriculture Department.

5. Study committees biased by agriculture and chemical company apologists.

A very useful tactic has been to form study committees to make an objective appraisal of persistent pesticide contamination. These committees, however, are typically weighted with people representing the chemical industry and people who have to audit their own past recommendations or performance. Such was Governor Romney's pesticide panel which made the expected self-protective report. Legislative reports, too, have come from agriculture-dominated committees. (It is a particular pleasure, therefore, to be speaking before this subcommittee!) Last year's Michigan joint legislative report was typical. I think I can prove its non-objectivity by pointing out that the report went to great length to report comments by the Michigan Association of Conservation Ecologists report wherever it approved pesticide use, but failed to mention that MACE's major conclusion was that we should stringently restrict the use of the persistent, chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides, and named them.

We submit that the examples which I have given are typical evidence that we are not getting an objective appraisal of persistent pesticide contamination by the people and agencies responsible. We believe that the alliance of our Agriculture Schools, Agriculture Departments, and chemical companies—though to some degree perhaps quite innocent—has kept necessary scientific information from flowing freely. We feel that so long as sole control of registration is in the hands of our Agriculture Departments, important decisions on pesticides will always be made too late. We therefore respectfully make the following recommendations:

1. Review and control of pesticides registration should be made by a broader-based council than just agriculture departments. Those charged with protecting our health and natural resources should have equal part in the decision-making process.

2. Congress needs to give the citizen the right to sue for the protection of the environment. Today the citizen can only protect himself if he has been uniquely harmed, not if everybody is being harmed. The West Michigan Environmental Action Council paid a leading law professor, an expert in conservation law, to research a bill for Michigan to this effect. We would like to give it to you for your attention and we ask that it be included for the record if possible.

3. The sale of DDT and Dieldrin for export or interstate commerce should be banned except by order of HEW in a public health emergency, or by specific use for rat control between walls of buildings. The other chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides—Endrin, Aldrin, Toxaphene, Lindane, Chlordane, Benzene Hexachloride (BHC), and Heptachlor—should be banned for outdoor, above ground use except where the United States Department of Agriculture can find no alternative, until the time that any of these chemicals can be proved short-lived enough

not to harm man or his environment. We have enough research on these materials to know that their continued general use simply is not prudent.

4. We support banning DDT as an immediate first step. It is a spurious argument—for several reasons—to say that DDT would only be replaced by more toxic materials.

5. If national legislation is constitutionally possible, legislation should be enacted to separate the natural resources departments from the agricultural school domination at all land grant colleges.

6. And finally, in order to help prevent further harm to our environment from all assaults, we strongly support legislation to create an independent environmental council such as the Council of Economic Advisors. We are past due giving the environment the kind of attention given the economy.

Again, we greatly appreciate your kind permission to appear before you, and the fact that you are holding these hearings.

A CLERGYMAN'S VIEW OF WELFARE

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Thomas W. Kirkman, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Royal Oak, Mich., has long enjoyed a reputation as one of the most articulate and eloquent men in my congressional district. His observations and insights on what is wrong with our present welfare system and what must be done to right it appeared last Sunday in a message to the congregation of which I am proud to be a member. Dr. Kirkman's words are especially timely as Congress begins consideration of the President's proposals for overhauling the existing welfare system. I commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

A CLERGYMAN'S VIEW ON WELFARE (By Dr. Thomas W. Kirkman)

Poverty is the major domestic issue in our nation today. Some may think that the problem of poverty is a political issue beyond the concern of the church. I would remind you that the church was the first group to deal with poverty and to minister to the poor. Centuries before secular governments manifested any interest in the less fortunate in society, the Christian Church was working hard in this field.

Many people seem to believe that the nation must spend more money on the poor. Senator Hart in a television interview said that when the war in Vietnam is over, we must take a large share of the money we have been spending in Vietnam and give it to the poor. In my judgment, the idea that money automatically cures poverty is patently false, for at least two reasons.

First, the United States is spending vast sums of money to relieve poverty today. It has been estimated that if you added together all of the funds spent to assist the poor—money spent by the federal government, the state governments, the county governments, the city governments, the Community Chests, Foundations, church benevolent organizations, and the gifts of concerned individuals—you would have a figure of 70 billion dollars per year. If there are 30 million poor, this means that each "poor" person should be getting over \$2,000 per year. A family of five would have over \$10,000 per year. When you divide the total number of poor into the amount of money presently being spent, the sum seems more

than adequate. I know that the poor are not receiving the \$2,000 per person per year. The bureaucracy which "minister" to the poor, consume the major share of these funds.

A second reason why "more money" is not a solution to the problem of poverty is that money in itself does not cure poverty. Anytime an individual is not able to provide for himself and his family, he is poor in his own eyes and in the eyes of his fellow human beings regardless of how much money may be given to him. In my judgment, the entire welfare system should be dismantled. We now have a series of competing agencies with widely different benefits. To add another layer of welfare upon the present bureaucracy would be a folly of classic proportions. All welfare must be handled by one agency which will have equal standards throughout the entire nation.

Some system of incentives must be devised so that the individual can be encouraged to do something for himself. Today, if a mother on ADC works, the amount she earns is deducted from her allotment. Under this system the individual is not encouraged to help to earn his own way in life.

Many plans have been suggested which will provide the individual with some incentives to do what he can for himself. Among these are day-care centers for working mothers, making the government an employer of last resort, on the job training, etc. St. Paul wrote that "if a man did not work, he should not eat." Although I do not want to see anyone starve, the point must be made that every individual, whenever possible, must be required to do everything he can to support himself.

Poverty in our day is many times tied directly to lack of skill and education. In our complex society, the unskilled and uneducated find themselves at the bottom of the economic ladder. Successful and proven programs of education and training must be available for all. The aim of every poverty program should not be just to "keep body and soul together". The goal of our welfare efforts should be to make the individual in need of help, self-sufficient. Something is wrong with a system which perpetuates ADC through three generations. No one really likes to be dependent upon someone else. The kindest thing which can be done for the poor is not to give them charity, but to see them free from the need for our charity.

NORTH VIETNAMESE LETTER

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain why earlier today I objected to the consideration by this House of a resolution relating to a North Vietnamese letter on the Vietnam moratorium.

As a matter of procedure, I note that the resolution offered by the majority and minority leaders came without any prior notice to Members under unanimous consent. The subject matter involved here is far too important to be rushed through without due consideration.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is my own suspicious nature, but I feel that the resolution is not an innocuous or innocent one. It has, I believe, certain implications which go beyond the words of the text. That is why, if this was to be a serious declaration by this House on the quest for peace in Vietnam it deserved appro-

priate committee attention and floor debate.

I would like to state categorically in reply to the suggestion made earlier that I acted inconsistently in objecting today, after desiring debate last night, that I did not have a special order last night, nor did I speak, and that in addition, many Members today were completely unaware of the resolution. I think that many distinguished Members of the other body are now regretting the undue haste with which they acted in 1964 in regard to our Vietnam policy.

Mr. Speaker, in examining the merits of the proposal, I feel that it was most unfortunate that certain prominent Americans saw fit to call attention and to magnify the significance of an attempt by a North Vietnamese leader to inject himself into our political process by a self-serving and irrelevant letter. It was the supporters of our past disastrous Vietnam policies that sought to give prominence to this letter from the Prime Minister of North Vietnam and to use it for their own purposes. This was a letter whose contents should be rejected by all Americans and which came from a personage whose name is scarcely a household word in this country. The letter was shamelessly used in some quarters to try to discredit the moratorium and the motives of its supporters by raising a convenient straw man.

Mr. Speaker, in this resolution today we are asked to purge the supporters of the moratorium from the curse of the letter. Is this really necessary? Would it not be more appropriate to condemn those of our own citizens who sought to give exaggerated attention to the letter and thereby impugn the aims of the moratorium? I know of no Member of this House who announced his support of the moratorium who has asked for this legislative opportunity to cleanse himself of any impropriety. Further, it is a distortion of the realities of the issue of our Nation's involvement in Vietnam to debate instead the uninvited intrusion into our policy consideration of a North Vietnamese.

In my view, it is a completely irrelevant and unnecessary undertaking because I doubt if anyone seriously argues that Pham Van Dong has any real influence in this country.

If the purpose of the resolution is to change the debate from the real issue to an irrelevancy, then it is understandable, and any politician has to applaud the ingenuity of the sponsors of the resolution.

CHICAGO RIOTERS

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, in 1968, we saw the alarming and even ridiculous spectacle of radical leftwing young people almost bringing the Democratic Party to its knees at its national convention. These few young people are naively presumptuous enough to think they have inherited the only morality, the only ethics, and the only hope for the world. Perhaps

this mentality is indicative more of the juvenile attitude of "know it all." These individuals have quite clearly not matured beyond that stage as evidenced in their crusading philosophy to right the world from injustices.

Every youthful generation is understandably ready to question the practices and policies of their elders. We all remember when we, too, shared the exhilarating feeling and knowledge that we were challenging the older generation. Questioning and reexamining values is a healthy process, and is not limited to age. But the immediate demands by today's young radicals, backed up by threats of violence to achieve their demands, is extortion and blackmail. The tactics of violence employed by these radicals serves no purpose, but further polarizes the American people, resulting in the lack of a mandate to correct many of the present problems facing us.

The eight individuals who now face Federal indictment charges in Chicago for conspiring to incite riots at the Democratic National Convention are now trying their best to cloud the issue and claim that when they are put on trial, anyone can be put on trial. It is amazing to follow the perversion and the illogic of their thought pattern. They can break the law. No one else can. They, only, are in a position of questioning authority, questioning law, questioning the system—no one else, they infer. And only they can make the judgment as to which laws, at which time can be broken, yet, feeling that they should be at the same time immune from the established law's penalty.

Now the "8 crybabies" of the radical, superliberal, leftwing element in America are about to face justice and receive the penalty for their ill-spawned, ill-conceived, but in all honesty, beautifully executed minirevolution in Chicago in 1968.

I have no sympathy for these particular "crybabies." I have no sympathy for these particular militants who would destroy everything but what they like and silence everyone but those who agree with them. If there were ever fascism, if there were ever nazism, if there were ever dictatorship in America, it arrived in Chicago, August 1968, in the form of militant, wild, swinging, and often brutal organization people who came with the purpose of destroying the democratic process of the Democratic Party to select and choose its leaders as well as operate its convention.

Thank God, the "crybabies 8" are so few. Thank goodness finally in the eyes of the overwhelming majority of peace-loving, quiet, lawful Americans these militants are able to receive justice, though those indicted feel that they are receiving injustice. Because of the greatness of our system and the tolerance of our people, they have been allowed to spread their little fires of treachery, hate, and anarchy. But now the ocean of public sentiment is about to wash them from the sands of memory. Little people with big mouths serve no cause. The "crybabies 8" have not yet begun to cry. I for one, feel no pity for them and hope that justice is served in large helpings to these particular "8."

THE WARREN LEGACY—THE DOCTRINE OF RACIAL PROPORTIONS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I again point out to our liberal colleagues on both sides of the aisle that I have still received no offers of support on my bill, House Resolution 497, to provide for inquiry into the feasibility of reducing racial tensions by removing racial imbalance nationwide.

Many of these same gentlemen have already expressed their complete approval of busing and racial assignment in my State and with ringing rhetoric have declaimed that racial imbalance is against the law of the land.

Yet, in their districts and in their States they continue to harbor rampant noncompliance with what they impose on others and offer no contribution to solve the ever-worsening national crisis in race relations.

Almost daily they would sit back and watch the news media further polarize our citizenry into warring black and white camps and yet they offer no leadership and volunteer no program to solve the ever-growing dilemma.

Certainly, our liberal brethren, by interfering in my State, have taken it upon themselves to proclaim that the race problem is a national one and cannot be solved by local people, by freedom of choice, or by voluntary action. The only solution that they have proposed has been to applaud lawless decrees which forcibly transfer the youth of one group to another group, regardless of the wishes of the youth or of the parents of either group.

Last night, even Earl Warren, their former champion on the Supreme Court from whom emanated all of the egalitarian theories that they now profess to worship, criticized Americans who fail to fully commit themselves to immediate and total integration.

As the race problem is claimed to be national in scope, the entire Nation must be involved in its solution. I remind the erstwhile social scientists that the Nation's Negro population is approximately 10 percent, while in my hometown of Baton Rouge, La., our Negro population is 27 percent, and in the State of Louisiana nearly 40 percent.

If the law of the land now is to include racial balance then our liberal friends should come forward with either legislation or litigation to force by busing or other methods the excess of our Negro population into their cities, towns, and counties, so that these Negroes from Baton Rouge are not denied their constitutional right of equality under the interesting theory of racial proportions.

Since Earl Warren has chosen to remain active in the race relations field, perhaps he will now complete nationwide the total integration for which his liberal proteges honor him, by using his powers of persuasion and leadership to convince these same liberals to act in their own

communities before it is too late—time is running out, he says.

I include four news articles, as follows: [From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 15, 1969]

FINCH DODGES BIAS IN NORTH, PUSHES SOUTH, STENNIS SAYS

The Nixon administration has been accused of forcing school integration in the South while permitting segregation in Northern cities to avoid political trouble.

"You haven't tried and your predecessors haven't tried" to desegregate Northern school systems, Sen. John C. Stennis, D-Miss., yesterday told Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Robert H. Finch.

Finch appeared before a Senate Appropriations subcommittee to testify against two House-passed amendments that would permit "freedom of choice" school assignment systems and rule out mandatory busing of pupils. The amendments "could seriously jeopardize the substantial progress we have made in school desegregation," he said.

But Stennis said the administration inherited and continued a policy based on the belief it was "less hazardous politically" to concentrate desegregation efforts on the South.

FINCH PLEADS DIFFICULTY

Finch denied it and said HEW school desegregation teams are surveying Chicago, San Francisco and New Jersey. "We are addressing ourselves to a national problem here," he said.

Finch said, it is much harder to prove a case against a city where school enrollment resulted from segregated neighborhoods than a town with separate school system for whites and Negroes.

Northern liberals have accused the administration of slowing down desegregation efforts as part of an alleged "Southern strategy" designed to win the South for the GOP.

The administration generally has decided against using the cutoff of federal aid as its method to force school integration. Instead, it has used the tactic of filing law suits to get court orders forcing integration—a tactic threat often takes several years to complete.

HEW'S STATISTICS USED

Stennis read HEW's own statistics to back his contention that the North was nurturing segregated schools while the federal government pushed "rapid and total abolition of segregation in Southern school districts.

Of Chicago's 610 schools, Stennis said, 214 have 99 to 100 percent black enrollment. Of Cleveland's 180 schools, 68 have 95 to 100 percent black enrollment. Of Detroit's 301 schools, 68 have 99 to 100 percent black enrollment.

Other HEW statistics, not released by Stennis, show that of the 56 public schools in Jackson, Miss., 19 have no white students. Of 54 schools in Montgomery, Ala., 20 are all black. Of 1,022 schools in Birmingham, Ala., 46 are 99 to 100 percent black.

CONNECTICUT BIAS CHARGED

In its first school desegregation suit in the Northeast, the Justice Department yesterday accused Waterbury, Conn., authorities of discriminating against non-whites by busing white children to parochial schools.

The suit, filed in U.S. District Court in New Haven, Conn., charged the Waterbury school system discriminated against Negroes and Puerto Ricans by means of elementary school districts established on the basis of race and transporting of whites to "independent, non public schools."

[From the Washington, (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 15, 1969]

WARREN ATTACKS DELAY IN EQUALITY

NEW YORK.—Former Supreme Court Chief Justice Earl Warren has criticized Ameri-

cans who fail to fully commit themselves to immediate implementation of the constitutional right of equality before the law.

"There are those who say: 'We can't hurry it. It must evolve over the years,' Warren told the 30th annual dinner of Freedom House last night as he received the organization's annual award. 'But 101 years since the adoption of the 14th Amendment is a long time and time is running out,' he added.

[From the Washington, (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 15, 1969]

WARREN HONORED BY FREEDOM HOUSE

NEW YORK.—Former Chief Justice Earl Warren of the U.S. Supreme Court received the 1970 Freedom House award last night.

Freedom House describes itself as "a national educational organization dedicated to the strengthening of free institutions through research and policy recommendations on public issues."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 15, 1969]

JUDGE EARL WARREN, JR., DISCUSSES HIS "BURDEN"

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.—Earl Warren Jr. carries the name of his father and the burden of living up to it.

"I'm going to carry the label the rest of my life as Earl Warren's son," he said in a recent interview, "but you can't run away from it because, as my father always taught us, you can't run away from yourself."

The past weeks have given Warren a taste of the damnation and praise generated by his father, former California Governor and Chief Justice of the United States Earl Warren.

ON MUNICIPAL BENCH 3 YEARS

As a municipal judge, he presided over a trial in which two bottomless go-go dancers were acquitted of charges of being lewd and obscene. The jury watched the dance in question in a nightclub setting and also went to see the Swedish film "I am Curious (Yellow)" as part of its search for current standards in regards to obscenity.

Warren discussed in his booklined office the life he has lived in his father's shadow. Slightly balding, with light blue eyes and a wiry build, Warren, 39, has been a judge for three years. He concedes he is still searching for identity.

"I think any person who is known as his father's son has a very deep yearning to be known as himself," Warren said. "I think this is why so often children from prominent homes do such bizarre things."

FORMERLY A REPUBLICAN

Warren practiced law from 1961 to 1966, when former Democratic Gov. Edmund G. Brown appointed him to the bench. He is a Democrat, although his father was a three-term Republican governor of California. Warren Jr. was a Republican, but changed his registration after Richard Nixon ran for governor in 1962.

"My philosophy is basically the same as my father's," Warren says. "He thinks in terms of all people. Never was there a man that was less classless or has less basic biases than he has."

Warren said he doesn't try to "imitate" his father. "I don't think anybody can emulate my father," he said. Accomplishing one-tenth as much as his dad would be "remarkable," he said.

SHOULD BE INVOLVED

"Judges should be involved in the social issues—issues involving health, education, rights of free speech," he said.

Warren said his father would have made a "great president," and asserted he was "the greatest chief justice we ever had."

Warren declined to speculate on his own future. Asked if he would seek elective office if the Democratic party beckoned, he replied:

"I'm just not thinking in those terms. As a jurist I have to stay out of politics, partisan politics at least."

But Warren was warmly partisan in praising San Francisco Mayor Joseph Alioto, whose recent \$100-a-plate testimonial dinner he attended. Asked if he could support him for governor, Warren thought a while, then answered:

"No question about it, the man has fantastic ability, tremendous integrity. I think he would be a splendid administrator in any position."

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS URGE STEPPED-UP VIETNAM WITHDRAWAL

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, recently 79 private college and private university presidents directed a statement to President Nixon and the Congress calling for "a stepped-up timetable for withdrawal from Vietnam." This action was reported in the Sunday, October 12, 1969, edition of the New York Times. I find the statement an eloquent one.

The signers of the petition point out, as I did on the floor Monday, that there are times to be silent and times to speak. I agree with these eminent educators that, "This is a time to speak."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce into the RECORD at this point the statement of the 79 presidents and a list of their names and the institutions they serve.

The material follows:

STATEMENT OF 79 COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS

We speak as individuals who work with young men and women. The universities and colleges which we serve take no positions as institutions on the Vietnam war; these are pluralistic communities where men speak for themselves alone on off-campus issues.

There are times to be silent and times to speak. This is a time to speak. The accumulated costs of the Vietnam war are not in men and matériel alone. There are costs too in the effects on young people's hopes and beliefs.

Like ourselves, the vast majority of the students with whom we work still want to believe in a just, honest and sensitive America. But our military engagement in Vietnam now stands as a denial of so much that is best in our society.

More and more, we see the war deflecting energies and resources from urgent business on our own doorsteps. An end to the war will not solve the problems on or off the campus. It will however permit us to work more effectively in support of more peaceful priorities. Far from being depressed about our nation's future and our institutions' future, we see bold opportunities ahead once the divisiveness of this war is in the past.

We urge upon the President of the United States and upon Congress a stepped-up timetable for withdrawal from Vietnam. We believe this to be in our country's highest interest, at home and abroad.

Following is a list of the presidents who signed the statement:

Morris B. Abram, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.

Ruth M. Adams, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.

James I. Armstrong, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.

Sanford S. Atwood, Emory University, Atlanta.

K. Roald Bergethon, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

Edward J. Bloustein, Bennington College, Bennington, Vt.

Landrum R. Bolling, Earlham College, Richmond, Ind.

Mary I. Bunting, Radcliffe College, Cambridge, Mass.

William G. Caples, Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio.

Robert K. Carr, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

Beverly D. Causey Jr., Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Geneva, N.Y.

John W. Chandler, Hamilton College, Clinton, N.Y.

Arland F. Christ-Janer, Boston University, Boston.

John R. Coleman, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.

Andrew W. Cordier, Columbia University, New York.

Dale R. Corson, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Robert D. Cross, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.

Charles DeCarlo, Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, N.Y.

James P. Dixon Jr., Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio.

William L. Dunn, Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Ill.

Edward D. Eddy, Chatham College, Pittsburgh.

John V. Elmendorf, New College, Sarasota, Fla.

Edwin D. Etherington, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

L. H. Foster, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Ala.

Hugh M. Gloster, Morehouse College, Atlanta.

Robert F. Goheen, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.

W. W. Hagerty, Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia.

Burton C. Hallowell, Tufts University, Medford, Mass.

Gaylord P. Harnwell, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

James M. Hester, New York University, New York.

Roger Howell Jr., Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.

Frederick H. Jackson, Clark University, Worcester, Mass.

Howard W. Johnson, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

The Rev. W. Seavey Joyce, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass.

Glenn Leggett, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa.

Edward Levi, University of Chicago, Chicago.

Theodore W. Lockwood, Trinity College, Hartford.

Dorothy N. Marshall, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Harold C. Martin, Union College and University, Schenectady, N.Y.

Joseph E. McCabe, Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Thomas C. Mendenhall 2d, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

Robert W. Morse, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland.

John W. Nason, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.

Joseph C. Palamountain, Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, N.Y.

Franklin K. Patterson, Hampshire College, Amherst, Mass.

Lawrence L. Pelletier, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.

Marvin B. Perry Jr., Goucher College, Towson, Md.

Martha Peterson, Barnard College, New York.

Joseph B. Platt, Harvey Mudd College, Claremont, Calif.

Calvin H. Plimpton, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.

Wesley W. Posuar, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh.

W. C. H. Prentice, Wheaton College, Norton, Mass.

James M. Read, Wilmington College, Wilmington, Ohio.

Thomas Hedley Reynolds, Bates College, Lewiston, Me.

Victor G. Rosenblum, Reed College, Portland, Ore.

Howard L. Rubendall, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.

John E. Sawyer, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.

Charles E. Shaine, Connecticut College, New London, Conn.

Alan Simpson, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y.

Joel P. Smith, Denison University, Granville, Ohio.

Thomas S. Smith, Lawrence University, Appleton, Wis.

Keith Spaulding, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.

H. Guyford Stever, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh.

Merton P. Stoltz, Brown University, Providence, R.I.

Robert E. L. Strider 2d, Colby College, Waterville, Me.

Samuel E. Stumpf, Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa.

The Rev. Raymond J. Swords, S. J., College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass.

David B. Truman, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.

Sharvy G. Umbeck, Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.

Miller Upton, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.

Marvin Wachman, Lincoln University, Lincoln University, Pa.

The Rev. Michael P. Walsh, Fordham University, Bronx.

Charles H. Watts 2d, Bucknell College, Lewisburg, Pa.

Willis Weatherford, Berea College, Berea, Ky.

Richard D. Weigle, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md., and Santa Fe, N. M.

The Rev. Robert J. Welsh, Villanova University, Villanova, Pa.

George H. Williams, American University, Washington.

John D. Wilson, Wells College, Aurora, N.Y.

Barnes Woodhall, Duke University, Durham, N.C.

GANDHI'S EXAMPLE FOR TODAY'S PROTESTERS

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, throughout the Nation the Vietnam moratorium is being observed by people of all ages and from all walks of life.

The moratorium was conceived as a day when concerned Americans would pause in the conduct of business as usual for a discussion of the war and to provide for a peaceful outlet for legitimate protests against U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Peace in Vietnam, we can all agree, should be made our Nation's No. 1 objective. To the extent that a moratorium on "business as usual" will serve to focus the attention of our country's responsi-

ble leaders to this objective, I heartily support today's observance.

This Chamber has also been the scene of probing discussions and debates on the wide-ranging implications of the Vietnam war.

To all of us who are concerned with the question of how we can best achieve peace in Southeast Asia, it is a time not only for probing deeply into the national conscience, but it is also a time for reflection as to how the national good can best be achieved without fanning the flames for burgeoning mass demonstrations which could lead to needless destruction of property, bloodshed, and even death.

It seems that man has never learned that the means to an end is as important as the end itself. For centuries man has sought peace in this world, and in the name of peace he has waged many wars. When Godly souls have attempted to teach earthly men peaceful and non-violent means to a peaceful way of life, they have inevitably met with violence and even violent death.

I think it appropriate at this time, Mr. Speaker, to take note of the memory of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, whose 100th birthday was observed on October 2.

In writing on Gandhi for the October 4 issue of Saturday Review, Robert Payne, author of a book on Gandhi to be published this month, wrote:

He changed the landscape of the human heart. Never again would people deride the idea of nonviolence, for he had planted it firmly in men's minds, showing them how they could prevent governments from imposing themselves too harshly on the people. To those who had lost hope he offered new hope, and the memory of that small man wandering over the roads of India in search of peace was to be a perpetual reminder that peace might someday be found.

To commemorate the centennial of his birth, Hawaii's Governor, John A. Burns, declared the week beginning October 2 as Gandhi Week in the 50th State.

The lessons we can learn from Gandhi are indeed still relevant to us during this agonizing period of the 20th century.

In this connection, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a most thoughtful editorial from the Thursday, October 2, 1969, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser, entitled "Lesson From Gandhi." I am also submitting for inclusion in the RECORD a related newspaper article concerning Gandhi Week in Hawaii. The editorial and article follow:

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Oct. 2, 1969]

LESSON FROM GANDHI

One hundred years ago today was born one of the most remarkable men in all human history, Mohandas K. Gandhi.

A spindly, bald-headed man clad in a diaper-like costume of white, he had none of the physical attributes ordinarily associated with great leaders.

But this insignificant appearing little man humbled the British colonialists and the native princes who had held his country in subjugation. His weapon: non-violent protest.

Gandhi became more than the father of modern, independent India, which was in itself a monumental status. He became a world-wide symbol and inspiration, a symbol of human decency and an inspiration for

those who had despaired that decency could rule.

Gandhi was assassinated in 1948. His death was mourned the world around by men of all faiths and persuasions. Robert Payne, author of a forthcoming book on Gandhi, writes in the Saturday Review:

"He had conquered India and changed the landscape of the human heart. Never again would people deride the idea of nonviolence, for he had planted it firmly in men's minds, showing them how they could prevent governments from imposing themselves too harshly on the people."

Payne says something else pertinent for our time:

"The legacy of Gandhi to India was the example of his life and his belief in nonviolence, the new dignity he gave to the villages, the simple assertion of human rights."

"He fought for elemental things, for truth and justice above all, and he was able to give weight and meaning to these words that were otherwise weightless and meaningless."

Gandhi will live long in history but his example has pointed meaning for today. Faith in nonviolence seems to be dwindling among many in the U.S. struggling to right social wrongs—as was harshly demonstrated in Honolulu just the other evening.

But if nonviolence can achieve what Gandhi achieved with it in India, is there not hope that through nonviolence America can solve her own problems?

Those who have given up on nonviolence would do well to reflect on the life of Gandhi—and especially on one great quality he had in abundance: the quality of humility.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Oct. 2, 1969]

"GANDHI WEEK" PROCLAIMED

Gov. John A. Burns today declared this week "Gandhi Week" in honor of the leader of India's drive for independence, Mahatma Gandhi.

"On Oct. 2 this year the world acknowledges with gratitude, awe and reverence the birth centenary of one of its greatest citizens—the man everyone has come to know as Mahatma Gandhi," Burns said in his proclamation.

"His name has become synonymous with a certain philosophy, the essential ingredients of which are truth, nonviolence and love."

The Governor said Gandhi "stressed the need to learn from all cultures and insisted upon keeping one's doors open to all knowledge."

"It seems but appropriate, therefore, that his own teachings and practice, his own philosophy and indeed even his methods have found their way freely into other cultures."

Hawaii has achieved at least one of Gandhi's ideals, "that of the brotherhood of man," Burns said.

TULSA EDITOR MAKES OUTSTANDING ADDRESS

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the new national commander of the American Legion, J. Milton Patrick of Skiatook, Okla., is a constituent of mine. After he took office and made a fact-finding tour of the Far East, Skiatook held a

welcome-home celebration in his honor, which was an outstanding event.

A highlight of the day was the keynote speech, delivered by a Skiatook neighbor, Jenkin Lloyd Jones. Mr. Jones is editor and publisher of the Tulsa Tribune, and his weekly column is nationally syndicated.

Jenkin Lloyd Jones' keynote speech addressed itself to matters of great importance to all of us here, and I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

LET THE EAGLE SCREAM
(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Ladies and Gentlemen: On July 3, 1775, when George Washington stood beneath the elm on the Cambridge Common and took command of his legion of Americans all the Virginians in the assemblage swelled with particular pride. And tonight, when a distinguished Oklahoman is honored in his home town for taking command of the latter day American Legion, we who are Oklahomans bask in the reflected warmth of the occasion.

But we who are Oklahomans have, perhaps, some reason for special pride. For in general we represent that backward section of the nation, much sniffed at by some of our intellectual community, where old-fashioned admiration for the American tradition has not gone out of style. More specifically, you can be patriotic in Skiatook and not be thought queer.

Now we all know that love of country can produce paranoia and delusion. As we look back on it it seems fantastic that the peasants of Europe were conned into killing each other in wars over the royal succession in Austria or over the limitless power greed of the corporal from Corsica. But intelligent and rational patriotism is the defense mechanism by which a people marshal their collective strength for the preservation of themselves, their institutions and their philosophies from those who would do them in.

A nation that has lost the belief in itself is not long for this world. A people driven by cynicism and self-doubt are on the way out. It is one thing to be dissatisfied with imperfections in the social order and to strive for its improvement. But it is quite another thing to permit a brutal and cynical takeover of a system with a high degree of freedom by those who advocate a system in which freedom is hustled to the wall.

In recent years in America, ladies and gentlemen, the American dream has been under direct assault. Elements that were subtly subversive only yesterday are now preaching open revolution. And the winds are rising.

The Earl Warren Supreme Court, by a system of logic that escapes me, has systematically dismantled all legislative efforts to force Communists to reveal themselves and to prevent them sheltering themselves on the public payrolls while laboring for the destruction of the state.

The result of this was predictable. Early last month, at the Long Island conclave of an outfit called the Socialist Scholars, professors now on the payrolls of the Universities of California, Wisconsin, Maryland and private-endowed but heavily government subsidized schools like Harvard, M.I.T., Yale, Amherst, etc., called for, and I quote, "a total break with America" and hailed the coming revolution.

Any pretense that these professors are sticking to their subjects in class and only pushing political action after hours was dropped. They now feel secure enough to use teaching time to subvert naive and immature youngsters that a representative democracy has placed in their care. It's like hiring wolves to run the sheep farm.

The Marxist orientation of the Students for a Democratic Society is now not only

plain but boasted of. And guess which heavily-armed and busily-arming nation in the world most directly benefits. Tick off the SDS program:

End the draft.
End R.O.T.C.
End university research for national defense.

Start the disarmament of America regardless of whether any other nation agrees to join.

Stop work on the Anti-ballistic Missile System.

Dismantle the "military-industrial complex", whatever that is.

It seems not to have occurred to the SDS leadership that conscription operates unchallenged in Russia, that no one pickets the clanging shipyards or the roaring munitions plants that are products of a "military-industrial complex," that Russian naval vessels are pouring into the Mediterranean and their missile-bearing subs are lying off America.

It seems to have escaped the notice of this leadership that Russia is working hard on its own A.B.M. system and that if it ever works well enough to render American blows against Russia acceptable while Russian blows against America remain unacceptable World War III could be over in a day.

Or maybe the SDS leadership knows all this very well.

Every left-wing organization in America, including the extravagant admirers of Moscow, Havana and Peking, is pushing the so-called "sexual revolution" for young Americans.

Professor Herbert Marcuse, the grizzled Red guru who seems to be safely dug in to the payroll of the University of California at San Diego, has written, "We must develop the moral-sexual revolution of youth."

And this is very strange. For there is no counterpart in those nations where the Communists are in control. The "Thoughts of Mao" preach a stiff morality. Castro has attempted to impose a high degree of puritanism on the Cubans. And a pot-smoking club or a free-love society at the University of Moscow would last maybe ten minutes.

Why isn't the sauce for the Free Enterprise goose also for the Communist gander?

The answer, of course, is obvious. What is sought for America is not freedom from outworn shibboleths but the disintegration of society. No people who have slipped into moral chaos have ever been able to defend themselves for long. The Red tacticians know their ancient history.

Dr. Benjamin Spock, the baby doctor, who the courts have decided has an unalienable right to urge young Americans to defy the laws of their land, was in Tulsa last week talking to a university audience about morally indefensible Vietnam war. But Doctor Spock's moral indignation is selective.

I never heard him denounce the terror when Ho took over North Vietnam that caused a million natives to flee south. I never heard him complain about the cynical violations of the 17th parallel or the incursions down the Laotian border or the systematic assassination of village chiefs long before the first American bomb was ever dropped in retaliation.

I have seen Doctor Spock weep over the picture of the napalmed baby. But somehow he never seems to have seen any pictures of the bodies lying in a Saigon street torn by terrorist TNT or the mass graves after the Tet offensive at Quang Tri.

The myth that people all over the world thirst to join their Communist brethren and that only evil American imperialist-adventurers prevent them from doing so is getting the hard sell these days.

But if you built a bridge between Cuba and Key West which way do you think the traffic would flow? If you took down the Berlin Wall which way would the crowd move? What is the meaning of swaths cut through

the Central European woods and mine fields and barbed wire?

And when has a Communist system, once it got in control, ever allowed the people to audit it by a free and open election?

The bankruptcy of the Communist system, not merely in terms of freedom of the spirit but in the delivery of the materialism that was to be its proudest boast, has been gathering now for half a century. It is producing severe internal strains. It required the tanks to be rushed, first to Budapest and then to Prague.

Why is it, then, with this sorry record and in the face of a material prosperity in the West unmatched in human history that the assault on Western institutions and particularly upon America is now proceeding with the greatest vigor and having a marked degree of success.

You might lay it against poor old Joe McCarthy, the late senator from Wisconsin. It was the farthest from Joe's intentions to become a Communist patsy, but that's what happened to him. They were laying for someone like Joe, and when he showed up the greatest job of brainwashing in human history got underway.

You see the scientific technique that has intrigued Communist theoreticians most of all was born in the experiments in the conditioned reflex begun by the great Russian physiologist, Dr. Ivan Pavlov, way back in 1902.

Doctor Pavlov proved that by conditioning dogs to certain stimuli they could be induced to react in a specific way, even to the point of a manufactured neurosis. This is the essence of brainwashing.

When Joe McCarthy came along, the American people were just waking to the chill disappointment that followed the foolish hopes of Yalta and Potsdam. So when he said he had proof there were several hundred Russian agents in the State Department, alone, a lot of people bought him entirely. There was a widespread demand for a house-cleaning of Reds not only in government, but in the universities and the fields of science.

The trouble was that Joe didn't have all the facts he claimed he had. In some places he made some wild swings. And the Communist strategists saw their chance and seized it. The cry arose that a reign of terror was being fastened upon America and that honest inquiry and academic freedom were being raped. The cry was picked up by innocent liberals and then by a large segment of the press. Soon millions of Americans were running around, scared out of their wits that a new kind of Nazism was about to seize the country.

Actually, very few innocents were hurt by Joe McCarthy. Indeed, far from cowering the campuses, the faculty member who wasn't shouting his head off against Joe was a cinch to be ostracized in the faculty club.

But the conditioned reflex was a howling success. I went to Europe during the height of the broohah and my European friends asked me with the sincerest concern whether it were not true that thousands of Americans were being herded into concentration camps.

As a result, any investigation of Communist activity and subversion in America was instantly denounced as "McCarthyism". Any attempted unmasking of a patent Communist ring was contemptuously dismissed as a witch hunt.

Even poor Whittaker Chambers, who forfeited his career in order to nail Alger Hiss dead-to-rights, lies in his grave under a cloud because America's academic community couldn't escape the feeling that what he did was not quite nice. And with all the evidence supporting Chambers and none to refute it Alger Hiss is still regarded on many campuses as a victim of McCarthyism.

The Communists went for bigger game. Any American organization devoted to patriotic

principles was the subject of its ridicule. The Daughters of the American Revolution and all veterans organizations, particularly the American Legion, were painted as hysterical fear-mongers, representing a paranoiac Far Right. This was an effort to draw the center line down the lefthand curb.

And the campaign continues apace to dismantle the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The effort to discredit the CIA and the FBI is not only obvious, but tireless. The other evening I was re-reading J. Edgar Hoover's 11-year-old book, "Masters of Deceit", and I found no warning in it that was not only not reasonable but that subsequent events haven't rendered extremely modest.

I think it's time we got over our Age of Innocence. I think it's time we came out of our trance. For too long we've been jerking our knees every time the cry of "McCarthyism" was raised, just as Pavlov's dogs slobbered every time he rang the dinner bell. Let's come off it.

For this struggle is for real. We swallow at our peril the comfortable pap now being peddled by the fellow travelers that Communism's internal troubles are now so great it has lost the dynamism for world revolution.

Anthony Kuznetsov, the popular Soviet writer who defected recently while visiting Britain, says that Soviet officials are boasting among themselves of their success in paralyzing the will of the West to resist the Communist assault.

"The long objective of the foreign policy of the present Soviet leaders is to dominate the world," Kuznetsov told British intelligence officials. "And they all agree that the U.S. is the only nation that can keep them from achieving this goal in their lifetime."

Well, what of America's morale?

I didn't find myself often in agreement with L.B.J. but I think I understood his agony when he asked, "Why all this poor-mouthing of America?"

It doesn't represent the American people. But a technique has now been perfected to con the mass media, which ought to know better, into peddling the impression that it does.

Let 10,000 people march down Broadway in a patriotic parade and let 100,000 cheer them from the sidewalks. And then let 100 militants attempt to block the march somewhere uptown and NBC, CBS and ABC will drop all else and rush to the spot. And on the evening news on videotape one gets the impression that New York erupted in fury that anyone should dare wave the flag.

Let a distinguished American be invited to a campus. And let a dozen bearded, bearded revolutionaries storm the platform. The reporters all rush to interview the shouters and the speaker is forgotten.

This technique is being used with cool calculation and with rapidly increasing frequency. And I would say this to many of my brother editors and many of the moguls of TV:

Shouldn't there be a statute of limitations on our stupidity?

At the risk of being impertinent, Commander Patrick, I would like to suggest that during your year in office the American Legion repeatedly ask one question:

Where else?

Where else in the world is there a nation so many human beings would like to get into?

Where else in the world is there an economic system that has offered the average citizen so many options of choice, so much return on the fruits of his labor?

Where else in the world is there a people who have given so much of their sweat to the uplift of other nations—even nations that have been long on complaint and short on gratitude?

Where else in the world is there a state

that has drawn so much of the fury of proven tyranny?

Where else in the world is there a population so devoted to honest self-criticism, so free to express their opinions, so intent on perfecting their imperfections?

In short, where else is there anything like the American Dream?

Commander Patrick, happy homecoming! Your fellow Oklahomans are button-busting proud of you.

And you come into your high honor at a propitious hour. For this is the hour when Americans should turn their backs for a moment upon the filthy imprecations and the carefully-contrived turbulence and count their treasures once again.

This is the hour when we should square our shoulders, suck in our guts and face the future with the joyous confidence that America's greatness richly merits.

Commander Patrick, I hope you'll let the eagle scream.

CONGRESS AND THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times Magazine of Sunday, October 5 contained an interesting and valuable article on some of the problems that we face today as Congressmen and as Americans, and as members of the human species as well.

The article consisted, for the most part, of an interview with a noted ecologist, Dr. David M. Gates, director of the Missouri Botanical Garden. Dr. Gates is a man who is well known to many Members of this Congress. He was an important witness before the hearings recently held by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on the bill introduced by my good friend and colleague from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) to create a Council on Environmental Quality. His testimony on that occasion was cited in the report of the committee on the bill, and was cited frequently in floor debate on that measure when it passed the House last week.

Dr. Gates is also the distinguished chairman of the 128-member board of advisors to the Ad Hoc Committee on the Environment. Over 20 percent of the Congress participates in the work of this important, informal group, and the advice and assistance of Dr. Gates to the work of this committee has proven to be invaluable to it.

The insights provided in this important article should prove of great value to each Member of this body. It deserves careful attention. I commend it to you.

The article follows:

SAVING THE WORLD THE ECOLOGIST'S WAY

(By Robert W. Stock)

ST. LOUIS.—For two hours, David M. Gates, the director of the Missouri Botanical Garden here, had led me past lily ponds, among lush plantings of greenhouse orchids, along paths crimson with roses. "There's one thing more you should see," he said, and he strode through a grove of verdant trees to the foot of a pine. It was startling in its grotesque ugliness, its trunk rising

to a tangle of charred and stunted branches. "This is our lone survivor of the days when they burned soft coal in St. Louis," he said. "Every other pine and evergreen was killed. We have others in the garden now, but they're all new."

Gates is an ecologist, a student of the relationship between life forms and their environment. He is also a leader among the band of scientific Cassandras who seek to alert the nation to impending doom. Our continuing rape of the natural environment, he warned, can produce an earth populated by "half-starved, depressed billions gasping in air depleted of oxygen and laden with pollutants, thirsting for thickened, blighted water." I wondered whether Gates considered the blackened, long-lived pine a symbol of hope or despair. "You can take your pick," he said. "We can have it either way."

There is a tendency, today, to think of ecology as a new science, and its practitioners as men called into being by the environmental crisis, but the facts are otherwise. Ecology ("eco" derives from the Greek word for "home" or "habitat") had its beginnings around the turn of the century. It is a branch of biology, cutting across a multitude of disciplines, from zoology to botany. In Gates's words, "Ecology is the very epitome of science itself."

Wind and sun, carbon cycle and photosynthesis, strontium 90 and pesticides; every force and element that interacts with plant or animal is grist for the ecologist's mill. By studying this interaction, and its effects upon living things, he can help a farmer to improve his crop yield, or a city to clear its polluted air.

Traditionally, however, the ecologist has operated far from the urban scene. He has most often been a very private person, attuned to field and forest and the groves of Academe, devoting his life to the careful observation and description of a handful of individual plants. But in the last decade or so, new ideas and technologies have transformed the discipline. The manifest threat to the earth environment has turned dozens of ecologists into social critics and has placed a premium on their abilities to devise and effect new programs. In many ways David Gates perfectly reflects these changes.

My visit with Gates began in his office on the grounds of the botanical garden, a 70-acre oasis in the center of St. Louis. A chandelier dripped crystals from the ceiling; rare orchids brightened his desk and the mantel above an ornate fireplace. More than a century ago, the room had been occupied by a transplanted Englishman named Henry Shaw, who had made a fortune in cutlery and real estate. It was he who established Shaw's Garden, as it is known locally, on the site.

Gates is 48 years old. His appearance is pleasant and undistinguished—5 feet 9 inches; a crewcut over a faint brush mustache; tweedy sports coats and baggy trousers. His voice is a monotone, relieved by an occasional chuckle.

"I'll tell you what we worry about most," he began. "An irreversible catastrophe. A number of pesticide spills, for example, in those areas of the ocean where large colonies of marine organisms produce much of the world's oxygen. If you plot out the frequency of this kind of event, they're getting closer and closer."

The ecological state-of-the-art frightens him. "We're still in the Stone Age. This is pure speculation, but think about it: Influenza epidemics have followed very closely periods of great volcanic activity. Maybe the dust in the atmosphere from that activity reduces the sunlight and triggers a virus or our susceptibility to it. So what happens if man loads the atmosphere with dust from combustion and construction projects and

then there is major volcanic action. The worst flu epidemic in history? As I say, that's all speculative—but it's the kind of thing we should know, and we don't."

For a David Gates, the isolated incidents of man's inhumanity to nature—and hence to man—are part of a complex ecological pattern. The earth is a single vast system of interrelationships among plants and animals and climatic forces—an ecosystem.

Thus: If there were not enough oxygen in the atmosphere to filter out ultraviolet rays, the seemingly benevolent sun would destroy life on earth. Plants produce that oxygen through photosynthesis; they also help keep the atmospheric balance by absorbing carbon dioxide from the air. Enter man. He burns ever-increasing quantities of oil and coal, filling the air with carbon dioxide. He cuts down and paves over huge tracts of forest and poisons ocean life with chemicals. Question: How long will it be before the earth's plants are unable to produce enough oxygen—or absorb enough carbon dioxide—to hold back the ultraviolet rays?

Or: If a stream is to be healthy, the algae must have nutrients in the form of nitrates and phosphates. Algae are consumed by fish, fish by animals, and the food web, as this ladder is known, thrives. Enter man. He spreads his farmlands with fertilizers, mainly nitrates and phosphates, which are washed off into the streams. The excess of nutrients spurs a sudden increase in algae growth. Some of the new algae are not part of the food web; their growth is not controlled by hungry fish. New, inedible algae displace the old, the fish gradually disappear from the stream, the food web is destroyed. Question: How long will it be before all of the streams of our farmlands are sick?

Spurred by his fear for the environment, and its human dependents, Gates has been crying havoc—in appearances before Congressional committees, in lectures to scientific and lay audiences, in magazine articles by the dozen. He is a confirmed egalitarian who wants to educate and arouse the public, but he concentrates his greatest effort on the nation's leadership so that action can be taken "almost by fiat."

First and foremost, he wants Federal support for a revolution in the ecological discipline itself. Speaking before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, he charged that ecology, as now constituted, is unable to answer the questions that must be answered: How will a particular kind of air pollution affect the population? What effects will a highway or a jetport have on a wildlife area? The traditional descriptive ecological data are often available, the details on specific plants and animals gathered by classical ecologists, but they don't suffice. The effects are too complex, too subtle. The data must be "pulled altogether into coherent models"—general laws and theories that can be applied to the particular case. Gates has asked Congress to establish a National Institute of Ecology to begin the task, and for Federal programs to entice more students into the discipline. "There are only a few thousand ecologists in the country," he says, "and less than a half-dozen are theoretical ecologists."

When David Gates was named director of the garden in 1965, he said, "it shocked the botanical world"—and later talks I had with other ecologists indicated that, for some, the shock has not yet worn off. Gates' academic training had been in molecular physics, and his career had encompassed a host of pursuits far from any garden path. He had worked on anti-aircraft proximity fuses, on upper atmospheric research with "sky hook" balloons, on the propagation of radio waves. He had been an administrator of military and government projects and had taught college physics. It was not until 1964 that he had an official position directly related to ecol-

ogy—as Professor of Natural History at the University of Colorado.

"What people sometimes lose sight of," Gates said, "is my childhood." His father, Frank, was a pioneer ecologist at the Kansas State University in Manhattan, Kan., where he was raised, and father and son spent 17 summers at an ecological field station in northern Michigan. "I didn't have many friends up there. I spent my time collecting plant specimens and studying them under my dad's tutelage. I loved it. But one day I asked myself, Was it really enough just to find plants and describe them—the traditional ecological way, you see? I wanted to analyze, not just describe. When I discovered physics in high school, that was it—so intricate and beautiful and precise."

Over the years, Gates never lost his early interest in ecology, and at a meeting in 1959, sponsored by his alma mater, the University of Michigan (Ph.D., 1948), he propounded a theory that was to have a major impact on ecological studies.

The basic notion was simple enough. Every life process involves the expenditure of energy; thus, the relationship between an organism and its environment can be viewed as a problem in energy exchange. If there is a balance, an equilibrium, between the amount of energy a plant absorbs, and the amount it gives off, the plant will be healthy. If the balance is tipped one way or the other, the plant will become too hot or too cold, and will perish.

What was revolutionary about Gates's energy-exchange theory was its potential application. If he could pinpoint the major elements involved in this transfer of energy . . . if he could measure all their effects on a plant in terms of units of energy . . . then he would be able to produce a mathematical model of the relationship between plant and environment. Such a model would enable him to predict just how any given organism would actually function in any given environment. It would make ecology like physics—"beautiful and precise."

Gates pursued his theory with experiments at the University of Colorado ("I elected somewhat arbitrarily to work on plants first, because they don't bite and run around"), and he accepted the post in St. Louis with

$$Q_{ab} = \epsilon \sigma T_1^4 + k \left(\frac{V}{D} \right)^{1/2} (T_1 - T_a) + L \frac{d_1(T_1) - r_1 h_1 d_2(T_a)}{r_1 + r_a}$$

As we walked on through the garden, Gates's enthusiasm for his plant charges emerged. He pointed to a redbud tree along the path. "You can see, as the day gets hotter, its leaves begin to hang vertically. That way they don't get so much of the direct rays of the sun. Trees have their own personalities, their own ways of adjusting. They're smart."

The Missouri garden has for 50 years been a world leader in breeding tropical water-lilies; in fact, the first to be patented was grown here—a delicate, yellow flower named "St. Louis." Some of the lilies in the garden ponds and greenhouses reach diameters of six feet. "They're smart, too," Gates commented during our tour of a greenhouse, lifting a lily's edge. The underside was covered with huge thorns—"to keep animals from eating them." He had fewer kind words for a neighboring water hyacinth. "A vicious plant. They clog waterways."

Outside the greenhouse Gates called to a short man in bluejeans, James Hampton, the garden's chief engineer. "I hear you did a great job the other night, Jim." The Junior League Ball had been in full swing at the garden when a storm hit; the cream of young St. Louis society, in gowns and tuxedos, had raced helplessly about as the heavens opened and the lights went out. Hampton had repaired the generators.

Keeping people—particularly upper-class people—happy is one of Gates's major duties. The garden is a private institution and is

the understanding that ecological research would become a larger facet of the botanical garden's program. Now snakes, alligators and wolves are being tested to determine their energy credits and debits (Gates speaks of "energy budgets"), and he is training graduate students from around the nation in his new discipline called biophysical ecology. His research is supported by the Ford Foundation, the U.S. Public Health Service, the Office of Naval Research and the Atomic Energy Commission. One project suggested by the A.E.C.: a study of the energy budgets of aquatic animals as a means of understanding the effects of thermal pollution from nuclear reactors.

The air-conditioning in Gates' office had induced a state of blissful comfort; it was lost the moment we stepped out the door into a standard summer day in St. Louis—97 degrees and humid. Gates set a brisk pace and maintained it: "I run a mile and a half every morning in the garden or wherever I am." (His tennis shorts and sneakers produce some raised eyebrows when he trots out of Washington's Cosmos Club.)

The garden is a serene and lovely landscape of rolling hills and winding paths, dotted with cultivated areas and gazebos. We passed benches occupied by pipesmoking elders, watched bare foot hippies rolling in the grass and small children chinning themselves on water fountains. Gates lectured in a calm, matter-of-fact manner.

"This pine here, one of the new ones. It has 450,000 needles. We know because we counted them." Energy exchange takes place at the surface of a plant—the flow of air over the surface, for example, helps keep a plant cool. Before Gates could begin to determine how much air flow the pine required to stay healthy, he had to find out its total surface area. That meant counting pine needles.

Wind speed is one of four major environmental factors ("independent variables") he measures. The others are radiation (as from the sun), air temperature and humidity. The surface temperature of the organism, and the rate at which it loses water, are two other factors, dependent upon the first. To find the energy budget of a leaf, he simply (1) fits these measurements into a formula, to wit:

primarily dependent upon private benefactors for support.

The most dramatic display at the garden is the Climatron—a 70-foot-high, glassed-in geodesic dome, the interior of which has the exact climate of a tropical rain forest. We went inside to cool off. There were waterfalls and limpid jungle pools, palms and banana trees rising above a thick canopy of paradise plant: "That's particularly handsome." "Aren't all flowers handsome?" I asked. "Oh, like all people I suppose. It depends upon your criteria."

And on we went, through the restored, century-old country home of founder Shaw and the rose garden with its 6-inch-diameter Mr. Lincoln roses and the dusty herbarium—least colorful of the garden's treasures but one of its most important. Two million botanical specimens are preserved here, including plants gathered by Charles Darwin during the voyage of the H.M.S. Beagle. Scientists from all over the world study these desiccated plant remains to understand the evolution of life on earth.

Finally, Gates led me into a dark and dingy building and through narrow passageways crowded with plants and scientific equipment. "Our research center," he commented grimly. "We're trying to raise money for a new one."

As we talked, I heard a faint cheeping in the background. Gates pointed toward a cylinder beside us. "It's a kind of wind tun-

nel, with a baby chick inside. We can control the temperature and humidity and air flow. We're trying to determine how much water the chick loses when we change one of those variables. It's part of working out the energy budget for a chick—figuring out the energy input and output."

Many of the center's projects involve Gates's energy-exchange theory, and he follows them closely. "It's important professionally that I keep my hand in research," he said. "Otherwise I'm dead in five years." Experimental observations like that derived from the chick test are put through a computer at Washington University. "We can now tell," Gates said, "whether a cardinal or a sheep will be able to live successfully in a particular location. We can predict it."

Cheek by jowl with the wind tunnel was a massive apparatus, a motor connected by plastic tubing to a glass tank, which in turn was surrounded by recording devices and surmounted by a bank of flood lamps. Within the tank rested a tiny lilac plant. "One of our air-pollution studies," Gates said, and introduced me to a tall, quiet scientist named Fred Lanphear, an associate professor of horticulture on leave from Purdue.

The motor, Lanphear explained, produces pollutants which are blown through the glass tank. "We're trying to find out what levels of pollution are critical," he said. "By controlling the temperature with the lamps and the humidity and air flow, we can pinpoint just what pollution does to different kinds of plants in different time periods."

Such studies will provide botanists with the data they need to develop pollution-resistant plants and will provide city planners with a guide in selecting plants that are best able to withstand pollutants. "I'm also interested in using plants as biological monitors," Lanphear said. "They can be more sensitive pollution detectors than most of the equipment available. You just have to know the symptoms." Sulfur dioxide pollution, for example, produces irregular streaking on either side of the midvein of a blade of grass. Ozone, chief ingredient of Los Angeles's photochemical smog, marks broad leaf plants with white flecks or reddish-brown stipples.

Lanphear envisions a time when carefully selected plants will form green belts around factories, not only to monitor pollution but possibly to reduce it. "The fact that pollutants injure a plant indicates it is absorbing them. The question is, to what extent can plants serve as a pollution filter. I'm conducting experiments in the lab to test the premise, and I find that some plants—the Douglas fir, for example—can take in huge amounts of sulfur dioxide without too much damage if they're given enough time."

Another research project at the garden looks toward a day when plants may be used to absorb noise. Scientists place a sound generator on one side of a grove of evergreens, for instance, and a sound meter on the other side. Their observations indicate that plants are better at absorbing high frequency sound (which is more annoying to the human ear) than the low frequency variety.

Members of the garden research staff are frequently away from their desks on field trips. Some have spent long periods of time in Panama—Gates has been a consultant for the Federal Government in determining the ecological consequences of building a sea-level canal through that nation. A former staff scientist has used his knowledge of the tropics to write survival manuals for G.I.'s in Vietnam.

Gates himself is constantly traveling, on field trips into his beloved northern Michigan ("It's not what it was when I was a boy—nothing is, I guess—but it's still beautiful") and to professional meetings. He is a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and on seven of its committees. He serves on commissions and boards for organizations such as NASA and

the Smithsonian. His home base is a two-story brick house on the garden grounds, which he shares with his wife Marian and their four children. Marian Gates is a small, bright, outspoken woman who was her husband's classmate back in Kansas. Murray, 21, is a college dropout, a long-haired artist who, like his father, is a former Eagle Scout. There are three daughters: Julie, 19; Heather, 12; Marilyn, 11.

Since it was first propounded, the Gates theory of energy exchange has earned universal acceptance in ecological circles, even though it was the brainchild of a molecular physicist, and other scientists are pursuing research in biophysical ecology. There are some doubters who believe that the "energy budgeters" will never measure precisely all the environmental variables that work upon a plant or animal—biological rhythms, for example. But Gates is supremely confident that he has found the key to unlock many of nature's mysteries, and to revitalize the ecological profession as well.

"We need a new breed of ecologist," he says. He believes that it was the development of theoretical physics a half-century ago that made possible the quantum leaps in that science, and that it is the lack of a strong theoretical foundation that has prevented ecology from making similar advances. "We're groping for answers," Gates says. "We try something, see if it works, then try something else. A body of theoretical knowledge will enable us to predict results, to know how organisms will react to changes in their environments. In a sense, this is what the modern environmental crisis is all about." As a teen-age naturalist, Gates had abandoned his father's science because it lacked this kind of analytical precision; now he hopes to bring it around.

All this, however, is in the realm of theory, and Gates is nothing if not a pragmatist. In his Congressional appearances he has frequently wandered from discussions of energy budgets and the ecological discipline to concrete proposals for what he calls "environmental management." Speaking before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, he called for the creation of "ecosystem analysis task forces," which would converge upon a particular geographical area and spend months studying it. "Take Long Island," he says. "I would send in not just ecologists but agronomists, recreational experts, sewage treatment people, sociologists, economists—it might easily be a team of 100 people. They would come up with options: This is what you can expect if things continued the way they're going; this is what can be done and what it would cost. Should this section of land be held out for food production? Is recreation the most important use of the upper end of the island? The task forces might be a Rand type of corporation or a Brookhaven National Laboratory which would report to the President's Environmental Quality Council."

Such studies, Gates feels, are immediately necessary to provide the nation with predictive models, enabling scientists to forecast the results of particular kinds of pollution, to anticipate environmental catastrophes. This type of crystal-ball-gazing is called operations research, and it is no accident that Gates should espouse it. He did the same kind of work during World War II, with antiaircraft weapons. "We'd be asked to figure out questions like this," he recalls. "If the Japanese sent so many suicide planes of such-and-such a speed against a carrier of such-and-such class, what were the probabilities that we could shoot them down?" What worked for suicide planes, Gates feels, would work for pesticide spills and sea-level canals.

Gates is an optimist, a doer, who gets his kicks from solving problems. He wants to believe that man can cope with the environmental crisis, and he does find some heartening developments. "Congress is becoming in-

creasingly concerned," he says. "Scientific groups of all kinds are getting involved. Industry is beginning to cooperate." Public pressure, he feels, is making a difference: "People are beating on their representatives, on local industry."

Yet a touch of nostalgia, almost of despair, constantly intrudes upon his conversation. "It's so difficult to make people understand the seriousness of the threat," he says. "They don't realize how much we've lost already. They don't realize that we live in a closed system, that the air and water, the plants and animals, are being irreparably damaged and there are no replacements. And it's not just a matter of esthetics. When we lose a wildlife species or a plant, we lose a genetic stock that future generations might need desperately for food."

Just before we parted, I asked him if he thought the trend toward human oblivion would be halted. "I don't know," he replied. "It's very likely we won't be able to stem the momentum, but we have to try. We're definitely not going to make it if we persist in fighting major wars, throwing away our energies. Priorities—it always comes back to that. We have to learn to care about what kind of environment we're going to live in. The question is, Will we learn in time?"

As I left Gate's office, I stopped for a moment to take a last look around the garden. My eyes rested on a magnificent ginkgo, a thick-trunked wide-branched tree that belongs to a species that is 200 million years old. Gates had told me that the tree was very resistant to insects—hence its longevity—but only fairly resistant to air pollution. Some effects were showing.

Two-dozen school children had been sitting beneath the ginkgo earlier. Now, they were gone, and the base of the tree was littered with scraps of paper and discarded soft-drink cartons. It was a small incident, and I reminded myself that one could read too much into such things. Yet it seemed a depressing omen.

VIETNAM MORATORIUM

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the conflict in Vietnam has been debated, discussed, dissected, and analyzed as much or more than any other issue in our history, but it has not been resolved.

A great jurist and a brave soldier, the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., once said:

I have no faith in panaceas, and almost none in sudden ruin.

Our experience in Vietnam confirms the wisdom of this observation.

There have been policy proposals in great number, a large percentage of them billed by their proponents as essential and by their opponents as suicidal. But "bombing above the parallel" and "attacking the petroleum depots" and "adding Hanoi and Haiphong to the target list" failed to bring military victory, just as "stopping the bombing" and "including the NLF in the negotiations" and "agreeing to prompt withdrawal of U.S. troops after a truce" could not produce a negotiated settlement.

Neither did any of these steps nor all of them materially weaken our position, jeopardize the lives of our troops, or widen the war.

None have been panaceas and sudden ruin has not followed their adoption.

There are no simple solutions to the Vietnamese problem, no easy ways out, no uncomplicated and painless answers to the bloody questions of a bloody war.

Those who insist they have the answers whether they be "hawk or dove" and who accompany their claims with denunciations of their opponents' patriotism, morals, and motives—as some do—have seriously hindered rational understanding of the issues by the millions of Americans who are neither "hawk" nor "dove."

I do not share with some of my fellow Americans the view that the war in Vietnam is imperialist, colonialist, or racist; or that it is the preemptive moral issue of our time; or that a man's integrity can be measured by his attitude toward U.S. military involvement in Vietnam. I know of no public official, no President, no Member of Congress, no Cabinet member—past or present—who takes pleasure in human slaughter or who measures his achievement by how many deaths—American deaths or Vietnamese deaths—have occurred today.

Our intervention in Vietnam is the result of decisions made by sincere and conscientious men of several administrations whose common objective was to create a world order in which men could live in peace and who firmly believed that the conquest of the Republic of South Vietnam by force of arms would have world repercussions more damaging to peace than an American military effort to save South Vietnam.

But this rigid application of our policy of containment of communism seems to me less appropriate in Southeast Asia than in Western Europe, where our most vital interests are at stake, and less urgent today than 20 years ago, when international communism was yet a monolithic world force under a militant and united leadership.

I firmly believe, too, that if Secretaries Rusk or Dulles or Herter or Wilson or McElroy or Gates or McNamara or Presidents Eisenhower or Kennedy or Johnson had foreseen the inability of the Saigon governments to respond to the challenge confronting them, the failure of our counterinsurgency strategies, and the terrible toll of this war in men, material, and national unity the history of our involvement in Vietnam would have been very different.

It does not reflect on the wisdom or good will of those who made decisions 5 or 10 or 15 years ago if we conclude today that those decisions were mistaken. And surely it is no tribute to our past leaders to continue a policy that has reached the point of diminishing returns. There is nothing immoral, unpatriotic, or disloyal about cutting your losses when you determine you were mistaken. There is something wrong, however, in continuing to lose lives to maintain a policy just because it looked right once. Too many people have died already—too many Americans, too many Vietnamese, too many men and women and children.

Our achievements in Vietnam have not been worth their cost and cannot now be made worth their cost. Unless we recognize this and the real limitation upon our actions it implies we shall continue

to expend American and Vietnamese lives and treasure in pursuit of goals that are unattainable at any reasonable cost.

This is not to suggest that we have accomplished nothing in Vietnam. Our intervention has forestalled the conquest of South Vietnam and given the Vietnamese the opportunity to defend themselves. But we have paid a terrible price to achieve this objective.

Neither would I suggest that a precipitous withdrawal from Vietnam is now our best course but I believe that we can and should disengage ourselves from this struggle. Our disengagement ought to be accompanied by renewed efforts to strengthen Saigon's capacity to defend itself. It ought to be given help and encouragement to establish free and democratic institutions that will earn for it the support of the Vietnamese people.

But, in the end, these are jobs that only the Vietnamese can do.

In advocating this course of action I do not pretend that it is a panacea or that it will certainly lead to a free and independent South Vietnam—it may not—but simply that disengagement is the best of some very bad alternatives and is clearly preferable to the loss of more and more lives in a cause, the cost of which already exceeds its value.

A CHURCH BELL RINGS ONCE MORE

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, in the little hamlet of Seaford, Long Island, a church bell sat for many years in the rear of an old weathered church. One day in 1968, the newly organized mens club of St. Michael and All Angels Church happened to bring up this fact and a discussion was started on the old bell. The bell had been dedicated in 1897 by "The Many Friends of St. Michael," as was inscribed on the bell. Since that day 1½ years ago, the endeavor has been going on to bring back a sound of a church bell in Seaford. It was felt that a bell that could not ring out and sound a message of joy was not in truth a bell. A stanchion was built for mounting the bell and a time capsule with many mementos of the church is going to be sealed in a niche in the base. A copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing this insert will be placed in the capsule.

Organizations in Seaford have contributed several hundred dollars in answer to an appeal for funds to help construct the stanchion and purchase a plaque.

A ceremony befitting this project of the mens club of St. Michael and All Angels Church will be held on Sunday, October 19, 1969, at 1:30 p.m. and several hundred people will attend. The plaque which is to be placed on the stanchion has a verse from Psalm 66, verse 1 and reads as follows:

Make a Joyful Noise Unto God, All Ye Lands.

This verse was picked by Rev. Harold L. Goetz, pastor of the church and this is

the message that the members of St. Michaels would like to convey to the world.

CANDLELIGHT IN FLUSHING

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the dignified and enlightening debate in the House of Representatives on October 14 was a proper prelude to the Vietnam moratorium. All of us left the House Chamber and the galleries reassured that free and public debate on important questions was still possible in the heart of government. The thousands of students who came to Capitol Hill for the debate also saw that the institutions of government could function properly.

I returned to my district on the day of the Vietnam moratorium to give the following speech which reflects my views on the meaning of this day and on the work still to be done by those of us unalterably opposed to continuing this war.

This speech followed a candlelight parade in Flushing which, in its solemnity and dignity and dedication confirmed the spirit in which the moratorium was started in the House Chamber the night before.

VIETNAM MORATORIUM

We gather this evening to mark a momentous day when America rose up and said "Peace" in the clearest voice yet heard. We have had hundreds or even thousands of peace rallies and demonstrations before the Vietnam Moratorium. We may need many more. But never have we seen an idea sweep America as it has today.

This was supposed to be a students' day of demonstration. It was taken over by adults. The mothers and fathers of this country are now ready to leave Vietnam! Their voices will be heard by this Administration, despite President Nixon's insensitive comment that "nothing new can be learned from them".

We are here because we believe deeply that something has gone wrong and we must try to set it right. That's how this moratorium started. And it will not die, nor be eliminated by presidential press release or the firing of General Hershey or by any new series of side-steps.

The President has had almost one year since his election to show us his promised plan to end the war. He has had nine months, with the full panoply of presidential power—the greatest array of force ever given any man in history—to carry out that promise. And still the end is not yet in sight.

We have lost 45,352 American lives. Wounded and maimed Americans number 252,059 from this war, making it the second most costly conflict in our history. And the Administration admits that it will take at least three years for total withdrawal of our troops.

Our job this evening and tomorrow and next week and month is to be sure that this Administration, and its successors, really understand what we are aroused about.

We want, first and now, withdrawal of all American troops from Vietnam.

Then, we want new priorities so that America spends the resources of the richest Nation in history on some of history's sorest problems: slums, schools, pollution, jobs and housing.

Finally, we want to know what went wrong in the Sixties so it won't happen again. Under

what inspiration did we proceed into so many overseas military obligations.

Perhaps some of these military missions and obligations are vital to our interests. But we must find some way to clarify and state and classify those interests among urgent domestic priorities so that America's mothers and fathers will not have to come again in five or fifteen years to rally on the streets to bring home five hundred thousand sons from a war we never wanted and cannot understand.

Many of us here tonight can look back to 1965 and the first anti-war protests. There are many memories, and a few legends about these past five years.

But there is no false satisfaction in having been aware before others that Vietnam was wrong. There is no joy in having been right when others were still groping for the answers. And tonight there should be no sense of triumph in seeing that a majority of Americans now think that Vietnam was wrong and that we should leave.

Rather, we shall triumph only when policy is changed. We shall persevere until the last ship brings the last American boy back from Vietnam. We shall work and march and pray until we have set America right again.

And we must remind those who criticize this moratorium that we have a President, not an emperor. We have a country where we can have free discussion and dialogue.

The hour is now late. The President and the Congress hear but do not yet understand fully. Let us send still more messages. Let us start once more.

QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE MORATORIUM

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my concern for the questions raised by the moratorium by offering these thoughts on the debate itself, the spirit in which we engage in it, and the ends we seek. First, as to the propriety of debating the war, I can think of no more appropriate question to discuss, given our obligations under article 1, section 8 of the Constitution. True, at the outset of this administration we were counseled to lower our voices. More recently it has been suggested that it would be better if we said nothing at all. Congress has often been accused of doing exactly that. But "when the blast of war rings in our ears," we have not only the right but a duty to find our voice. And a

Congress which has expressed a desire for greater participation in the formulation of foreign policy can hardly be reluctant to discuss it. I am glad this point was quickly and properly resolved.

Second, in what spirit do we discuss this war? Not of anger and frustration, I submit, although angry and frustrated we are; certainly not of rancor or ill will toward fellow Americans in or out of policymaking positions; and not even of implacable hatred of the foe, but calmly, thoughtfully, and constructively. It is our part to voice the Nation's reason, not simply echo its agony. Reasonable we must be, although it would, I think, sharpen our perspective if we thought of ourselves as the parents of draft-age boys.

Finally, we must try to arrive at an agreed definition of what it is we seek to achieve in Vietnam, and to which any further efforts and sacrifices should be directed. "Victory," in its ordinary sense, has been abandoned by most Americans including the President, as the definition of the goal to be achieved; it has been abandoned in favor of "peace." We must admit "peace" is susceptible of as many interpretations as "victory." So we have a duty to be candid with each other about what is meant by "peace" in Vietnam.

To most, it means termination of U.S. military involvement there, and the withdrawal of American troops. Whether this would produce peace in Vietnam, is a matter of conjecture but not of primary concern to those who consider our involvement prohibitively costly in American lives, treasure, reputation, and self-respect; those who cannot view its termination as anything but preferable to its continuance for one more day. The argument is compelling. What has been won in the past 7 years? What remains to be won? It is certainly difficult to estimate how much national security or world stability have been purchased to date. It would have to be great indeed in order to justify the direct sacrifice of blood and treasure, and the indirect sacrifice of housing, education, pollution control, and economic strength to say nothing of racial and campus harmony, or the sense of gladly shared purpose which ought to animate a great nation in conflict. I incline to the view that to date more has been lost than won. Hindsight suggests the investment was ill advised. History does not reveal its alternatives. It may well be that without U.S. inter-

vention, a Titoist regime governing all of Vietnam under Hanoi, would have emerged as a bulwark of nonaggressive neutrality between China and the rest of Indochina. Perhaps no bulwark was required, or if required, not ours to build. If all this was predictable we must acknowledge fallibility in making or heeding predictions. In any event, in our own interest as our leaders saw it, we intervened. We manipulated South Vietnamese leadership and ravaged the land. We bear a great responsibility for the war, certainly. Do we bear an equally great responsibility for the "peace" we leave behind?

If so, how to discharge that responsibility is the question before the Nation, the President, and this House. It is not an easy question as the debate last night revealed. It turns the most eager exponents of simple withdrawal into cautious military strategists. Why? Because of the demands it makes on conscience and honor. Yes, our prisoners must be returned. No, Vietnamese hostages must not be abandoned. Yes, the enslave theory, and its assumption of continued American presence has validity. Yes, Vietnamization of the war is essential, and should include pressure on the regime to pass power to a more representative body. No, in short, the men cannot come home at once. Thus, the debate quickly narrowed the gap between supporters and opponents of current policy. No support at all was offered the 30-day-wonder theory of withdrawal. Had the debate been allowed to continue we might have been able to illuminate other possible approaches, from Senator AIKEN's novel suggestion to its opposite, accelerated withdrawal coupled with the threat of selective air attacks in the north, if necessary, to insure Hanoi's cooperation both with our removal, and the eventual establishment of an indigenous, representative government in South Vietnam.

In my view the careful implementation of a deliberate and declared policy of disengagement should be encouraged, or if you will demanded, but only to the end of achieving exactly that. If more is demanded, by putting our collective shoulder to the wheels of wishful thinking, something else could be sacrificed to this tragic conflict: rational government. In due course a question of honor can become a question of order.

SENATE—Thursday, October 16, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, send peace on earth, and by Thy grace put down the pride, greed, and anger that turn man against man, and nation against nation. Speed the day when wars are ended and all men call Thee Father.

O Lord, remove from us and from all men both hate and prejudice, that Thy children may be reconciled with those

whom they fear, resent, or threaten, and thereafter live in peace.

As we consecrate ourselves to Thee, make us to know that our work is Thy work. Strengthen the faculties of our minds and dispose our efforts for the welfare of all the people and the furtherance of Thy kingdom.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of

Wednesday, October 15, 1969, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.