

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## NONSECRET MOON FLIGHT

## HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there are many ways to view the accomplishments of our national space program and particularly the recent monumental success of Apollo 11 in landing men on the Moon. The Evening Bulletin, of Philadelphia, Pa., on Thursday, July 17, 1969, carried an interesting article by Mr. Max Lerner pointing out the significance and value of the open space program that the United States is conducting. As Mr. Lerner points out:

I welcome the stress on manned and humanized space flight as against the Soviet stress on unmanned and the impersonal.

The importance of Mr. Lerner's words should not be forgotten as we seek direction as to the future of our national space program. The article follows:

## NONSECRET MOON FLIGHT

(By Max Lerner)

WALTHAM, MASS.—There has never been a moment in human history so massively and carefully prepared and so intensely watched by the whole sweep of the earth's population as the projected landing on the moon by the American astronauts. But there are no sure precisions in the cosmos, whether in the world of nature or of man. After everything has been planned for, there remains the element of accident or contingency—what we call "luck."

What the world therefore will really be watching—each group with whatever form of prayer or propitiation it owns up to—is to see whether luck or mishap will attend the fateful moment.

## PRESTIGE DAMAGED

Soviet leaders, it seems to me, have chosen with an unsurprising lack of grace, to barge into this moment of history and crash the party. It is a way of recognizing that science is not only science but a form of political and prestige rivalry, too.

The original Sputniks and the slow American start in space gave the Russians a huge start some 12 years ago. They have since fallen behind, as the Americans have moved toward space primacy in the past eight years—since President Kennedy's grave decision. Mr. Kennedy said to Khrushchev, at the summit meeting in 1961, "Let us go to the moon together." The Russians refused. Now their intent seems to be to undercut or upstage the drama they've been unable to prevent.

There's more than rivalry at stake here. There are two basic life-styles and civilization-styles engaged in the same effort, and the way they operate in it sheds considerable light on their nature and destiny.

The usual way of seeing the difference between the two approaches is to stress the difference between unmanned and manned flight. But there is a larger difference into which that fits—the difference between secrecy and openness.

## PRICE FOR OPENNESS

There were Soviet economic and technical failures in the first half of the Sixties that slowed the Russians, including some tragedies with a high cost in human life, never officially revealed. Nobody knows the trou-

bles the Russians have seen in recent years, although Sir Bernard Lovell estimates that they have again fallen a year behind in their schedule.

The Americans have had to pay a high price for their openness, especially when the grisly death of three astronauts made them stop and revamp their technological and safety apparatus. But even here it was a case of one step backward and two steps forward.

The openness of the tragedy goaded the Americans into an urgency they might not otherwise have achieved.

The American program is bound to have tragedies again. The open society, like the closed society—the open life, like the secret life—cannot escape the tragic, but its wrestling with the tragic and its transcending of it are also open, and inspiring.

## AMERICAN APPROACH

By the American style, the harvest—if all goes well—is a greater focusing on the symbolic event before and after it happens, a greater drama and, therefore, a greater glory. If things go badly, the misery and heartaches also are greater.

The Soviet method cuts not so much the loss or tragedy as the vulnerability to open failure.

The corollary to secrecy is in personality. Young Americans have the right intuition when they worry about becoming impersonal items in a computerized world and when they link it potentially with a closed society. Yet, the fact is that this linkage, which has been made in modern totalitarian society, is being resisted in America, and not only by the young rebels. That is why I welcome the stress on manned and humanized space flights as against the Soviet stress on the unmanned and the impersonal. You have to mix science and technology not only with vast economic resources and planning, but also with compassion, imagination, sweat and a big chunk of humanity.

## MRS. ANNA CORNEHL

## HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I recently informed the President's office that a very fine lady who is one of my constituents would be celebrating her 100th birthday. The President responded by sending the lady a congratulatory telegram. She was, of course, overjoyed and grateful. I, too, wish to say "thank you" to the President for his thoughtfulness and consideration.

The lady is Mrs. Anna Cornehl, and an excellent weekly newspaper known as the Bronx Press-Review also contributed to the enjoyment of her birthday by publishing an article about her. As a tribute to Mrs. Cornehl, I am entering the complete text of that article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

A 100-old woman recalls with gratitude that when she came to Unionport as a bride the townsmen refrained out of delicacy from "shooting over my head," in deference to the fact that she wasn't a local girl.

The shooting wasn't to have been in anger: it was a form of "shivaree," rough and rustic romping to mark a local wedding night. The

playful shots were reserved for local girls in the village of 500, back in 1893.

"The bride of that time is Anna Cornehl, of 2953 Philip Ave., who last Sunday was tendered a special reception in the church she helped to found, walking the rural roads and traveling by wagon, to sign first members.

Mrs. Cornehl is a spry lady this day. She complains a little of a partial hearing loss, and of twinges of arthritis. But she still is able to prepare meals, and to talk of the old days to friends and neighbors who come to see her often. "I love to have people drop in," she says.

She was born Anna Heick in Wehrendorf, Hanover, Germany, and came to this country with her mother and sister. Her great grandfather and grandfather had come to the United States earlier. The family chafed against the "Prussianizing" of their native land. For a time she lived in Hawkeye, Iowa, on a farm, then came to New York. Employment was difficult, and she was untrained, like most women, for work. She found a post as a maid in a home next door to the family of former Governor Alfred E. Smith, in Greenwich Village.

She married a maritime officer, George H. Cornehl, and they came uptown by train to Van Nest and were taken to their home on Havemeyer Ave. by public coach, driven by a man named Dannenfesler, she recalls.

The villagers who forbore from shooting guns over the bride's head greeted them at a celebration given by the couple, at which all who wanted were treated to food and drink.

The Cornehls were to occupy several other quarters after their first. They lived on Gleason Ave., and then Lurting Ave. Mrs. Cornehl lives now with her daughter, Augusta, in the Philip Ave. house.

She sighs as she notes that "people nowadays" aren't as "nice" as they were in her girlhood. "They think too much about themselves now," she says a little mournfully.

She doesn't look mournful often. Mrs. Cornehl is a woman of high spirits, with a wide smile in her age-carved face. She is slight but active and she still has traces of a German accent. She and her daughter amiably disagree over some of her recollections, which she has to strain through nearly a century of remembrance. Details sometimes differ from the family records handed down to her daughter orally.

When she came to Unionport, there were two main East-West streets, Westchester Ave. and Eastern Blvd. (now Bruckner Blvd.) and three North-South streets, Aves. A (Zerega Ave.), B (Castle Hill Ave.) and C. (Havemeyer Ave.) Castle Hill Ave. was the local shopping center, but for important purchases Unionporters went to "The Village," at Westchester Square.

The centenarian recalls that when she came to Unionport there was no policeman, but that somehow there was a jail on Gleason Ave. The Odd Fellows Home was on its present site, but then consisted only of a small frame building. PS 36 on Castle Hill Ave. gave public school instruction.

The religious centers were historic St. Peter's Episcopal Church, attended by the owners of the beautiful large estates that bordered the East River waterfront, and St. Raymond's the "Mother Church" of the Bronx Catholics.

But she was a German Lutheran, and there was no church for her. So she started out to organize one. She visited the many German families resident in those days in Unionport, and the young matron soon had the congregation founded. It is still active, in a small frame building at 2134 Newbold Ave.—St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church of

Unionport, where the celebration was held on Sunday.

Every once in a while she recalls, with some emotional warmth and some economic pain, that she used to buy milk at three cents a quart. "There were cows all around here," she notes. "Chickens, too." She paid ten cents a dozen for eggs.

She remembers that the boys from the old Catholic Protectory, the site of which is now occupied by Parkchester, used to bathe in Westchester Creek. Mrs. Cornehl remembers good times in Sehring Park, on Starling Ave. where there was bowling and dancing. But a "rough crowd" from Bergen Ave. broke up the place one night, and it was not reopened, she recalls.

There was a home for alcoholics on Westchester Ave. in those days, too.

Progress came to Unionport when the IRT Pelham Bay Line subway was built—the community was changed from rural to suburban. She says "it's being heard today that 'some of the nicest people moved away'."

"Mrs. Cornehl bore two children, and was attended by a Dr. Droogan, who made house calls on a bicycle. Another local physician was Dr. Ellis, of Doris St. She doesn't recall first names.

Her son Fred, a Certified Public Accountant in government employ, died last year in St. Petersburg, Fla. Her daughter, Augusta, called Connie, still lives with her. They live an amiable and interesting life, entertain often, talk lightly.

"I've had a good life," Mrs. Cornehl says. "People will age less if they keep active. I've always been on the go. My church work has been greatly rewarding, religiously and socially." She admits she likes an occasional glass of champagne.

Her husband won a citation for saving survivors of the U.S. battleship Maine, at Cuba—the sinking incident blamed on the Spaniards which was a cause celebre in the Spanish-American war. He was first officer of the City of Washington, which joined in the rescue work. Later he became a captain of Ward Line vessels plying to Cuba. Mrs. Cornehl recalls that when they met "it was love at first sight."

It was love at first sight when she encountered life. She still is in love—although sometimes slightly bewildered by its changes—with life.

"But it doesn't seem like 100 years," she says.

#### LEAD-POISONED KIDS

### HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a silent epidemic in the ghettos of our urban centers affecting children who live in dilapidated housing. It is lead poisoning.

Lead poisoning results from old paint which peels off walls and fire escapes and falls within easy reach of children who eat it. The disease in its early stages is just like a virus, and most often is not reported until it has reached its most critical stages. When it gets this far, it results in epilepsy, cerebral palsy, permanent mental retardation, and death.

It is estimated that 25,000 to 30,000 children suffer from lead poisoning in New York City alone.

I have introduced three bills to combat lead poisoning: H.R. 9191, H.R. 9192, and H.R. 11699. In July, these bills were reintroduced with 18 of my colleagues as

cosponsors. These bills are H.R. 13256, H.R. 13254, and H.R. 13255.

I am inserting in the RECORD an article from the October 21 issue of Look magazine. Written by Margaret English, the article, "Lead-Poisoned Kids," cites the seriousness of this disease around the Nation.

I urge my colleagues to read this well-documented article, and to support the essential legislation to alleviate the problem:

#### LEAD-POISONED KIDS

(By Margaret English)

On April Fool's Day, 1969, two-year-old Yanda Russell began throwing up everything she ate. On April 4, her frightened mother took her to Children's Hospital in Washington, D.C. Six hours after she was admitted, Yanda went into convulsions and became semi-comatose. The resident on duty had seen too many similar cases, and he half expected Mrs. Russell's answers to his gentle questioning. Like most people in the area, she lived in a decayed, prewar tenement. The paint in her apartment peeled away in strips, and holes in the plaster were within easy reach of a two-year-old. For 11 months, she had been yelling at her daughter to quit picking at the paint.

Tests showed that Yanda's blood contained more than three times the safe amount of lead. X-rays revealed lead deposits in her bones. Lead in her brain had caused it to swell inside her skull and had brought on the vomiting and convulsions. She was treated with chemicals that flushed the lead out of her system, and, in three weeks, she was walking, talking and eating normally. Now, she has a 50-50 chance at a healthy life. If she is unlucky, she will suffer permanent neurological damage. Her chances of fighting her way out of the slum she was born in have been reduced by half, all because she ate as few as three flakes a week of lead-containing paint from the walls of her home. There are thousands like her.

Lead paint has not been used on interiors for over ten years, but in old buildings, it lies just beneath the surface of the newer coats of lead-free paint. When the walls are not properly maintained, the old paint lifts away in layered chips along with the new. This is the decor of slum housing.

Most of the children who eat paint have pica, a vaguely defined craving for non-food substances that afflicts about one child in five. Some pediatricians say that pica is caused by minor brain damage, insufficient mothering or overuse of oral pacifiers. However, Dr. Agnes Lattimer, director of Ambulatory Pediatrics at Chicago's Michael Reese Hospital, tends to put down the psychological causes of pica. "Most of these children are anemic," she says. "We're not sure just why, but we find that when we treat the iron anemia, the pica improves." In any case, to her, pica is almost a side issue. A child who lives in a new or well-maintained house can have all the pica in the world, and he won't get lead poisoning.

About 200 kids die from lead every year. Between 12,000 and 16,000 are treated and survive. Half of these are left mentally retarded. Only about one case in 25 is treated. This means that every year, as many as 400,000 kids may be poisoned, half of them ending up with a permanent handicap, like behavior problems or impaired intellectual ability.

The early symptoms are mild and vague. Constipation, clumsiness, lethargy, crankiness or nausea could mean lead poisoning or any number of other childhood ailments. Often, the symptoms go completely unnoticed and disappear, leaving the child with only a little bit of brain damage—perhaps just enough to keep him from getting through high school or holding down a

steady job later on. No one can positively identify these victims, but we understand enough about lead poisoning to know that they must exist.

Health officials have learned that when they go out looking for cases, they find them, and the more they look, the more they find. Chicago began a mass screening program in 1966. In 1967, 27,959 Chicago slum kids were tested. Although only a third of the children were in the high-risk age group (one to three years), 2,379 had dangerously high levels of lead in their blood.

Chicago prides itself on having the most extensive screening program for lead poisoning in America, but Mrs. Catherine Smith, of the South Side, is not impressed. Four of her children have been poisoned. Only when she withheld rent for five months did her landlord repair the paint and plaster in her apartment—and then just in the most conspicuous spots. There is still loose lead paint within reach of her youngest son, who nibbles at it when her back is turned. Mrs. Smith would like to get her kids into a housing project where the paint is tight and lead-free. So would the 70,000 other people on the public-housing waiting list in Chicago. If Mrs. Smith could have a safe home, she would be a little more impressed.

Baltimore doesn't have a screening program, but the city does get very tough with landlords of lead-poisoned children. Once a Baltimore child is hospitalized, the Health Department will force the landlord to remove all peeling paint and any tight lead paint from chewable surfaces below a height of four feet. Mrs. Burrie Green's apartment walls in Baltimore were partially stripped after her infant son Larry was hospitalized in the summer of 1968. But when he came home, flakes of old paint still fell within his reach, and a year later, he was poisoned again in the same apartment that had been officially declared lead-free. Twice poisoned, Larry now has little hope of a full recovery.

Still, Chicago and Baltimore are two of the best cities to live in if you can't afford to settle anywhere except in the lead belt.

If Mrs. Barbara Last lived in Chicago instead of Boston, her daughter Debbie might have been screened and treated before she started getting stomachaches and acting crazy. Then maybe she could have been promoted from the first grade last year. Specialists at Children's Hospital Medical Center, Boston, have developed a method for detecting lead poisoning in children from the lead deposits in their hair. This is how Debbie's case was finally diagnosed. Yet Children's Hospital couldn't get the necessary funds to run a mass hair-testing this summer.

When Mrs. Brenda Scurry left Florida for New York in 1964, she wasn't thinking about lead poisoning. She just thought that things were better up North, which may account for why she didn't end her journey in Baltimore. If she had, perhaps her daughter Janet would be alive. Dr. J. Julian Chisolm, Jr., of Johns Hopkins says of the Baltimore Pediatrics clinics, "We take the attitude that any child who vomits in the summertime has lead poisoning until proven otherwise." If Janet had arrived at a Baltimore hospital in a coma and with a history of paint eating, she might have been tested and treated in time. As it was, she was taken to a Bronx hospital on April 15. No one thought of testing her for lead poisoning until April 21. On April 22, she died. More than a week after she buried her daughter, Mrs. Scurry learned the results of the blood test: Lead poisoning.

This can be stopped. Mass screening and testing programs help, and every city with prewar dilapidated housing should have them. Cracking down on a landlord after a kid has been poisoned helps too. But Paul Du Brul, an anti-lead activist from New York's Lower East Side, believes we should go further: "There shouldn't be any lead poisoning, at least not on the scale that we

have it in this country. It is completely within our power to prevent mental retardation in thousands of children a year. All we have to do is keep lead paint out of the reach of little kids who put everything in their mouths." That means making their homes lead-free—either by stripping the walls and repainting them or covering the old paint with wallboard.

It's no use telling women not to let their children eat paint. They try, but it does about as much good as telling a child not to suck his thumb. Dr. Lattimer of Chicago lays it out: "You have to have a home safe enough to put a child down in while you do the washing and ironing. You can tie him down, but then he doesn't get to explore his environment. Then the Head Start people tell you he's culturally deprived. If you live in a lead trap, you can't win."

The landlords will squawk when they have to panel or strip their buildings. They'll say they can't afford it, and some of them won't be able to. Dr. René Dubos, who won a Pulitzer Prize for his book, *So Human an Animal*, likens the elimination of lead poisoning in the slums to the pasteurization of milk. At one time, the dairy people insisted there was no way to market milk that was guaranteed not to give you tuberculosis. The public demanded, and it was done. Dr. Dubos says the same must be done with lead: ". . . This problem is so well defined that it may provide an occasion to introduce a kind of social accounting. . . . If we do not act in a ruthless manner on this limited problem, then I believe that our society is intellectually and morally dishonest in talking about improving social conditions or improving our total environment. If we, with all our technological means, are not willing to make the effort that would be demanded to get rid of [lead poisoning], then our society deserves all the disasters that will come to it."

In St. Louis, a few concerned people are trying to organize a lead-poisoning program. It hasn't really gotten off the ground yet, because the medical folk believe that they have to run a pilot test to find out if there is really enough lead poisoning in St. Louis to bother with. You have to get funding for this kind of thing. Mrs. Sandra James lives with her two-year-old son and a couple of older kids, in a tottering frame house down on Mills Street in St. Louis. She hasn't heard of the citizens' committee, and she doesn't know too much about lead poisoning. In her apartment, the paint lifts off the walls in sheets, and there are holes in the plaster right through to the beams. One of them is about a foot off the floor next to the kitchen door. "That's the hole my baby eats out of," she said. "I smack him for it, but he keeps doing it anyway." I ask Mrs. James if I could have a piece of the paint: "Help yourself," she said. I brought it back to New York and had it analyzed. Of course, it was full of lead.

#### SENATE DESIRE TO CUT TAX PRIVILEGES FOR WEALTHY LAGS

**HON. CLARENCE D. LONG**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on August 7 the House passed the most extensive tax reform bill in history. This bill is not yet adequate, but it is a major step toward fairness to the middle-income taxpayer. Portions of my own bill to close 13 loopholes, including the oil depletion allowance, through which the wealthy escape paying their fair share of the tax burden and thereby dump it on

the rest of us were part of the tax package which passed the House.

The tax reform bill now lags in the Senate, where it appears to be rapidly losing momentum. Until the Senate passes the tax reform measure, tax inequities will persist.

The American people have not forgotten the urgent need for tax reform. Congress should not forget that need either. Mr. Stuart S. Smith, a correspondent for the *Baltimore Sun*, recently wrote a penetrating and well-balanced article on the tax reform package which I share with my colleagues by including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### SENATE DESIRE TO CUT TAX PRIVILEGES FOR WEALTHY LAGS

(By Stuart S. Smith)

WASHINGTON.—The most sweeping tax reform measure in the history of the republic is in danger of foundering because the ordinary American citizen is no longer paying attention.

Important proposals to ensure that wealthy individuals and powerful corporations shoulder a fair share of the federal budget burden are in jeopardy. The flagging interest is reflected in a sharp drop in mail demanding tax justice. All last winter, spring and summer Capitol Hill offices were flooded with letters insisting on knowing who was getting a tax break and why.

Numerous writers told their congressmen they had just been reading astonishing and to them little-realized facts about the Internal Revenue Service. Not infrequently they enclosed clippings. Some said they had learned for the first time, that all too many wealthy individuals and more than a few big businesses pay taxes on gross income at a lower rate than, say, a scrubwoman earning an income below the federal poverty level.

#### PROTECT NO. 1

Carried along on this tide of consternation, the House last August passed the most forthright set of Revenue Code amendments ever adopted since the income tax was established in 1913. In the interim, however, this flow of mail has ebbed and changed. Those who write now are no longer outraged small businessmen, pensioners or fathers and mothers supporting families from modest salaries.

These days most of the letters are written by those who get, and want to keep, the special benefits the House bill reduced or eliminated. The signers include persons who are allowed specific advantages from undistributed corporate profits, tax-free bond interest, estate tax manipulations, capital gains deductions, dividend credits, accelerated real estate depreciation, inflated expense account deductions, intangible oil and gas drilling expense write-offs and oil depletion allowances. Altogether, these privileges, which all but a minuscule per cent of the nonrich cannot obtain, cost the Treasury an estimated \$22.1 billion a year and reduce the tax base by almost \$50 billion. Even though the House only slightly narrowed this escape hatch (or "loopcavern," as one expert called it), those who stood to lose were incensed.

Meanwhile, the reform legislation was handed to the Senate Finance Committee, a majority of whose members have strong ties to large industrial and financial circles and who time and again have demonstrated their partisanship for special interests on the Senate floor.

Shortly after returning from the summer holidays, the committee began hearings. It took testimony from 269 witnesses and received more than 400 supplementary statements. Almost all who appeared in person or sent in written comment for the committee record argued against one or another of the

House provisions. This testimony was offset only in small part by the mere handful of individuals who bothered to speak up in behalf of the general public.

#### IMPORTANT ISSUES BECLOUDED

Moreover, the issues of paramount importance to the ordinary consumer have been beclouded by the noisy dispute over deductible gifts to non-profit institutions and tax-free municipal bonds—problems which concern less than 5 per cent of the personal income tax payers.

To be sure, Senator William Proxmire (D., Wis.) testified one day that "any tax system which requires 2.2 million people under the poverty level to pay federal income taxes, yet allows Atlantic Richfield Oil Company to earn over \$465 million between 1964 and 1967 without paying one red cent in federal income taxes clearly requires revision."

However, the senator, who is not a committee member, never received an answer to his implied question; that is, what mechanism permits this injustice and what does the committee propose to do about it? Indeed, the panel heard very little testimony at all about the special tax advantages oil firms enjoy, especially including drilling cost deductions as well as oil and gas depletion allowances. Some Washington commentators suggested that this was not by chance. The Associated Press discovered and reported that Senator Russell B. Long (D., La.), the committee chairman, has since 1964 collected at least \$329,151 in oil royalties that were tax-free because of the 27.5 per cent exemption he is currently defending in Congress.

The somewhat mysterious figure of 27.5 per cent was a compromise set a quarter-century ago after the House called for 25 per cent and the Senate said 30 per cent was better. It permits any oil well owner to deduct that amount from each well's gross earnings—year after year even though no additional drilling expenses are ever incurred.

#### GRANDER THAN TEAPOT DOME

The House measure made the relatively modest proposal of dropping the depletion figure to 20 per cent. After all, as even the Supreme Court once pointed out, the deduction is "arbitrary" and "bears little relationship to the capital investment."

It is, furthermore, one of the biggest giveaways to a wealthy special class ever dreamed up by United States officials, and by its sheer enormity makes even the noxious Teapot Dome episode seem like a minor boondoggle.

In "The Rich and the Super-Rich," Ferdinand Lundberg, a New York University adjunct professor and former newspaper financial writer, charged that "the depletion allowance is a plain gouge of the public for the benefit of a few ultragreedly overreachers and is plainly the result of a continuing political conspiracy in the United States Congress."

Even Milton Friedman, one of the country's most prominent conservative economists and the man who advised Richard M. Nixon on financial matters during the presidential campaign, abhors this tax favoritism with his customary vehemence.

Testifying before the Joint Economic Committee's economy in government subcommittee October 6, Mr. Friedman declared: "The alleged objective of our scandalous collection of special measures about oil—prorationing, depletion, oil import quotas and still others . . . is the preservation of oil reserves for time of national emergency. It would be far cheaper, and far less corrupting politically, to subsidize this objective directly—if indeed any subsidy is necessary—than to continue our present policies."

#### TAXPAYERS REVOLT PREDICTED

To be sure, President Nixon does not listen to such experts alone. In the South and West, oil is an invincible political force and is not to be scorned in the East, either. In the year 1965 alone, Standard Oil Company of New

Jersey had a gross revenue of \$11.471 billion—which exceeded the combined revenues of 30 state governments, which that year raised \$11.375 billion.

The Internal Revenue Service refuses to disclose by how many millions Standard Oil was able to reduce its corporation tax through depletion deductions and other write-offs, but President Nixon made plain his reluctance to tackle such influence. Harry S. Dent, one of the President's chief political aides, even had the temerity to write a Republican inquirer in Texas in Mr. Nixon's behalf that David M. Kennedy, the Secretary of the Treasury, would "soon" correct his Finance Committee testimony accepting the allowance cutback to 20 per cent. Mr. Kennedy, however, failed to reappear before the committee.

Some senators are ready for a showdown, with or without administration and committee support. Noting that the Treasury has calculated that the depletion and intangible oil well drilling expense write-offs result in \$1.3 billion in lost revenues every year, Senator Proxmire pointed out that this amount is three times the federal law-enforcement expenditures, 15 times over the federal court budget and three times more than the school lunch and food stamp program budget.

Other congressmen have warned that their current mail does not reflect the country's true sentiment and have predicted that a taxpayers revolt will result if meaningful reform legislation is not enacted.

The committee, which went behind closed doors last week to ponder the matter in secret, has promised to report to the Senate by the end of this month. At that time the letter writers on both sides will learn how much their pleading and cajoling accomplished.

#### KOREA'S POLITICS—IN PROSPECTIVE

### HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, since the end of World War II, Korea has always been a focal point of the world's attention. Its land is still divided into north and south, and the Communists in the north pose a constant threat to the south. Korea is a frontier of freedom in the Far East and plays an important role for the security of the United States as well as the free world nations in the Far East. As Korea has a strategical significance, the United States maintains its troops in Korea for the common defense of freedom.

Despite the invasion and continuous threat of the Communists in the north, Korea has enjoyed political and economical stabilities over the past several years. Furthermore, Korea's internal policies to attain self-sustaining national defense and economy have been successfully carried out. All of this has been accomplished with the help of the United States. A feat of which we can be justly proud.

The fact that Korea has made immense progress should not divert our attention from the fact that Korea still has many typical domestic problems, detrimental factors which stand in the way of insuring a free political system and economical growth. There remains, of course, the ever-present threat from the north.

The proposed constitutional amendment bill permitting President Park to seek the third consecutive term brings the issue of Korea's future clear to the forefront. Many question whether any other leader on the scene today is capable of leading the country through the trying times ahead. President Park's record is impressive. He has successfully normalized Korea-Japan relations. He has made the controversial decision to dispatch troops to Vietnam. Both of these actions will serve the interests of our country.

The third term also raises the question of Korea's commitment to democratic government. In my judgment, the lack of experience in the practice of democracy has caused a head-on crash between the supporters and oppositionists over the proposed amendment of the constitution. I expect it will take a considerable time to see Korea reflect the qualities of democratic government as they exist in advanced nations. The experience of our Nation would indicate that when national survival is at stake, progress in the development of democratic institutions is retarded. In fact, Korea is still under quasi-war conditions and the achievement of self-sustaining readiness in national defense and economy is so paramount that progress in the other aspects of social development must, of necessity, be slow.

Whether President Park is to be allowed to seek a third term is an issue for the Korean people. To those who question the practice of amending the constitution to make this possible, I would point out that we as Americans should recognize that our national interest has been ill served when we meddled in the internal affairs of other nations. Korea is proud of the progress made in constructing its institutions and we should be constructive in our criticism, lest this brave little nation and strong ally shrink from the common cause which binds us.

#### CAN LAW RECLAIM MAN'S ENVIRONMENT?

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the August-September 1969 issue of *Trial* magazine carried a most informative article entitled, "Can Law Reclaim Man's Environment?" So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read this article, I insert its text at this point in the RECORD:

#### CAN LAW RECLAIM MAN'S ENVIRONMENT?

"For a long time I made speeches. I thought that was the answer. Now I am convinced the answer is in the courtroom."

So spoke Dr. Clarence C. Gordon, botany professor at the University of Montana to more than 1000 lawyers at the recent Denver, Colo. convention of the American Trial Lawyers Association.

"The nation just hasn't time to wait to correct environmental insults," he warned—a warning echoed by noted conservationist, Dr. Charles F. Wurster, Jr. of the State University of New York, Atty. Victor J. Yanna-

cone, Jr. of the Environmental Defense Fund, Consumer Crusader Ralph Nader and Prof. James W. Jeans of the University of Missouri-Kansas Law School.

The lawyers were hearing for the first time why they must join the front ranks of fighters to preserve our biosphere from disintegrating.

They were being told—in no uncertain terms—that "insults to our environment by modern technology" belonged in a new category of "corporate crime."

Nader urged them to treat this crime as "one which utterly dwarfs into insignificance crime on the streets—in terms of people injured and killed because of dangerous machinery, pollution, and unsafe household products."

"And a major group of corporate criminals are those industries responsible for environmental pollution," he said.

"Those companies are pushing mankind to the brink of environmental doomsday," Dr. Gordon added.

Yannacone—who through the Environmental Defense Fund has been battling U.S. and state governmental agencies, large industries and the many self-motivated groups—declared that civil law suits, based on damages, are "necessary to protect Americans fast enough before they are dead."

"Every member of the trial bar," he said, "must knock at the door of courthouses throughout the nation and seek the protection of equity of our environment."

"Let each man and every corporation so use his property as not to injure that of another, particularly so as not to injure that which is common property of all the people. Let no wrong be without a remedy."

Yannacone made these points: that legislative relief is too slow and cumbersome; that U.S. agencies (the Army Corps of Engineers, Department of Agriculture, Atomic Energy Commission, state flood control agencies, etc.) are too self-centered in their role as defendant, judge and jury; that the billion-dollar agriculture industry sways state legislatures even in the face of death-dealing pesticides (DDT and other chlorinated hydrocarbons); and that modern scientific methods have been developed to determine relative social costs and benefits of "public improvement" projects for this and coming generations.

Yannacone said:

"Conventional conservation education and action will not save any natural resource which has become the object of private greed or public blundering."

"Only imaginative legal action on behalf of the general public in class actions for declaratory judgments and injunctive relief will get the story told and lay the matter before the conscience of the community in a forum where the conflict can be resolved and evidence tested in cross-examination."

"Although we in the trial bar consider it a major part of our professional obligation to avoid litigation, and encourage settlement and compromise, there is a time not to settle. There is a time not to compromise. There is a time to try the case. Litigation seems the only rational way to focus the attention of our legislators on the basic problems of human existence—the protection of the basic elements of our environment, air and water and the diverse, viable population of plants and animals on the ground, in the air and in the seas."

Do we have sufficient time on this earth to delay taking action—legislative and judicial? TRIAL has made an exhaustive survey of environmental insults and ensuing dangers, and it states editorially: We don't have time.

As Barry Commoner, director of the Center for Biology of Natural Systems, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., warned the Senate Governmental Relations Subcommittee:

"... we need to reassess our attitudes toward the natural world on which our technology intrudes. . . . Modern technology has

so stressed the web of process in the living environment at its most vulnerable points that there is little leeway left in the system.

"And the time is short; we must begin now to learn how to make our technological power conform to the more powerful constraints of the living environment."

Dr. Commoner cited the prediction from the National Academy of Sciences/National Research Council of a crisis in water pollution by 1980.

The warning is simple and stark: Because of natural biological cycles by the present technology of sewage treatment and crop production we have begun to stress the self-purifying power of the nation's surface waters to the point of biological collapse.

Representatives of the growing breed of scientists willing to become involved in public crusades against such things as DDT, highway building, air and water pollution, Dr. Paul R. Ehrlich, population biologist at Stanford University, asserts:

"The trouble with almost all environmental problems is that by the time we have evidence to convince people, you're dead. . . . Drastic action is needed to head off a catastrophic explosion. . . . If we had a 100 years to solve it, I would be optimistic. . . ."

Dr. Charles F. Wurster, organic chemist at the State University of New York, calls for an end of the world's great experiment with DDT, charging that the chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides are contaminating and seriously degrading biotic communities in many parts of the world. Ecological sanity is needed today," he asserts.

Dr. Charles C. Johnson, Jr., Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Administrator, Public Health Service, pinpoints just a few of the environmental stresses on the average American today:

1) toxic matter released in the air at the rate of 142,000,000 tons a year from motor vehicles, factories, power plants, municipal dumps and backyard incinerators.

2) microbiological contamination of food (compounded by the use of "convenience foods" which require little or no heating); 50% increase of food additives in the past 10 years; pesticide residues on food crops; traces of veterinary drugs in meat, milk and eggs.

3) more than 3.5 billion tons of solid waste discarded each year—marring landscapes; adding to malodorous, polluting dumps; and breeding rats, disease organisms and filth.

4) more than 500 new chemicals and chemical compounds introduced annually into industry, along with countless operational innovations—causing thousands of workers to suffer from cancer, lung disease, loss of hearing, dermatitis and other occupational diseases.

5) chemical, viral and bacteriological wastes contaminating our rivers and lakes—increasing the difficulty to find water supplies treatable for human consumption.

6) radiation sources from large-scale applications of nuclear energy, laser and microwave technology, medical X-rays and radio-nuclides, and household electronic equipment—against which science has only begun to develop protection.

7) thousands of new miracle drugs produced by pharmaceutical research to treat specific disease problems that often cause unforeseen side effects and possibly serious genetic defects.

The economic cost of this pollution—in medical bills, household maintenance, etc.? Each of the 200 million Americans pays \$65 per year in less polluted areas and as much as \$200 per year in highly polluted areas.

Recent events indicate the rising concern of our federal and state governments:

The U.S. Health, Education and Welfare Department is sponsoring a scientific symposium to determine full biological effects and health implications of the gigantic

microwave industry, medical use of radio-nuclides, use of microwave ovens, and other electronic equipment which is used in homes.

A secret special committee within the Agriculture Department has called for stoppage of all aerial dusting with DDT and its use in aquatic areas.

Congress is going beyond President Nixon's budget to allot \$750 million a year to combat water pollution.

New Jersey has instituted suit against seven major airlines for \$55,000 in damages for air pollution due to exhausts from their jets.

States, overwhelmed by the tremendous costs of fighting environmental insults, are seeking help from industry. (One exception: California bowed to the \$4.4 billion agriculture industry and allowed the continued use of DDT.)

The following hypothetical problem offered by Dr. J. Douglas Smith and Dr. Joseph J. Harrington of Harvard University, president and vice president of Process Research, Inc. (a water pollution control firm in Cambridge, Mass.) dramatizes the complexities of environmental control. Lawyers must be prepared to resolve the legal ramifications of such a problem:

Cranberry growers on Cape Cod, concerned with improving agricultural benefits, have adopted a policy of spreading chemical fertilizers on their cranberry bogs; these fertilizers eventually run off into the tidal inlets of the Cape, where there exists a concerned clam digging industry. As well as stimulating cranberry growth, these fertilizers stimulate the growth of other sorts of plant life; on the tidelands of the Cape, the growth of unicellular algae has recently been prolific. Clams feed by filtering food from large volumes of water and collect appreciable quantities of such algae. When the accumulated algae decompose, they generate enough gas to make the clams buoyant. Great numbers of clams have floated to the surface and drifted to sea on outgoing tides. Along with seriously endangering Cape Cod's clam digging industry, tons of rotting clams washed onto the beaches at Newport, Rhode Island, have created an air pollution problem of such magnitude as to threaten cancellation of this summer's Newport Jazz Festival.

#### U.S. REVOLUTIONARIES LINKED TO HANOI

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, in today's Washington Post, October 15, Jack Anderson has a thought-provoking column concerning the link between Hanoi and the anti-Vietnam war movement in the United States. I recommend this to all readers of the RECORD, especially those who are participating in today's moratorium. I cannot help but think that among the demonstrators are those who would withdraw if they knew just how much they are aiding Hanoi's efforts. The article follows:

#### U.S. REVOLUTIONARIES LINKED TO HANOI

(By Jack Anderson)

TOKYO.—For the millions at home who will demonstrate against the Vietnam war today, the intelligence files here contain some facts worth pondering.

This column has examined documentary evidence that a few rabid revolutionaries who seek to dominate the anti-war movement in the United States are receiving instructions from Hanoi. They aren't against

war at all; they merely are on the enemy's side.

Indeed, their aim is to stir up new "wars of liberation," including guerrilla warfare in the streets of America, to advance the Communist cause. Their immediate instructions are to agitate in the United States for an unconditional withdrawal from Vietnam.

In retrospect, I believe it was a mistake for the U.S. to plunge into the Vietnam conflagration. This remote patch of jungle simply hasn't been worth the price in American blood and treasure.

But those who are in a big rush to write off 38,887 American war dead and \$81,407,000,000 of the taxpayers' money should consider the French experience. The French pullout of North Vietnam 15 years ago precipitated a Communist slaughter that hadn't been duplicated since the mad days of Adolph Hitler.

Too hasty abandonment of South Vietnam likewise might produce another bloodbath. Yet the Hanoi-directed militants, according to intelligence documents, are striving to turn the antiwar protest into a national demand for "quick and complete withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam."

Possibly to avoid treason charges, the American militants are not in direct touch with the Hanoi government. Most contacts, apparently, have been kept on a friend-to-friend or organization-to-organization basis.

The Hanoi-controlled South Vietnam Liberation Students' Union, for example, maintains an underground liaison with U.S. leaders of the Students for a Democratic Society and the Students' Committee for the End of the Vietnam War.

On the eve of the Vietnam Moratorium, Tran Buu Kiem, the Students' Union chairman and former chief Vietcong delegate in Paris, wrote a letter to his American disciples urging "the active and massive participation of the American youths and students in this fall struggle movement."

#### HANOI LETTER

The letter, dated Oct. 6, called for a prompt American pull-out from Vietnam. Kiem contended that "the replacement of a score of thousands of troops is insignificant, as compared with about half a million U.S. youths still remaining in South Vietnam.

"Your interests and those of the American people and the United States do not lie in such a drop-by-drop troop pullout, but in the quick and complete withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam; not in the Vietnamization or de-Americanization of the war in South Vietnam, which is unpopular and costly in human and material resources, but in ending it. . . ."

"If Mr. Nixon sincerely wants to live up to his promise to end the war, a promise which he made when he ran for office and when he took over the presidency," the Kiem letter continued, "there is no other way than to respond to the 10-point solution of the Republic of South Vietnam's provisional revolutionary government by quickly withdrawing all U.S. and satellite troops from South Vietnam without imposing any conditions and by abandoning the lackey Thieu-Khieu administration, leaving the South Vietnamese people to decide their own internal affairs.

"You are entering a new, seething and violent struggle phase. We hope that you all will pool your efforts in achieving great success in this fall struggle phase."

#### INTELLIGENCE REPORT

Another intelligence document, made available to this column, casts a revealing light on the North Korean role in stirring up opposition to the constitutional amendment, which will determine the future of South Korea. A national referendum will be held Friday to determine whether South Korea's bantam President Chung Hee Park can run for a third term.

"In connection with the constitutional amendment," declares the intelligence analysis, "the Pyongyang regime is trying to arouse popular views adverse to the constitutional amendment in an effort to create political chaos in the Republic of Korea. The Pyongyang regime is concentrating all efforts on its psychological warfare to encourage the recalcitrant elements in the South."

The attempt to extend President Park's rule for another term has been described, even in the Western press, as undemocratic. The truth is that the Park government has adhered scrupulously to the democratic processes.

Once the referendum is decided by popular vote on Friday, South Korea's troubles may merely be beginning. The intelligence document estimates that North Korea will intensify its efforts to subvert South Korea next year, thus "taking advantage of the possible political chaos in the ROK during the 1971 election."

#### GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION ADVISORY BOARD

### HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, a meeting is now taking place at the General Services Administration that offers great encouragement for the new direction of the Federal Government under the Presidency of Richard Nixon. I refer to the recently created National General Services Public Advisory Council, which is meeting today for the first time.

It is with justifiable pride that I announce one of the members comes from my home State of Arizona, Mr. Gordon Marshall of Phoenix, vice president and general manager of American Concrete Pipe Co. Mr. Marshall joins the Council with many years of experience in the contracting business and a varied background of public service. He is a past president of the Arizona Chapter of Associated General Contractors, an associate director of Associated General Contractors of America and chairman of the Bureau of Reclamation Task Unit. He acts as treasurer and member of the Executive Committee of the Arizona Association of Manufacturers and serves on the City of Phoenix Finance and Services Committee and the conservation committee. He is a member of the Phoenix Chamber of Commerce, is on the board of the Visiting Nurse Service, a vestryman, and past senior warden of All Saints Episcopal Church, and past precinct committeeman and member of the State Republican Committee.

The Chairman of the Council is Mr. Robert A. Forsythe, a Minneapolis attorney and former Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Mr. Forsythe is no stranger to the Senate, having served as administrative assistant to the late Senator Thye of Minnesota.

Topics under discussion at today's meeting range from GSA activity in product testing and Federal procurement to Federal building projects and property management. Included on the

agenda are discussions on Federal communications and transportation, disposal of surplus property, retention and disposal of Federal records, and the programs of equal employment opportunity and minority business enterprise.

Mr. President, I call the new National General Services Public Advisory Council to the attention of Senators to show an example of the positive actions being taken by the executive branch to make this Federal Government more responsive to the people. This direct involvement by the public, through the advisory council technique, will strengthen present programs and lead the way for sound planning for the future.

The 16-member panel was sworn into service by Administrator Robert L. Kunzigg, who heads GSA, the multibillion dollar agency that acts as the business manager of the Federal Government.

Administrator Kunzigg is to be commended for establishing this advisory group for the purpose of injecting a greater degree of public involvement in the affairs of GSA. It is interesting to note that the lady and gentlemen who are council members come from the business, academic, and other segments of the general public. These are successful people who will contribute much to the General Services Administration. As public minded-citizens, they are meeting without pay.

The other members of the National General Services Public Advisory Council are Jay Davis, Jr., vice president and director of Southern Counties Gas Companies of Los Angeles; William J. Dorgan, former mayor of Palisades Park, N.J., and a partner in Torway Warehouse, Inc., of Edgewater, N.J.; Kenneth C. Foster, of Newark, N.J., executive vice president of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America; Robert L. Froemke, of Pompano Beach, Fla., dean of the College of Business and Public Administration of Florida Atlantic University; Stanley Gaffin, who heads his own public accounting firm in Boston; John W. Galbreath, who operates his own real estate, mortgage and insurance companies out of Columbus, Ohio, and is president and principal owner of Pittsburgh Pirates baseball club; Robert T. Handren, an architect-engineer who is a senior partner in the firm of Handren, Sharp & Associates of New York City; Ralph A. Hart, president and chief executive officer of Heublein, Inc., a Hartford, Conn.-based food and beverage manufacturer, importer and exporter; Stanley W. McKiernan, partner in the law firm of Slane, Slane, Lane & McKiernan of Los Angeles; Mrs. Carmel C. Marr, a New York attorney who presently serves on the New York State Human Rights Appeal Board; George M. Page of Austin, Tex., a principal of Page, Southland & Page, architects and engineers; Alfred M. Snipes, a prominent administrator-businessman from Oklahoma City; Ray A. Watt, of Washington, D.C., president of the National Corporation for Housing Partnerships; and John T. Wiley, of Atlanta, assistant vice president of Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co.

#### THRIFT

### HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, while the administration is waging the frustrating battle against inflation, it might be wise and prudent at this point to determine how we got into such financial trouble in the first place, as well as how to prevent it from occurring again.

There are many self-proclaimed experts who have ready answers to the spiraling boom we are in today. Many have just cause to debate the issue for they are truly knowledgeable of their field; others might best keep quiet and let the experts attempt to find ways to stem inflation.

However, I think it important to bring to the attention of my colleagues a piece by Fred Emery of the Galesburg, Ill. Labor News.

His column, "Point of View," offers a succinct and logical exegesis of the roots of inflation. Mr. Emery correctly points out that the incentive for thrift is disappearing in our society along with the individuality of the working man. A man must be rewarded for saving instead of penalized; borrowing must not be so attractive and the credit card so popular.

I commend this article to my colleagues for I believe it should be read by all who are sincerely interested in solving the economic problems of not only individuals but of the Nation.

The article follows:

#### POINT OF VIEW

(By Fred Emery)

The incentive for thrift in our society is being lost today and with it we are losing our freedom as individuals.

The worker who is thrifty and tries to become self-sufficient by putting aside a portion of his paycheck each week is penalized by the government who rewards his efforts by taxing his savings and the interest on his savings. On the other hand the worker who spends his paycheck each week on loan payments is rewarded by a tax exemption on his interest payments.

The worker who tries to provide for his old age through saving for the future, finds that inflation which is fed by easy credit has destroyed the value of his savings faster than he can save. Thus, why save at all he reasons.

Personal savings and personal security were once the basis of personal pride and integrity. Today however, personal pride is gained by the amount of credit cards a person can boast of and the level of living one can obtain through credit.

By the destruction of habits of thrift in our society, people are becoming more and more dependent on the government to provide for their personal welfare and consequently losing the freedom that comes from personal responsibility.

The thrifty worker has long provided the basis for his own welfare in a capitalist society because his savings provide the necessary capital to business to provide the jobs that provided his income.

Today when credit replaces thrift as a basis for our economy the borrower finds that the increased cost of his purchase leaves him less for the necessities of life and makes an ever increasing income imperative, thus feeding the fires of inflation that are destroy-

ing his ability to become a financially responsible citizen.

Credit unions, bank and all lending institutions have depended on the thrifty to provide the capital for loans both business and personal. But because people today find that being thrifty is becoming a liability rather than an asset they are losing confidence in savings institutions to help them provide for their personal social welfare and are looking increasingly to their government and employer to provide their social security needs. This in turn enslaves them to their employer and government.

Even credit unions, which are owned by the shareholders or savers, strive to give the borrower greater advantages and limit their saving members to less and less benefits, thus killing the incentive for thrift. Some credit unions today are taking away some of the savings insurance benefits of their savers that have encouraged their members to save and become less dependent on their employer and government.

As personal responsibility for one's own welfare decreases so does freedom. When a worker becomes dependent on his employer for his retirement benefits he becomes enslaved by his employer.

When social security benefits become his only other means of retirement income because inflation has wiped out the value of whatever else he might have accumulated, the worker finds that he becomes totally dependent on others for his welfare. We must have social security benefits and other types of group retirement programs, but the individual must also be given the opportunity to provide an even greater measure of security in his personal life.

If our free capitalist society is to survive and freedom along with it, the incentive for thrift must be restored. Personal thrift, initiative, and financial responsibility of the workingman must be rewarded instead of penalized.

#### TRIBUTE TO GEORGE SHICK

### HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the most respected and popular State house reporters in New Jersey, George Shick, of the Trenton Evening Times, recently passed away. His life provided memories of integrity, professionalism, humor, and warmth to countless friends. His death leaves a void impossible to fill. In its final tribute, the Evening Times simply and eloquently stated what so many of us feel about George. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Trenton (N.J.) Evening Times, Oct. 13, 1969]

GEORGE SHICK

Some people, they say outlive their enemies. George Shick didn't. He never had any to begin with. The Times Newspapers' long-time State House reporter liked life and liked people very much and you had to like him too, and the better you knew him the more drawn you were to his extraordinary personality, which blended humor and irreverence and old-fashioned graciousness and a lot of other good qualities in a compelling mixture.

Nobody could resist it. Not the three New Jersey governors who came to his retirement dinner; not the legion of other movers-and-

shakers whom he knew and bantered with during his 41 years of covering the State House; not the two generations' worth of reporters and editors who worked with him; not the hundreds—maybe it was thousands—of other people who neither wrote for papers nor appeared in them, but whose friendship he treasured.

He was much more than just a man everybody liked, although that alone would have marked him as distinctive. He was also a thorough professional who was doing exactly the kind of work he wanted to do and so repaid the fates for this good fortune by always giving the job the best that was in him, which was considerable. And in covering four decades of news stories he inevitably came to know as much about state government, how it worked and who made it work as anyone under the gold dome, and he shared his knowledge gladly, to the unending gratitude of a long procession of young reporters from his own and other newspapers.

There is nothing tragic about the death of a man at 74 with a rich life behind him, a legacy of fine children and grandchildren, and a state full of friends who remember him with great affection. You have the feeling that this is how it ought to be; that the passing of all humans should come as George Shick's did, with the job done and the potentialities all fulfilled.

#### WASHINGTON POST INSULTS NEW HAMPSHIRE

### HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, if one wants to find out why things are as wrong with people in this country as they are, especially with certain alienated young people, one needs look no further than a page 1 story in the Washington Post of today, the day after the so-called Vietnam moratorium. This story, written by Colman McCarthy of the Post's staff, insults New Hampshire in general and Nashua in particular by suggesting that the values which obtain in the Granite State are old fashioned, obsolete or church-dictated. The Post was put out that little attention was paid to the moratorium in Nashua and its article included such choice exercises in prejudice as:

The 300 Nashuans who publicly rallied for peace in Viet Nam did it without help from their neighbors who preferred peace in Nashua but of a different, sleeper kind. . .

Without Sanders Nashua would be just another minor shrub in the rocky New England garden. . .

Although town meetings are traditional in New England, and much boasted about, town demonstrations are not. Private feelings even about the war, even when 204 New Hampshire boys have been killed, are not meant for public display. . .

Nashua is still basically an old French Catholic town. The authoritarianism that was basic to pre-Vatican II Catholicism is still in the bones and in the souls. . .

Possibly the deepest reason is that it is now a quiet season in Nature. . .

As for the rest of Nashua, the large majority who ignored the moratorium, it is getting along fine with the world. At least today.

Mr. Speaker, such writing in a metropolitan paper like the Washington Post

is not surprising but it is downright insulting to the good citizens of New Hampshire who are deeply grieved about the tragic losses of their sons in Vietnam, yet who know the United States is at war there. They are not going to undermine negotiations by the American President for an honorable end to the war. Beyond that fundamental, New Hampshire men and women are not buying Hanoi's bidding to Americans to demonstrate against their Government.

Nashua, N.H., is a progressive, dynamic, growing community, with fine schools, expanding industries, and enlightened self-government. It would survive and flourish with or without any single industry. For the Post to imply that the resentment of its citizens against war in general and the Vietnam war in particular is dulled or stilled by dependence on a war-related industry is slanderous in the extreme for it is false and suggestive of dishonor.

As for those precepts of respect, courtesy, honor, propriety, and religious conviction of which the Post speaks with thinly disguised distaste, well, we have such principles and precepts in New Hampshire in good measure and we are proud we do. The Nation could use more of such principles. So could the Washington Post.

However, the Post would not understand, for it consciously reflects the urban blight that dims individual independence and sublimates character to the metro dry rot syndrome that helps to destroy personal strength of character in so much of urban United States of America today.

The article by McCarthy follows:

FOR SOME IT MEANT CHANGE BUT OTHERS IGNORED PROTEST

(By Colman McCarthy)

NASHUA, N.H., October 15—The jackhammer of the antiwar protest that pounds other parts of the land today produced little more than trembles in this small, solid town in the Merrimack Valley, a part of simpler America and its quieter culture.

The shops stayed open to serve the town's 50,000 citizens, the schools did their teaching, most of the mothers kept to the chores of home, and the businessmen, always in groups and breaking out cigars or breaking into laughter, lunched as usual in undingy places like the Berkshire Country Inn.

The 300 Nashuans who publicly rallied for peace in Vietnam did it without help from their neighbors who preferred peace in Nashua, but of a different, sleeper kind.

The Nashua Telegraph, which has been dispensing conservatism since the days of local hero Daniel Webster and his devil, ran a Page 1 story Tuesday on veterans who agreed with a statement by New Hampshire's senior senator, Norris Cotton. Moratorium day was anti-American, said the senator; further, it was anti-Nixon, anti-peace, and pro-Hanoi.

The Telegraph, which apparently savored the senior senator's statement as much as the vets, had no space for junior Sen. Thomas J. McIntyre who gave a speech in the state the same day. Once pro-war, lesser fry McIntyre searched his politician's soul before an audience in Hanover, saying the U.S. should now "get out of Vietnam with all due speed."

As for news of the upcoming events of moratorium day, Tuesday's Telegraph put it on an inside page, between the obituaries and a listing of recent drunk drivers.

A second possible reason for Nashua's mood of guarded quiet is the presence of

Sanders Associates, Inc. As the state's, as well as the town's largest single employer—over 7,000—Sanders produces electronic equipment and devices. Its biggest customer is the U.S. government, particularly the Defense Department. Last year, Sanders did \$198 million worth of business, much of that for the production of war tools.

Few in Nashua are naive enough to fear that if Vietnam suddenly ends, the Sanders defense contracts will terminate and then who will replace this goose and its golden Defense Department eggs? Yet among many citizens who talked about the company today, moratorium day was unfigurative. The event did not strike them as a destructive act; it seemed more like a defacement. It was indirectly hacking at Nashua's foliage, the part which has grown thick enough to conceal the stem of the town that knows that without Sanders, Nashua would be just another minor shrub in the rocky New England garden.

ANTIWAR TEACHER

What peace activity there was in Nashua began early among those whose necks will soon be on the Selective Service line: the high school juniors and seniors. At 7:30 a.m., the English class of William Hodge met in a second-floor room of Nashua Senior High. Hodge, strongly antiwar, has been warned by the principal against imposing his views on students.

"I don't," says Hodge. "Whenever I say something about the war that is not in the area of fact, I say, clearly, 'This is my opinion.' The kids know this. So they shoot back with their opinions.

"These are ways of getting the kids informed about the war, rather than merely getting them riled. I think if they have all the facts, then they can't do anything but oppose the war. If they are going to refuse in conscience to cooperate with the government, then it's my job as a teacher to help inform those consciences. With facts, not arguments."

In other classes this morning, mostly in English and social studies, students discussed Vietnam. More opposed the war than not. But even to many of them, their own remarks came out formless and wan. They know that next year at this time they might be in Vietnam, no matter what they say or think now.

At 8 a.m., local station WOTW held a discussion on the moratorium. In a near parody of talk shows that love to pit lefties against righties, nothing new was said about the war.

One radio tuned to the show was that of Mayor Dennis Sullivan. But the mayor was out of town, so it was his secretary who had it on. "Even if Mayor Sullivan was here," she said, "he had planned to totally ignore the moratorium in Nashua. For him, it isn't even happening." What is happening is the mayor's re-election campaign, which he announced two days ago. Neither of his two opponents has mentioned the moratorium, either.

At 11 a.m., a church service was held. The gathering of 200 was mostly young people, mostly male. At noon, they marched to City Hall Plaza, the spot where John Kennedy launched his presidential campaign in 1960 and where Gene McCarthy spoke to a crowd of 8 people early in his New Hampshire campaign. Speeches were made and donuts were passed through the crowd.

At 1:30 p.m., the people, still munching, broke up. The kids, who were almost the whole crowd, drifted away. A few of them joined with adults in cars and headed for Manchester, the state's largest city, 17 miles north. It was hoped the yearning for peace would be more visible and vocal there.

The life-as-usual mood of Nashua today was not created by any large pro-war sentiment. Many say the town is about evenly divided about the war, so one group does not dominate the other. Paradoxically, the mood of Nashua was created not by those

who oppose the moratorium, but by those who supported it but didn't turn out.

DOVES STAY IN COOP

Three reasons exist for the Nashua doves keeping to their coops.

First, they maintain with some impatience that they already declared themselves for peace in Vietnam 18 months ago when they sent Gene McCarthy on his way. This New Hampshire expression for peace was done through the ballot box, the proper and truest form of democracy; so why repeat it now with marches and vigils, a lower form?

Second, Yankee propriety. Although town meetings are traditional in New England, and much boasted about, town demonstrations are not. Private feelings, even about the war, even when 204 New Hampshire boys have been killed, are not meant for public display.

Third, Nashua is still basically an old French Catholic town. The authoritarianism that was basic to pre-Vatican II Catholicism is still in the bones and in the soul. Since the Catholic hierarchy itself is divided on Vietnam, or is when it occasionally gets around to the subject, what can the humble Catholic in the pew be expected to know?

Possibly, the deepest reason for Nashua's quiet mood is that it is now a quiet season in nature. The Merrimack Valley is plush with color-tossed trees, rich in russets, mauves and spirited yellows; everywhere is the wrapping paper of autumn.

A few miles from Nashua is Derry, where Robert Frost once farmed and wrote poems. The epitaph he wrote for his tombstone would serve well as the motto of the peace seekers today: "I am in a lover's quarrel with the world." As for the rest of Nashua, the large majority, who ignored the moratorium, it is getting along fine with the world. At least today.

THE BIRMINGHAM NEWS COUNTER-DEMONSTRATION TO THE MORATORIUM ON THE WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS FROM VIETNAM

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Clarence B. Hanson, Jr., publisher of the Birmingham News and Post-Herald newspapers in Alabama is to be highly commended for his counter-demonstration to the moratorium on the withdrawal of all troops from Vietnam. The manner in which the News backed our men in Vietnam was highly impressive.

Mr. President, the News devoted the entire front page to counter these incredible demonstrations. The front page displayed a large American flag in colors. The headline banner quoted President Nixon's sentence:

Our road is not easy, not simple. . . . But right.

In large type across the bottom of the front page, the News printed a quotation from the Honorable Albert P. Brewer, Governor of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent for his quotation to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WHICH: THE EASY—OR THE HONORABLE WAY?

(By Albert P. Brewer)

Another time of testing has come to America.

Many times in our history as a nation, we

have had to decide between the easy way and the honorable way, both at home and abroad.

While our decisions to stand firm in behalf of freedom and justice have not always been universally popular, they have always been supported by the great majority of American people.

Today, we reach a time when we must decide again between the easy way and the honorable way.

Our flag flies in battle on foreign soil—while at home there are those who would have us believe that our people have lost the will to meet our commitments.

Let the word go forth from Alabama and America today that this vocal minority does not speak for the tens of millions of silent Americans whose deep desire for peace burns as brightly as the fires of our warriors' camps but who know that a peace without honor and justice is no peace at all.

Let every enemy, wherever he may be, know that we as Americans have again chosen the honorable way.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Hanson sent a letter along with a copy of the News to U.S. Senators. His letter appropriately describes the actions of the demonstrators. I was very much impressed with Mr. Hanson's patriotic response to the demonstrators, and I commended him in a telegram which reflected my opposition to the moratorium.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hanson's letter and my reply be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THE BIRMINGHAM NEWS Co.,  
Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR SENATOR: Whatever their motivation, whether misguided thinking or, in some cases, traitorous intent, those who are leading and supporting the so-called "Vietnam Moratorium" are doing the United States grave damage. At the minimum, these people are encouraging the Communist North Vietnamese to intensify their intransigence so amply demonstrated in the months of futile talks in Paris.

If the North Vietnamese succeed, with the help of these Americans, in their obvious aims, the credibility and influence of the United States in its historic and demonstrated efforts to create a world of peace and justice will be drastically reduced, leading to possibly catastrophic consequences.

Wednesday, October 15, 1969, was a black day for the United States. The Birmingham News resorted to its own counter-demonstration, using all its front page to show that most Americans strongly dissent from the views of the "Vietnam Moratorium" crowd and their ilk.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE B. HANSON, Jr.,  
Publisher.

OCTOBER 16, 1969.

HON. CLARENCE B. HANSON, Jr.,  
Publisher, Birmingham Post-Herald and News, Birmingham, Ala.:

The front page of your October 15 edition is impressive and thanks for sending me a copy. The counter-demonstration as displayed by your newspaper reflects the true and dedicated American spirit. I wish more of our Nation's media would respond like the Birmingham News. The following is a statement I made on October 14:

"I do not agree with the National Moratorium Committee's October protest movement to withdraw all U.S. troops from Vietnam. I support President Nixon's current initiatives for a lasting and honorable peace. Such withdrawal proposals strengthen Hanoi's position, prolong the war, forfeit all the

objectives supported by four Presidents and break faith with our brave men who have given their lives for their country, world security and freedom."

Keep up your fine patriotic work.  
STROM THURMOND,  
U.S. Senator.

#### VIETNAM IN PERSPECTIVE

### HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, for some weeks I have wanted to restate my views on Vietnam in greater detail. Perhaps this reflects an uncertainty in the correctness of my position, and perhaps it does, since I know of the intelligence and patriotism of my friends who hold contrary views. In the final analysis, the correct policy for America is a matter of informed judgment, and where precise answers are not possible, reasonable men can, and often do, disagree.

The October 15 moratorium provided the immediate catalyst for the exposition of my views. I harbored strong, strong feelings about the propriety of this event. Its sponsors did not truly seek to develop a dialog on the war as was announced. The repetition of such nonsense was insulting to the listener. The sponsors all possessed positive and often expressed opinions against the war in Vietnam. Their objective was simply to change current U.S. policy by forcing our political leadership to capitulate to their views. It is not unfair to characterize such coercive tactics as a repudiation of democracy. Although tactics may be deplored, the right of such protesters to dissent is unquestioned. It is the utter impossibility of our President conducting an intelligent foreign policy when badgered by fanatics and publicity seeking politicians—as well as concerned, confused, and frustrated Americans—that I find so offensive. The moratorium was not helpful to the President in exercising his constitutional responsibility to shape our foreign policy. That, at least, is one fact about which I am absolutely sure.

I have often thought that any responsible appraisal of Vietnam policy would first require certain emotional catch phrases to be discarded. One of the most abused is "Peace in Vietnam." How often have we heard that peace in Vietnam can be achieved only if American troops are withdrawn? Of course, this is utter nonsense.

An illusory "peace" will come to America if we no longer engage in war in Vietnam. But the war and the killing will surely continue until it is ended, as all wars are, by one side achieving a victory over the other, or at least so imminently threatening to do so that a negotiated cessation of hostilities affords the best chance of salvaging national interests. Unless we cling to a selfish definition of "peace" for America, and to hell with the world, it must be evident that precipitous withdrawal will not bring peace to Vietnam, but will merely enhance the chances of victory by the forces of North

Vietnam, or at best, a negotiated settlement upon their terms.

The question is, therefore, will such a foreseeable consequence be in the long-range policy interests of the United States?

At this point, it is not a digression to discuss this policy interest of the United States and how it evolved.

Although some might disagree, I could never be shaken from my absolute conviction that the main thrust of American foreign policy in this century has been peace—world peace—a secure peace—genuine peace. World peace is America's foreign policy.

Since World War I—to pick a convenient starting place—the methods of achieving this shining goal have changed in response to domestic pressure and world events. But we have never lost sight of our objective, and this objective—world peace—surely is the only defensible reason for our present involvement in Vietnam.

Immediately after World War I, our statesmen and returning doughboys were united in one firm conviction: the world had bled enough. We must never permit such a catastrophe as a world war to occur again, it was said. But tactics differed. The League of Nations, a world forum for resolving disputes short of war, was best calculated to maintain the peace, thought some. Others were fearful of standing international organizations and preached nonalignment and selective multilateral disarmament pacts. In the end, much of the world took the former course and the United States, the latter.

During the period between the wars, a new generation was born which did not share that conviction so deeply held by those who had fought and suffered in World War I. This new breed had ample reason to take up the torch for internal social change. For after all, dust was blowing across the Great Plains, displacing millions of farmers; the economy was sick and soup kitchens for the hungry were a real fact of life. In this environment, the young became involved, seeking economic and social change. Under these circumstances, they were to be excused, perhaps, from failing to notice that equally powerful forces were afoot elsewhere in the world.

The Japanese began a long war of conquest against China. The "rape of Nanking" and the attack on the Panay rated newspaper mention but did not truly arouse our interest.

The Italian venture into Ethiopia and the pitiful plea of Haile Selassie for assistance before the League of Nations were not sufficient to arouse our national interest either. Nor did the early machinations of Adolph Hitler in Europe. After all, it was said, these events were "halfway around the world" and the "pressing priorities at home" demanded that we not "stick our nose in other people's wars" or become an "international policeman."

It was expedient during the thirties to rely upon the inexpensive and relatively painless course of isolationism. But it did not work and proved very expensive and tragically painful after all.

The world became involved in a war

and it ultimately and inevitably involved the United States.

Twenty years ago, events had reached full circle. Immediately after World War II, our statesmen and returning GI's were united in the same conviction held by their fathers a generation earlier: the world had bled enough. We must never permit such a catastrophe as a world war to occur again. "If only they had stood up to Hitler when he marched into Austria, all this could have been avoided," was the generally accepted postmortem.

This time, however, there was little disagreement upon tactics. An international body must be organized and the United States must be a part of it. And we must never again be indifferent to aggression anywhere in the world. Aggression feeds upon itself, we learned at a fearful price, and must be stopped by concerted action early before it consumes us all.

Such was the lesson of World War II. And we learned it well, for it has been the main source of American foreign policy ever since.

The Truman doctrine, our support of Greece, the Marshall plan, the policy of containment, intervention in Lebanon, regional alliances, the Berlin airlift, our response in the Middle East in 1956, massive retaliation, the Korean war, our policy in the Congo, and, yes, Vietnam—are all manifestations of, and variations from, the same theme.

The exception, proving the rule, was Hungary. But Hungary, and more recently Czechoslovakia, merely reflected certain military realities; and more importantly, Hungary and Czechoslovakia were not considered a part of the free world to which our policy has consistently applied.

It is a fact which should not be forgotten that the basic reason for American intervention in Vietnam in the first place was that our then President was persuaded that world peace could best be maintained by resisting acts of aggression against a piece of geography which we chose to include as part of the free world.

Whether that initial decision was a wise one depends upon one's view of America's basic postwar policy of resistance to aggression; whether aggression in fact occurred; and whether we correctly included South Vietnam within the penumbra of free world protection.

It is my judgment that the initial decision was correct.

I shall not defend our basic policy further than to say that it has been the policy of every President and every Secretary of State since World War II. Their collective wisdom is impressive and it reflects the hard lessons of history.

Nor is it necessary to dwell upon the favorite debating point of some that aggression never occurred in Vietnam, since Ho Chi Minh was merely a popular nationalist leader bent upon reunifying his country. The facts are otherwise. He was a cutthroat of the worst kind, who was fanatically obsessed with imposing a Communist totalitarian government upon all of the territory embraced by

former Indochina, and perhaps beyond. This remains the policy of North Vietnam today.

A more debatable question concerns the propriety of including South Vietnam within the free world's protective sphere.

Again, it is unnecessary to belabor this overworked point. The decision was a judgment one and was based, I am sure, upon an appraisal of the world and its prospects for peace if South Vietnam were permitted to fall. Pertinent to this decision was the lesson of Korea where an armed invasion promptly followed a misunderstood decision to exclude Korea from free world protection; the question of a SEATO commitment to Thailand, and the credibility of our treaty commitments elsewhere; the likely extension of Ho Chi Minh's domination into Cambodia and Laos; the effect of American timidity upon the future actions of China against Formosa, for instance, or by North Korea against South Korea, for another.

In summary, the risks to world peace, if aggression were permitted to succeed in South Vietnam, were sufficiently clear and present to justify our intervention.

If one accepts the correctness of the initial intervention, then the often-repeated refrain that "we should not have become involved in the first place, but our honor requires that we see it through" makes no sense at all. Honor, saving face, or prestige have nothing to do with it. It is world peace we are after and there is nothing immoral nor inconsistent in fighting to maintain it.

A proper decision reached more than 10 years ago should not be followed blindly, however, if circumstances have changed. Many point to the schism between Peking and Moscow as evidence of a fundamental change in the Communist world, justifying policy changes on our part. Whether communism may or may not be monolithic is a matter of academic interest only. It is irrelevant to their potential and propensity for aggression against their neighbors. Such differences as may exist within the Communist world have not disturbed their common opposition to the United States, nor their zeal to export revolution.

Try as I might, I cannot see any change in the objectives of North Vietnam. The very actions by the Communist North which provoked our intervention in the first place still exist today. Unless resisted, North Vietnam still intends to force its will upon the people of South Vietnam and neighboring countries. And this aggression must be resisted, in the name of peace.

It does not follow, of course, that adherence to a policy of resisting aggression requires that American troops bear the brunt of the fighting and the dying. Local forces have the first responsibility for defense. President Nixon's "plan" which tantalized the electorate last fall is now being implemented and involves a proper shift of combat responsibility to the South Vietnamese themselves. If successful, it may involve a withdrawal of American troops, but it does not represent a retreat from those basic American policy interests which prompted our involvement in the first place.

Those who passionately cry "Peace now!" seldom confuse their thinking with a sober consideration of the consequences of precipitous withdrawal. But the President must.

For example, if America withdraws from Vietnam, is it more or less likely that the "quiet war" in northern Thailand will intensify? If the fighting increases, what should our response be? Should we honor treaty commitments to Thailand, if requested to do so? If we do not, what will be the effect upon the credibility of our commitments elsewhere? Are the prospects for peace in Europe enhanced if the other side has reason to doubt the American resolve to honor its NATO commitments?

Will China be more likely to attempt to remove Formosa and Nationalist China as a thorn in its side, if America manifests weakness in Asia? If China should try, what should our response be?

Will the irresponsible and unpredictable government of North Korea be more or less likely to keep its promise to invade South Korea, if we withdraw under pressure from North Vietnam? If the war in Korea is resumed, what should our response be?

The questions go on and on. And each must be carefully considered in connection with our Vietnam decisions because they are all interrelated and any miscalculation, on our part or theirs, could bring us eyeball to eyeball with a nuclear war.

Much of what I have said will, of course, be rejected out of hand by the professional "doves." Over the years, I have heard all of the contrary arguments and believe, in sum, they represent either basic disagreement with America's postwar foreign policy—an alternative is seldom mentioned—or genuine faith in the peaceful intentions of the major Communist countries. How simple the questions of defense become if one admits of no threat. Constructive debate at this time should not focus on the emotional issue of bringing the boys home, but rather on workable foreign policy alternatives in the seventies.

Reason will not reach the professional doves, but I am supremely confident of the willingness of the American majority to unite behind their President if he takes them into his confidence and shares with them the peace-seeking reasons for his apparently warlike actions.

Johnson was never able to verbalize the reasons for a similar policy. Nixon must try harder or he may be faced with the necessity of abandoning tested policy abroad as the price of internal stability at home. To force our President into such a decision would be a tragedy for American and for world peace.

#### NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK, OCTOBER 19-25, 1969

#### HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the week of October 19 to 25 our

Nation will once again observe National Business Women's Week which was established by the National Business and Professional Women's Clubs in 1928.

This annual observance gives all of us an opportunity to honor once again the working women in the United States who now number more than 29 million. It also calls attention to their accomplishments in the past and the present, and spotlights the urgent need for constructive use of women's full capabilities in business and the professions in the future.

As a woman in the Congress, as well as member of the Aurora, Ill., Business and Professional Women's Club, I am proud that women all across the country are more aware than ever of the importance of an informed, active electorate and realize the necessity for civic responsibility and service. The more than 3,800 affiliated clubs with over 180,000 members throughout the United States are affording commendable leadership to women everywhere.

This past July the national federation held its 50th anniversary convention in St. Louis. These 50 years have seen great strides made by working women in all fields—business, education, the professions, and so on. Today, women can be found in each of some 480 occupations listed by the U.S. Census Bureau. This is a marked contrast to the era when the Business and Professional Women's Clubs were first organized—when only a few types of jobs were open to women.

I hope all of you will join with me in applauding the achievements of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs during National Business Women's Week, and will give your support to their praiseworthy efforts for a better America.

#### BIG TRUCK BILL

#### HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, my editorial for today is from the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La. The editorial follows:

[From the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La., Sept. 4, 1969]

NIXON AIDE TESTIFIES: BIGGER TRUCK DECISION IS LEFT UP TO CONGRESS

(By Dan Rapoport)

WASHINGTON.—The Nixon administration left it up to Congress Wednesday to decide whether heavier and bigger trailer trucks and buses are safe enough to be permitted to travel on interstate highways.

Federal Highway Administrator F. C. Turner told a House Public Works subcommittee his agency did not have "sufficiently reliable evidence" to determine whether the increased sizes of trucks and buses proposed in controversial legislation would mean additional safety hazards to motorists.

If Congress decides motorists' safety is not affected "measurably," Turner said, the Administration would urge that implementation be delayed until July 1, 1972, rather than on the date of passage. The government needs the three years to set performance standards for the bigger trucks, he said.

Turner's long-awaited disclosure of the Administration position on the bill, while not an endorsement, brought smiles to the faces of subcommittee members who support the legislation.

An opponent, Rep. Fred Schwengel, R-Iowa, said it was "incredible" that the Transportation Department did not recommend delay in action on the bill until it could collect adequate safety data.

The bill, supported by the trucking industry and opposed by the American Automobile Association, would increase from 8 feet to 8½ feet the maximum allowable width of trucks and buses using the interstate highway system.

The limit on weight would be raised from 73,280 pounds to 108,500 pounds. The length, which is not limited now, would be set at 70 feet. Turner recommended a maximum length of 65 feet.

The trucking industry says bigger vehicles would permit more economical movement of freight and more comfortable bus travel. The bill's opponents say the larger vehicles would increase the risk of traffic accidents and cost the government millions of dollars each year in repairs caused by added wear and tear on the highways.

Turner acknowledged that large trucks affect "the mental and emotional attitude of the general motoring public." But he said government studies presented no evidence that such trucks are involved in more accidents than smaller ones. He did say that when a car is struck by a truck 15 or 20 times its size, "the truck tends to demolish the smaller vehicle."

Schwengel said President Nixon had declared during his election campaign last Fall he would oppose any legislation that did not protect the "safety and convenience" of the traveling public.

In view of Turner's testimony, Schwengel said, "I have a feeling that Dick Nixon didn't get the full story. I intend to do my best to see that he does."

Consumer advocate Ralph Nader termed the Administration's decision "a flight from responsibility because Congress does not have the resources" to decide the safety issues.

But Nader said "Mr. Nixon's Transportation Department does and the Federal Highway Administration should immediately disclose all the secret studies it has conducted regarding the hazards of giant trucks." Nader said Turner is deliberately suppressing the studies.

On Tuesday, two law students working for Nader issued a preliminary report of a summer-long study of the trucking industry which charged that it operates defective tractor trailers and overworks its drivers.

Under federal law, truck drivers are limited to 10 hours of driving at a time. The students claimed the law has been consistently ignored. In two cases, they said, drivers were killed in accidents attributable to fatigue and defective equipment.

#### SST WILL BE ECONOMICALLY COMPETITIVE WITH SUBSONIC JETS

### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the SST has been accused with being an airplane for the "elite," or for the "jet-setter." The inference is that the average person will not be able to afford to fly in the SST because of the cost of the aircraft to the airlines.

The truth is that the SST will be four times as productive as the Boeing 707

subsonic jet now in service. This fact makes it possible for the price of a ticket on the American SST to be competitive with the fare on a present-day 707.

Mr. Speaker, associate editor of the Seattle Times, Robert L. Twiss, has written an article which appeared in the October 5, 1969 edition, which adds to this contention. The article follows:

#### SST WILL BE ECONOMICALLY COMPETITIVE

(By Robert L. Twiss)

Two factors studied at length by The Boeing Co. show the firm's Model 2707 supersonic transport will be competitive economically with the best of the subsonic jets, H. W. Withington said yesterday.

Withington is a Boeing vice president and manager of the Supersonic Transport Division of the firm's Commercial Airplane Group.

"The SST definitely will be competitive with the subsonic jets, at first from higher load factors resulting from its passenger appeal and then from resistance to inflation," Withington said in an interview.

Withington said he bases his conclusions on extensive studies completed by Boeing in the past year.

"This is one of the most important things to come out of this program in the past six months to a year," Withington said.

Discussing higher load factors expected during the early years of SST operation, beginning in 1978, Withington noted that subsonic jets captured about 90 per cent of the North Atlantic market within three years after entering service.

This was because of their tremendous passenger appeal, including their great speed advance over piston-engine transports and their comfort and quietness in the cabin.

Load factors or percentage of seats occupied in the subsonic jets began to level off after the first three years of service, as expected, with more jets flying and travelers taking jet speed and comfort for granted.

In the case of the SST, however, the 1,800-mile-an-hour delta-wing plane is expected to have five years of greater benefit from its great passenger appeal and the much larger market, Withington said.

The higher load factors expected during this period will offset the slightly higher seat-mile costs of the SST, compared with an advanced-technology subsonic jet, such as the Boeing 747, he added.

Then the SST will be more inflation-resistant than subsonic jets, he explained. The Boeing economic study assumed that inflation would continue as it has in the past five years.

"The SST is less people-sensitive than a subsonic jet," Withington said.

He meant the greater productivity of the SST would resist higher costs in flight-crew and ground-personnel salaries and wages better than subsonic jets. Costs of fuel and materials are escalating less rapidly than salaries and wages, he said.

Fuel costs actually decreased between 1955 and 1965 and then leveled out and began to climb at the present rate ½ of 1 per cent a year. Why did airlines show financial gains with jets during the latter part of that decade?

"The conclusion is increased productivity of the subsonic jets and airline personnel," Withington explained. "Both people and equipment productivity went up." As time went on, however, airline costs outstripped even the great productivity of the subsonic jets, so fares began to go up.

The Boeing SST will be four times as productive as the Boeing 707, which means the faster-than-sound airliner will be more inflation-resistant than today's subsonic jets, Withington continued. The great productivity of the SST thus would offset the steady increase in labor costs, which will affect op-

erating expenses of the subsonic jet transport more than it will affect the SST's operating cost, he said.

Historically, with the passage of time, labor costs steadily increase because of inflation, wage increases and other factors. Because the SST is more productive for each hour of labor, it is less sensitive to wage-escalation pressures than subsonic jets, Withington said.

"By 1988, the total operating cost of the SST and the 747 will be essentially comparable," Withington said.

"Boeing studies of load factors expected for the SST were based on extremely conservative assumptions," Withington said. These include a free-world traffic growth rate of 10 per cent a year and a stringent sonic-boom assumption, with no SST flights figured over land south of the Arctic Circle.

Taking out short-haul flights from the forecast of revenue passenger miles expected to be flown in 1980, the studies show supersonic transports such as the Anglo-French Concorde and the Boeing plane will have about 200 billion revenue passenger miles available over such SST routes as the North Atlantic.

A revenue passenger mile is one passenger flown one mile. Withington said the 200 billion figure which would be available to SST's in 1980 is about the total free-world revenue-passenger-mile figure of a couple of years ago.

SST market penetration, of course, depends on the number of planes delivered and placed in service. Withington said the Boeing studies were based on expected Concorde and Boeing SST manufacturing rates, about three a month for the Concorde and five a month for the Seattle-built plane.

"By the summer of 1979, about 15 months after the United States SST enters service, the Boeing SST and the Concorde would provide 30 per cent of the total potential SST market in that time period," Withington said.

That percentage would climb as more SSTs are delivered and SST flights are expanded throughout the free world's over-water routes, Withington said.

#### VOLUNTARY PRAYER

### HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, to provide the schoolchildren of this Nation with a chance to start the school-day with a voluntary prayer, we have been offering five prayers weekly for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

These prayers can be recited from the RECORD without interference from the Supreme Court which has approved the distribution of pornographic and obscene literature, but sought to halt prayer and Bible reading by American schoolchildren.

The prayers offered for this week include:

1  
For blue of stream  
and blue of sky,  
Father, we thank Thee;  
For pleasant shade  
of branches high,  
Father we thank Thee;  
For fragrant air  
and cooling breeze,  
For beauty of  
the blooming trees,  
Father in heaven,  
we thank Thee.

II

God made the little flowers bloom,  
And made each rustling tree;  
He made each bird and blade of grass,  
And then He thought of me.  
Thank you,  
Dear God, for making the flowers,  
And touching each rustling tree;  
For making birds and a blade of grass,  
And thank You for making me.

III

A great gray elephant,  
A little yellow bee,  
A tiny purple violet,  
A tall green tree,  
A red and white sailboat  
On a blue sea . . .  
All these things  
You gave to me,  
When you made  
My eyes to see . . .  
Thank You, God!

IV

We offer Thee thanks for  
the moon in the night;  
And thanks for the rain and  
the sun's golden light;  
And thanks for the wind and  
bright, falling leaves;  
And thanks, too, for flowers  
and deep-rooted trees.

V

Here a little child I stand,  
Heaving up my either hand;  
Cold as paddocks though they be,  
Here I lift them up to Thee,  
For a benison to fall  
On our meat and on us all.

SMUT PEDDLERS USE MASS MAILING LISTS

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 12, Edith Kermit Roosevelt, a distinguished journalist, authored a column which appeared in the Philadelphia Bulletin on the subject of obscenity and the use of mailing lists to push pornographic material into American homes through the family mail box.

Her article was outstanding because it sums up the case against pandering advertising based on hearings taking place before my Subcommittee on Postal Operations. We will have additional hearings on this subject. Our next hearing date is October 22, in the Cannon House Office Building. We will hold a day long hearing in Philadelphia on November 1 in the U.S. courthouse.

I want to express my appreciation to Edith Kermit Roosevelt publicly for her article.

I believe that freedom of expression is threatened to a far greater extent by the contempt for the ideal of freedom of expression as a right inspired by massive distribution of pornography than by mild regulation which protects the privacy of families from the intrusion of pornographic junk mail advertising.

The article entitled "Smut Peddlers Use Mass Mailing Lists" is hereby submitted for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

SMUT PEDDLERS USE MASS MAILING LISTS

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—The right of privacy as a distinct and separate American law is winning expanded interpretations. One reason for this is easy to see. As the means of communications bring us closer together, it becomes easier for those who pander to commercialism, to intrude upon the intimacies of our lives.

An area of privacy which is of increasing public concern is the right of a person to be protected in his home from receiving pandering advertisements which may be sexually provocative or distasteful to him or his family. The number of complaints received by the Post Office Department alone have soared to more than one-half million in the past three years. A Gallup Poll released three months ago reveals that 85 out of 100 adults interviewed said they favor stricter laws dealing with obscene literature sent through the mails.

MASS MAILINGS

The major source of outrage among our citizens is the unsolicited mass mailing of advertisements by some 15 to 20 large firms. These operators generally send out computerized first-class mailings to rake in profits amounting to as much as \$10 million a year in a market that runs into billions of dollars.

Many smut merchants operate by means of mailing lists, which contain the names of pre-teen children. These names are gathered through the purchase of pre-teen mailing lists compiled originally by other businesses who sell to children by mail, such as stamp clubs and record clubs.

The greatest cause of public concern is the fear that sexually perverted material will endanger the ethical, mental and moral health of children. Rep. Robert N. C. Nix, Philadelphia Democratic congressman who is chairman of the Postal Operations subcommittee, is in charge of the current hearings on smut peddlers.

He says "such mailings have the effect of undermining parents in their attempt to educate their children as to the meaning and purpose of sex. Pornography undermines the family because by its nature, it preaches that men and women are sexual objects to be exploited for personal pleasure."

CHANCE TO OPEN MAIL

Do children actually get their hands on this material?

Consider these figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The highest labor force among women of all ages in March, 1967, was that of married women with children from ages 6 to 17. This group represented 45 percent of the entire women's labor force and totaled more than 6 million.

From this, we might properly infer that several millions of children who have arrived at a crucial, inquisitive time of life have an unsupervised opportunity to open the mail before their working parents return home even if it is not addressed to the youngsters personally.

Is exposure of children to pornographic material harmful?

Many persuasive statements by responsible experts reinforce the common sense judgments of most parents concerning the harmful effects of salacious literature on juvenile behavior. Dr. Benjamin Karpman, while chief psychotherapist at St. Elizabeth's Hospital here, told the Congress that you can take a perfectly healthy boy or girl and by exposing them to abnormalities you can virtually crystallize and settle their habits for the rest of their lives.

BURDEN OF RESPONSIBILITY

Why then has not this flagrant misuse of the mails been halted?

In 1967, the Congress established a procedure which has proved to be inadequate. A citizen, once he determines that mail he has received is "erotically arousing or sexually provocative," can file with his post office a judicial enforceable order prohibiting the sender of that pornography from directing any further mail to his home. There are at least two weaknesses in this procedure:

First, the individual has to receive at least one pornographic mailing before he can initiate the procedure for having his name removed from the sender's mailing list.

Second, the Government's directive to have a smut peddler remove an individual's name from his mailing list does not always work. This is because some smut peddlers put out successive mailings under a different company name, usually with different company officers listed. The Government's directive applies to the old company, not to the new one which more often than not is operated by the same people.

A number of new measures have been introduced in the Congress designed to close the loopholes and to strengthen the smut laws in accordance with President Nixon's proposals. Certainly, any legislation that is passed should place the burden of responsibility on the senders of the pornographic material and not on the protesting householders.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM: ENOUGH

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, October 15, 1969, has been set aside by many Americans as a day of dedication to peace and of demonstration against U.S. involvement in the war in Vietnam.

As an American and a Member of this most distinguished House of Representatives, I hope that all Americans will observe it as a day of prayer, rededication, and respect: prayer for those lost in the conflict in Vietnam and their families, rededication to those principles of freedom and equality on which we have always prided ourselves, and respect for the sacrifices made for those principles by our men in Vietnam and throughout the world.

There are those who charge that participants in the demonstrations against the war are less than patriotic and that their dissent is un-American. How much further from the truth can they be? The great majority of those involved are protesting precisely because they feel it is their responsibility as Americans to do so.

Indeed, 160 years ago one of our Nation's founders, Thomas Jefferson spoke out on this subject at his first inauguration. Viewing the spectrum of dissent and disagreement over basic principles then prevalent, Jefferson stated that in our country "every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle." Indeed sir, our Nation is not so different than it was in Jefferson's day. We are still "a rising nation, spread over a wide and fruitful land, traversing all the seas with rich

production of our industry, engaged in commerce with nations who feel power and forget right, advancing rapidly to destinies beyond the reach of mortal eye." I fear, sir, that while we have felt power, we have forgotten the right. The right of American boys to live full lives in peace, and the right of the Vietnamese people to choose a government that is truly representative of their own will. The will of the people must in the end prevail.

While moratorium day will be a day of national protest and demonstration against the war and its evils, it will also be another type of demonstration—of democracy in action. The entire world shall be witness to the true greatness of the American system of self-government.

From the banks of the Yalu River in Communist China to the wall of silence in East Berlin, from Johannesburg in racially divided South Africa to the shores of the island of perpetual terror in our own hemisphere, Haiti, the greatness of our democracy will be in evidence. That evidence will lie in our freedom of expression, of peaceful protest, of respected disagreement—even over government policies—permitted every citizen. For the many millions in this world who live under totalitarian regimes, or worse, who have no say in the shaping of their own destinies, this peaceful demonstration tomorrow will be a beacon of hope, that somewhere it is possible to be a free man, speak your mind, and remain a free man.

I have long opposed the war and have doubted the righteousness of our commitment. Supposedly we became involved in the war in order to defend in the Far East the principles of democracy and freedom which we ourselves enjoy. I do not see though, that a country which imposes strict press censorship, jails political opponents and has no civilians in its topmost government posts can represent these principles. And I do not see how we can, in good conscience, continue to defend with our lives and treasure a dictatorship or a tyranny.

Putting aside the thought that we should never have become involved in the Vietnamese war in the first place, there is little doubt that we should have removed ourselves from it long ago. But, as a result of faulty advice and information, we find ourselves still embroiled in this senseless conflict.

Earlier this year I called for removal of half our troops from Vietnam by the end of this year and the swiftest possible withdrawal of the remainder. I see no added benefits accruing from a delayed withdrawal which we would not have from an immediate withdrawal—except an added loss of life and an added burden of sorrow for our country.

This most cruel and destructive war has lacerated our country. It has slashed into the very heart of this Nation by cutting into the hearts of those mothers and fathers whose sons will not be coming home again. While the casualty figures of the war exceed 45,000 men, the real casualty rate is infinitely higher. For, how many families have been buried

with their sons, buried by the mantle of unending grief? What of the mothers whose eyes gleamed with their sons' reflection, who loved their sons more than themselves? What of the fathers who worked their hands to the bone so that their sons could have more time to enjoy their young lives, who watched their sons growing into manhood and then were informed that death had snuffed out this manhood in a far-off land?

Mr. Speaker, from Appalachia to Death Valley, from the factories of Detroit to the waters of the Rio Grande, all along this great country I hear America cry. It is a silent cry, but in its silence it rings in the ears of the Nation. It is the yearning of a mother for her son, a young wife for her husband, children for their father. We not only hear it, but we can see it in their leaden eyes. The vacuum left by death can never be really filled. How much longer shall we allow this to continue? No one has the right to expect us to become like stone, to become deaf like the very stone slabs on the graves of our sons.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward with great anticipation to the time when this war will no longer plague our Nation. There is much that needs to be done here at home, and it must be a united effort.

The scars of this war will be evident long after the hostilities end. While the American people are passionate and outspoken when they feel a basic principle has been violated, they have an unshakable faith in the ideals that form the pillars on which this Nation is founded.

In this time of protest, faith in the American ideal still remains strong and unwavering. The words of Abraham Lincoln over 100 years ago apply so well to the America of today and the future:

Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the union when again touched, as surely they will be by the better angels of our nature.

---

#### VIETNAM

### HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that the House will now adjourn without giving all who so desire the opportunity to participate in the debate relative to our policy in Vietnam.

The gallery is filled with Americans, both young and old, who are dignified in their demeanor and deeply desirous of obtaining congressional direction in this most critical problem. It is, I believe, a mistake to turn concerned Americans out into the street with the feeling that this great Chamber, whose tradition is steeped with the richness of debate on major issues, refuses to give more than a couple of hours to a discussion which has divided our people as it has indeed

caused cleavages amidst our community of nations.

I also find it regrettable that the President saw fit to stifle the dissent through the release of a letter from the Premier of North Vietnam, allegedly supporting the Vietnam moratorium. To intimate that Americans who disagree with administration policy may be unpatriotic does a disservice to all Americans who have died on farflung battlefields to preserve the right to dissent, to all Americans who believe in our democracy, and certainly to the high office of the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, what disturbs Americans most is that they perceive what the administration does not—namely, that we cannot expect either South Vietnam or North Vietnam to help us out of our dilemma. Certainly the South does not want America to withdraw her troops. It is a known fact that their regime could not last without our support, and they will never attempt much-needed reforms, or discuss the formation of a broad-based government as long as they know we are prepared to stay in their country indefinitely, and as long as they have a veto power over American military policy. Also, we can be assured that the North is prepared to stall at the negotiating table while casualties continue to increase.

The administration places emphasis on an appropriate response from Hanoi in determining our timetable for disengagement. The North could withdraw all its forces from the South immediately; then what would be our response? I suppose the answer would be to withdraw all of our military personnel. I submit that once we are gone, North Vietnam could, if they so desired, renew the conflict. What then would our answer be?

Mr. Speaker, as you can readily see, this would be like chasing one's own tail. The American people see and understand this, and cannot understand why our administration does not. Therefore, what Americans are asking is that the President make a determination based not on what either North or South Vietnam wants, but on what is best for America. They want to save the lives of American boys, and want to begin to expend our great resources to combat the domestic crises which already threaten to destroy us from within. Is that unpatriotic?

Is it unpatriotic for Americans to petition their President to readjust our priorities and set up a timetable to bring our troops home as soon as possible, while continuing our efforts to strengthen the Government of South Vietnam so that they can assume full responsibility for the war?

Mr. Speaker, is it unpatriotic for Americans to be concerned about the excessive war expenditures which cut deep into the pockets of taxpayers, lay bare the backs of the needy, and allow critical domestic needs to go unattended? Are these motives sinister? Should they be misinterpreted? I say emphatically, "No."

Mr. Speaker, most Americans want to support their President, but they want his support in return. They want peace, and they want it now.

CONGRESSMAN CARL ALBERT INVITES ATTENTION TO NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

**HON. CARL ALBERT**

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the progress of our American business women in the economic phase of our national life has been nothing less than phenomenal. Over the past 50 years American women have taken an ever increasing part in the business life of our Nation.

Consequently, I invite the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the week of October 19-25 is being observed by the business and professional women's clubs all over the United States as National Business Women's Week.

The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs is an organization representing millions of our American women in making their influence for good and for progress a telling force in the United States. I wish to join them in saluting the achievements of all business and professional women in the thousands of communities across the country. More than 3,800 of these clubs have organized into a federation which each year promulgates and publishes a legislative program approved by our American women. At this time I offer a copy of that legislative program for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I congratulate the Federation on its excellent program which reads as follows:

NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL CONVENTION JULY 20-24, 1969, ST. LOUIS, MO.

**ACTION ITEMS**

Item 1. Constitutional Amendment. Support legislation to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex.

Item 2. Actively work for pending legislation providing for: (a) a broadened head-of-household benefit under the Internal Revenue Code; (b) increased personal exemption and credit for dependents under the Internal Revenue Code; and (c) a more equitable distribution of the tax burden.

Item 3. Propose and support legislation to provide: (a) uniform laws and regulations for men and women as to working hours, working conditions, rates of pay, equal employment, including retirement for age; (b) equal treatment for working men and women in the area of survivor and retirement benefits; and (c) increased child care deduction under the Internal Revenue Code.

Item 4. Propose and support state legislation to provide for uniform jury service and uniform qualifications in the selection of men and women to serve on grand or petit juries in any court.

Item 5. Propose and support legislation to bring about more effective crime control and law enforcement.

**POLICY ITEM**

Support measures within the framework of the Constitution of the United States that promote peace and strengthen national security and make more effective the United Nations and such other international organizations of which the United States is a participant, without relinquishment of our basic freedoms.

Special note is called to the United Nations Convention pending before the United States

Senate on the political rights of women and to the longstanding support for ratification of this convention by the Federation.

**BEST POVERTY PROJECT: GREEN THUMB PROGRAM**

**HON. TIM LEE CARTER**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, there is one program funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity and administered by the U.S. Department of Labor, the Green Thumb program, which I wholeheartedly endorse in Estill County, Ky.

The Green Thumb project is directed by Mr. Charles Bishop with assistance of the local county agent, Clarence Bayes. This program involves retired carpenters, welders, brick layers, painters, farmers, and members of other trades in this county.

This group of retirees has been active in roadside beautification, historic cemetery restoration, and the establishment of recreational areas. The members, though possibly they may work more slowly, have proven themselves extremely capable.

I include an article from the Lexington Leader of September 19, 1969, for the perusal of the Members:

**BEST POVERTY PROJECT? COUNTY AGENT SAYS IT'S THE GREEN THUMB PROGRAM**  
(By Neville Shackelford)

IRVINE, KY.—"They may be old and slow but when it comes to getting the job done, I'll match them against any equal number of young men any day."

This was how foreman Charles Bishop described his crew of what he called "oldsters" who are participants in the Kentucky Green Thumb Program here in Estill County.

"And more than that," Bishop—an oldster himself—added, "we can do just about anything. You name any job within reason and we can do it."

In total agreement with Bishop, County Extension Agent Clarence Bayes said the Green Thumb Project was the best of the so-called "poverty programs" in the county.

On one job alone, Bayes said, the Green Thumbs saved the Estill County Fair Board hundreds of dollars by completely refurbishing the local fairgrounds and facilities.

These men, he said, rebuilt and repainted the grandstands, repaired buildings, and did a lot of other improvement work that the Fair Board otherwise might not have done.

One of the reasons Charles Bishop was so confident in the ability of his men to do any job within reason is that the group is made up of retired carpenters, welders, bricklayers, painters, farmers and members of several other trades. Also, always used to working, it is no trouble to get them to work. As a matter of fact, Bishop said, he has to watch to see that they don't work too hard.

In their enthusiasm at again being given a chance to do something useful, these men often forget they "ain't as glib as they used to be" and overdo the job by scaling ladders, climbing trees and attempting other feats that might endanger their safety. One of Bishop's duties is to see that his men do not do "any such stuff."

Projects completed in Estill County by Green Thumbs include highway parks, roadside beautification, historic cemetery restoration and the establishment of recre-

ation areas. This group was mainly responsible for the Cottage Furnace Recreation Area, which was opened for picnicking this year in the Daniel Boone National Forest. They now are renovating the Estill County jail and restoring the historic Civil War Cemetery at Chestnut Stand.

A product of the U.S. Department of Labor, the Green Thumb Program was set up to give employment to senior citizens in the lower income group in rural areas. To become a member of the work crew, a man must be 55 years of age or older. Preference, however, is given to those over 65.

The program mainly concerns itself with conservation and beautification projects, but under certain circumstances can work on jobs like improving public facilities or renovating public buildings. They can do this if there are sponsoring agencies such as fiscal courts or city councils and if these agencies provide all necessary materials. The Green Thumbs cannot work on private projects.

Green Thumb members work three days a week and are allowed to earn up to \$1,500 annually on the job. But there are other benefits.

According to Charles Bishop, who is 68, it gives a man who has been placed on the shelf a new lease on life.

"To enter again in the mainstream of life," he said, "gives a man a greater incentive for living and improves the health and morale. It gives him that good feeling of being useful again and adds years to his life."

Of one thing there is little doubt: Green Thumbs—in Estill County at least—take great pride in their work and are as enthusiastic about their jobs as schoolboys about swimmin' holes. As Langley Reed said as he swung a briar hook, "it makes us feel young in spirit and gives us a good appetite." If all this is so, it may indeed be as Clarence Bayes observed the best of the poverty programs.

**PRIVATE ENTERPRISE CAN PROVIDE INITIATIVE**

**HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I have always believed, and continue to believe, in a private enterprise approach to the problems facing us.

Business is, in fact, the forward thrust in our economy. This is very different from other economies where government is the forward thrust.

The fact that business is the forward thrust rather than government is the real genius of our system, for business can and should react faster than government to the needs and desires of people. Government can only and should only be the leavening element to control abuses.

Creative enterprise, encouraged by government, knows few limits. It can create an industrial revolution or shoot for the moon.

Recognizing this, our job in government is to make our problems into our profit centers. By the same token, business must move into our problem areas if it is to avoid further expansion of government.

American enterprise is fast coming to the realization that the future depends to a large extent upon how the business community responds to the many formidable problems facing the country.

Today, I would particularly like to comment on the insurance industry.

I see men and companies developing creative insurance against the hazards of illness, casualty and loss of life—insurance available to people in all walks of life.

I see insurance adapted to encouraging social goals, such as nonsmoking and safe driving. I see insurance marketed in such a way that it is available to more people.

Security is a fair desire of all people—security in old age, in illness, in disaster. To the extent private enterprise can help solve these problems through insurance, to that extent government interference is avoided.

To the extent government can help by encouraging private enterprise to do this, to that extent we will help people both as individuals and as taxpayers.

**WILLIE WHITE OF ROCHESTER, N.Y., THWARTS YOUNG MUGGER; COURAGEOUS EXAMPLE OF RESPONSIBLE CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT**

### HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, too often we hear about victims of muggers, rapists, and robberies whose screams and shouts for help went unanswered. The tragic reply seems to be, "Well, I just did not want to get involved."

I would like to share with my colleagues the story of one man who did get involved. Willie White, Jr., of Rochester, N.Y., stopped early one morning to change a flat tire. Nearby a 61-year-old woman walking to catch her bus was suddenly attacked by a young man. Without hesitation Mr. White came to her help.

This takes courage. But responsible persons have always had courage to do what they have to do.

There is a sad side of this story, Mr. Speaker. And it speaks ill for society today. Mr. White's actions are the exception to the rule. Until this situation is reversed, we are getting nowhere in our fight against crime in the streets.

Every citizen must take the responsibility. We must stop looking the other way when others break the law. Every one of us must strive for that day when the act of violence is the exception and not the act of mercy.

I commend the efforts of Mr. White, Mr. Speaker, as I am sure the other Members of the body will do when they read the following article from the Rochester Times Union, and an editorial from the Rochester Democrat & Chronicle:

[From the Rochester Times Union, Oct. 6, 1969]

**AIDED WIDOW—WILLIE WHITE GOT INVOLVED**  
(By Dick Cooper)

"I don't like to see things like that happen. I can't understand why no one else

came to her aid," said Willie White Jr., 45, of 475 Cottage St.

White was talking about the woman he saved from an assailant on Genesee Street.

The woman, Mrs. Charlotte T. Eichler, a 61-year-old widow, was walking to catch a 6:30 a.m. bus to work last Wednesday when a man came up from behind and grabbed her purse and lunch bag.

Mrs. Eichler hung on to the purse and the assailant dragged her, screaming, along the sidewalk.

At that point White looked up from his car where he was changing a tire. He called to the man to let the woman alone.

"The woman yelled 'Help. Help. Won't somebody help!'" White said.

"I ran over carrying a flashlight," he said. "The man, about 25 years-old, took off carrying the woman's bag."

"I chased him about a block and hit him with the flashlight," he said.

He said the assailant was stunned by the blow, dropped the bag but ran on.

White, a mechanic for the Monroe County Water Authority, is married and has four children. He said he was not scared during the chase but was quite shaken when he returned to help Mrs. Eichler to her feet.

"Thinking back," White said, "I don't know what I would have done if I caught the fellow, but I didn't think of that at the time."

"I just don't like to see things like that happen."

White said he couldn't understand why none of the motorists passing the scene stopped to assist.

"One young fellow came by in a car and saw me chasing the guy and all he did was speed on by," White said.

Deputy Police Chief Harry Griswold said the case would be reviewed and White's name would be submitted to a board of judges to recommend him for a commendation during next year's Police Week.

[From the Rochester Democrat & Chronicle, Oct. 10, 1969]

#### GET INVOLVED ON THE LAW'S SIDE

On a recent day Rochesterians read about a New York City policeman who pleaded in vain for passersby to notify police that he needed help in arresting three prisoners whom he held at gun point.

They also read of a heart-warming local incident that shows not everyone is unresponsive. That was the purse and lunch bag snatching assault upon a Genesee Street widow in which motorist Willie White Jr., 475 Cottage Street, pursued the assailant and retrieved the stolen articles.

This doesn't balance the books. Too many citizens are timid beyond reason in coming to the aid of their fellow men. In New York City the policeman asked six pedestrians to call police; there was no physical risk involved; only when a police patrol car showed up was the off-duty officer able to book and jail his prisoners, who had tried to rob him.

Rochesterian White put the question of chronic non-involvement cogently: "I can't understand why no one else came to her aid." None of the motorists who saw what was happening bothered to stop.

It is not only the apathetic witnesses of these two events who are, in a sense, on trial. Every Rochester resident, through the Police Bureau's recent city-wide mailing, has been invited—admonished might be a better word—to report any actions that indicate a crime is about to be committed. He should do so by calling 232-3311, the police emergency number. Is this too much to ask?

As new as the project is, police already can cite instances in which burglars have been caught as the result of alerts by neighbors. Getting adequately involved on the law's side can give us a safer city.

A LESSON IN CIVICS FOR MAYOR LINDSAY

### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in today's edition of the Chicago Tribune discusses some aspects of the so-called Vietnam moratorium day and its application to the city of New York. The editorial says it all and there is no need for further comment from me. I commend it to my colleagues and insert it in the RECORD at this point:

A LESSON IN CIVICS FOR MAYOR LINDSAY

Hanoi may be grateful to its "Dear American Friends" for the so-called Viet Nam Moratorium day demonstrations yesterday but they must have been a sad disappointment for New York's Mayor John Lindsay, who had called for a civic protest against the war. The response in New York was a civic repudiation of Mayor Lindsay. This should be a lesson to Hanoi, as well as the mayor for if there is a center of anti-war sentiment in this country it is "Fun City."

Lindsay draped New York's city hall in mourning and ordered all flags on municipal buildings to be flown at half-staff. The police and fire departments openly defied the mayor. All police and fire company stations proudly flew their flags at full-staff. The Uniformed Firefighters association issued a statement saying it would take no part in "this day of national disgrace." The Patrolmen's Benevolent association adopted a resolution denouncing "organized public attacks on the foreign policy of the United States" and expressing "full confidence" in President Nixon's conduct of the war.

As additional evidence of their repudiation of the mayor, all New York police patrol cars kept their lights on in daylight. Sen. Hugh Scott (R., Pa.), minority leader of the Senate, had suggested this sign of contempt for the enemy-inspired, communist-organized anti-war demonstrations. New York taxi drivers and many bus drivers also kept their lights on.

The mayor had requested that all public schools be closed. Altho attendance was somewhat below normal, the schools stayed open. Acting Supt. Nathan Brown pointedly remarked that school children in poverty areas, for whom Lindsay professes such loving solicitude, would be deprived of their usual free lunches if the schools were closed.

Lindsay had requested all churches in New York to toll their bells for the dead in Viet Nam. Only 15 of the city's thousands of churches agreed to toll their bells, and our New York correspondent said none could be heard in the Times Square area. He said he saw only one black arm band in the same area.

When the commissioner of baseball ordered the flag at Shea stadium to be flown at half-staff for the World Series game, in compliance with the mayor's request, the army and marine corps bands said they would not play the national anthem. The commissioner ordered the flag raised.

New York's Gov. Nelson Rockefeller expressed his well-known disdain for Lindsay, a fellow Republican "liberal," by flying the flag over his New York City headquarters at full-staff. The American Legion had declared that lowering the flag on such a day could not be considered as honoring the dead but would be a "capitulation to the enemy."

Lindsay was supported, however, by elements who are described collectively as "limousine liberals" by City Controller Mario Procaccino, one of the mayor's two oppo-

nents in his campaign for reelection. At an all-day service in Trinity church, in the Wall street district, names of the dead in Viet Nam were read by bankers, brokers, and industrialists. Other supporters of the mayor included the nude show, "Oh, Calcutta," which ran an ad in the New York Times saying "Viet Nam is obscene," and the cast of "Hair," a show which combines nudity with blasphemy and desecration of the flag. The "Hair" company participated in demonstrations in Hammerskjod square [the United Nations] and Bryant park.

On the whole New York gave a fitting response to Lindsay's contemptible attempt to exploit anti-war sentiment for political advantage by calling for a day of protest that would have given the enemy immense aid and comfort if it had been more successful. New York demonstrated that Americans may be against the war but are not un-American. In the words of Fred Hampton, Illinois chairman of the Black Panther party, Lindsay's fiasco was "anarchistic, opportunistic, and Custeristic."

TABULATION OF QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, tabulation of my annual questionnaire reveals that the great majority of my constituents who responded are in favor of President Nixon's major proposals in the field of postal and welfare reform, revenue sharing and providing food for needy Americans.

Given five possible policies in Vietnam, the largest number, more than one-third, approve of the Vietnamization of the war.

A surprisingly large percentage, 72.8

RESULTS OF FRANK T. BOW'S 1969 QUESTIONNAIRE

[In percent]

	Yes	No		In percent
1. Do you favor a Federal tax-sharing program under which the Federal Government would share a portion of its revenues with the States giving them broad discretion in the expenditure of the money.....	81.3	18.7	In the following questions, please indicate the alternative that most closely represents your opinion:	
2. From what you have read about the tax reform bill passed by the House of Representatives this month do you believe that most of the so-called tax loopholes have been closed.....	15.3	84.7	1. With regard to the Middle East, the United States should—	
3. Do you favor the bill soon to be debated in the House to abolish the electoral college and choose our President by direct popular vote.....	84.9	15.1	(a) Give maximum support to Israel including military equipment.....	10.3
4. Should Federal scholarship and loan funds be withheld from students who participate in criminal, destructive, or disruptive behavior at the institutions they attend.....	94.6	5.4	(b) Give maximum support to the Arab nations including military equipment.....	.5
5. Do you favor President Nixon's program of selecting postmasters and rural letter carriers on the basis of merit rather than that of political appointment.....	95.8	4.2	(c) Work with the Soviet Union, England, and France to effect a settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute.....	52.6
6. Do you favor removing the limitations on earnings of those who receive social security retirement or disability payments.....	72.8	27.2	(d) Adopt a hands-off policy.....	36
7. In his proposals, the President would lower the cost of food stamps for the poor; the very poor could get them free. The amount of food the stamps could buy would be increased. The authorizations for the relief of hunger in the United States would be increased by \$1,000,000,000 from the present \$1,500,000,000. Do you favor these proposals.....	69.5	30.5	2. With regard to Vietnam, the United States should (check 2 if necessary)—	
8. Would you support a complete overhaul of the welfare system which included these features: (1) uniform national standard of payments to provide minimum necessary income for the aged, disabled, children without parents; (2) an annual minimum income guarantee for families which include a potentially able-bodied worker with provisions for job training and incentives to make the family become self-sustaining.....	85.5	14.5	(a) Continue withdrawal of American troops regardless of consequences.....	26.5
9. Do you favor President Nixon's recommendation for a limited anti-ballistic-missile program.....	62.9	37.1	(b) Continue withdrawal as quickly as South Vietnam troops can take over the military responsibility.....	35.0
10. Do you favor establishing the territorial limits of the United States (now 3 miles out at sea) with respect to the ships of any other country at the same distance as the territorial limits claimed by that country.....	88.7	11.3	(c) Make additional concessions at the Paris peace talks.....	6.8
11. Do you support President Nixon's proposal to convert the Post Office Department into a self-supporting Government-owned corporation.....	78.0	22.0	(d) Increase military pressure on North Vietnam in an effort to bring about concessions from that nation and the Vietcong.....	13.3
			(e) Resume bombing in an effort to win military victory.....	18.4
			3. With regard to social security benefits, we should—	
			(a) Enact the Bow bill for automatic cost-of-living increases (about 7 percent if enacted effective this month).....	87.0
			(b) Enact a 15-percent benefit increase even though this might require additional payroll taxes.....	13.0
			4. With regard to the Selective Service System do you believe Congress should—	
			(a) Modify the basic rule for selective service, selecting by lot first from the youngest in the prime age group, ages 19 to 26, and work up, rather than from the oldest and work down, and also permit graduate students who are selected after undergraduate deferment to finish an academic year if already started.....	41.7
			(b) Abandon the Selective Service System for a voluntary military manpower procurement system to provide for meeting the manpower needs of the Armed Forces through a completely voluntary system of enlistments except in times of declared war.....	58.3
			5. With the completion of the successful Apollo 11 moon landing, do you believe that the United States should now—	
			(a) Continue to increase its space budget with a new goal of landing a man on Mars and/or other planets by the end of this century.....	22.2
			(b) Scale down our space budget and concentrate on domestic human needs.....	77.8
			6. Would you rate President Nixon's performance to date as (circle 1)—	
			Excellent.....	14.5
			Good.....	42.7
			Fair.....	32.7
			Poor.....	10.1

PEACE MORATORIUM

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, probably no event has been more overpromoted by the news media than the so-called "Peace Moratorium"—not World War II, no U.S. Government bond sale, no call for help after any disaster.

In spite of this extraordinary promotion, in spite of the distortion of the premises and of the goals of the moratorium, in spite of the enormous bias of the press favoring the opponents of President Nixon's efforts to achieve a lasting peace, it should be noted by someone that the overwhelming majority of this House and the overwhelming majority of the American people support the President and sincerely believe that he is doing

everything he can, that he is making the correct moves, to achieve peace as quickly as possible.

As one who voted not to cut off any so-called debate in the House, as one who sat through most of the session, as one who did not vote to adjourn, I can say I heard nothing new—the same old weary statements, few facts, some inappropriate poetry—but nothing constructive toward achieving peace. I heard and saw documented confirmation of what we all knew, namely, that the government in Hanoi applauded and abetted the moratorium, even though some of the moratorium proponents and assistants disclaimed any allegiance in fact, finance or spirit.

The debate in the House could be described as gentlemanly—with a few infractions—because this is the venerable custom of the House. The galleries were full much of the time, but gallery passes were promoted by only a few Members.

The speakers pleaded for nonviolence on the morrow, in a manner designed to excuse themselves from any culpability if violent or obnoxious behavior resulted.

In spite of this extraordinary promotion, the overwhelming majority of this House supports the President in his efforts, however excruciating, to extricate us from this miserable war, even though we tolerated the series of monologues last night.

Sometimes our tolerance can be mistaken for approval. Sometimes our tolerance can embolden the enemies of our Government here and abroad. Sometimes our tolerance can lead to an apathy which will usher in a modification of our representative parliamentary system by a chaotic system of settling societal problems by demonstrations in the streets and revolution.

I believe that most of the persons who participated in the moratorium actually supported the President's efforts and objectives. Only the headline leaders ac-

tually proposed immediate unconditional withdrawal from Vietnam. It is not so easy to identify those who want peace at any price.

The moratorium did not appear to prove much other than most people want to end the war in Vietnam. It was, however, extremely successful—as a training program and proving ground for future demonstrations against the Government during the deescalation of hostilities and after the war is ended.

In the future, U.S. citizens should be more careful and discriminating about the objectives for which they march—otherwise they are likely to be joining with persons with whom they conscientiously disagree.

#### CRISIS AND OPPORTUNITY

### HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an outstanding address by Maritime Administrator A. E. Gibson before the American Merchant Marine Conference on October 15, 1969:

#### CRISIS AND OPPORTUNITY

(By A. E. Gibson)

One hundred and fifty years ago the city of Savannah saw the dawn of the age of the steamship. There is no more appropriate place in which to greet the coming of a new day for the U.S. Merchant Marine.

So I hope you will permit me the prerogative of a keynote speaker to transpose my composition into a major rather than a minor key. Instead of talking about the U.S. Merchant Marine—A National Crisis, I would like to talk about the U.S. Merchant Marine—A National Opportunity.

That the crisis is real, I cannot deny. We have steadily lost ground to foreign competitors in commercial service until we now carry less of our own trade than ever before in our history. Two-thirds of our merchant fleet is already at the vanishing point, and it is too late to prevent a further decline in our maritime capability in some very important areas. We must all fervently hope that there will be no national emergency within the next few years that would call for the ships we will no longer have.

President Nixon's new maritime policy will give us the opportunity to make a new start. It will reaffirm the intent of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936—to provide and maintain a fleet built and operated under U.S. flag, capable of carrying our domestic and a substantial part of our foreign waterborne trade, and of serving as a naval auxiliary in a national emergency.

Under the new program we shall be able to provide incentives for increased efficiency in ship operations, with less need for government aid and intervention.

It will enable both shipbuilders and operators to increase their share of commercial trade.

And finally it will increase our research and development efforts to narrow the cost margin between U.S. and foreign shipbuilding and operation.

With the advent of the President's new maritime policy, we shall have passed the crisis and shall be on our way to recovery. Our ailing Merchant Marine will still have

some bad days to go through, but at last the prognosis is favorable.

The United States is engaged in nearly one-third of the world's trade and provides much of the defense capability of the free world. How can we afford anything less than a modern and efficient merchant fleet? Yet government policy in the past has failed to achieve the valid objectives of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, not simply because of poor programs, but because of lack of consistent support, lack of flexibility in meeting changing conditions, and lack of adequate funding. The new maritime program is planned to overcome these deficiencies and to strengthen our government's commitment to a strong merchant marine.

In the past the government has not only failed to make a total commitment, but the piecemeal and uncoordinated way in which various programs have been administered by both the Maritime Administration and the Navy has not encouraged efficient shipbuilding.

Much of the great productivity and low cost of Japanese shipbuilding is a result of the very large orders for similar types of ships which have enabled the Japanese to take advantage of the economies of mass production which they have so skillfully learned from us. There is not a Japanese yard today that would compete with an American yard in complexity and variety of ships built—tankers, containerhips, complicated naval vessels, nuclear and conventionally powered ships. Yet, this very variety and complexity is expensive and time-consuming. When ordered in small lots of two or three, such ships are bound to cost more and take longer to build.

This system runs counter to all the American mass production techniques that have given many of our other industries their economic strength and competitiveness in foreign markets. It is of interest to note that the larger portion of U.S. shipbuilding costs are attributable not to labor but to material. One efficient U.S. shipbuilder estimates material costs at about 65%, as compared with labor and overhead costs of 35%. This means that U.S. material costs alone are greater than the cost of the whole ship built in a low cost foreign yard.

This differential is clearly seen in the prices recently quoted by one U.S. yard for building two containerhips. The price was about \$1,000,000 less for comparable unsubsidized construction when certain machinery components were purchased from foreign suppliers, compared to the cost for a nearly identical ship which, because it involved an application for construction-differential subsidy, would require all components to be of U.S. manufacture. I believe we should identify more clearly the reason for some of the additional cost of U.S.-built ships.

The fact that several of our American yards have already undertaken to modernize their facilities and even to build totally new and highly productive yards is a tribute to their optimism and their business acumen. The prospect of building tankers of 200,000 deadweight tons and over for transportation of Alaskan oil has spurred plans for facilities capable of building such ships. When there is a reasonable prospect of orders, I have every confidence that U.S. shipyards will be ready to handle them.

The Maritime Administration has sought to encourage more efficient contracting procedures by instituting a design competition for a series of basic ship designs that may comprise our merchant fleet in the next decade. The initial response is imaginative and exciting. This gives the shipyards, naval architects, and owners an opportunity to combine their talents to design ships which lend themselves to efficient shipbuilding and operating practices. We have clear evidence in recent multiple ship orders that very sub-

stantial price reductions are achievable by concentrating on a single standard design.

By using more productive and profitable ships and by adopting new management techniques, more of our shipping lines may be able to operate without government help. As you know, several containership operators have already demonstrated that these highly efficient ships can compete internationally without operating subsidy.

Probably we shall not see the day soon when all differentials can be removed. But with the more capital-intensive type of operations now being employed, seamen's wages become a relatively less significant part of total costs. The development of the total system concept—the coordination of land and sea transportation to provide direct producer-to-consumer service—requires the kind of large-scale organizational capability in which Americans have traditionally excelled. As in other U.S. industries which are able to compete internationally, we shall be doing what we can do best.

The new program will be designed to make private investment in our Merchant Marine more attractive by minimizing the bureaucratic control and overseeing which has been winding the industry in a cocoon of red tape.

With the development of a modern, privately owned fleet in active service, it will no longer be necessary to keep large numbers of reserve fleet ships idle against emergency needs.

In return for greater flexibility and support by the government, I believe we have a right to ask for greater initiative and effort on the part of shipbuilders and their supplier industries and ship operators to improve their competitive position in relation to foreign yards and operators.

I am concerned at the apparent growing dependence, particularly of some subsidized lines, on military cargo. This is not a healthy situation. The service provided by U.S. flag berth liners and tramp ships in Vietnam over the last four years has been essential to conduct of our military operations there. Response of our commercial shipping to military requirements has been in the national interest and in the best tradition of our Merchant Marine.

But a continuation of substantial dependence on military cargo when no longer required as an emergency measure cannot be justified. The emphasis on the declaration of policy in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is on support of our trades at all times, with military support only in time of war or national emergency.

Although U.S. liners are carrying about 24% of U.S. liner cargoes, this can hardly be viewed as a substantial portion of such trade. Steps should be taken promptly to concentrate their sales efforts to a much greater extent on commercial cargoes.

U.S. shipbuilding also depends heavily on military orders. Well over half of the total number of employees in commercial shipyards are engaged in naval work. As I have pointed out, these are highly complex ships, often of new designs, ordered, at least originally, in small lots. They require a completely different type of production set-up from that required for series production of comparatively simple, standardized merchant ships.

To the extent that commercial yards are deterred by dependence on naval work from automating their facilities and actively seeking to design and produce merchant ships at lower cost, they will be failing to seize the opportunity that will be offered by the new maritime program to regain their place of preeminence in merchant shipbuilding.

In the new maritime program, we expect to have the opportunity to use government research and development, in conjunction with industry research efforts, to help in the search for continued and improved competitiveness in the U.S. merchant fleet. Government research is particularly appropriate in

areas beyond immediate commercial feasibility.

One such field is of course the planning for the development of advanced nuclear ships. In building and operating the *NS Savannah*, we have demonstrated not just the possibility of nuclear ship propulsion, which naval shipbuilding had already shown, but its eventual commercial feasibility, by opening many of the ports of the free world to nuclear shipping. The Germans and the Japanese will be reaping the advantages of this effort as they send their own nuclear ships into service, especially as the Japanese nuclear ship is intended to transport fissionable materials.

I think it would be as short-sighted as the Government's failure to pursue the promise of the *SS Savannah* in 1919, if we failed now to carry out the additional research and development required to produce a nuclear ship that is completely competitive with conventionally powered vessels. The advent of very large fast containers and the huge ice-breaking tankers forecast by the successful passage of the *Manhattan* through the Arctic ice fields demands some such propulsion.

One of the most important elements in any new maritime program is one seeking to encourage the development of procedures to resolve labor-management or interunion disputes without work stoppages. It has been my belief that, as with the obsolescence of our ships and shipyards, the unsatisfactory state of our maritime labor relations has been in large measure attributable to a vacillating, inadequate government maritime policy. I am hopeful that with the assurance of the government's commitment to a rational long-range program, both maritime labor and management will recognize the importance of resolving their differences without disruption to service. Reliability of service is even more important than new ships to exporters and importers.

A new maritime program is bound to cost something. But the cost of our indecision, indifference, and neglect in the past has already been high and may, if not promptly paid, be the price of our nation's security, and certainly of its economic preeminence.

The crisis of our Merchant Marine offers us the opportunity for a new beginning. Let us rededicate ourselves to the objectives of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936—the development and maintenance of a fleet that will be fully capable of carrying our trade and of meeting our defense needs. Let us seize with vigor and determination the chance to build the strongest and soundest Merchant Marine this country has ever had.

This, then, is the keynote that I would like to strike for your conference. Let it not be a mourning note for a sorry state of affairs that results from the sins of commission and omission of the past. With the assurance of President Nixon's backing for a new maritime policy, let us determine to restore our American Merchant Marine to its rightful place of leadership in furthering our national policy. Let our keynote be one of hope and optimism for the future.

NATIONAL BUSINESSWOMEN'S WEEK

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor today to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that next week is National Businesswomen's Week. Since I have been a member of the Business and Professional Women's Club most of my adult life and have had the great joy of participating in their activities and in trying to reflect their aims and goals, I am taking this opportunity to place in the Record at this point the legislative platform adopted at the B. & P.W. national convention during July at St. Louis. This speaks eloquently of some of the major goals of the organization:

Item 1: Constitutional Amendment—Support legislation to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex.

Item 2: Actively work for pending legislation providing for: (a) a broadened head-of-household benefit under the Internal Revenue Code; (b) increased personal exemption and credit for dependents under the Internal Revenue Code; and (c) a more equitable distribution of the tax burden.

Item 3: Propose and support legislation to provide: (a) uniform laws and regulations for men and women as to working hours, working conditions, rates of pay, equal employment opportunity, including retirement for age; (b) equal treatment for working men and women in the area of survivor and retirement benefits; and (c) increased child care deduction under the Internal Revenue Code.

Item 4: Propose and support state legislation to provide for uniform jury service and uniform qualifications in the selection of men and women to serve on grand or petit juries in any court.

Item 5: Propose and support legislation to bring about more effective crime control and law enforcement.

In addition, this week can be a time for women to rededicate themselves to increased public service either in elective office or public participation.

It is strange and singularly tragic that in the United States while there are 202 million Americans with 102,291,000 of them women, yet in the House of Representatives with 435 Members there are only 10 women; and in the U.S. Senate of 100 Members, there is the single distinguished Senator from Maine, the great lady of America, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, beloved by women everywhere.

Interestingly enough, only this week I had the pleasure of an hour-long visit with Senora Nelly Turbey de Munoz from Bogotá, Colombia, who informed me that in Colombia where they have had the vote for women only 12 years and where there are 200 members of the House of Representatives, 10 are women and of their 100-member senate, five are women. Therefore, it would seem to me that American women need to involve themselves in all areas of our public life from school board to the Senate, from participatory town meeting discussions to the Cabinet, and to represent those great fundamental principles American women stand for—justice, equality, a better nation for all our citizens, and an increasing awareness of our sense of values and standards. American women through organizations such as the Business and Professional Women have a magnificent contribution to make to our Government.

We can no longer ignore the responsibilities of citizenship. They are not a luxury nor a privilege; they are a necessity and a responsibility. It is only dedication to service and building the kind of world we want for ourselves and our fel-

low human beings that will bring about the kind of changes necessary to meet the stormy tides of today's life.

I congratulate the Business and Professional Women upon their long service. I am proud to be a member and I am proud to be a woman who has had an opportunity to try and implement the ideals of our organization.

FASCELL SUPPORTS ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON MARIHUANA

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, this week I joined with our colleague from New York in sponsoring an important proposal to establish the Presidential Commission on Marihuana.

The commission, a nine-man team to be appointed by the President, will be charged with examining all of the questions relating to the use and abuse of marihuana. It will conduct a study including, but not limited to, the following areas:

First, the extent of use of marihuana in the United States to include number of users, number of arrests, number of convictions, amount of marihuana seized, type of user, nature of use;

Second, an evaluation of the efficacy of existing marihuana laws;

Third, a study of the pharmacology of marihuana and its immediate and long-term effects, both physiological and psychological;

Fourth, the relationship of marihuana use to aggressive behavior and crimes; and

Fifth, the relationship between marihuana and the use of other drugs.

An indepth study of this nature is long overdue. It is particularly important that we have an authoritative and scientific answer to the third, fourth, and fifth questions. Reports have been made in the past, but each seems to refute the other and, therefore, leaves considerable doubt.

I wholeheartedly concur with the Miami Herald's editorial, "A Study of Marihuana Would Serve the Nation," which I hereby call to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Miami Herald, Sept. 22, 1969] A STUDY OF MARIJUANA WOULD SERVE THE NATION

President Nixon, following a border meeting with Mexico President Diaz Ordaz, announced a crackdown on marijuana that will be the largest search-and-seizure operation ever conducted by this nation's civilian authorities.

That the use of marijuana has become widespread and a major problem is apparent. But the nature of the problem is not so clear.

For example, the President's new health chief at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, says marijuana should be placed in a different category from other drugs. He says present laws on marijuana are punitive and "completely out of proportion" to the dangers.

Former President Johnson's National Crime

Commission reported two years ago: "Marijuana is equated in law with the opiates, but the abuse characteristics of the two have nothing in common . . . The desired dose of opiates tends to increase over time, but this is not true of marijuana."

Last year, a British Advisory Commission on Drug Dependence found no evidence that marijuana-smoking led to violence or seriousness of dependence.

Yet these findings are directly contradicted by law enforcement officers who encounter the problem every day. Most contend that introduction to marijuana can be the beginning of abnormal behavior that has wide range, and frequently that the dabbling in marijuana leads to experiments with heroin or other harder drugs. It is a psychological matter of seeking greater kicks, the officers say.

The Presidential study group which recommended the marijuana crackdown said that some 60 per cent of college students use marijuana, or pot, as it is popularly called. At a recent rock music festival in New York, reports indicated that some 300,000 or more students attending almost all used pot. In Dade County and Florida, officials say the use of marijuana has become widespread even at the public school level.

In Florida, it is a felony to possess marijuana. Federal law provides a mandatory minimum sentence of two years for possession and for selling it a felony conviction with a minimum sentence of five years.

If marijuana is harmful to the health, and leads to use of harder drugs, the U.S. student population appears headed for disaster. If it is not, laws providing severe penalties for its use seem out of order.

The nation needs a clearer picture of what marijuana is and what its use can cause. Without it the demand for the drug and the supply of it seem near impossible to curb.

U.S. Attorney General John N. Mitchell warns that youths by the thousands are turning to marijuana and describes laws and scientific ignorance on the subject a "never-never land." He wants new laws that will be tougher on peddlers, more lenient with youthful experimenters and that distinguish between hard narcotics and marijuana.

Voices are being raised everywhere on the subject. U.S. Rep. Claude Pepper thinks the U.S. surgeon general ought to provide a study of marijuana similar to the one that pointed up dangers in cigaret smoking.

A New York congressman has proposed a Presidential commission, on the scale of the Warren or Kerner commissions, to define authoritatively what problem the use of marijuana constitutes for this country. We endorse the idea.

A. L. BETHEL

### HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. A. L. Bethel, general manager, Marine Division, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Sunnyvale, Calif., will today deliver a most interesting paper at the Shipbuilders Council of America Panel at the 1969 Propeller Club convention and American Merchant Marine conference.

As one who has long been concerned over the future of the U.S. Navy and the Merchant Marine, I feel Mr. Bethel's remarks about the future of shipbuilding in the United States are most significant,

and I am pleased to insert them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### SUPPORTING INDUSTRY LOOKS AT SHIPBUILDING IN THE 1970'S

I appreciate the opportunity of meeting here with you today. Since the Division of my company that I represent exists primarily to serve in the manufacture and development of propulsion machinery for both naval and maritime industries, our interest in this question is a longstanding one. Unfortunately, no subject since World War II has been talked about more, with less action, than the plight of the U.S. merchant marine and our rapidly obsolescing Navy. It is difficult for me to understand how this problem could receive such low national priority in view of the widespread agreement that urgent action is required to save the U.S. merchant marine and modernize our aging Navy.

In spite of the long history of many promises with little action, I still feel optimistic for the future. Future bright predictions are often quite difficult to make, especially when the extrapolations are made from the atmosphere of the not-so-bright present. Fortunately, there are some very stimulating signs afoot which lead me to view the next decade in shipbuilding with some excitement.

The first fact facing us is that as the population grows, so does the need for world transport. The need for sea transport will go up in the world and not down. Air transport, while on the increase, does not change this fact. Even behemoths like the C5A airplane can carry only 100 tons of freight compared to container ships now contemplated, which may carry upwards of 15,000 tons of cargo. The issue is not how the goods will be carried, but what share the United States will capture of this world sea transport market.

It is also inconceivable to me, with a continually rising gross national product, which indicates a need for even a greater foreign exchange base, that we can continue depending on foreign flag ships for 95 percent of our shipments and foreign building for such a large fraction of our ships and their machinery. The very essence of the strength and development of this country originated with and was sustained by its aggressive merchant marine. Even the Soviet Union, which is primarily a huge land-mass nation, has come to recognize the high seas as a growing instrument for expanding its influence and its power both militarily and commercially. Thus, while the United States naval might is succumbing to obsolescence and the U.S. maritime strength is dwindling to insignificance, the Soviets have steadily and intensively built up both their navy and their merchant marine.

My optimism for the future stems from the fact that the needs of world shipping are increasing and that more and more people are becoming convinced that the U.S. maritime problem has reached such a serious stage that national action must be taken now.

I am encouraged by the positive attitude and actions of the new Maritime Administrator. The recent Woods Hole Conference on Maritime Research and Development is a good indication that we may now start getting some action. Here, however, I must inject a note of caution. An aggressive R&D program is fine, provided it complements aggressive ship construction, but it is not desirable to make it a prerequisite to an expanded construction program. Technology exists now to revitalize the merchant marine and to modernize the Navy. We must be careful that the R&D program is not held out, or accepted, as a sedative for our ailments. The only cure that will work is to build ships, and build them now.

Another basis for my optimism is that I sense a great technical awakening of an industry that has long been accused of being

a dead, unimaginative one. There is real progress in all aspects of ship development, ship propulsion, and cargo handling. The era of the 15 to 17 knot ship is passing. The 25 to 30 knot container ship has arrived to take its place and, as you know, action is being taken now to build even larger container ships powered with 120,000 SHP plants, with sustained speeds of 30 knots or more. The day of fast sea transport is upon us. These new highspeed ships are having a profound technical impact on the naval architect, the marine engineer, and the cargo handler. These ships will not only require ingenuity in powering but also in hull form and hull strength. They give us the opportunity to exercise fully all of our skills in the ship design and ship construction fields.

I have been most encouraged by the comments and actions by the Maritime Administrator, Mr. Gibson, regarding the use of nuclear power for merchant ships. I am confident that in the years to come our high speed, highly productive ships will be powered by this remarkable fuel. My company is one of the leaders in the manufacture of nuclear generating equipment for land based or utility use. We have designed most of the nuclear systems now powering the nuclear Navy. With some positive interest from the operators and the appropriate government agencies, we are prepared to extend this vast experience to the marine industry. Our foreign competitors are currently building ships utilizing nuclear power plants. It would be a virtual catastrophe should we fail to move ahead with a technology peculiarly American in development. We must not let this occur.

Any conversation with people in the marine industry ultimately turns to tankers and their spectacular development in the past decade. I believe we have not yet seen the full impact that these large ships will have on the world sea transport thinking in the decade ahead. Yet, we have to recognize that credit for the emergence of the 200-300,000 deadweight ton giants must go to foreign yards.

Speaking of tankers, I, like all of you here, am eagerly awaiting the evaluation of the ice breaking tanker experiment in the voyage of the *Manhattan* through the Northwest Passage to Prudhoe Bay. Irrespective of the outcome of the ice breaking mission itself, the stirring story of the conversion of the ship, with the vast amount of engineering and construction effort, involving a cooperative venture of four shipyards, in a time frame of only eight months, shows what this industry can do when properly motivated and turned on. As a tribute, I suggest that the official drink for this convention be—Manhattan on crushed ice!

The prospect of larger, faster, high-powered, quick turn-around ships, with fast freight handling shows that the U.S. marine industry can be creative and face up to new needs and threats from foreign competition. We must now marry our technical skills with a corresponding national determination to carry us into a brighter future.

Some of the antagonists of an expanded and viable maritime program state that there is inadequate shipbuilding and manufacturing capacity in the United States to meet an expanded program. They cite delays that have been encountered in the existing limited programs as evidence for lack of capacity. It would be foolish to deny such delays. But many of these stem from the piecemeal shipbuilding programs of the past, which provided little opportunity for intelligent planning and programing. But I think the memories of the antagonists are short, for no country has ever produced the tonnage or variety of ship designs in so short a period of time as the United States did in World War II. And there is no doubt in my

mind that given a clearly-stated, long-term national objective, accompanied by a substantially expanded construction program, American industry will rise to the occasion and provide the labor base, and expanded shipbuilding and manufacturing facilities to meet whatever size shipbuilding program the country determines is reasonable. We must all debunk the proposition that the Nation does not have the ability to take on an expanded shipbuilding program.

At this point, I would like to bring up an old thought for new consideration. Looking to the future, I would hope that in a push toward an expanded merchant marine, new emphasis will be given to standardization. More standardization is essential to reducing prices and meeting foreign competition and I understand that foreign supply is likely to be a near term consideration. While we do have the engineering flexibility and the technical know-how to design propelling machinery for almost any configuration of ship or horsepower, we must recognize that there is little payoff from building ships or their machinery in quantities of one and two, with a multitude of design variations.

In summary, my view of the '70s rests largely on the fact that the need for sea transport is increasing not decreasing; that the words of the '50s and the '60s deploring the state of our aging Navy and merchant marine will be replaced by actions of the '70s; that American industry is ready, willing and able to provide the skills, manpower, and facilities to meet an expanded naval and maritime program; that the industry, desiring a greater share of the world market, will discard old practices and mores and engage in far more standardization than has ever been the case in the past; and that the shipbuilding and shipping industries will continue to develop exciting and imaginative forms of transport that are already beginning to set the pace on the worldwide scene. The direction we have to take is obvious, and paraphrasing a recent historic message—we only have to take a small step to create a giant leap forward. All we have to do nationally is to say—Go!

**THREE CALIFORNIA CITIES JOIN SMOG CASE CRITICS**

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

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, three more California cities have expressed their support of efforts now underway to call for a full open trial in the antitrust suit pending against automobile manufacturers accused of a 15-year conspiracy to retard development of air pollution controls.

I commend the leaders of my hometown Monterey Park, Desert Hot Springs, and Corona for their interest in this vital matter, and I now insert in the RECORD the respective resolutions passed by these cities pertaining to the smog antitrust case:

**RESOLUTION 7387**

A resolution of the City Council of the City of Monterey Park authorizing the Federal Department of Justice to file certain litigation on behalf of the City of Monterey Park relating to a civil antitrust suit against certain automobile manufacturers. The city council of the city of Monterey Park does resolve:

Whereas, the City Council of the City of Monterey Park endorses and supports the

Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 113 relating to uniting in a common interest against violators of the Sherman Antitrust Act, including concrete and steel pipe manufacturers and electrical equipment manufacturers, resulting in refunds from overcharges from price fixing and the imprisonment of presidents of several companies for law violations; and

Whereas, the County of Los Angeles has been fighting all forms of air pollution since 1953 and, because the automobile industry is the major contributor to air pollution, has repeatedly urged and warned the presidents of certain automobile manufacturers to equip motor vehicles with smog control devices; and

Whereas, a Federal Grand Jury was impaneled in 1966 and after meeting for eighteen months in secret session forwarded its findings to the Attorney General who brought suit against the major automobile manufacturers for conspiring, in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act, to restrain and delay the development and installation of smog control devices; and

Whereas, since the Department of Justice has petitioned to settle the case out of court, the County of Los Angeles has petitioned to intervene in the suit against the automobile manufacturers, asking \$100,000,000 damages for injuries to public health and welfare and the cost of Air Pollution Control.

Now, therefore, be it further resolved: Section 1. That the City Council of the City of Monterey Park urges the governing bodies of the major cities and counties of the United States to endorse the County Counsel of Los Angeles, John Maharg, by filing similar petitions to intervene in the suit.

Section 2. That the governing bodies be invited to send representatives to observe the hearing on the intervention action by Los Angeles County which is scheduled to take place in the Federal Court at Los Angeles on October 13, 1969.

Section 3. That copies of this resolution be transmitted to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States and to Judge Jesse W. Curtis, United States District Court, Central District of California; State Senator Alfred H. Song, 28th District; Assemblyman Walter Karabian, 45th District; Supervisor Kenneth Hahn, and Supervisor Ernest E. Debs, Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, by the City Clerk.

Section 4. That the City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

Approved and adopted this 6th day of October, 1969.

KENNY GRIBBLE,

Mayor of the City of Monterey Park, Calif.

Attest:

LAURA LEE McMILLEN,  
City Clerk.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the City Council of the City of Monterey Park at a regular adjourned meeting held on the 6th day of October, 1969, by the following vote of the Council:

Ayes: Councilmen: Karnos, Kreger, Lewis and Gribble.

Noes: Councilmen: None.

Absent: Councilmen: Erambert.

LAURA LEE McMILLEN,  
City Clerk of the City of Monterey Park, Calif.

**RESOLUTION**

A resolution of the City Council of the City of Desert Hot Springs urging the Justice Department of the U.S. Government to vigorously pursue its action against the big four auto makers for entering unlawful agreements that delayed development and installation of antipollution devices for motor vehicles.

The City Council of the City of Desert Hot Springs does hereby resolve as follows:

Whereas, the residents of the City of Desert Hot Springs, the State of California, and the United States of America are vitally concerned with the pollution of our environment; and

Whereas, it has been conclusively shown that the major cause of air pollution is the internal combustion engine; and

Whereas, there is apparently significant evidence to indicate that the four major automobile producers and their trade association entered into unlawful agreements that delayed development and installation of anti-pollution devices for motor vehicles; and

Whereas, this City Council believes that it would be in the best interests of the American public for this matter to be brought before the public eyes for its scrutiny; and

Whereas, the Justice Department of the United States Government has, in a suit brought by it against the four major automobile manufacturers and its trade association, agreed to a consent judgment thus precluding a fair and open trial on the matter;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the City Council of the City of Desert Hot Springs does hereby respectfully request that the Justice Department of the United States Government reverse its position with regard to said consent decree and vigorously pursue this action against the auto makers to its completion;

Be it further resolved that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded by the City Clerk to the Honorable John N. Mitchell, Attorney General of the United States.

Passed and adopted this 17th day of September, 1969.

Attest:

STONE WRIGHT,  
Mayor.  
WILLIAM D. WILLIAMS,  
City Clerk.

**RESOLUTION 3677**

Resolution of the City Council of the City of Corona, State of California, protesting the U.S. Department of Justice's proposed out-of-court settlement of United States of America v. Automobile Manufacturing, Inc., et al., U.S. district court for the central district of the State of California, 69-75-JWC and authorizing the city's attorney to file therein objections by the city to the proposed consent judgment.

Whereas, cities, counties and other units of government have in the past, united in common interest against violators of the Sherman Antitrust Act, including concrete and steel pipe manufacturers and electrical equipment manufacturers, resulting in refunds from overcharges from price fixing and the imprisonment of presidents of several companies for law violations; and

Whereas, the City of Corona for many years has been fighting all forms of air pollution; and

Whereas, a federal grand jury was impaneled in 1966 and after meeting for eighteen months in secret session forwarded its findings to the Attorney General, who brought suit against the major automobile manufacturers for conspiring, in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act, to restrain and delay the development and installation of smog control devices; and

Whereas, the Department of Justice has petitioned to settle the case out of court; and

Whereas, such a settlement will preclude an open trial of the issues of said suit and possibly leave the City of Corona without sufficient legal grounds to institute damage actions against the defendants for air pollution caused by motor vehicle exhaust emissions; and

Whereas, the proposed settlement will for the aforesaid reasons and many others be extremely detrimental to the public health

and safety of the citizens of the City of Corona;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Corona, in special session assembled this 3rd day of October, 1969, as follows:

1. It hereby protests the U.S. Department of Justice's proposed out of court settlement of United States of America v. Automobile Manufacturing, Inc. et al, U.S. Dist. Ct. for Central District of Southern California 69-75-JWC.

2. It hereby authorizes its City Attorney to file in said suit this City's Objections to the Proposed Consent Judgement.

Be it further resolved, that a certified copy of this resolution be sent to the following governmental officials: United States Attorney General John N. Mitchell; Senators George Murphy and Alan Cranston; Congressman George Brown; and Supervisor Kenneth Hahn, Second District, County of Los Angeles.

Adopted on this 3rd day of October, 1969.

TONY BOLLERO,

Mayor of the City of Corona, Calif.

Attest:

BLENDA M. NEUENDORF,

City Clerk.

I, Blenda M. Neuendorf, City Clerk of the City of Corona, California, do hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was regularly introduced and adopted by the City Council of the City of Corona, California, at a special meeting thereof held on October 3, 1969, by the following vote of the Council:

Ayes: Councilmen Blandi, Bollero, Hart, Parker, Rust.

Noes: None.

Absent: None.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of Corona, California, this 3rd day of October, 1969.

BLENDA M. NEUENDORF,

City Clerk of the City of Corona, Calif.

#### CLEAN WATER RESTORATION ACT

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the League of Women Voters of Baton Rouge, La., has forwarded to me an editorial carried in the September 5, 1969, issue of the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate in support of the recent effort to secure full funding of the Clean Water Restoration Act. So that my colleagues may be aware of the views expressed by the Morning Advocate, I include the text of the editorial at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### THE MURKY OUTLOOK FOR CLEAN WATER

"Water, water, everywhere,  
Nor any drop to drink."

With these words the poet Coleridge depicted the plight of a marined becalmed in a windless sea and perishing of thirst. On every hand and to the farthest horizon he sees nothing but water, in inexhaustible supply. But it is all polluted, with salt, and to drink it would mean death.

The average land-going American of today may be in little danger of so painful a fate. But what will be the lot of his children or his grandchildren may be another question.

Already some major rivers have become so polluted by industrial and municipal wastes and from other sources that their water is suited for very few uses, even industrial, without expensive purification. One of the Great Lakes is believed by some experts to be lost and on the way to conversion into a

huge slough as a direct consequence of pollution.

The American people have become concerned over this situation and the danger to our water supply, one of our two greatest and most indispensable resources, the other being air, also seriously polluted.

Congress also is concerned, to the point of passing the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 and authorizing the expenditure of \$1 billion for assistance to local governments in sewage treatment plant construction and improvement—a basic project in water pollution control. But Congressional interest has a way of becoming very intermittent and Congress now seems inclined to go along with an administration proposal to actually appropriate only \$214 million, less than a fourth of what has been authorized.

To bring about funding of the full amount of \$1 billion and to support other pollution control measures is the goal of the recently formed "Citizens Crusade for Clean Water." Member groups in the crusade include the League of Women Voters, the AFL-CIO, the United States Conference of Mayors, the Council of State Governors, the Izaak Walton League, and about 30 others, plus many individual citizens. But as the League of Women Voters points out, even this respectable backing will not be enough unless the Congressmen themselves see that the public is truly interested in the clean water campaign and unless they hear from their constituents to that effect. Time is growing short for action at this session.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1965 will require specified degrees of treatment for both municipal and industrial wastes by 1972. To meet the deadline will require a pooling of resources by the federal government, the states and the cities, with full participation by private industry. If any member of this partnership lags, the others may lag also and the situation may be worse in 1972 instead of better.

#### OPRESSED WITH TWO WEAK EVILS

### HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, over 400 years ago, Shakespeare called "two weak evils, age and hunger." One of these evils should have disappeared by now. You would think that after a man has lived a full and productive life, old age could be enjoyed without the penalty of hunger. But that is not the case.

All over the country, in every State, in every county, in every congressional district, even my own, there are older Americans who do not enjoy their old age. Instead of a reflective period of wisdom and security, old age is still a time of struggle. Never mind the luxuries, it is simply a struggle to live.

This is inexcusable in our time. Every benefit that we can provide elderly citizens should be, and not only should, but has to be provided.

Mr. Speaker, we have in effect today the Food Stamp Act, designed to relieve some of the hunger around us. I am pleased to cosponsor today a bill to amend the Food Stamp Act to allay the emptiness of the elderly. This legislation will allow older people to exchange food stamps for meals prepared and served by private, nonprofit organizations.

Recently, our colleagues in the Senate recognized the need and passed such a bill.

There are so many elderly people who are physically unable to shop for or prepare food. Under the present law, people who otherwise meet age, residency, and income requirements are not eligible for food stamps if they do not have cooking facilities in their homes. I see no reason why the elderly, often the most isolated and deprived, should be denied the benefits of food stamps.

The legislation I am cosponsoring allows nonprofit, charitable organizations to accept food stamps in exchange for cooked meals prepared for home delivery or for consumption in community dining halls.

It authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to designate authentic nonprofit organizations which could accept the food stamps.

This legislation follows the concept of utilizing private initiative for solutions to our problems. The redemption of the stamps would assist the specific church or nonprofit organization to purchase food. Possibly, this would encourage more church groups and charitable organizations to undertake the needed work of bringing a hot meal to our elderly.

I urge my colleagues to consider the debt we owe our senior citizens, and then to fully support this measure.

#### WEDNESDAY'S MORATORIUM

### HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives was seen at its best and, regrettably, at its worst, on the evening of Tuesday, October 14.

On the one hand, as those present know and as the press has reported, the 2 hours of debate conducted under special orders on this Nation's involvement in Vietnam were thought provoking, illuminating, in good taste and dignified, and marked by mutual respect.

Here was a demonstration that there is nothing to fear from the frank, open exchange of differing opinions and views. Here, if you will, was an example of democracy at work—an example of freedom of expression we like to tell the world to take as a pattern in forming their own governments.

And, though it was short lived, the exchange should serve as a pattern not only for the free world but, I submit, for the Members of this body.

But there was an irony in the forced conclusion of our discussion Tuesday evening.

There was irony in the fact that a quorum could not be found to keep the House in session, yet a subsequent vote on adjournment produced a quorum.

There was irony in the fact that those who argued, conscience bound, to defend with arms another people's right to freedom of expression voted to silence the equally concerned and sincere voice of

the elected representatives of approximately 25 percent of this Nation.

There was irony in the fact that those who argued that a coalition government cannot succeed in South Vietnam knocked another block from the foundation on which our democracy was built. Mr. Speaker, those who voted to silence Members of the House who were prepared to defend the right of thousands of our citizens to express their conscience and their concern peacefully only called attention to a primary reason why more and more citizens are taking their concern to the streets.

Some argue that Wednesday's moratorium was "shameful." I argue, Mr. Speaker, that there is a degree of shame in the fact that this was the first exchange of this sort in the House of Representatives despite the fact that 6 years and more than 40,000 American lives have been spent in Vietnam. I hasten to add that I have served in the House during those 6 years and I do not hold myself without fault.

The will of the American people will be heard one way or another. If it is not heard by the Government, it will be heard in spite of it. A cursory analysis of election results in the last year and a half illustrate what I mean. How many who have campaigned on a platform to escalate or even continue our involvement in Vietnam have been defeated?

The will of America's young people will be heard. If it is not heard by elected representatives who today discount the value of their counsel, it will be heard in 1970. It will be heard in 1972. As I left the House floor Tuesday evening I overheard one representative of the news media discount the significance of the overflowing galleries that evening because "they were a bunch of kids 18, 19, and 20." Their day will come and it is not far off. The fact that a debate took place in the House at all Tuesday evening indicates their voice is already being heard.

Many charges have been leveled at today's generation of young people, but it has been several years since I have heard our youngsters as a group charged with apathy. They are concerned; they are involved; they are not phony; they have principles and consciences; they are eager to, and will, participate actively in government.

Yes, there were a lot of young people in the galleries the other evening and, without exception, they were well-behaved, courteous, and orderly. There were no disruptions or boos—no catcalls when opposing views were expressed.

Let us be wary of writing off the import of our gallery visitors because of their age. Let us take note of their courtesy and concern and applaud them for both.

Mr. Speaker, there is a message for all of us in the Gallup poll results reported in the last week. On Sunday, Gallup reported poll results indicating that 57 percent of the American people favor complete withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam by the end of 1970. This morning Gallup reported results of a poll indicating an identical 57 percent approval of President Nixon's leadership. It is significant that results of the first

poll were reported in terms of an upward trend; the second poll in terms of a downward trend. I am absolutely convinced that the question of whether or not these two percentages will ever meet again depends on one thing alone: the success of the President in implementing his announced plan to disengage from Vietnam and transfer the responsibility of that war to the South Vietnamese.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of more than 20 Members of this body who remained unheard when the House voted by a vote of 112 to 110 to adjourn Tuesday evening. I include the statement which I prepared for presentation at that time at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY MR. OLSEN

In the last several years I have registered my misgivings and my personal recommendations on Vietnam policies to high ranking individuals in the Administration and I have joined in introducing legislation in the Congress which called for greater effort on the part of our government to place this issue before the United Nations.

I have never issued public statements regarding the conduct of the war unless I sincerely believed specific action on the part of our government was in the interest of the peaceful goal all of us seek.

However, after years of frustrated involvement in Vietnam, I believe there comes a time in foreign affairs, as in domestic, when the "people" must be heard. The mounting tension in American democracy between the "people" and their chosen representatives has reached the point where policies directing this Nation's efforts in South Vietnam fail to command respect in the conscience of the American people. When government policies no longer express the will of the people those laws lose their natural legitimacy and such is the case in Vietnam.

A 1967 Congressional poll indicated that 80.2% of the people in the Western District of Montana wanted to continue the then course of the war or escalate with 63% of these in favor of an all out military effort to win. Only 12.8% were in favor of withdrawal. One year later in 1968 another Congressional polling of the same area showed that those in favor of maintaining the status quo or stepping up our military effort had slipped to 55% and that those in favor of de-escalation had risen to 45%. A private poll of the Northwestern states, including Montana, which was completed in August of this year indicated that 52% of those asked were in favor of withdrawal of American Troops and turning the fighting to the South Vietnamese. Another 22% recommended immediate withdrawal. Results of the most recent Gallup Poll show that the percent of Americans favoring complete withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam by the end of 1970 to be 57%.

All of these polls results and the mail I received daily in my office have convinced me a significant trend has developed. It is a trend that must be reckoned with and the leaders of this nation should not turn a deaf ear.

President Nixon, in a letter to a Georgetown University student this week drew a distinction between "public opinion" and "public demonstrations" vowing government policy would not be "made in the streets." White House sources further pointed out that his reply to the student was directed not at the "shouters" but to the "concerned majority" of Americans who have remained silent. The results of the Polls I have cited, which polled not only people in the streets, but also the "silent Americans" or the "concerned majority" to which President Nixon was referring, has indicated their "will" overwhelmingly in favor of withdrawal of American troops.

The President is free to decide to pay no

attention to the thousands of persons participating in the moratorium, but can he ignore the will of a growing majority (currently 57%) of the people as reflected in the trusted public opinion polls. When President Nixon took office last January, I didn't detect any lack of willingness to accept the will of just 43.4% of the voting public.

Administrations past and present have been guided by military leaders who have shown many blatant and obvious cases of misjudgment: the tragic loss of 74 lives when a navy destroyer on routine maneuvers off the Philippines was sliced in two when it turned into the path of the Australian carrier: the navy sending the underarmed and tiny electronic spy ship, Pueblo, and 82 men into North Korean waters despite a high level intelligence warning of danger. Not long after the Pueblo and its crew were captured, an unprotected electronic "snooper" plane was shot down as it passed over the shores of North Korea with the loss of 30 lives: the Pentagon also authorized a secret contingency arrangement with Thailand, which, if mutually invoked, would have placed U.S. troops under Thai command: the testing of poisonous gas, resulting in the death of 640 sheep in Utah and the storage on Okinawa of gases which sent 26 men to the hospital not to mention the additional strains placed on Japanese and United States relations.

I say this series of bumbblings, including the mishandling of our effort in Vietnam, has led the majority of the people in this country either to apathy or to outright opposition, in varying degrees, across the country.

A very important point that is often overlooked is that the South Vietnamese have to take over the operation and defense of their own country—whether now, or one to ten years from now. Are we to leave more than a half million men in Vietnam while we wait for Saigon and Hanoi to come to some political settlement? I believe that is not our obligation.

Since the beginning of the cold war we have intervened on an average of once every 18 months in some foreign country. We have often looked at these interventions as our duty bound response to moral imperatives. We have somehow convinced ourselves and are telling the world that our interference in the affairs of other nations grows out of our determination for justice, self-determination, and freedom for all men. I am not saying these ambitions are wrong but that they are clearly not the major reasons for our interventions. It has been on the basis of cold war fears and our anti-communist diplomacy that we have continued to become involved in these crises.

Following the second World War we were cast as the protector of freedom. It is a role we took unwillingly but are now afraid to relinquish.

Ronald Steel made a similar observation in his outstanding book, *Pax Americana*, when he wrote "where a communist problem exists, as in Vietnam, we have found the defense of freedom to be an unshirkable obligation, even if performed on behalf of a regime which may be as indifferent to freedom as the communist one it opposes. When we decide to honor our moral duty, the label that the oppressor wears is exceedingly important."

The United States waded into Vietnam for no other reason than to prevent domination of the South by the Viet Cong. Surely we have always realized that we cannot be South Vietnam. We cannot govern South Vietnam. We cannot accept full responsibility for the war. Our commitment is limited. The outcome of that struggle depends now, as it always has, on the ability of the people of South Viet Nam.

There have been many disappointments in our relations with the South Vietnamese and the government of South Vietnam. We had hoped that we could help the South Vietnamese to help themselves to build a na-

tion and a government that could attract the support of its own people and to achieve a political victory over the Viet Cong.

Time and time again our hopes have been dashed by the corruption of our South Vietnam ally—a government, as Senator Kennedy said, that "has consistently proved incapable or unwilling to meet the demands of its own people, a government that has demanded ever more money, ever more American lives to be poured into the swamp of their failure."

The casualties are still coming home and the thought of more dead, more bombed villages, more children maimed and made homeless is increasingly repugnant.

From January 1961 to date, the war has taken 45,598 American lives and left 254,274 of our troops wounded. It has cost the taxpayers of this nation a total of more than 81 billion dollars with an additional 25.3 billion dollars to be spent in Viet Nam in fiscal year 1970.

In Montana alone 202 deaths have already resulted from our defense of the South Vietnamese. Their names are:

Anderson, David Anthony.  
Barber, David Lynn.  
Barnum, Wayne Alan.  
Burkhardt, Larry James.  
Burns, James Lynn.  
Byington, Steven L.  
Carroll, Robert Hugh.  
Deitchler, Russell Floyd.  
Derenburger, Ronald Hal.  
Dean, Lester Allan.  
Dorris, David Walter.  
Edden, George Edward.  
Fish, Glenn Charles.  
Fuhrman, James Francis.  
Gallagher, Raymond Leroy.  
Grayson, Reid Ernest, Jr.  
Han, Charles William.  
Hinther, Gary Rodger.  
Johnson, Lester Wesley, Jr.  
Kriskovich, Raymond George.  
Lockwood, Harold Spencer.  
Martin, Ronald Steven.  
Moe, Ronald John.  
Murphy, Jon Michael.  
Murphy, Steven Patrick.  
Nathe, Michael Leo.  
Osterloth, James Allan.  
Peters, George Edward, Jr.  
Picard, Michael W.  
Pickle, Jimmy Dee.  
Rollins, Dale Franklin.  
Rowland, Zack Oscar.  
Sullivan, David Patrick.  
Tillotson, Robert Virtus.  
Uhren, Bernard Jeffrey.  
Wear, Dennis William.  
Welch, Robert Edward.  
West, John Robin.  
Williams, Ralph Leroy.  
Woods, Albert Clarence, Jr.  
Zahn, Florian J.  
Allen, Robert Christian.  
Anderson, David George.  
Archer, Sanford Kim.  
Boyer, Charles Goodhue.  
Chavez, Paul Edward.  
Cruse, Lionell Russell.  
Doane, Michael Leo.  
Healy, Louis Glenn.  
Hendrickson, Michael Franc.  
Howard, Walter John, Jr.  
Johnson, William Michael.  
Kendall, George Percy, Jr.  
Light, Glee Roy.  
Loyd, Harold Ivan.  
Nelson, Louis Howard.  
Padilla, Michael David.  
Schwarz, Larry Edward.  
Sonsteng, Dennis Wayne.  
Stockburger, Arthur Lee.  
Wood, Alvy Eugene.  
Zerbst, Gilbert Leroy.  
Cawley, Robert William.  
Clifford, Gregory Allen.  
Hagl, Edward Allen.  
Helsley, Gregory Phillip.

Lawrence, Delmar Leon.  
Beary, Dan Warren.  
Birkland, Wiley Cole.  
Byford, Gary D.  
Chopper, Franklin Delano.  
Clark, Richard Dewyatt, B.  
Cyr, William Louis.  
Derheim, Kenneth Lee.  
Eckstein, Rodger Dean.  
Frank, Edward Roy.  
Haakensen, David Arnold.  
Hinkle, Mark Gordon.  
Hoerner, Raymond Dale.  
Kern, Douglas Duane.  
Kleiv, Manfred Lloyd.  
Knudson, Kenneth Max.  
Locher, Walter Norvel.  
Miller, Bernhardt William.  
Mooer, Gary Owen.  
Murrey, Tracy Henry.  
Naasz, Larry Duane.  
Nelson, Ray La Grande.  
Parker, Joseph E., Jr.  
Pokerjim, Joseph Louis.  
Polk, Preston Wayne.  
Reece, Weston Henry.  
Salzer, Stanley William.  
Swensgard, William Elling.  
Urban, John Robert.  
Vandenacre, Howard.  
Wandler, Louis John.  
Whetham, Vernon E.  
Dudley, Charles Glendon.  
Richardson, Roger Paul.  
Sampson, Leslie Verne.  
Anderson, Jack Herbert.  
Babich, Ronald Gregory.  
Backeberg, Bruce Burton.  
Casey, Dennis Lee.  
Fleming, Patrick Jay.  
Fried, Douglas Lawrence.  
Garcia, Frank, Jr.  
Havranek, Michael William.  
Johnson, Lyle Albert.  
Jordet, Ronald George.  
Juel, Darryl Richard.  
Klemencic, Joseph Gordon.  
Lehuta, Donald Alexander.  
Mayes, Richard Le Otis.  
Nelson, Stephen Carl.  
Schultz, Danny Carl.  
Stephens, James Williams.  
Street, Douglas Gerald.  
Green, Robert William.  
Prather, Christopher D.  
Hobbs, Charles M.  
Joyce, John G.  
Veale, Ralph D.  
Bois, Richard J.  
Lameiras, Richard A.  
Lamieux, Walter J.  
Fowler, Donald L.  
Richardson, Robin W.  
Hudson, Joseph W.  
White, Gordon G.  
Ferguson, Ronald Bruce.  
Habets, Gregory Lee  
Hood, Roger William  
O'Neill, Daniel John  
Dunbar, Doyle Daniel  
Greiner, Gary James  
Griffin, Gary O'Neal  
McCarvel, Stephen Lewis  
Thomas, Roy Stephen  
Barton, Jim Albert  
Pickett, Richard Dale.  
Summers, Jon Ray.  
Westervelt, Johnnie Bowen.  
Bristol, Clarence Frank.  
Kilyine, Richard James.  
Plamaray, Alexander P.  
Webster, Christopher C.  
Grasser, Arthur.  
Henderson, Hal Kent.  
Langaunet, Bruce Magnus.  
Stenbridge, Wayland D.  
Sib, Ervin Rinal, Jr.  
Hamilton, Don David.  
Biberdorf, Dennis Floyd.

In addition to the tragic loss of lives, that is yet to follow, there is also the loss of the 2.1 billion dollars being spent each month in

Vietnam which could provide, if used domestically, public libraries for 12 million of Americans who have no library facilities; eliminate the backlog of need for: 169,000 school teachers; 125,000 nurses; and some 50,000 doctors by providing four years medical or teacher training for 844,000 young people and give a college education to the 100,000 young people who were not able to go on to college this year because of the lack of funds.

The cost of all housing and urban affairs programs of the federal government, including slum clearance and other efforts to make the nation's cities safer and more satisfying places of human habitation represent only 6 weeks of the cost of the Vietnamese war. Our entire contribution to the United Nations organizations comes to 80 hours or 3 days of war expenditures in Vietnam.

Our children may well wonder at the sense of values of a nation which spends \$52,000 to kill one guerrilla on the other side of the world.

The United States began some time ago to take steps to persuade the South Vietnamese to take eventual complete control of the War. But despite the fact that never before in history has a nation done for another what we have done for South Vietnam, it has been to little avail. It seems to me that with our generous contribution of resources—human, monetary and material—South Vietnam should have triumphed long ago if it had a government with the desire or capability to meet the needs of its people.

Perhaps we have performed a disservice to those we would help by holding onto the initiative of that conflict: by permitting them to depend too much upon the United States: and by looking the other way and sometimes contributing to the corruption of the South Vietnamese government.

It would appear a mistake to continue our present policy which allows things to drift on in the wild hope that some solution will be found. The time has come for the Congress to act within the limits of its power and recommend continuous and orderly withdrawal of United States forces as expeditiously as possible until all American forces are removed, the pace of withdrawal to be limited only by steps to insure the safety of our forces.

#### MARIHUANA STUDY

### HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the public's concern about the growing use of marijuana is coupled with some confusion about legal and medical aspects of the matter.

In light of the hearings before the House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 3 on the problem of drugs, I thought that the following editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times of September 19 would be of interest to my colleagues:

#### FOR A MARIHUANA STUDY

The Nixon administration, concerned about the growing use of drugs, has offered a new control bill to Congress that seems hastily conceived.

The heavy increase in the use of marijuana has given law enforcement officials a special problem. An entire generation is emerging that sees no more harm in marijuana than in alcohol or tobacco. The recent gathering of some 300,000 youths in Bethel, N.Y., many of whom were pot-smokers, demonstrated that when enough persons ignore a law, as Americans did during prohibition, it is unenforceable.

While Atty. Gen. Mitchell conceded that authorities are operating in a "never-never land" of insufficient information about marihuana, his bill put it in the same category as heroin and LSD. Possession of any of them would be punishable by prison sentences, although Mitchell said in some cases rehabilitation programs would be advisable and leniency might be extended toward youthful drug experimenters. Nevertheless, the entire resources of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics would be devoted to stamping out marihuana and other drugs that have no recognized medical use.

To make them more effective, Mitchell would give narcotics agents the right to "no-knock" drug raids. The constitutionality of such raids is dubious. In "The American Constitution," Prof. C. Herman Pritchett says, "Whether armed with a warrant or not, officers cannot break down a door to effect a lawful arrest and the seizure of incriminating evidence unless they are refused admission after giving clear notice of their authority and purpose." (*Miller vs. The U.S.*, 1958).

Before the nation embarks on the monumental task of stopping marihuana smoking and college campuses are infiltrated with narcotics agents, the subject should be removed from its "never-never land." A high level commission should be appointed to report definitely on the effects of marihuana.

Rep. Claude Pepper (D-Fla.) suggests the U.S. surgeon general make a study of marihuana as he did of cigarette smoking. This is surely in order.

The war on hard drugs must go on and the salvation of narcotics addicts should be a government goal. But a great deal more should be known about marihuana before the government attempts what could be a "noble experiment" such as prohibition, which bred contempt for the law and worse evils.

#### COLUMBUS DAY

### HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, Americans have traditionally honored men who excel in fields of exploration, particularly those whose feats of courage and imagination have led to the opening of vast new worlds.

The birthday of Christopher Columbus is a time for celebrating the most significant feat of exploration for our Nation. As we honor Columbus for his achievement of 477 years ago, we realize the overwhelming importance of his deed by looking at Columbus and his voyage in light of the space exploration activities of 1969.

The new world of freedom made possible by Christopher Columbus is still embarked on its mission of discovering still newer worlds. As our children and our grandchildren look back to the beginning of the space age, they will also look further back in history to the miracle of 1492 as the time when it all started.

The Congress has assured the appropriate place in history for Columbus by designating Columbus Day an official national holiday beginning in 1971. This will serve not only to remind us of a hero who braved the unknown to discover a new land but also to teach us to strive for new and better worlds, never taking freedom for granted or accepting our so-

ciety as the end-all. We have to improve our society or perish and to succeed we need the courage and determination of men like Christopher Columbus.

#### MR. DIAMOND REMEMBERED HIS START

### HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, a native son of the First District of Georgia has died—Mr. B. F. "Barney" Diamond—and he will be sadly mourned by all of us who have had the good fortune to have known him.

"Barney" Diamond's outstanding rise from orphan to one of Savannah, Ga.'s biggest industrialists is in the very spirit and tradition of our great country. His work, his interests, and his remarkable concern about people, and his disassociation with titles, offices, and personal recognition will be remembered and admired for many years to come.

I feel that the following story about this amazing individual—B. F. Diamond—from the October 13 edition of the Savannah Evening Press merits your attention:

#### HE WENT ON TO SUCCESS AND REMEMBERED START

(By Ann Marshall)

Savannah industrialist B. F. "Barney" Diamond was born in Bulloch County and grew up here at Bethesda Home for Boys.

Despite worldwide success and recognition, Bethesda remained the center of his interest and charities.

When Diamond died yesterday, his construction firm was completing work on a bridge across Shipyard Creek at the very site where he lived on the Bethesda marshes.

The roadway which will open Skidaway to development as an oceanographic center and will add thousands of homesites to the growth of Chatham County and the whole state, is considered one of the major construction projects of the times.

Land for the approaches to the causeways was obtained from the Union Society at the edge of the Bethesda property.

He refused time and again to take the presidency of the Union Society, which runs Bethesda, and of the Bethesda Alumni Assn. Both were continuing beneficiaries of the Bernard F. Diamond Foundation and of his private gifts.

From large financial grants to priceless bushes from his extensive private gardens, from jobs for Bethesda alumni to inspiration for Bethesda boys, through the more than 40 years since his own time there, Diamond remained a devoted alumnus.

He died about 7:30 p.m. yesterday at St. Joseph's Hospital after a short illness. He would have been 68 tomorrow.

He was president of the B. F. Diamond Construction Co. and was a resident of 18 South Rockwell Ave. in Vernonburg.

Chatham County Commission Chairman Robert F. Lovett expressed regret at the "great loss to the community," and said, "He'll be missed. He was a wonderful fellow."

Mayor J. Curtis Lewis said he was "distressed" to learn of the death.

"Mr. Diamond was a remarkable man. He was a self-made man who deserved a tremendous amount of credit for his accomplishments," the mayor said.

Mr. Diamond shunned personal acclaim, turning down posts such as the presidency of the Union Society.

The president of the society, Wade Layton,

expressed the sorrow of the group, of which Diamond was a board member.

"I know I express the regret of every member of the Union Society," Layton said. "We tried to get him to take the presidency over and over, and again this year, but he never would do it."

W. Lee Minglehoff, Jr., chairman of the Savannah Port Authority, called him "a staunch member of SPA."

#### INTERESTED IN WATERFRONT

"He showed a great deal of interest in the Savannah riverfront and will be missed very much by the authority in its efforts on behalf of the community," Minglehoff said.

The B. F. Diamond Construction Co., which Diamond founded in 1930, has its headquarters on the riverfront here. Diamond had acquired his technical knowledge through correspondence courses when he began as a steel-erection contractor in Washington, D.C., and Baltimore, Md.

He also was owner of Marine Construction and Engineering Co. Ltd. of Freeport, Grand Bahama Island, and owned a 1,200-acre cattle farm near Savannah.

His various enterprises included construction of the new Bull River Bridge for the State Highway Dept., construction of the second Elizabeth River Tunnel between Portsmouth and Norfolk, Va., in 1962 and the rebuilding of the Pennsylvania Railroad bridge over the Potomac River in 1943 without interrupting traffic.

During World War I, he went to sea in the merchant marine, and in World War II his company completed many projects for the Navy. He was given the Navy "E" award for these.

The highest honor given in the construction industry, the Moles award for "outstanding achievement," was given to Diamond in 1967.

The Diamond firm specializes in heavy and marine construction, manufacture of many types of marine equipment and steel fabrication, and general construction in Freeport.

He was a member of the Oglethorpe Club, the Savannah Golf Club and the board of stewards of the Savannah Yacht and Country Club. He had been a member of the "Geechee" syndicate which won the 1966 Miami-to-Nassau sailing race.

With Frank S. Jackson, Charles S. Sanford and Julian F. Corish, he had founded the Bernard F. Diamond Foundation Inc. in 1952 to support the Union Society and other charitable organizations.

#### NAMED DIRECTOR

He had been named a director of the Liberty National Bank and Trust Co. in 1967, and also was appointed that year to the SPA by Mayor Lewis.

Funeral services will be held Wednesday at 11 a.m. at Sipple's Mortuary. Burial will be in Hillcrest Abbey.

Surviving are his wife, Mrs. Delores Austin Diamond; a son, John A. Diamond; two stepdaughters, Miss Pamela Alkazin and Miss Cheryl Thompson; a brother, Raleigh B. Diamond of St. Augustine, Fla., and three grandchildren.

#### PENNSYLVANIA A LOW TAX STATE

### HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Shafer administration said that a new report by the U.S. Census Bureau proves that Pennsylvania is a low tax State.

The census report, which was published in this week's U.S. News & World Report, shows that Pennsylvania ranks

45th among the 50 States and the District of Columbia in the amount of State and local taxes paid by individual citizens.

In a statement, Gov. Raymond P. Shafer said:

This report further supports the statements I have been making throughout this year that Pennsylvania, by comparison to other states, is not overtaxing her people for the kind of services they are getting at the State and local level.

I hope that those people who constantly complain that they pay the highest taxes in the Nation in Pennsylvania will study the report so they can better understand the truth.

Too often, the emotions of raising new revenues cover over the facts—and if we are to solve our current crisis, every citizen has the responsibility of at least making an attempt to learn the facts. I hope that this report will help all Pennsylvanians in that attempt.

The new report shows that Pennsylvania taxpayers pay \$113.38 in State and local taxes for every \$1,000 earned. The national average is \$134.51. The highest State and local taxes are in North Dakota where a citizen pays \$190.96 for every \$1,000 earned.

In the two industrial States that are larger than Pennsylvania, which ranks third in population, the State and local taxes are: California, \$160.84; New York, \$158.21.

#### EFFORT TO CORRECT INEQUITY

### HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the retired military men who reside in my district I am today introducing a bill to correct a grave injustice to retired members of our uniformed services.

For a hundred years prior to 1958 the statutes clearly guaranteed that retired pay was to be passed upon a percentage of active duty base pay, the multiplier being determined by the number of years service up to a total of 30 years, after which no additional benefits accrued.

It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that persons who entered the service under that rule have every moral right to expect the Government to make good on its guarantee.

Today the Department of Defense and the Congress are embarked upon a campaign to make military service more attractive. I approve of that effort. One thing that is proposed is to make military pay comparable to that of civil service employees and of workers in private industry. But military retirees of today, especially the older ones, will not receive the benefits of that campaign. Instead, they received low pay in anticipation of an attractive retirement pay system, now arbitrarily denied to them.

As a result, older retirees now receive substantially smaller retired paychecks than younger retirees of the same grade and number of years of service with the difference in some cases exceeding 50 percent. This discrepancy which comes about entirely because of a breach of faith with them on the part of the Gov-

ernment will continue to increase with each future pay raise for the Active Forces.

In 1966 the President's Cabinet Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Systems proposed a far-reaching code of standards relating to Federal retirements of all kinds. Prominent among the proposals was one which would insure that—

Whenever a staff retirement system is changed, provision shall be made to protect the equities of any individuals who would be adversely affected by such change.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would simply apply that principle to persons who had served or were serving prior to the abolishment of the statutory guarantee for continuing computation of pay based upon the rates in effect for active duty personnel. That action took place on June 1, 1958, and my bill is limited in its application to those persons who entered the service prior to that time. It provides that the retired pay of such persons be recomputed on the new active duty rates in effect at the time those rates were changed.

I believe that the Government can do no less than live up to its word. I urge my colleagues to support the proposal which I am introducing.

#### BLACKLISTED BY MEN WEARING WHITE HATS

### HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, blacklisting of scientists for the Health, Education, and Welfare Department's advisory committees is a practice which has been going on since at least 1953. It has become encrusted on the bureaucratic keel, and I am convinced that it does not represent evil men at work. I think it is simply too inconvenient for those now making the decisions to do the hard work necessary to come up with new methods.

An editorial in the Washington Post of October 11, 1969, makes this point very succinctly. "Blacklisting for the Fun of It" is close to being correct for I believe that those who do it are not vicious unprincipled men, but merely those who find a precedent for their actions which is always easier than making a decision.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is certainly no fun for those who have been blacklisted. One of the central points of my continuing privacy studies within the House Committee on Government Operations has been that a man should be informed of the range of charges against him. He must have the right to confront the record, if not to confront his accuser directly.

For example, during hearings on Retail Credit Co. of Atlanta, Ga., in May of 1968, I bore down heavily on the following phrase in their basic agreement for services:

All reports, whether oral or written, will be kept strictly confidential. Except as required by law, no information from reports nor your identity as the reporting agency will be revealed to the person reported on . . .

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased that Retail Credit's new contract, dated June 1968, had removed the words "nor your identity as the reporting agency." The removal from the basic contract of those words I regard as a small step toward decency.

The individuals who have been injured by that practice of Retail Credit Co. were denied insurance and employment opportunities with no chance to find out who was generating the information which occasionally was in error. Qualified scientists are now being denied the opportunity to gain the academic prestige which comes from membership on such advisory panels and, worst of all, our Government and our Nation are being denied the insights and experience they could bring to bear on solving our problems.

Mr. Speaker, two points should be made. First, the vast majority, I believe in almost every single case, the advisory panels do not deal with classified information. Press reports even state that some who are alleged to have been blacklisted for HEW actually have clearance to participate in top-secret Department of Defense advisory panels.

The second important point is that opposing blacklisting does not mean that all standards must be abolished. I certainly recognize that some people may be unsuitable for a number of quite legitimate reasons which have nothing to do with their supposed loyalty to America or their support for the war in Vietnam.

The central question in this is why the practice has been allowed to continue for this length of time. I hope that the review of Secretary Finch will move HEW to a more reasonable position and perhaps a broader focus should be brought to bear on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks, I insert the editorial from the Washington Post:

#### BLACKLISTING FOR THE FUN OF IT

Blacklisting is always an abomination. It is peculiarly so when it is practiced by the government of a people guaranteed equality of opportunity. It is at its very worst when the blacklisting carries with it a stigma of untrustworthiness and disloyalty. For more than 20 years the United States government—ever since the inauguration of the so-called loyalty-security program in the Truman administration—has been compiling blacklists, stigmatizing employees or applicants for government employment as "security risks" and doing so on the flimsiest of foundations, the unverified allegations of faceless informers unknown not only to their victims but unknown even to those who must make judgments on the basis of what they whisper. Selection of government employees by lot would constitute a safer system.

This blacklisting procedure, excoriated when it was viciously exploited by the late Sen. Joseph McCarthy, has been brought to light again just recently by scientists who complained that it is being applied with particular rigidity and folly by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in regard to Public Health Service appointments and to the selection of scientists for part-time advisory posts. Science, the magazine of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, published two searching articles by Bryce Nelson last summer exposing these practices. And this newspaper itself carried an extensive article by staff writer William Greider on June 30 elaborating on the ways in which the HEW security system barred certain scientists from advisory panels.

One high-ranking health official in the Johnson administration, George A. Silver, then deputy assistant secretary of HEW, decried this process of blacklisting as totally needless in regard to the commissioning of Public Health Service doctors. "What possible security problems would they represent?" he asked. The procedures followed, he said, "sharply limit the opportunity to get creative people with an innovative viewpoint" in the Public Health Service.

Investigation of the cases of some of these blacklisted persons shows unmistakably that nonconformity of any sort tends to be penalized as evidence of unsuitability. Mere opposition to official policy on the war in Vietnam has been used to put a job applicant on a blacklist. Sen. Edward Brooke, outraged by the treatment of one of his constituents, said concerning the procedures: "There are certainly grave questions about the desirability and constitutionality of governmental practices by which anonymous officials use secret information and undisclosed criteria to deny someone a job in a nondefense-related field."

Most victims of the blacklistings never know their names are there—and so can do nothing to clear or redeem themselves. No one, indeed, can know what doors may have been closed to him by a vilification muttered behind the hand of an unidentified character assassin. It is as senseless as it is unjust. And it is an absurd myth that these blacklists are kept confidential or inviolable; there are leaks about them all the time, destroying reputations, wrecking careers. They inflict wanton injury at once upon the individuals involved and upon the Government of the United States.

Queried by Science last June, HEW Secretary Robert Finch said he was "looking into" the matter of blacklists. How does he like what he sees? Does it make any sense? Is it honorable? Does it comport with the American concept of freedom?

#### HOUSING NEEDS AND THE MARYLAND MORTGAGE CRISIS

### HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, shortage of mortgage money for the housing market in the State of Maryland has reached near crisis proportions. The Maryland Governor has been urged to call a special session of the General Assembly to resolve the problems. These issues were well presented by my distinguished Maryland colleague, Mr. HOGAN, in an address delivered before the Maryland Association of Real Estate Boards. I commend these remarks, as follows, to my colleagues:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN LAWRENCE J. HOGAN BEFORE THE MARYLAND ASSOCIATION OF REAL ESTATE BOARDS, INC., ANNAPOLIS, MD., OCTOBER 10, 1969

The Realtors' theme of the day is the same. I am sure, as it has been for the past several months—Help! Today I want to discuss with you the role the Federal Government can be expected to play in providing the needed assistance.

Of course there is no need for me to relate in detail the problems presently facing real estate all over the country, and particularly in Maryland, as you are certainly more aware of them than I. Quite simply, the latest increase in the interest rate has resulted in the unavailability of funds for mortgage lending as well as more expensive housing, which combined have either priced the

middle and low income families entirely out of the market or made funds totally unavailable to them. With the interest rate on the open market at the highest level since the mid 1800s, the major investors in mortgage loans, the thrift institutions, are unable to attract savings, resulting in a curtailment or complete halt in some areas, of their mortgage lending operations.

In addition, statutory ceilings imposed on the interest rates on FHA and VA mortgages, have worked a major difficulty in obtaining funds for these loans. Some lenders are simply withdrawing from the market and investing their funds in other outlets rather than accept the low interest rate permissible on FHA-VA loans or incur adverse publicity from increasing the yield on such loans through charging points.

To get quickly to the main subject of your concern—our Maryland problem—you may be sure that I fully realize the desperate conditions presently existing in the Maryland market as a result of the state usury limit of 8% as well as a limitation on the points which may be charged. If it is any solace, several other states—13, I believe—also find themselves in this same predicament. These low usury ceilings have led to the withdrawal of private investment funds from the mortgage market and finally the withdrawal of FNMA, resulting in a "no loan" situation.

Many real estate agents have stopped sales completely. Others have been forced to close down their business offices. Sellers cannot sell homes. Buyers of moderate and low incomes cannot get loans to buy. Returning veterans from Vietnam are unable to take advantage of the benefits which Congress has given them under the VA mortgage provisions because lenders will not finance homes in Maryland.

Although the national market conditions have had their effect on your business, I am sure your primary concern at the moment is what can be done to relieve the situation here in Maryland, and your first question is "What can Congressman Hogan do in this regard?"

It has been suggested that I and other similarly concerned Representatives and Senators amend VA and FHA bills currently being considered to exempt VA and FHA-insured loans from state usury ceilings. On the surface this sounds like a simple solution. Unfortunately, it is an impractical solution, as the suggestion of such an effort arouses the ire of every states rights defender in the House and Senate who promptly rise to their feet in oratory.

During the recent House debate on a bill to extend the authority of the Administrator of the VA to set interest rates on mortgage loans, Representative Joel Broyhill, my colleague from northern Virginia, offered an amendment to exempt VA-insured loans from the District of Columbia's usury statute. I will add that this amendment was passed, but not without protest. The issue of states rights did not enter in here, however, as Congress has the specific charge of legislating for the District and such action was entirely appropriate and considered necessary under the present conditions.

At that time I spoke with Members about the possibility of having this amendment extended to exempt VA-insured loans nationwide, and received the reactions. . . . "This is not a problem for Congress, but for the state legislatures." . . . "Since only 13 states are involved, why should those of us who represent the other 37 states get involved." . . . "It's a problem for the legislatures of those 13 states."

With all due respect for the rights of each state to legislate for itself, I feel the national interests involved in the making of FHA and VA loans provide a substantial case for Congressional consideration of such exemption. Since this problem in Maryland has reached crisis proportions and our Governor

refuses to call a special session of the state legislature to relieve the situation, at the time Rep. Broyhill offered his amendment I called upon the Members of the Veterans Affairs Committee to give prompt consideration to such an exemption for VA loans and I requested the Banking and Currency Committee to consider a similar exemption for FHA loans.

My requesting Federal action in this regard and my personal support for a Federal law exempting VA and FHA loans from the state usury laws should not be construed to indicate that I in any way relieve Governor Mandel of his responsibility to assist the Maryland legislature in achieving the earliest possible passage of corrective legislation. If the Governor and the state legislature cannot be depended upon by the people of Maryland to act in their best interests at a time like this, they are not really concerned about their responsibilities. I plead with them to remember the low and middle-income homebuyers who are being hurt the most by their inaction. Yet the effects will not be felt by individuals only. Mortgage bankers will simply move out of Maryland, thus cutting off funds for community development and industry also. Low rates on municipal and school bonds will drastically cut back sales. It is doubtful that we will know for months to come the total extent of the effect this will have on the economy of Maryland.

Again, I urge the legislature to fulfill its responsibility promptly upon being called into session and not prolong this worsening situation.

Well, I have cited the primary avenue open to the state legislature to help solve the problem. Hopefully, no later than early January this will be done. After that time, however, we will still have with us the problems of inflation and high interest rates, shortage of mortgage funds on a nationwide scale, and further solutions will have to be found, for the most part by the Federal Government.

What can the Federal Government do? Well, two major and obvious answers come to mind—curtail inflation through reduction in Government spending, and redirect Federal funds into housing. To assist in accomplishing the latter, we are fortunate in having the recently published results of a study by the Commission on Mortgage Interest Rates, which the 90th Congress authorized to analyze the problem of increasing interest rates. I consider this to be a very valuable report in that it realistically and fully lays the problem before us, and I am hopeful that the recommendations of the Commission will be given serious and prompt consideration. It appears there is no magic formula. Resolution of the problem will require the combined efforts of the President and the leaders of Congress through executive order and legislation to redirect various Government assets into the housing sector.

As some of you may not be familiar with the recommendations of the Commission, I would like to briefly present some of them to you as well as legislative response to the same:

The Commission recommended that legislation be enacted to increase the Federal Home Loan Bank System's authority to borrow from the Treasury an amount necessary to provide an emergency backstop for the credit lines given to member associations. In response, Senator Proxmire has introduced S. 2572 to increase the System's borrowing authority from \$1 billion to \$2 billion.

The Commission recommended the Federal Reserve make a meaningful effort to improve the market for Federal Agency securities by buying and selling such issues in the open market on an outright basis as well as under re-purchase agreements, while some members of the Commission, including Chairman Wright Patman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, wanted to go beyond

this and require the Federal Reserve to support housing-oriented Federal agencies directly. Chairman Patman thereafter introduced H.R. 13939 directing the Federal Reserve Board to purchase FNMA obligations to assure that it has adequate funds to support the secondary conventional market as well as its existing function in Government-backed mortgages. Also, Senator John Sparkman, Chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, introduced S. 2958 to give the FNMA the authority to provide a secondary market for conventional mortgages, much as it does in the FHA-VA market.

The Commission calls our attention to pension and mutual funds, noting that while such funds had total financial assets of about \$200 billion at the end of 1968, their total mortgage portfolio amounted to only about \$10 billion, a mere 5 per cent of their assets. The Commission's report specifically notes that the Federal Government's own pension and trust fund accounts are the worst offenders in ignoring the mortgage market, with nearly all of their assets held in U.S. Government bonds. Private pension funds only held about 4 per cent of total assets in mortgages while state-managed pension funds held nearly 15½ per cent of their assets in mortgages in mid-1967. In partial response to this observation, Chairman Olin Teague of the House Veterans' Committee has introduced H.R. 9476 to make up to \$5 billion in reserves in the National Service Life Insurance Fund available for purchase of VA guaranteed mortgages, thus providing more credit for this market and insuring a high return to the Fund.

I would like to comment here that I feel that private pension funds and mutual funds should be encouraged to invest heavily in mortgages.

The Commission, though not unanimously, recommended that the abolition of the statutory 6% ceiling on the interest rates on FHA-VA mortgages and enactment of legislation to establish a dual market system for a three-year trial period, which will permit much greater flexibility than administratively established ceilings of the past have permitted. During the three-year trial period of the Commission's dual market approach, under one part, loans would be made under a "free" rate with no discount in the primary market. Under the other part, the market would continue to operate much as it does now with ceilings regularly reviewed and changed to keep in line with market rates and minimize discounts.

Under the Housing Act of 1968 the Congress authorized the establishment of the Government National Mortgage Association to guarantee bonds issued by FNMA or other approved issuers based on and backed by a pool of Federally-insured or guaranteed mortgages. It was expected this mechanism would improve the efficiency of the mortgage market and enable the housing sector to compete more effectively for funds in the over capital market than ever before. Also, the sale of these mortgage-backed securities would increase the potential liquidity of the portfolios of mortgage institutions, and would provide an attractive investment alternative for investors who heretofore have not invested funds in mortgages for various reasons. Although these objectives can be accomplished with a minimum extension of Government activities, the President has not as yet issued any regulations regarding guarantees on marketable securities, depriving FNMA and other private institutions of an important vehicle for attracting funds. I join the Commission in urging the President to implement this legislation without delay.

Legislation to exempt interest or dividends received on savings in institutions which invest the bulk of their funds in residential mortgages has been suggested as an approach by other sources. Although the House has already acted upon tax reform and any such measure introduced in the House at this

point would receive no consideration, it would be timely for the Senate to give attention to such an exemption in its review of tax reform proposals.

I present these to you in order that you may see and know some of the possible approaches of action available to the Congress and the President and be aware of those which will be receiving consideration.

In closing, I wish to assure you that I am at present thoroughly reviewing the pros and cons of these and other proposals and will make every effort to assist the leaders of Congress in taking the appropriate corrective action to redirect funds into the housing market.

Once again, I urge the President, Members of Congress, the Governor and the Maryland State Legislature to do everything within their respective capacities to deal with this situation which has reached crisis proportions in the State of Maryland.

#### VIETNAM MORATORIUM

### HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a negotiated settlement in Vietnam does not now appear likely. What then, should we do?

We could make an all-out effort to win the war, which means pouring in more troops and greater casualties. The American public has overwhelmingly rejected this solution.

We could withdraw immediately. I believe our people reject this equally extreme solution.

Instead, we have adopted the policy of gradual withdrawal. To work, this policy must make it clear to Saigon that there is a limit of time to our participation there and that Saigon will therefore have to shape up if it wants to survive and also find some way to negotiate a settlement with the National Liberation Front and Hanoi. The time limit should be announced to Saigon—but not to the world.

How long a period of time should this be? The withdrawal must be sufficiently slow and steady, so that we do not seem to be pulling the rug out from underneath Saigon. If the time limit were very short, if out of frustration we suddenly withdraw, then the whole world would think that we went back on our commitments and would doubt our maturity and stability. It might lead to the deaths of many South Vietnamese. The American public would be revolted by this. Therefore, there must be a period in which we gradually shift from participation to retirement from the war. This gives Saigon a chance. If during this period Saigon could not shape up, it would prove that Saigon could never stand on its own feet. Nobody would blame us for not trying to prop them up forever. We would not be "bugging out." We would have acquitted ourselves with honor.

During this period, everything possible must be done to reduce the level of fighting and the number of casualties. Firm order to that effect should be issued by the President.

How long should this period of time be, then? Clark Clifford—with the par-

tial endorsement of the President—has suggested that all troops be withdrawn by the end of 1970; former Ambassador to Japan, Edwin Reichauer, has suggested the end of 1971. This is a question of judgment. What is important is that some definite time be set and be firmly communicated to Saigon, and the level of fighting be reduced as much as possible in anticipation of this. In my judgment, to carry out this policy it is necessary for President Nixon to begin announcing further withdrawals on a much larger scale than he has so far. It takes a considerable period of time to get out; it is a big logistic move. And larger troop withdrawals may be the only way to make it clear to Saigon that there is a definite limit of time to our participation there.

Finally, we must enunciate a new Asian policy, a policy of less military commitment. We must learn some good lessons from this tragic Vietnam war. The President has suggested the outlines of this new policy. It is a policy that says we are not going to say out of involvement in the internal instabilities of the nations of Asia because we have shown in Vietnam that we cannot do much about internal instabilities. In fact, our presence seems to make matters worse rather than helping. At the same time, the President is trying to reassure Asians that we will remain concerned in their future, in a part of the world that has more than half of the world's population, and that we will do our best on the economic side and maintain an option on the military side in the event there is some type of situation—such as blatant aggression—that we might be able to do something about. But we are going to be less committed militarily. In short—no more Vietnams.

#### HOPEFUL SIGNS IN FIGHT ON CRIME

### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, although the crime situation in the United States continues to be a major problem, basic steps are being taken by the Attorney General's office to correct the unreal approach to law enforcement which has been characteristic in past years. The issue of wiretapping is an excellent example.

In the last administration the use of wiretaps was restricted to the area of national security alone. The present Attorney General, John Mitchell, made it quite clear in January that the use of this device would be made "carefully and effectively" against organized crime and other major crimes as well. As a result of this commonsense approach, progress is being made. The Attorney General, in a speech on September 29 in Miami Beach, stated:

While we have had only limited experience with judicially approved wiretapping authorizations, this experience has proved to be very successful in combating organized racketeers, especially in the field of narcotics.

In New York City, 124 pounds of heroin was seized as a result of a wiretap. In Washington, 41 persons involved in an alleged narcotics trafficking ring were apprehended as the result of one wiretap. Some of them reportedly had organized crime connections. In Ohio, a wiretap led to the seizure of \$100,000 in counterfeit bills and the arrest of seven persons; and in Buffalo, 23 persons were arrested on a charge of being involved in a United States-Canadian gambling organization.

The above are some of the results of the "new look" at the Department of Justice. Ironically, the changes of policy in the Department are merely a returning to the basic functions for which the Justice Department was created. The Attorney General stated the case bluntly and briefly in the above-mentioned speech:

There has been a tendency to ignore the law enforcement community in favor of the social scientists who can explain the motivations of the criminal, but who can do little to protect the innocent against the mugger or armed robber.

Let me tell you that, as Attorney General, I am first and foremost a law enforcement officer. I believe the Department of Justice is a law enforcement agency. I think that persons who break the law ought to be promptly arrested and tried today.

While I sympathize with physical conditions and emotional problems which may cause persons to commit crimes, I cannot sympathize with those who seek only to excuse criminals.

In the Miami Beach speech Attorney General Mitchell outlined various measures which have been proposed by his department to counter the crime wave. The attack on this monumental problem, the program of the Nation's chief law-enforcement officer, should be of interest to all concerned citizens. For this reason I include the above-mentioned speech by Attorney General Mitchell in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN N. MITCHELL, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE, HOTEL FONTAINELEAU, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., SEPTEMBER 29, 1969

#### I. INTRODUCTION

1. It is a pleasure to address the annual convention of the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

I understand that I am a last minute substitute for President Nixon. Unfortunately, the President is unable to be with you today. I know that he wanted to be here to assure you of his support of your efforts in the field of law enforcement.

During the past eight months, I have been in close communication with the IACP, especially with your most able Executive Director, Quinn Tamm.

Several months ago, I participated in your working seminars held in Washington. A major portion of these discussions concerned student violence and civil disorders. What particularly impressed me was the awareness, by the participating police officials, of the necessity for preventive law enforcement. These seminars emphasized that law enforcement is not merely the application of force. Enlightened police officials recognize that careful pre-planning, communication and negotiation can frequently avoid serious confrontations.

I was pleased that the IACP stressed that law enforcement officials should be flexible in order to solve new law enforcement problems within the currently prevailing social

and legal philosophies of the nation. The American law enforcement community would do well to look to your leadership.

Your high standards of professionalism, your openness to new ideas, your desire to bridge the gap between law enforcement officials and certain alienated parts of our citizenry, have made you leaders in the administration of justice at the state and local level.

We, at the Justice Department, have called on you in the past for your help and advice. We will continue to call on you in the coming years.

We will continue to support this organization and its more than 7,000 members in every way possible, especially through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration grant program. We hope that you will seek our counsel when you have problems to be solved.

2. I have come to Miami Beach today to speak to you about the single most pressing problem that I face as Attorney General and that you face as concerned and responsible police officials—crime in America.

The latest FBI Uniform Crime Reports show that in 1968 there were 4.5 million serious crimes committed in the United States, a 17 percent increase over 1967.

There was a 30 percent increase in armed robbery; a 15 percent increase in rape; a 13 percent increase in murder and an 11 percent increase in aggravated assault.

From 1960 to 1968, the volume of serious crime has risen 122 percent, while the population has increased only 11 percent. The citizen risk of becoming a victim of a crime has nearly doubled from 1960 to 1968.

In February 1967, the President's Crime Commission reported: "There is much crime in America, more than ever is reported, far more than ever is solved, far too much for the health of the nation. Every American knows that. Every American is, in a sense, a victim of crime. . . . The most understandable mood into which many Americans have been plunged by crime is one of frustration and bewilderment."

Despite the Presidential report and the ever increasing crime rate, there has been a tendency in the past to shrug our shoulders and to hope that if we talk about crime it will eventually disappear.

There has been a tendency to ignore the law enforcement community in favor of the social scientists who can explain the motivations of the criminal, but who can do little to protect the innocent against the mugger or armed robber.

Let me tell you that, as Attorney General, I am first and foremost a law enforcement officer. I believe the Department of Justice is a law enforcement agency. I think that persons who break the law ought to be promptly arrested and tried today.

While I sympathize with physical conditions and emotional problems which may cause persons to commit crimes, I cannot sympathize with those who seek only to excuse criminals.

When this Administration took office eight months ago, we decided that the time had come to stop talking to stop offering excuses and to start acting now. And we did act—we have put forward a carefully-planned, well-financed, and aggressive action program to combat crime now.

Of course, we recognize the need for and we strongly support research and development projects which may help us solve crime tomorrow—sometime in the future.

But tomorrow is too late for the ghetto housewife who is many times more likely to be mugged than the suburban housewife. Tomorrow is too late for the small store owner who is killed in a holdup by a narcotics addict.

Indeed, tomorrow may be too late for all of us. That is why we have launched a

comprehensive anticrime campaign as a first priority in our domestic program.

As President Nixon has said: "The public climate with regard to law is a function of national leadership."

The leadership of this nation believes that any effective anticrime campaign must rely primarily on law enforcement officials. The police are the first line of defense, and they must be given every reasonable tool if they are to meet the challenge of crime in an increasingly complex society. For this reason, the Administration's executive, legislative and budgetary proposals to combat crime concentrate strongly on the law enforcement function.

I think that you will find that this Administration is sympathetic to law enforcement and that, in areas of doubt, we tend to put our faith in the good intentions of the police, rather than to rely on the bad intentions of criminals.

Let me give you some examples of how we have exercised our federal leadership—how we have resolved areas of doubt in favor of law enforcement:

The previous Administration refused to use Congressional authority—Title III of the Omnibus Crime Bill—to wiretap except in national security cases. We have reversed that policy. We have authorized wiretapping for organized crime and narcotics crimes on a highly selective basis. So far, we have found court-approved wiretapping to be extremely productive and a major aid to law enforcement.

The prior Administration failed to suggest any method for detaining criminal suspects prior to their trial even if these suspects showed a substantial likelihood of committing another crime. We have proposed a pre-trial detention bill which would, on a rational basis, deny freedom to those who appear likely to commit another crime pending their trial.

The prior Administration declined to utilize Congressional authorization in Title II of the Omnibus Crime Bill for the admission of voluntary confessions which did not strictly adhere to the *Miranda* warning requirements. We have reversed that policy.

While we still require federal law enforcement officers to give the complete *Miranda* warning, we will not automatically concede a case if, by inadvertence, the complete warning has not been given in obtaining a voluntary confession.

We hope that these actions will aid our federal efforts against crime. We also hope that these actions will say to state and local law enforcement officers: "The Justice Department is with you. We want to help you whenever and wherever possible."

As further evidence of our commitment to law enforcement, I would like to outline for you briefly some highlights of the federal government's anticrime program in terms of Executive action, legislative proposals and fiscal appropriation requests.

#### II. WASHINGTON MODEL PROGRAM

By far the most serious aspect of crime we face as a nation is crime in the streets. I have told you of the latest FBI Uniform Crime Reports which show a 17 percent increase in serious crime.

What the FBI reports do not show is the increase in fear and national anxiety. For every law-abiding citizen who is the victim of a crime, there are dozens of friends, relatives, business associates and neighbors, who fear that they may be next.

Basically, the federal government has very limited jurisdiction over street crime. We can set the tone for leadership. We can initiate pilot projects. We can offer financial and technical assistance. But the primary responsibility is still with the state and local governments.

One place where the federal government does have substantial jurisdiction over

street crime is in the District of Columbia. In the first six months of this year, the District of Columbia crime rate increase has exceeded the national average.

In many ways Washington is a microcosm of the national crime problem. It has had a major racial disorder. It has a high welfare and unemployment rate. Some of its downtown area suffers from economic blight. Many of its citizens are afraid to walk alone in the evening.

Very early in his Administration, on January 31st, President Nixon launched an ambitious program to combat crime in the District of Columbia. It was generally designed to be a model program for other cities.

As the President said: "By searching for new ways of applying the resources of the federal government in the war against crime here (in Washington), we may discover new ways of advancing the war against crime elsewhere."

A critical part of the model anticrime program for Washington is massive aids to law enforcement.

We believe that the well-trained beat patrolman is our most effective single weapon against the street criminal.

Therefore, we asked for the addition of 1,000 policemen to the authorized force and for more effective recruiting methods to fill the existing vacancies.

As a result, the Metropolitan Police Department is now recruiting about 115 officers per month as opposed to 18 per month in 1967. We have agreed with the Department of Defense to participate in a pilot project which would permit a six-month early release from military service of individuals who qualify and agree to become police officers.

Our plan also calls for improved management and manpower utilization. For example, we have asked for an increase in police cadet and civilian positions which will hopefully release professional policemen for patrol and law enforcement functions.

We have asked for an expansion of the police Legal Advisor Officer. These Legal Advisors are available to advise police officers on the street about complex legal requirements which arise during investigations.

We have proposed or supported legislation which would aid the police in apprehending criminals—by authorizing police to wiretap under judicial supervision, by making it illegal to resist an unlawful arrest, by permitting police to stop and frisk criminal suspects and by eliminating the "no-knock" bar to searches where the evidence is in danger of being destroyed.

As part of the model District of Columbia plan, we have also placed great emphasis on criminal trial and court procedure. We have proposed a complete reorganization of the local court system where, unfortunately at present, the median time from indictment to disposition of a criminal case is now 10 months.

We have asked for more judges so that the guilty may be convicted quickly and the innocent may be cleared.

We have asked for more prosecutors in the United States Attorney's office. We have established a Major Crimes Unit which will handle serious criminal problems such as professional narcotics traffickers and organized gangsters. We have set up two and three-man Crime Teams who will be able to devote enough time to difficult and important prosecutions.

We have proposed legislation which would correct some of the technical barriers that now unnecessarily tie up criminal trials and exclude otherwise reliable evidence of guilt.

Justice must be evenhanded to be effective. Therefore, we have proposed legislation which would establish a full-fledged Public Defender Service, capable of offering free lawyers for about 60 percent of the indigent

persons who appear in most criminal, juvenile and civil commitment proceedings.

We have also supported legislation which would increase payments to private lawyers who represent indigents and which would permit these payments in a wide variety of cases in Washington and in other federal jurisdictions.

We have proposed legislation which would expand the District of Columbia Bail Agency to permit more effective investigation of the background and personality of an arrested suspect in order to determine whether he should be released pending his trial.

We have made special provisions for the juvenile who now accounts for 38 percent of our crime index arrests.

We are asking for the establishment of a combined Juvenile-Family Court which can more sensibly handle many of the problems of juvenile offenders and intra-family offenses. We have asked for an expansion of a juvenile group rehabilitation project and for a well-staffed psychiatric-care residential facility for delinquents.

We have also requested major reforms in the local corrections system with new physical facilities, more use of halfway houses and expanded rehabilitation counseling. About 46 percent of arrested suspects have previously been in prison.

This is just a brief summary of our model anticrime package. The federal government and the District of Columbia government have implemented much of the Washington plan by Executive action.

But the Congress has not approved a single legislative proposal. Nor has the Congress approved a single dollar of the \$22 million in additional monies which was requested for fiscal 1970, which commenced on July 1, 1969. Without the money, the District of Columbia anticrime program will be paralyzed. Without court reorganization and the other legislation we have requested, our anticrime efforts may fall.

Crime continues to rise in the District of Columbia.

The citizens of Washington—and the people of this country who look to Congress for leadership—should not be forced to wait longer.

### III. LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

The other major area where the federal government can lead the way to combat street crime is through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the Department of Justice. The LEAA is the federal government's major commitment to help states and local communities improve their police and criminal justice systems.

In its first year of operation in 1968-1969, it expended most of its \$63 million budget—\$19 million in planning grants to states and local communities; \$29 million in action grants, including special funds for 11 major cities; \$3 million for research and development into crime problems; and perhaps most promising was \$6.5 million to finance college studies for law enforcement personnel.

For the current fiscal year, we have asked for \$296 million for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. If appropriated, \$250 million of this is scheduled to go to the states for action programs.

The greatest single emphasis in the LEAA program has been the funding of police efforts to decrease street crime.

For example, one large midwestern state received \$1.3 million last year. Of this amount \$236 thousand was awarded for police civilian disorder control; \$120 thousand for the development of police training programs; \$30 thousand for a study of how to use civilians in police departments; \$48 thousand for a special program to train promising young police officers; \$180 thousand for management studies of the efficiency of local police departments; and \$60 thousand to establish model community relations units.

In other states, we have funded experiments in using helicopter patrols, in setting up new electronic alarm systems in high burglary rate areas; in establishing special teams to deal with youth gangs; and in funding statewide criminal teletype networks.

Our studies of plans submitted by all 50 states show a most promising and continued emphasis on law enforcement, with 77 percent of the funds going to the police and to anti-street crime programs. The larger breakdowns show 18 percent for police training, salary increases and career development; 22 percent for police civil disorder control programs, and 11 percent for detection and apprehension techniques.

Unfortunately, I must tell you that not only has the Congress failed to pass this \$296 million appropriation request, but it appears to be headed toward a substantial decrease.

Law enforcement agencies all over the nation will suffer if the full appropriation is not passed promptly.

### IV. NARCOTICS

Another area in which the federal government has substantial jurisdiction involving street crime is the battle against illegal narcotics and dangerous drugs. Between 1967 and 1968, there was a 64 percent increase in arrests for narcotics and marijuana. Half of those now being arrested for drug abuse are under 21 years of age.

The battle against narcotics is an integral part of the Administration's anti-street crime program. A narcotics addict may need \$70 or \$80 a day to satisfy his habit. Thus, he turns to robbery, mugging and burglary in order to obtain money. It was recently estimated that in New York City alone \$2 billion a year is stolen by narcotics addicts and that about 11 percent of those arrested for violent crimes have a history of narcotics addiction.

Last July 14, President Nixon delivered a statement on the problem of drug abuse and promised that action would be taken by this Administration now. The President said: "A national awareness of the gravity of the situation is needed; a new urgency and concerted national policy is needed at the federal level to begin to cope with this growing menace. . . ."

One of the most significant parts of the program so far has been a landmark proposal called the Controlled Dangerous Substances Act of 1969. It would consolidate and reorganize all the existing drug laws—some of which date back to 1914. It would substantially expand federal law enforcement authority to control narcotics, barbiturates, amphetamines and marijuana.

For example, it would authorize agents of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs to arrest persons for violations of any federal law and not just for violations of the federal narcotics statute. It would permit agents to break into suspected premises without knocking and would also permit them to conduct administrative searches for illegal drugs and marijuana.

I know there is a great deal of controversy surrounding the use of marijuana. But marijuana is an illegal substance. Most medical authorities have stated that it is at least a hallucinogenic with no known medical purpose. If used excessively, it can be dangerous. Furthermore, current statistics indicate that many hard narcotics users started off on marijuana.

Under these circumstances, we decided to stop closing our eyes to the marijuana problem in this country. Two weeks ago, we launched the first major search and seizure border operation history aimed at stopping the importation of illegal drugs from Mexico.

It is estimated that the Mexican border traffic accounts for 80 percent of the illegal marijuana in this country, 20 percent of the heroin and large amounts of barbiturates, amphetamines and other dangerous drugs.

By utilizing the resources of the Department of Justice, Bureau of Customs, the Department of Defense, and other agencies, we have started a coordinated and intensive land, sea and air operation against border smuggling.

We realize that the wide publicity given to this operation will probably deter many smugglers and may not result in large scale seizures. But if we can keep marihuana and other drugs out of the United States by whatever means possible, then I think we will have succeeded. Our goal is not the occasional user. It is the large scale professional trafficker who makes a living out of smuggling illegal narcotics.

The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs in the Department of Justice is our main agency concerned with the enforcement of federal drug laws. We have asked for an increase in its appropriations from \$17 million in fiscal 1969 to \$25 million in fiscal 1970, and an increase in its personnel from about 1300 to almost 1500.

These increased appropriations and manpower will permit the Bureau to step up its enforcement program in our cities, to implement its plan to train 22,000 state and local law enforcement officers and to expand its international operations.

Our goal is not long jail sentences for the average narcotics addict who must sell a bag or two of heroin in order to sustain himself. He should be the object of research and rehabilitation. I am interested in prosecuting those who make their living by dealing in substances which ruin men's mental and physical health, and which poses a danger to our general welfare.

#### V. ORGANIZED CRIME

Another aspect of crime where the federal government has broad jurisdiction is organized crime.

Relying on the hopelessness of ghetto residents, organized criminals sell heroin and cocaine; playing on insecure credit, they loanshark the honest working man; recognizing elector indifference, they corrupt labor unions and political leaders.

Here again, President Nixon proposed an aggressive program to combat this interstate network of criminal syndicates. He said that "the moral and legal subversion of our society is a life-long and lucrative profession" for the organized racketeer.

The core of the federal effort against organized crime has been to reorganize the Strike Forces. They are interagency teams designed to throw a whole net of federal law enforcement over an organized crime family in a particular city. We have expanded these teams from four to seven, and we plan to reach 20 by the end of fiscal 1971.

In addition, we have set up a federal-state racket squad in New York City. If this joint venture proves to be successful, we plan to organize others in an effort to cooperate with state and local authorities in our Strike Force assault.

The LEAA has also made several initial grants to states and cities to aid them in establishing organized crime units. If their appropriation is approved, we hope that more localities will apply for funds to combat organized crime.

We have also asked for additional legislation to help us in the battle against the organized gangster. Among the bills we have proposed or supported are a general witness immunity law which would have a broad scope for many potential witnesses against organized crime; an amendment to the Wagering Tax Act which would expand our current ability to prosecute gambling; and a law designed to make it a federal crime to corrupt local police and other public officials.

While we have had only limited experience with judicially approved wiretapping authorizations, this experience has proved to be very successful in combating organized racketeers, especially in the field of narcotics.

In New York City, 124 pounds of heroin was seized as a result of a wiretap. In Washington, 41 persons involved in an alleged narcotics trafficking ring were apprehended as the result of one wiretap. Some of them reportedly had organized crime connections. In Ohio, a wiretap led to the seizure of \$100,000 in counterfeit bills and the arrest of seven persons; and in Buffalo, 23 persons were arrested on a charge of being involved in a United States-Canadian gambling organization.

In order to mount this broad attack on organized crime, the Administration has asked for a \$25 million increase in funds for all government agencies involved in this effort—a 40 percent increase over the previous Administration request. About \$16 million of this will go for more FBI and IRS personnel, to work with the Strike Forces. Almost \$3 million will go to the Criminal Division of the Justice Department and the remainder of the money will be spread among the Secret Service, the Department of Labor, and other government agencies.

The result of our activities so far has been promising. In fiscal 1969, 44 indictments were returned against 59 suspected organized crime figures (38 more than in 1968) and 29 suspected organized crime figures were convicted. In total, 71 organized crime figures were either indicted or convicted in this fiscal year as compared with only 48 the previous year.

Furthermore, we have arrested a number of crime figures who are members of the ruling commission of the organized crime syndicate in Buffalo, in Newark, in New Orleans, in Rhode Island and in Chicago. We think that this new assault shows great hope of success against this difficult problem.

#### VI. CONCLUSION

A model program for the District of Columbia, direct federal grants to states and local communities, and aggressive new programs against narcotics crimes and organized crime—these are some of the highlights of this Administration's action plan to reverse the flood of crime now.

In each one of these programs, there has been special emphasis on law enforcement. I want criminals off the streets and there is no better way to get them off the streets than by relying upon you—the law enforcement community in this country.

You can be sure that this Administration will, to the best of its abilities, marshal all of its moral, political and economic power to support law enforcement officers in our battle to defeat crime.

We all know that with your help we will succeed and without your help we will only face a national disaster.

#### MAO'S CHINA ASSESSED AT WEAK, DIVIDED AND CHAOTIC

#### HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, for those interested in obtaining a concise survey of the military, political, and economic events in China since Mao Tse-tung assumed power in 1949, I heartily recommend an excellent booklet put out by the Committee of One Million entitled "Twenty Years of Tyranny."

Openly against the admission of Red China to the United Nations, the Committee of One Million has enlisted the able assistance of three distinguished experts on Communist China, Dr. Jurgen Domes, of the Free University of West Berlin; Dr. James T. Myers, of the Uni-

versity of South Carolina; and John F. Lewis, American journalist and editor.

Together they conclude that 20 years under Mao and Communism has left China "weak, divided, and chaotic, teetering on the brink of anarchism."

On the 20th anniversary of Mao's ascent to power, "Twenty Years of Tyranny" reveals China as a "record of squandered human resources and political resources of support, both within the party and without, which if not unprecedented, must still be recorded as gross political ineptitude or outright stupidity.

In conclusion the authors feel that China still needs today, as she needed in 1949, political leaders who are able to bring internal peace, stability and a measure of prosperity to this vast and potentially great nation.

#### AMERICAN BANKER EDITORIAL

#### HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the American Banker is especially appropriate in view of the recently concluded meetings of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund:

#### PROFESSIONALS ON THE JOB

A feeling of justified confidence in the work that has already been done, creating a climate for constructive adjustment to the needs of the future, characterizes the international financial community as its leaders gather for the annual meetings of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund.

The shocks and tremors of the international financial community during the past year, and the difficulties and disappointments over the slow pace of development among the poor nations are not a cause for alarm, for the systems have worked through the problems which they were designed to handle, and on balance, on almost all fronts, have finished the year stronger than when they started it.

Nor, though, is survival being taken as the basis for complacency. Sound theoretical work and analysis has been done, and new machinery set in place to handle the well-discerned problems of the future; and as these sensible approaches are put into practical use, the whole structure is strengthened and the way made clear to develop techniques for further advances, to deal with the next great series of problems.

The 112 member nations of the IMF have done great creative work during the past year in bringing into final form the concept of Special Drawing Rights, to meet the needs of the non-Communist trading world for additional international liquidity. And even as they will be taking the final procedural steps at this meeting to make SDRs a reality, they will be turning their full attention to problems of the adjustment mechanism. There has already been much thoughtful discussion about the need to make international exchange rates more flexible, and such specific concepts as crawling pegs and wider bands. Now it will advance from the theoretical to the practical and political, subject to hard, selfish, sensible questioning on behalf of national interests and mutual goals.

On the World Bank side, firm direction markers have emerged at the end of Robert McNamara's first full year. The Bank is bringing both its soft-loan affiliate, the International Development Administration, and its catalytic agent for private investment, the International Finance Corp., into

much closer coordination for the achievement of policy objectives. It is demonstrating a willingness to take a more vigorous role in encouraging governments to create the conditions which will support development efforts. It is bringing cool, precise and detailed analysis to the problems it confronts, as a basis for the most effective allocation of its resources. Parenthetically, it can be noted that this reflects the personal style for which Mr. McNamara drew world attention when he ran the U.S. Defense Establishment; it has become manifest once again in the way he is running the World Bank.

But it is not just the institutional personalities that impart strength to these organizations. The individual members, tough, experienced, and realistic, know where they have been, and know where they are going as they convene in the 25th of these annual meetings since the Bank and Fund were founded at Bretton Woods. They do not diminish for a moment the dimensions and crucial importance of the problems they face; but they share a sense of accomplishment in having dealt reasonably successfully with problems in the past which appeared to pose even greater threats; a realization that it will require new ideas and high morale to deal with the problems of the present and the future; and a quiet conviction that, as seasoned professionals, they will be able to do the job.

#### DAY OF RETROSPECT

### HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Ron Loewen, of Wichita, Kans., is serving this semester as president of the student body at Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia. Mr. Loewen has suggested to his fellow students and to the faculty and administration on his campus that a "day of retrospect" be initiated to allow students and faculty to spend a normal class day discussing curriculum. His leadership and initiative have been recognized not only on campus but by the editorial writers of the Wichita, Kans., Eagle. Ron Loewen has made a constructive and positive suggestion which could lead to better communication not only on the campus at Emporia, but other higher education institutions throughout the Nation.

Of course, I am pleased and proud to take note of Mr. Loewen's idea because he demonstrated the same kind of interest, responsibility, and initiative while serving as a congressional intern in my Washington office during the past summer.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wichita Eagle:

#### DAY OF RETROSPECT

The president of the student body at Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, appears to be a young man with good sense.

He has called for a "day of retrospect" on the KSTC campus.

Outlined in his "State of the College" message, Ron Loewen's plan is for faculty and students in each department to meet during a normal class day to discuss curriculum.

Students would have an opportunity to offer suggestions on curriculum improvement or relevancy and to seek justification for some of the courses being taught and to request some that are not offered.

The faculty then could talk openly with the students and explain obstacles in the way of requests and to explain the rationale of the curriculum offerings.

Loewen's approach beats mindless obstruction and rioting which accomplishes nothing.

He proposes bridging the gap in communications and putting the students and faculty in a face-to-face situation where wrongs can be righted.

Why should students be saddled with courses they see no need for? Why shouldn't they be consulted on courses that ought to be added?

#### VIETNAM MORATORIUM

### HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, in the course of the moratorium yesterday millions of words were spoken across the Nation. Out of the welter of speeches, most provocative and a few thoughtful, the remarks of our colleague, the Honorable FRANK THOMPSON at Princeton University were outstanding for their clarity, depth, and vision. I believe that my colleagues will be impressed by his thoughts which follow:

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANK THOMPSON, JR., DEMOCRAT OF NEW JERSEY, FOR DELIVERY AT PRINCETON UNIVERSITY IN OBSERVANCE OF THE VIETNAM MORATORIUM, OCTOBER 15, 1969

Thank you for inviting me to be here in Princeton with you today. I am grateful to share this solemn day with you. I assure you that I am more comfortable here than I would be in Washington.

This is not the first time Americans have gathered to call for an end to the killing in Vietnam. Nor is it unusual to see organized dissent from our policies. We have been at it for a long time. Some things have changed, however; for now we are no longer a voice in the wilderness nor even a disgruntled minority. Make no mistake about it—a clear majority of Americans now recognize our policies as ill-advised and want now an end to this divisive and foolish conflict.

Along the way, we have learned some terrible lessons.

First, we have learned that it is senseless to send American troops to save a government that is opposed by its own people. We went into Vietnam, presumably, to protect that country's right to determine its own future. Let us resolve today that what we mean by assisting a nation in "self-determination" is not the perpetuation of a military dictatorship.

Second, we have learned that it is superficial and ultimately self-defeating to judge national security solely in terms of numbers of troops, bombs, ships, and missiles. In Vietnam, we the strongest of nations, face one of the weakest. Yet their resolve to stand against outside force has thwarted the quick "victory" so many have promised us. We also have been denied progress at home. In our country, the true measures of national security—domestic tranquility and the quality of life—and the true reasons for caring about national security—justice, equality, and freedom—are in a real sense casualties of the war. While we are destroying one country in order to save it, we are tearing our own country apart in order to protect it.

We have learned further that the American people will not long follow leaders who talk nonsense to them. Nor will they long tolerate those who fail to respond to the popular will. Richard Nixon said of today's moratorium,

"As far as this kind of activity is concerned . . . under no circumstances will I be affected whatever by it." George McGovern has provided a good answer . . . "American foreign policy cannot be formed in defiance of American idealism and conscience." I think that message is fair warning to those who think that they can keep the lid on for another two or three years. Let's have no more talk about an acceptable minimum of casualties—I guess that means acceptable to everyone but those included in the minimum. If there is a reason to continue the war—and I do not think there is—it is certainly not by buying time from the American people at the cost of some acceptable minimum of American lives.

Now perhaps not all of us have learned these lessons. I recognize that there are sincere men among us who would like to end the war but dare not; or perhaps fear that the terms are not yet good enough. Most of these even admit that probably it was a mistake to become involved at all. But now they say, having committed our prestige and sacrificed many lives, we cannot simply "cop out." I understand their anguish. No one likes to lose face. No one likes to suggest that the only true heroes of this war—the Americans and Vietnamese who have fought and died in it—were sacrificed in vain. But I think we must measure the loss of face against the failure of courage. And the loss of lives against the loss of still more. It does this country no credit and it honors those who have died not at all for us to admit an error and then fail to act on that admission. It is an admirable thing to admit guilt, but redemption lies only in acting to right whatever wrongs we have done. And I believe that many have been wronged in this conflict.

Our military forces have been asked to do a job for which they are ill-suited, a job which can never be done by outsiders anyway. Our people have been asked to tolerate injustice at home because we need the money for foreign ventures. And the Vietnamese have been promised a solution to their problems—a solution now best expressed by the American major who explained, "It became necessary to destroy the town in order to save it."

I say let's make an end of it. Therein lies honor and patriotism. For what is the real standard of men who care about their country? It is, I think, that they are willing to call it to a higher standard. That's what thousands of Americans are doing today.

The fact that we are ready to do so should give all of us hope for the future. It's true that as a people our problems have never appeared more difficult. Some even have turned away from the struggle—an understandable reaction to frustration and failure. But I think that those who take the relative lull of the last nine months as a sign that the old ways will still work are tragically mistaken. This country, both on days of massive dissent like this one and during weeks of quiet brooding, is moving right out from under its old leaders. This country is changing and I think for the better. Change is often accompanied by uncertainty, and it usually springs from a period of frustration. We are on the edge, though, not of an abyss, but of a national rebirth. For you represent a generation that is truly committed to the ideals so long taught in our schools and voiced by our leaders. I don't believe that you're going to forget all that. You can turn this country around, not through violence and revolution, but through your idealism and energy.

So I urge you to stay in the struggle. You are making a difference. And we are making a difference today. The unfinished agenda in this country is long, but it begins with putting an end to the war. Only then can we turn with some hope of unity and a major commitment of resources to the great tasks at home.

I do not believe, however, that the conclusion of the war will lead to speedy solu-

tions to all our problems. We will need to be watchful that the fruits of peace are not stolen from us. The President has already suggested that there will be no peace dividend. But that need not be so. Money now being spent in Vietnam can be channeled to domestic problems if the President and Congress have the will. And they will have the will if you make your voices heard. There are many who see the 30 billion dollars now being expended annually on the war as a future source of funds for more engines of war. Let us who see in this war's end the hope of feeding the hungry and housing the poor contest this distorted sense of American priorities.

John F. Kennedy began this decade by summoning the nation anew to greatness. The least we can do to honor that legacy is to end the decade by putting an end to the killing in Vietnam and finding a way to peace at home.

Let us go on then from this October 15th to Peace.

Let us go on to find new hope for this country. Let us find a way to redeem our time with a better vision of the future.

CONDEMN HANOI'S TREATMENT OF OUR SOLDIERS

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most tragic aspects of the war in Vietnam is the plight of American prisoners of war held in North Vietnam. These men have sacrificed their freedom, their health, and the peace of mind of their families. Hundreds of these prisoners, unprotected by the Geneva Convention of 1949, barely survive in Vietcong jungle camps and Vietnamese prisons. From those few prisoners who have been released have come glaring evidence of mistreatment—bad food, solitary confinement, looting of mail, and even torture.

The families that remain behind also are severely affected by these practices. Living in a perpetual state of uncertainty, they have no way of knowing whether their loved ones are alive or dead. Mrs. Richard Cooper, a sister of a Vietnamese prisoner of war from Amherst, N.Y., states better than I the frustration that the anxious families feel. In a letter dated September 22, she said:

AMHERST, N.Y.,  
September 22, 1969.

DEAR MR. McCARTHY: As the sister of a prisoner of war in North Vietnam, I beg you to speak out against the inhumane treatment of these prisoners by the North Vietnamese. No matter what one's views are on the war in Vietnam, one cannot tolerate this flagrant violation of the four basic tenets of the Geneva Convention: the free flow of mail, impartial inspection of camps, the release of the sick and wounded and, above all, the release of a list of the prisoners. The information we've received from the two Navy prisoners recently released is grim and shocking.

Any public statement by you on this matter will be greatly appreciated by the families and friends of these men.

Very truly yours,

ELLEN T. COOPER.

At this time I would like to join with all my colleagues who have called for the public condemnation of Hanoi's

treatment of our soldiers. I am, therefore, introducing a resolution that urges that the North Vietnamese comply with the tenets of the Geneva Convention and immediately remove those conditions that are threatening the lives of our captured soldiers.

This issue cannot be looked upon as a partisan issue. Rather it is one that concerns every single Member here. I urge, therefore, that all those gentlemen who have not yet done so join in this attempt to secure better treatment of our POW's.

JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL MORATORIUM PROGRAM

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, as part of the nationwide Vietnam moratorium, I had the privilege of participating in a frank discussion of the war in a program put on by the students of Jefferson High School in Annandale, Va. I would like to take this opportunity to publicly express my appreciation to the students, faculty, and administration of Jefferson for inviting me to present my views concerning Vietnam and to commend them for encouraging free and constructive discussion on what is probably the most pressing issue of our time.

Joining me on the program was Mr. Dolph Droge, an officer of the Agency for International Development's Vietnam Bureau. Each of us presented a statement containing our appraisal of the Vietnam situation and then answered questions submitted by the student body. Since it can safely be stated that almost all Americans want peace, the differences in point of view between Mr. Droge and myself centered around the question of what the most effective course to pursue to achieve that peace would be. The student body itself seemed to have fairly mixed feelings on what approach the United States should follow in Vietnam. Our dialog, I feel, provided them with facts not previously presented and stimulated the submission of approximately 250 questions directed to Mr. Droge and myself. I think that everyone who attended came away with more information than they had upon entering and that is a good thing. Peaceful discussion of opposing or variant points of view can only serve to make the decisionmaking process of legislators more accurate and responsive to the will of the people.

Finally, I wish to praise Mr. Jordan, principal of Jefferson High School and Mrs. Krist, the faculty member who recruited me, Mr. Sane, adviser to the student cooperation association, and Brian Lewis, president of the SCA and moderator of the program. All these people worked very hard to make the program a success. But most of all, I wish to congratulate the students of Jefferson High who were responsible for the entire program. They conceived it, organized it, and ran it. And they did all the above with professional-like efficiency accom-

panied by a sincere desire to learn more about the conflict in Vietnam and the different proposals for peace. Unlike the situations encountered at some other schools in the area, schools whose administrators did not have the foresight to provide for free discussions, the students of Jefferson had the opportunity to voluntarily participate in the Vietnam moratorium day special assembly periods. All in all, I think it was a most worthwhile endeavor.

HONORS MEMORY OF CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on October 11, 1969, my distinguished colleague and good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania, JAMES A. BYRNE, delivered a most eloquent speech on Christopher Columbus to the Columbus Square Civic Association in Philadelphia.

Mr. BYRNE is well informed on Columbus and his speech shows a fascination with the great Italian explorer that we both share.

I am happy to commend his speech, which follows, to my colleagues:

HONORS MEMORY OF CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS (By Congressman JAMES A. BYRNE)

I take it as a great personal honor that you have invited me here tonight to participate in this affair honoring the memory and achievements of a great man—and without this man, we would not be here tonight; neither you nor I, nor the 200 million Americans of our beloved nation, nor the millions more who inhabit the mainland and the islands from the northern tier of Canada to Cape Horne to the south.

I am, frankly, very unmoved by theories advanced in recent years that Christopher Columbus was not the first European to sight the land of the Western Hemisphere.

Even if these so-called theories have a grain of truth—and I am not persuaded they do—I don't believe for an instant that they detract one bit from the glory and honor due to Christopher Columbus.

For the important fact is that Christopher Columbus and no one else was responsible for opening these great continents to colonization, providing for the homeless, the hungry, the ambitious and the adventurous from Europe's teeming shores, a new land with new opportunity, where all would one day be equal, with this equality limited only by each man's qualifications and ability and not based on what rank his father held.

If, indeed, there were precursors of Columbus who touched upon these shores, then let me say they had a great opportunity but did not follow through the way Columbus did.

They left no maps for the Genoan navigator to follow. As Columbus himself put it, he found these shores through prophesy and not maps.

If indeed Columbus was preceded by other mariners, then we must remember that this land lay fallow for another 500 years before Columbus opened the Americas for colonization and civilization.

Even the most complex proposal seems simple after one has showed the way, and it was Christopher Columbus who showed the way, despite the doubters and the ob-

structionists. After him came many; but he was first to show the way.

In his own words, he stated, "They all made fun of my plan then; now even tailors wish to discover."

Of course, many legends, some sure to be apocryphal, have grown about a man as famous as Columbus. I think his accomplishments were great enough not to require that we add to his luster accomplishments he did not claim himself.

Christopher Columbus was *not* the first man to believe that the Earth was round and he was not the first to propose that the rich lands of the east could be reached by sailing west.

History tells us that this latter suggestion was first promulgated by another Italian, the Florentine cosmographer Paolo Toscanelli, and Toscanelli's papers were indeed utilized by Columbus in drawing up his proposals for discovery.

Some people are quick to paint a portrait of a great man in stark white and blacks. Of course, this is unfair, unfair to history and unfair to the individual. Columbus was a complex individual straightforward in purpose but embittered by the tribulations of life.

Physically, he was a tall man of dignified carriage, with pale skin and red hair. When angered, he was known to acquire a red face; and he was often angry. This was his entitlement, considering the frustrations he suffered at the hands of those not as confident and not as brave.

The school books do not give sufficient credit to what he accomplished *despite* the fruitless, frustrating, years of waiting followed by years of hardship; and then followed by years of fighting for the honor, wealth and credit which he believed was his due.

There is no question that these frustrations contributed to his falling health, which resulted in his subsequent death—alone and bitter.

We know very little of the early years of this mystical, determined sailor, not even the date of his birth—there was no Bureau of Vital Statistics in those days.

We do know he was born in Genoa in 1451, the son of Domenico Colombo, a weaver, and his wife, the former Suzanna Fontanarossa. His childhood is clouded, but at the age of 14 he first went to sea and fought in many battles, finally being shipwrecked off the Portuguese coast on Aug. 13, 1476.

But the hunger for adventure and discovery was strong within him and he sailed to Iceland and the South Atlantic. In the waters of the South Atlantic, he often came upon pine tree trunks and wrought wood. This strengthened his belief in the lands to the west.

The king of Portugal rejected his proposals in 1484 and he went to Spain to try his luck there. His arguments took *eight long years* before the Spanish monarchs granted him the ships and the crews for this prophetic journey.

When we say ships, we must qualify that statement; they were hardly more than boats: the Santa Maria about 117 feet long and the Pinta and Nina each about 50 feet long.

Oh yes, we can say that much smaller vessels have crossed the Atlantic and even circumnavigated the globe in recent years. But the thing to remember was that Columbus did it without any knowledge of what lay before him; without maps; with only a dream.

On Aug. 3, 1492, the small fleet sailed from the harbor of Palos, arriving at the Canary Islands on Aug. 12. From there they left on Sept. 6, sailing into the unknown and foreboding western ocean, where none had gone before.

Actually, in a matter of time, the voyage was not very long—a month and six days. But these were 36 days of fear, of rebellion, of privation.

On Oct. 12, 1492, the fleet reached land—an island of the Bahamas which Columbus called San Salvador. He believed these were the Indies off the shore of the continent of Asia. How was he to think otherwise? To this point, no one knew that these vast lands even existed.

During his cruises of the islands, the Santa Maria went aground and was a complete loss. After establishing a colony on Hispaniola, Columbus set sail for a return to Spain in the two tiny caravels.

Three more times, Columbus set sail from the old world to the new, carrying colonists and establishing colonies. But Columbus was a better admiral than he was a politician; he just wasn't in the same league as the members of the Spanish court who poisoned his reputation at home and in the new world.

The Spanish crown broke the agreements made with Columbus. On May 19, 1506, still a relatively young man, he died at Valladolid, Spain, a frustrated man.

Actually, Columbus did not accomplish what he set out to do. He did not find a route to the rich lands of Asia; he did not find the vast quantity of jewels and gold he had set as his aim.

But if Columbus today could see the results of his voyages and explorations, I think he would be satisfied. We—all of us—owe a debt to him which can never be repaid.

#### COMMENDING THE PEACEFUL APPROACH TO VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, the issue of Vietnam now rests with the people. It is only a matter of time before the people who want this war stopped now overcome the belligerency of an administration which states its premeditated reluctance to listen to the crowds in the streets.

Yesterday's moratorium on war produced a sincere and peaceful effort of American citizens to secure redress for their grievances from their Government. I will continue—so long as the war drags on, hanging in limbo—with no specific policy for getting out.

We cannot tolerate any further the lack of specific stated objectives for ending our involvement. It was precisely such a lack of specific and meaningful objectives which produced the tragedy of Vietnam.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues two editorials from WCBS News Radio 88, New York City. I am pleased to point out the evidence that WCBS does incorporate a concern for diverse views within its editorial policy. The first editorial, "Vietnam—VI" is a station editorial. The second is a reply to a previous WCBS editorial. Fredric Carlin, vice president of the Organization for Urban Responsibility wrote the reply.

These comments are worthy of note. Like the participants in the moratorium on war and its purpose, these views deserve attention.

The editorials follow:

VIETNAM—VI

Vice President Spiro Agnew has done it again. This time, one of his utterances concerns 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

WCBS radio recently broadcast an editorial urging that President Nixon fulfill this campaign promise of "new ideas, new men" to end the war in Vietnam. However, the editorial opposed Senator Charles Goodell's bill calling for withdrawal of all American troops from Vietnam by December of 1970 on the grounds that it goes too far. Here now, replying to the editorial, is Fredric Carlin, vice president of the Organization for Urban Responsibility.)

In its latest editorial on the deplorable war in Vietnam, WCBS accurately pointed out that the present South Vietnamese regime "freely countenances wholesale corruption . . ." and "has done little to initiate much-needed reforms to which the United States has pledged its support."

Senator Charles Goodell's thoughtful new approach provides a positive method of ending this quagmire in Southeast Asia. It provides a new direction to the unending war, leading to a specific end by December, 1970. It provides for a change of American priorities so that our actions as a nation can be directed not toward projects for war but to programs for peace and progress here at home.

It is apparent that the South Vietnamese government is more interested in perpetuating its own continuity in office than in making concessions that might end this war and not take this horrible and horrendous war as seriously as does our government. Their interests and American interests are no longer parallel.

As Mayor Lindsay has so accurately pointed out, America's essential interest as we enter the 1970's is the future of our cities. Our obligation is to act—now—to redevelop the inner city, to create new housing, to build new schools, promote new industry, to alleviate poverty, to assure effective health care services and to guarantee protection for our citizens in the subways and in the streets.

We can no longer afford the useless and futile luxury of pouring nine billion dollars

into a meaningless war while programs such as Model Cities are cut for lack of funds and vital efforts such as Head Start are unable to expand.

Senator Goodell has demonstrated, by his courage and by his understanding, that the Congress can initiate action to change America's misdirected and outdated courses of action, and act for our urban priorities now.

#### SYRIA'S CREDENTIALS FOR MEMBERSHIP IN THE U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL

### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I appeal to President Richard M. Nixon with all the sincerity and depth of feeling I can command to use the full effect of the highest position in the world in combating the efforts of the Syrian Arab Republic to be elected as a member of the Security Council. Can any decent human being be other than appalled at the prospect of this bandit-country becoming a member of the Security Council? Were this to happen, the United Nations surely would suffer a greater loss of respect. Recognizing that the U.S. Government is only one among the member nations and has carefully tried to avoid dominating the United Nations, nevertheless, certainly this is an issue which calls for the use of our full influence.

Documentation of the case against Syria appears in the following policy background released by the Embassy of Israel in Washington, D.C., on October 13, 1969:

#### SYRIA'S CREDENTIALS FOR MEMBERSHIP IN THE U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL

1. Article 23 of the United Nations Charter specifies:

"The General Assembly shall elect six Members of the United Nations to be non-permanent members of the Security Council, due regard being specially paid, in the first instance, to the contribution of Members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the Organization."

On October 20, 1969, the Syrian Arab Republic will present itself for election as a member of the Security Council to take up the seat vacated by Pakistan. It is an amazing prospect.

2. For the sake of the UN's own integrity and credibility, there will be members of the General Assembly who will want to look into the credentials of the Syrian Arab Republic before casting their votes, as the Charter specifies. The accident of geographic location is of itself not sufficient qualification for membership in the body charged by the Charter with "primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security."

Assuming the UN Charter is the guide and the General Assembly no mere international rubber stamp, the credential check will bar the Syrian Arab Republic from election to the Security Council. For what are the credentials which the Syrian Arab Republic offers in respect of international peace and the other purposes for which the United Nations stands?

The Syrian Arab Republic defied the United Nations in 1948 by launching an unprovoked war of aggression against a neighboring State. The Israeli villages captured were razed to the ground and when the Syrian

army withdrew in 1949 it left behind a wasteland of destruction.

The Syrian Arab Republic has declared ever since that it will persist in waging war against Israel despite the Charter of the United Nations and despite its own international obligations.

The Syrian Arab Republic renounced its armistice agreement with Israel and repeatedly exploited the strategic Golan Heights to shell and launch terror raids against vulnerable farm villages in Israel's northern lowlands.

The Syrian Arab Republic was the first to organize terror bands against Israel. El Fatah was originally organized in Syria as an arm of the Syrian army's Deuxieme Bureau. Israel brought complaints to the Security Council on Syria's role in initiating warfare by terror as far back as 1965 and 1966. Syria has since been implicated in organizing terror warfare against Ethiopia.

The Syrian Arab Republic has rejected the UN Security Council Resolution of November 22, 1967 and has refused even to receive the Special Representative of the UN Secretary General.

The Syrian Arab Republic has throughout conducted a campaign of persecution against its Jewish community, subjecting the Jews to arbitrary imprisonment, loss of civil rights, confiscation of property and curfew. To compound the felony, Jews are not permitted to leave Syria.

Christians in Syria, too, have been the victims of discriminatory measures, their schools closed and their freedom of worship inhibited.

The Syrian Arab Republic sent raiders to kidnap Israeli farmers and fishermen from Israeli territory, incarcerating them in the prisons of Damascus and Palmyra where they were subjected to the most inhuman physical and mental torture. For years, while they were lingering in these jails, the Damascus authorities denied even that they were being held in Syria. No appeals, no interventions from the United Nations, from the International Red Cross, from the Vatican, from third Governments helped. When, after more than twelve years, Syria finally admitted to holding these persons and agreed to return them, those who came back to Israel alive were wrecks of human beings, all but one of whom had to be confined in mental hospitals.

And, most recently, and most notoriously: The Syrian Arab Republic has, for more than a month, held in detention two Israeli civilians hijacked by Arab terrorists to Damascus in an American civil aircraft on an international flight. The continued forcible detention of these innocent civilians, who were brought to Syria by violence, is an act of piracy for which the Syrian Arab Republic is accountable before international law. All the efforts of the civil airline authorities, of the U.S. Government, and of other Governments and international agencies to secure their release have met, thus far, with failure.

3. These are the credentials which the Syrian Arab Republic brings before the members of the UN General Assembly. If they are ignored and Syria is indeed elected to the Security Council, it will serve only to broaden the gap between the UN Charter principles and the UN as an instrument of international justice and peace.

#### THE METS

### HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker—We've seen the mighty rise and fall The Yankees, Dodgers came and went But who could have imagined all

The glory coming to the Mets!  
The Series' heroes beat the odds  
We say, do wonders never cease?  
To their shining standard, nod.  
If they can do it, so can "Peace."

#### A QUESTION FOR THE LIBERALS ON THE VIETNAM MORATORIUM AND FORTHCOMING PROTESTS

### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have been approached many times in the past few weeks by people who ask whether I am for the organized Vietnam protests. My answer is a flat "no." This leads immediately to, "Why not? Don't you want peace?"

This is the compelling question thrust at some of us who do not support these protests by the Vietnam moratorium and the New Mobilization Committees. This is the question that is supposed to separate the peace lovers from the warmongers. Sadly, this is the way many people—usually left of center—view the war and its ancillary protests and demonstrations. If you want peace you must be for the demonstrations and if you are against the demonstrations you must be a warmonger. Of course, the logic is absurd but that does not make it any less common.

If the good, honorable, and sincere people who oppose the war were not so naive they would not tie up with the worst revolutionary elements in the country. This is one thing I have never been able to understand about the American left. Why did not the good liberals say, "You nuts go ahead and have your demonstrations on October 15 and November 15. Thanks, but we will have our protest on November 1 or some other time."

The truth of the matter is that the organizers of the October 15 moratorium and forthcoming protests represent a galaxy of who is who in radical life today. The draft evaders, draft card burners, flag burners, rioters, Communists, and anarchists with all their obscenity and hate-filled propaganda get the ball rolling and good, sincere American liberals follow behind their banner. That banner, for the most part, is down-the-line anti-Americanism and propaganda.

The organization leading the protests is called New Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam—New Mobe or NMC, for short. Over the last few years several of these groups have operated in the anti-Vietnam effort. As soon as one group was demonstrated to be heavily Communist dominated and Communist influenced, it would be dissolved and another would appear in its place. For example, NMC springs from the National Mobilization Committee which succeeded the Spring Mobilization Committee, which committee was found to be dominated by Communists of various factions by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Of 48 initial leaders of NMC's steering committee, at least 30 of them were leaders, sponsors, or offi-

cials of the National Mobilization. Fully three-fourths of the 48 were either connected with a previous radically oriented committee, known Communists, or extreme leftist radicals. This list of 48 includes some new names, but it also includes a number of identified Communists of long standing such as Arnold Johnson, Irving Sarnoff, and the Trotskyite Fred Halstead. I think you can see from this why I find it difficult to understand how sincere liberals can support this type of organization. If they want to protest, I suggest they set up their own organization free of these influences.

The thing that impressed me the most about our marathon session on October 14 which was set up by Congressmen who oppose the war, was that they had little in common with those who had organized the October 15 moratorium. As pointed out in the House debate on October 14, a leader of the moratorium stated that the objective of the moratorium was to support complete, immediate, and unilateral withdrawal of our troops from Vietnam. He further stated that "we want out now, and this is not contingent on anything that Hanoi or the Vietcong might do." Presumably, this means that if thousands of Communist troops streamed down through the DMZ tomorrow and into South Vietnam, this would not stop us from withdrawing our troops completely and immediately. I am sure not too many Members of the House would support this policy.

I reject the idea of guilt by association but a person ought to use some common-sense to keep from being used by groups which are the antithesis of his own beliefs and standards. Herein we see a strange double standard, too. It is all right for the liberals to get on platforms and programs with the anarchists, Communists, or leftist extremists but think of what would be said if those on the American right were to do the same thing.

If I supported a rally of the Ku Klux Klan, or endorsed the efforts of the American Nazi Party, would you not be appalled, and would you not throw the verbal book at me, and endorse candidates to run against me, and try to throw me out of office? Of course, and you would be right in doing so. These are totalitarian, terrorist groups some would place on the very far right and they have no place in our future. Do extremists on the left deserve different? Of course not, but those who support these October 15 protests are readily willing to associate with, support, condone, encourage, finance, laud, and lend near allegiance to the totalitarian counterparts of the left. Like it or not, the Communist Party, the Socialist Workers Party, the Young Socialist Alliance, the SDS, and others are doing a great deal of the leading and organizing, yet many Americans blissfully join in. What is worse, they feel justified in criticizing others who do not follow along.

How any American can join with protestors who carry the Vietcong flag is beyond my understanding. You will recall these same anti-Vietnam people burned an American flag in New York City at their April 1967 protest. Their Pentagon protest in October 1967 brought a mire of filth.

Valid protest can bring about valid changes of American policy and I would under no circumstances attempt to curtail these efforts. But any protest must be responsible. Protestors must realize the ends which they are trying to produce cannot be achieved by improper means. As staged, the protestors call for immediate withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam. Both moratorium and new mobilization committees have flatly stated this as their immediate objective. But this means death for tens of thousands of South Vietnamese people, not life and freedom; it means the destruction of their culture, their so recently taken steps toward sound government; their varied religions; the growing industrial, agricultural, and educational achievements; it means that another 15 million people will be ground into slavery by the tanks and tortures of communism.

This administration has moved as far in the direction of peace as anyone can realistically expect until some response is received from the enemy. So, to the protestors I suggest they protest, long and loud, but I think they should redirect their voices and, to use the popular phrase, "Tell it to Hanoi."

Like it or not, those who joined in the October 15 moratorium have supported one of the initial actions of the fall offensive. The following information might be of use to them in deciding whether they wish to continue.

#### THE FALL OFFENSIVE

The September 27 issue of the *Guardian*, a Communist newspaper, carried this invitation: "Join the Fall Offensive Against the War."

The Student Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam—SMC—controlled by the Trotskyite Communists, has as a heading for one of its recent pamphlets: "Join the Fall Antiwar Offensive."

The New Mobilizer, the publication of the radical New Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam—NMC—in its September 25 issue states: "Fall Offensive Skyrockets."

A letter of September 29, 1969, addressed to antiwar GI newspaper editors by the Vietnam Moratorium Committee—VMC—the sponsor of the October 15 Vietnam moratorium demonstrations, begins by saying:

By now you are probably aware of the Vietnam Moratorium Committee and its part in the "Fall Offensive" against the war in Vietnam. . . .

What is the fall offensive?

It is a series of demonstrations, mostly in October and November, in which the above-mentioned organizations, SMC, NMC, and VMC—and also SDS—conduct various forms of protest against the war in Vietnam. Despite pious references to "peace," the main objective of the drive is to pull all American troops out of Vietnam now, regardless of the degree of preparedness of South Vietnam to defend itself from a Communist takeover and its people from further Communist atrocities. The schedule of demonstrations, including two actions by Students for a Democratic Society—SDS—were listed in the New Mobilizer as follows:

#### FALL CALENDAR OF NATIONAL ACTIONS

Sept. 24: *Conspiracy Trial* opens in Chicago. Mass rally at Federal Building, endorsed by NMC.

Oct. 8-11: *SDS Actions* in Chicago: "Bring the War Home."

Oct. 15: Vietnam Moratorium: effort to "stop business as usual" for one day & engage in community ed. against the war. Moratorium will be extended to 2 days in Nov. if war is not ended.

Oct. 25: *New Mobilization* actions in Chicago, relating to "Conspiracy" trials and the war. Guerilla theater march down State St., tribunal on war & repression and rock concert are planned.

Nov. 8-15: *Week of local activities* around war & U.S. imperialism relating to several constituencies and political styles. Plans: Joe Hill caucus, SDS.

Nov. 13-14: Possible dates for November Moratorium.

Nov. 13: *Washington Action* (sponsored by NMC). March Against Death: A Vietnam Memorial begins at Arlington Cemetery, Wash., D.C. at midnight. Single file procession from cemetery past White House to Capitol, with candles. Names of U.S. war dead & Viet towns & villages destroyed will be called out as line passes White House; names put in casket at Capitol.

Nov. 14: *Student Strike*, called by Student Mobe, endorsed by NMC.

Nov. 15: *Washington Action* (sponsored by NMC):

9 a.m. March on Washington. Assembly begins at The Mall (between 3d & 6th sts. NW).

10 a.m. March Against Death. Concludes with a brief memorial at Mall.

11 a.m. Mass March to White House begins. Special contingent of GIs and Death Marchers will lead march and a delegation will present political demands & caskets with war dead names at White House.

2 p.m. Rally at Ellipse. Speakers & rock concert.

8 p.m. Meetings by various groups to discuss strategy for next few days.

Nov. 15: *San Francisco Action* (sponsored by NMC). Mass March and Rally.

Nov. 16: *National Workshop on the Draft*. Sessions on draft resistance, counseling, possible repeal of draft laws and discussion of ways of working with GIs.

The riotous, violence-packed "Bring the War Home" SDS "demonstrations" in Chicago last week, the October 8 through 11 phase of the offensive, could be a foretaste of other things to come before the fall offensive is over.

In view of the inadequate coverage given by the press to the nature of the NMC, SMC, and VMC it would be helpful to provide some background information for future reference.

#### NEW MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE TO END THE WAR IN VIETNAM

The July 18, 1969, issue of the *Militant*, the Trotskyite Communist newspaper, reported on a meeting of "antiwar activists" in Cleveland on July 4 and 5 of this year as follows:

A broadly representative gathering of antiwar activists meeting here July 4-5 initiated plans for a massive fall offensive against the Vietnam war culminating with a giant Washington demonstration Nov. 15 for the immediate withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Vietnam.

As a result of the conference the New Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam was formed to succeed the National Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam. The September 5 issue of *New Mobilizer*, the publication of NMC, stated:

To carry forward the work of the old National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam in a time when the forces against the war now constitute a clear political majority, a new anti-war coalition was formed to effect the inclusion of a wider social base among GIs, high school students, labor, clergy and third world communities. The new anti-war coalition is aptly called the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam.

What was the "old National Mobilization Committee?"

This was the group that played the key role in organizing the violent confrontations and disruptions during the 1968 Democratic National Convention, and whose leaders are now on trial in Chicago for conspiring to incite the Chicago riots. It also staged the violent Pentagon "confrontation" of October 1967.

Earlier, under a different name, the "Spring Mobilization Committee," this organization had staged Vietnam Week, April 1967.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in an official House report, found that Communists were playing "dominant" roles in the Spring Mobilization Committee. Not long after HCUA issued its report, "Spring" Mobilization changed its name to "National" Mobilization, but even the Daily Worker pointed out that it was the same old committee with no more than a change in the first word of its name.

Basically, the New Mobilization Committee which is playing a major role in the fall offensive is the same old National Mobilization Committee. Following are some of the NMC steering committee members who were also active in the National Mobe:

Arnold Johnson, the public relations director of the Communist Party; Irving Sarnoff, identified as a member of the CP who took the fifth amendment when asked if he was a member; Sylvia Kushner, who has long participated in leftist causes, is the wife of Sam Kushner, a member of the CP; Otto Nathan, charged by the State Department with having been a Communist in Germany in the 1930's and who refused to tell HCUA in June 1956 if he had ever been a Communist; Rennie Davis and Dave Dellinger, both now on trial in Chicago for the Democratic Convention disruptions; Sidney Lens, who made two trips to Cuba and conferred with Fidel Castro and "Che" Guevara and who allowed his name to be used, and spoke at meetings of, the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, which committee, according to testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1961, had from its inception been subsidized by the Cuban Government.

A quick check of the 48 persons listed as members of the steering committee of New Mobe reveals that at least 30 were officials, sponsors, or organizers of National Mobe. The 30 are:

Stewart Meacham, served as National Mobe sponsor.

Katherine Camp, National Mobe sponsor.

Richard Fernandes, National Mobe sponsor.

Barbara Bick, sponsor.

Norma Becker, sponsor.

John McAuliff, sponsor.

Dave Dellinger, sponsor and National Mobe's national chairman, and a self-described Communist.

Rennie Davis, sponsor and spokesman for National Mobe, and advocate of the cause of North Vietnam.

Sidney Lens, sponsor.

Sidney Peck, sponsor.

John Wilson, sponsor and official of SNCC.

Robert Greenblatt, sponsor and former national coordinator of National Mobe.

Arnold Johnson, organizer of National Mobe, admitted Communist and party's legislative representative.

Fred Halstead, organizer of National Mobe, admitted Communist and SWP candidate for Vice President.

Irving Beinin, organizer of National Mobe, and writer for the Guardian.

Irwin Bock, organizer.

Donald Kalish, organizer.

Sylvia Kushner, organizer.

Max Primack, National Mobe organizer.

Larry Seigle, organizer of National Mobe and national chairman of YSA.

Abe Bloom, organizer.

Ron Young, organizer.

Arthur Waskow, organizer.

Allan Brick, organizer.

Jerry Gordon, Cleveland affiliate of National Mobe.

Cora Weiss, organizer of National Mobe.

Carol Lipman, organizer of National Mobe and member of YSA.

Allan Myers, organizer.

Al Evanoff, organizer.

Brad Lyttle, organizer.

Some 70 percent of those persons listed on the steering committee are either old hands from the National Mobilization Committee or identified Communists and far leftists. There is no coincidence here, but there is planning. Thirty of the 48 persons can be directly traced to National Mobe where they served in various capacities including positions as national chairman, national coordinator, and major spokesman.

In addition, New Mobe has among its leaders: Harry Ring and Gus Horowitz, both long-time members of the Socialist Worker's Party; Joe Miles, a member of Young Socialist Alliance, and Bob Green, long-time associate of many SWP front groups.

At this point I believe we should think back to the Democratic Convention riots which I noted a few minutes ago. It was here that the leaders stated that any violence would be "initiated by the police," the "police would be responsible." The demonstrators were attempting to set the police up as the scapegoats and to make the world believe that the demonstrators were all for peace. In the same manner, protesters now are decrying violence, yet, can we expect the same thing?

It should be remembered that the "peaceful" demonstrators organized by National Mobe to go to Chicago went there with football and motorcycle helmets, metal crotch protectors, and wearing heavy hiking and work shoes. Some of them carried knives. They hurled practice golf balls with 3-inch nails projecting out of them at police.

What happened in Chicago was primarily the responsibility of the National Mobilization Committee. With the same

people, by and large, now at work for New Mobe we can only wonder whether the outcome of "New" Mobe demonstrations will be the same.

#### THE STUDENT MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE

The Student Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam—SMC—is, by self-description "the national organization of all high school and college students who are united in uncompromising struggle against the war in Vietnam." In addition to supporting the Vietnam Moratorium Committee's October 15 function, SMC is sponsoring a national student strike against the war on November 14.

The origin of SMC dates back to a 1966 conference to call a national student strike against the war in that year. The strike and conference were proposed by Bettina Aptheker, a member of the national committee of the Communist Party and daughter of Herbert Aptheker, a longtime CP functionary. SMC was Communist dominated from its inception. There were Communists from both the CP and Socialist Workers Party—SWP—a Trotskyite Communist organization, in SMC until June 1968. Trotskyites are now in control and have declared their intention to keep it a single-issue organization—demonstrating and agitating solely against the war in Vietnam. The SWP, cited by the Attorney General as a subversive organization, has as its youth organization the Young Socialist Alliance—YSA.

Two individuals who are serving on both NMC and SMC are Carol Lipman and Allan Myers. Both are members of the YSA, with Carol Lipman, a member of the staff of the Young Socialist, the national magazine of YSA, and in addition the executive secretary of SMC. Allan Myers is the editor of the GI Press Service, a service which recently published a listing of GI antiwar newspapers and their locations at the various military bases.

An article from the Washington Post of September 30 reported that on the previous day SMC announced a "No Peace for Nixon Campaign." According to a national organizer of SMC, Don Gurewitz, SMC plans student demonstrations across the country at every public appearance of the President. Let us take a look at some of SMC's demonstrations in the past, as told by Director J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI in his Appropriations testimony earlier this year:

The Student Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam, which is controlled by members of the Young Socialist Alliance, the youth group of the Socialist Workers Party, sponsored anti-Vietnam war demonstrations in various cities throughout the United States from April 4 to 6, 1969. Many antiwar protest groups participated in the demonstrations which had two main themes—namely, to bring servicemen home from Vietnam and to achieve free speech for servicemen advocating antiwar sentiments. The principal demonstrations were conducted at New York City; Chicago, Ill.; and San Francisco, Calif. At New York City, 30,000 individuals participated in a march and rally. Among the demonstrators were members of the Communist Party, the Socialist Workers Party and its youth group, and Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). At Chicago, approximately 10,000 individuals participated in a march and rally.

One of the principal speakers at the rally was an official of the Black Panther Party. At San Francisco an estimated 10,000 demonstrators marched through San Francisco to the Presidio, a military base. Several arrests were made by the San Francisco Police Department and several military policemen were injured when the marchers attempted to force their way into the Presidio.

#### VIETNAM MORATORIUM COMMITTEE

As is well known by now, the prime movers of the VMC, which is sponsoring the October 15 moratorium as part of the fall offensive, are Sam Brown and David Hawk. The purpose of the VMC's demonstration is to bring a halt to "business as usual" on that day on the Nation's campuses, in businesses, and factories. If successful, the moratorium would be extended to 2 days in November, 3 in December, 4 in January, and so forth, and it would end only when all U.S. troops are withdrawn immediately and unilaterally from Vietnam. Peaceful and non-violent means are stressed by the VMC.

The October 11 issue of Human Events, the Washington news weekly, reported on a visit of one of its reporters to the VMC office:

While the VMC is not Communist-controlled, it nevertheless is working hand-in-glove with "New Mobe" whose steering committee is rife with Communists and pro-Communists. The VMC, for instance, is using the suite of rooms just below the suite being used by "New Mobe" and the traffic between the two floors is extensive. Members of both VMC and the "New Mobe" acknowledge close cooperation and the ironically named David Hawk, a leader in the VMC, appears on the steering committee of "New Mobe."

These observations are borne out by the October 13 issue of the National Observer which quoted Sam Brown on VMC's relationship with NMC or "New Mobe":

The New Committee's (NMC or "New Mobe") headquarters is just one floor above the moratorium committee's here. Mr. Brown says his group has "very friendly, co-operative relationships" with it and that "I expect we'll be able to support" the Nov. 15 march.

The VMC is also cooperating with SMC, if the Militant of July 18, the publication of the Socialist Workers Party, is stating the case factually:

SMC will also help build the nationwide moratorium against the war, planned by the Vietnam Moratorium Committee for October 15; the leaders of SMC and the Moratorium Committee agreed to cooperate in getting the participation of hundreds of thousands of students."

A member of the staff of U.S. News & World Report in its October 13 issue also appraised the relationships among the three anti-Vietnam groups. He quotes a Government official as saying he has "no reason to believe this whole movement is Communist activated, although it is obviously an enormous boost to their side in Vietnam." He further observed: "The three committees in charge of these plans are separate organizations, with separate leaders, but some 'interlocking directorships.'"

Those who have endorsed the October 15 demonstrations might also do well to consider this statement by Sam Brown as quoted by Theodore White on page 87 of his book, "The Making of the President—1968":

Think of what we've grown up with. We've recognized the true nature of the United States. We saw the United States attack Cuba, it attacked the Dominican Republic, it attacked South Vietnam. The Communists are now a fragmented force; the United States is now the great imperialist-aggressor nation of the world. (Emphasis added.)

This charge might require some tall explaining on the part of some churches, businesses, schools, and individuals who endorsed the October 15 demonstrations in the face of Ho Chi Minh's butchery of South Vietnamese civilians over the years or the Soviet Union's 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia.

In addition, the supporters of the October 15 affair could well be hard pressed to explain to their constituents, congregations, and clients who believe in supporting our Government by the purchase of savings bonds their position on a VMC directive to GI newspaper editors: "Cancel those — savings bonds."

Sam Brown, along with Marge Sklenkar of the VMC Washington office, participated in Vietnam summer, a 1967 radical-left, anti-Vietnam protest project which attracted extremists from various segments of the left movement. Some of the prime movers in this project were Mike Ansara of the SDS at Harvard; Lee Webb, a former national secretary of SDS; and Richard Fernandez, a member of the steering committee of NMC. Fernandez was a sponsor of spring mobilization committee and treasurer of November 8 mobilization committee, "spring's" predecessor.

David Hawk played a key role, according to the press, in obtaining signatures to a pledge made public earlier this year in which almost 200 college leaders—editors of campus newspapers and heads of student bodies—said they would refuse to be drafted to fight in Vietnam. He has, in other words, organized what some people would consider the cream of our campus youth to defy the laws of the United States. Living up to the pledge he signed, he himself has refused to be drafted and is awaiting trial in Scranton, Pa., for refusing induction into the Army.

The VMC makes no bones about the fact—and actually publicizes—that Hawk was a SNCC worker in 1964 and 1966 in the South at the very time Stokely Carmichael and other members of the group were fomenting riots and were generally engaged in highly inflammatory racial agitation.

In fairness to the VMC leaders it should be pointed out that they have said they reject SDS tactics and want no part of any SDS violence which may occur.

It is important to note, however, that David Hawk is on the steering committee of NMC, which under its former name was the prime organizer of the 1968 Chicago convention violence. This group—under President Johnson as well as recently—has probably done more to undercut U.S. policy in Vietnam than any other organization in the Nation.

#### THE PARTY LINE

On September 10, 1965, the national organizing department of the Communist Party of the United States sent a communication "to all districts" suggesting slogans to "strengthen the campaign to

end the war in Vietnam." The first four of nine suggested slogans were:

1. End the War in Vietnam!
2. Stop U.S. Aggression Against Vietnam!
3. Bring Our Boys Home!
4. Withdraw All U.S. Troops!

Over 4 years later, the party line is still the same, but how the orchestration has crescendoed for a unilateral and immediate withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam. The VMC, according to a news release of October 8, expects to enjoy its greatest initial success on the campuses, with growing support coming from among the clergy, professional people, businessmen, Government employees, Members of Congress and the public at large.

#### THE FALL OFFENSIVE AND SOME COMMUNIST REACTIONS

Reactions from Communist quarters are understandably favorable. The Chicago Tribune of October 10 carried an article from Paris with headlines stating: "Reds Applaud U.S. War Foes; Blast Nixon." The news item explained that the National Liberation Front's "foreign minister" said in Paris that "the Vietnamese people warmly acclaim this movement" and that the movement "tightens the solidarity between the Vietnamese people and the progressive people in the United States."

The Communists are taking full advantage of propaganda value in the protests and the Communist press-in-residence in the United States, the Daily World, noted on October 9 in an editorial:

Popular support for the October 15 Moratorium against the war in Vietnam is mushrooming, with the turnout on that day expected to exceed anything so far produced by the U.S. peace movement.

This newspaper urges an all-out turnout.

No less enthusiastic in their support were broadcasters from Hanoi who beamed a message to various parts of the world. It included these remarks addressed specifically to NMC and the Communist newspaper, the Guardian:

We [North Vietnam's leaders] are very elated to learn that you will launch a big fall campaign against the Nixon Administration's war policy, urging it to put an end to the war in Vietnam and to bring all U.S. troops home immediately.

We warmly welcome your initiative and highly appreciate your great efforts to coordinate actions in the campaign.

We wish you great success in the fall campaign . . . We would like to convey to you our sincere thanks and best regards.

#### THE "UNITED FRONT" OPERATION

What we see in the fall offensive is a near perfect example of a Communist united front operation. The Student Mobilization Committee, although Trotskyite-Communist controlled, has other types of Communists in it and, also, of course, many non-Communist radicals, leftists, pacifists, and idealists.

The New Mobilization Committee is itself a united front or umbrella-type operation. Working together in it are Moscow-type Communists, Trotskyite Communists, Castro Communists and others, and also a broad assortment of fellow travelers, leftists, radical pacifists, and some gullible idealists.

SDS, as is well known, is infiltrated by both CPers and members of the Peking-oriented Communist organization, the Progressive Labor Party, although the bulk of its membership is apparently made up of more or less native radical youths.

The Vietnam Moratorium Committee has the support of all of these groups—and of the CP itself—in its program for protest. In turn, it has won the cooperation of numerous non-Communists and even anti-Communists who would not normally aid any SDS, SMC, or NMC project. But this is the method of the "united front." Through their united front tactic the Communists are working for one of their major goals and—by one means or another—they are winning the cooperation of some people and organizations from the left, the right, and the center.

VMC is not Communist. I am not implying that it is, but its skirts are not clean on the question of cooperating with Communists. David Hawk, we should remember, is on the NMC steering committee. Also, VMC proclaims in its literature that it has the endorsement of the New Mobilization Committee as well as the acknowledged endorsement of such Communist-infiltrated groups as Women's Strike for Peace. Although its leaders say they have no tie with the Student Mobilization Committee, as long ago as last July a spokesman for SMC in announcing the fall offensive, included VMC's moratorium as a part of it.

To the best of my knowledge, the leaders of the Vietnam moratorium have at no time made a clear-cut statement excluding themselves from the SDS-SMC-NMC cooperative operation. At no time have they said that they do not want these groups to support or participate in the moratorium.

Thus, we have the "united front" operation. VMC leaders, I believe, must certainly be aware of the nature of SDS, NMC, and SMC. They are not ignorant. They are not being duped, yet they are willingly cooperating with these groups.

Let us stop and think again for a minute of the announced goal of the people behind the moratorium. In an October 8 release the Vietnam Moratorium Committee stated that its goal is an "immediate and final end to American involvement in the Vietnam war."

What does this mean?

Let us forget for a moment about Communist strategy and tactics here in this country, about the pros and cons of various elements of our Vietnam policy, and think about people, about human beings—millions of them. Let us think for a while, as all good Americans should, about fellow humans. Let us think realistically, as the VMC people say we should, about killing, injury, death, agony, and blood. We know South Vietnam is not now able to defend itself from the combined power of the VC and North Vietnam, supported by the colossi of communism, the U.S.S.R. and Red China. What will happen if we do what the VMC wants us to do; that is, pull out of Vietnam?

The late Dr. Tom Dooley, who we would all agree was one of the greatest humanitarians of our era, has given us an idea of what will happen in his book,

"Deliver Us From Evil," in which he recounted his experiences as a naval medical officer at Haiphong, then a staging area for those refugees who chose to leave North Vietnam as guaranteed by the Geneva agreement of 1954. One example cited by Dr. Dooley will suffice:

Now two Viet Minh guards went to each child and one of them firmly grasped the head between his hands. The other then rammed a wooden chopped chopstick into each ear. He jammed it in with all his force. The stick split the ear canal wide and tore the ear drum. The shrieking of the children was heard all over the village.

So appalling were Tom Dooley's experiences at Haiphong among victims of Communist terror that he felt compelled to devote one full chapter to the brutality inflicted on these innocent people. Dr. Dooley stated:

The purpose of this book is not to sicken anyone or to dwell upon the horror of oriental tortures. But I do want to show what has come upon these people of the delta. And justice demands that some of the atrocities we learned of in Haiphong be put on record.

Dr. Dooley was not the only one who has pointed up what will happen if unprotected people are left to the mercy of the Vietcong or the North Vietnamese Communists. The November 1968 issue of the Reader's Digest featured an article, "The Blood-Red Hands of Ho Chi Minh," by John G. Hubbell, which provides further evidence of what an immediate U.S. pullout would mean to many thousands of women and children, as well as men, in Vietnam. Author Hubbell describes the unbelievable brutality of Dak Son where mostly women and children were killed with flamethrowers by the Vietcong. Another case of Communist genocide was that of Hue in which 1,000 civilians were slaughtered by the Communists.

A later article on the same Hue massacre placed the number of dead at 2,200, exhumed from 25 different locations; 800 persons are still unaccounted for. The later account of the massacre by James Cary in the June 19, 1969, issue of the Copley News Service, gives a chilling idea of what would happen if an immediate U.S. withdrawal left the Vietnamese people without adequate protection:

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

It is not unreasonable to ask at this point whether the exponents of immediate withdrawal would be willing to assume some degree of responsibility if repetitions of the Hue massacre followed an immediate pullout.

Lt. Gen. Lewis W. Walt of the U.S. Marine Corps who commanded I Corps area of South Vietnam in 1966 and 1967 commented on the above-mentioned article by John Hubbell of the Reader's Digest. Stated General Walt:

This article accurately depicts the true nature of the enemy in South Vietnam. I saw the little boy with his hands cut off. I have

seen heads impaled on stakes, and disemboweled bodies.

I learned early in my two years of duty in South Vietnam, fighting and working alongside the South Vietnamese forces, that the communist terrorism described in this article is no mere accident of war but a program of systematic butchery. This deliberate and brutal assault against the grassroots citizenry is one reason why we who have responded to South Vietnam's call for assistance believe devoutly that our efforts to save this nation are worthwhile, necessary and important.

After reading this article, I for one could not see how any Member of this House, of the Congress, or any American citizen worthy of the name, could knowingly and consciously support a complete and immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Vietnam. I insert the article, "The Blood-Red Hands of Ho Chi Minh," by John G. Hubbell, at this point in the RECORD:

#### THE BLOOD-RED HANDS OF HO CHI MINH

(By John G. Hubbell)

The village chief and his wife were distraught. One of their children, a seven-year-old boy, had been missing for four days. They were terrified, they explained to Marine Lt. Gen. Lewis W. Walt, because they believed he had been captured by the Vietcong.

Suddenly, the boy came out of the jungle and ran across the rice paddies toward the village. He was crying. His mother ran to him and swept him up in her arms. Both of his hands had been cut off, and there was a sign around his neck, a message to his father: if he or anyone else in the village dared go to the polls during the upcoming elections, something worse would happen to the rest of his children.

The V.C. delivered a similar warning to the residents of a hamlet not far from Danang. All were herded before the home of their chief. While they and the chief's pregnant wife and four children were forced to look on, the chief's tongue was cut out. Then his genital organs were sliced off and sewn inside his bloody mouth. As he died, the V.C. went to work on his wife, slashing open her womb. Then, the nine-year-old son: a bamboo lance was rammed through one ear and out the other. Two more of the chief's children were murdered the same way. The V.C. did not harm the five-year-old daughter—not physically: they simply left her crying, holding her dead mother's hand.

General Walt tells of his arrival at a district headquarters the day after it had been overrun by V.C. and North Vietnamese army troops. Those South Vietnamese soldiers not killed in the battle had been tied up and shot through their mouths or the backs of their heads. Then their wives and children, including a number of two- and three-year-olds, had been brought into the street, disrobed, tortured and finally executed; their throats were cut; they were shot, beheaded, disemboweled. The mutilated bodies were draped on fences and hung with signs telling the rest of the community that if they continued to support the Saigon government and allied forces, they could look forward to the same fate.

These atrocities are not isolated cases; they are typical. For this is the enemy's way of warfare, clearly expressed in his combat policy in Vietnam. While the naïve and anti-American throughout the world, cued by communist propaganda, have trumpeted against American "immorality" in the Vietnam war—airial bombing, the use of napalm, the inevitable (but relatively few) civilian casualties caused by American combat action—daily and nightly for years, the communists have systematically authored history's grisliest catalogue of barbarism. By the end of 1967, they had committed at least

100,000 acts of terror against the South Vietnamese people. The record is an endless litany of tortures, mutilations and murders that would have been instructive even to such as Adolf Hitler.

Perhaps because until recently the terrorism has been waged mainly in remote places, this aspect of the war has received scant attention from the press. Hence the enemy has largely succeeded in casting himself in the role of noble revolutionary. It is long past time for Americans, who are sick and tired of being vilified for trying to help South Vietnam stay free, to take a hard look at the nature of this enemy.

#### BLOOD-BATH DISCIPLINE

The terror had its real beginning when Red dictator Ho Chi Minh consolidated his power in the North. More than a year before his 1954 victory over the French, he launched a savage campaign against his own people. In virtually every North Vietnamese village, strong-arm squads assembled the populace to witness the "confessions" of landowners. As time went on, businessmen, intellectuals, schoolteachers, civic leaders—all who represented a potential source of future opposition—were also rounded up and forced to "confess" to "errors of thought." There followed public "trials," conviction and, in many cases, execution. People were shot, beheaded, beaten to death; some were tied up, thrown into open graves and covered with stones until they were crushed to death.

Ho has renewed his terror in North Vietnam periodically. Between 50,000 and 100,000 are believed to have died in these blood-baths—in a coldly calculated effort to discipline the party and the masses. To be sure, few who escape Ho's terror now seem likely to tempt his wrath. During the 1950s, however, he had to quell some sizable uprisings in North Vietnam—most notably one that occurred in early November 1956, in Nghe An province, which included Ho's birthplace village of Nam Dan. So heavily had he taxed the region that the inhabitants finally banded together and refused to meet his price. Ho sent troops to collect, and then sent in an army division, shooting. About 6000 unarmed villagers were killed. The survivors scattered, some escaping to the South. The slaughter went largely unnoticed by a world then preoccupied with the Soviet Union's rape of Hungary.

With North Vietnam tightly in hand, the central committee of the North Vietnamese communist party met in Hanoi on March 13, 1959, and decided it was time to move against South Vietnam. Soon, large numbers of Ho's guerrillas were infiltrating to join cadres that had remained there after the French defeat in 1954. Their mission: to eliminate South Vietnam's leadership, including elected officials, "natural" leaders, anyone and everyone to whom people might turn for advice. Also to be liquidated were any South Vietnamese who had relatives in their country's armed forces, civil services or police; any who failed to pay communist taxes promptly; any with five or more years of education.

A captured V.C. guerrilla explained how his eight-man team moved against a particular target village: "The first time we entered the village, we arrested and executed on the spot four men who had been pointed out to us by the party's district headquarters as our most dangerous opponents. One, who had fought in the war against the French, was now a known supporter of the South Vietnamese government. Another had been seen fraternizing with government troops. These two were shot. The others, the village's principal landowners, were beheaded."

General Walt tells of the "revolutionary purity" of Vietcong who came home to two other villages. In one case, a 15-year-old girl who had given Walt's Marines information on V.C. activities was taken into the jungle and tortured for hours, then beheaded. As a warning to other villagers, her head was

placed on a pole in front of her home. Her murderers were *her brother* and two of his V.C. comrades. In the other case, when a V.C. learned that his wife and two young children had cooperated with Marines who had befriended them, he himself cut out their tongues.

Genocide. In such fashion did the storm of terror break over South Vietnam. In 1960, some 1500 South Vietnamese civilians were killed and 700 abducted. By early 1965, the communists' Radio Hanoi and Radio Liberation were able to boast that the V.C. had destroyed 7559 South Vietnamese hamlets. By the end of last year, 15,138 South Vietnamese civilians had been killed, 45,929 kidnapped. Few of the kidnapped are ever seen again.

Ho's assault on South Vietnam's leadership class has, in fact, been a form of genocide—and all too efficient. Thus, if South Vietnam survives in freedom, it will take the country a generation to fully replace this vital element of its society. But the grand design of terror involves other objectives, too. It hopes to force the attacked government into excessively repressive anti-terrorist actions, which tend to earn the government the contempt and hatred of the people. It also seeks valuable propaganda in the form of well-publicized counter-atrocities certain to occur at the individual level—for South Vietnamese soldiers whose families have suffered at communists' hands are not likely to deal gently with captured V.C. and North Vietnamese troops.

Dr. A. W. Wylie, an Australian physician serving in a Mekong Delta hospital, points out that a hamlet or village need not cooperate with the Saigon government or allied forces to mark itself for butchery; it need only be neutral, a political condition not acceptable to the communists. After a place has been worked over, its people of responsibility are always identifiable by the particularly hideous nature of their wounds. He cites some cases he has seen:

When the V.C. finished with one pregnant woman, both of her legs were dangling by ribbons of flesh and had to be amputated. Her husband, a hamlet chief, had just been strangled before her eyes, and she also had seen her three-year-old child machine-gunned to death. Four hours after her legs were amputated, she aborted the child she was carrying. But perhaps the worst thing that happened to her that day was that she survived.

A village policeman was held in place while a V.C. gunman shot off his nose and fired bullets through his cheekbones so close to his eyes that they were reduced to bloody shreds. He later died from uncontrollable hemorrhages.

A 20-year-old schoolteacher had knelt in a corner trying to protect herself with her arms while a V.C. flailed at her with a machete. She had been unsuccessful; the back of her head was cut so deeply that the brain was exposed. She died from brain damage and loss of blood.

Flamethrowers at Work. Last December 5, communists perpetrated what must rank among history's most monstrous blasphemies at Dak Son, a central highlands village of some 2000 Montagnards—a tribe of gentle but fiercely independent mountain people. They had moved away from their old village in V.C.-controlled territory, ignored several V.C. orders to return and refused to furnish male recruits to the V.C.

Two V.C. battalions struck in the earliest hours, when the village was asleep. Quickly killing the sentries, the communists swarmed among the rows of tidy, thatch-roofed homes, putting the torch to them. The first knowledge that many of the villagers had of the attack was when V.C. troops turned flamethrowers on them in their beds. Some families awoke in time to escape into nearby jungle. Some men stood and fought, giving their wives and children time to crawl into trenches dug beneath their homes as protection against mortar and rifle fire. But when

every building was ablaze, the communists took their flamethrowers to the mouth of each trench and poured in a long, searing hell of fire—and, for good measure, tossed grenades into many. Methodical and thorough, they stayed at it until daybreak, then left in the direction of the Cambodian border.

Morning revealed a scene of unbelievable horror. The village now was only a smoldering, corpse-littered patch on the lush green countryside. The bodies of 252 people, mostly mothers and children, lay blistered, charred, burned to the bone. Survivors, many of them horribly burned, wandered aimlessly about or stayed close to the incinerated bodies of loved ones, crying. Some 500 were missing; scores were later found in the jungle, dead of burns and other wounds; many have not been found.

The massacre at Dak Son was a warning to other Montagnard settlements to cooperate. But many of the tribesmen now fight with the allies.

#### MUTILATION ON THE SCHOOL BUS

If the communists' "persuasion" techniques spawn deep and enduring hatred, Ho could not care less; the first necessity is the utter subjugation of the people. Ho was disturbed by the rapid expansion of South Vietnam's educational system: between 1954 and 1959, the number of schools had tripled and the number of students had quadrupled. An educated populace, especially one educated to democratic ideals, does not fit into the communist scheme. Hence, the country's school system was one of Ho's first targets. So efficiently did he move against it that the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession soon sent a commission, chaired by India's Shri S. Natarajan, to investigate.

Typical of the commission's findings is what happened in the jungle province of An Xuyen. During the 1954-55 academic year, 3096 children attended 32 schools in the province; by the end of the 1960-61 school year, 27,953 were attending 189 schools. Then the communists moved in. Parents were advised not to send their children to school. Teachers were warned to stop providing civic education, and to stop teaching children to honor their country, flag and president. Teachers who failed to comply were shot or beheaded or had their throats cut, and the reasons for the executions were pinned or nailed to their bodies.

The Natarajan commission reported how the V.C. stopped one school bus and told the children not to attend school anymore. When the children continued for another week, the communists stopped the bus again, selected a six-year-old passenger and cut off her fingers. The other children were told, "This is what will happen to you if you continue to go to that school." The school closed.

In one year, in An Xuyen province alone, Ho's agents closed 150 schools, killed or kidnapped more than five dozen teachers, and cut school enrollment by nearly 20,000. By the end of the 1961-62 school year, 636 South Vietnamese schools were closed, and enrollment had decreased by nearly 80,000.

But, in the face of this attack, South Vietnam's education system has staged a strong comeback. Schools destroyed by the communists have been rebuilt, destroyed, and rebuilt again. Many teachers have given up their own homes and move each night into a different student's home so the communists can't find them, or commute from nearby cities, where they leave their families.

Against such determination, the size of Ho's failure can be measured: in 1954, there were approximately 400,000 pupils in school in North and South Vietnam together; today South Vietnam alone has some two million in school. About 35,000—four times as many as in 1962—now attend five South Vietnamese universities, while 42,000 more attend night college.

A South Vietnamese government official explains: "A war shatters many traditional values. But the idea of education has an absolute hold on our people's imagination."

BAR OF JUSTICE

The pitch of communist terrorism keeps rising. After the Tet carnage at Hue early this year, 19 mass graves yielded more than 1000 bodies, mostly civilians—old men and women, young girls, schoolboys, priests, nuns, doctors (including three Germans who had been medical-school faculty members at Hue University). About half had been buried alive, and many were found bound together with barbed wire, with dirt or cloth stuffed into their mouths and throats, and their eyes wide open. The communists came to Hue with a long list of names for liquidation—people who worked for the South Vietnamese or for the U.S. government, or who had relatives who did. But as their military situation grew increasingly desperate, they began grabbing people at random, out of their homes and off the streets, condemned them at drumhead courts as "reactionaries" or for "opposing the revolution" and killed them.

"The Tet offensive represented a drastic change in tactics," says General Walt. "This is a war to take over the South Vietnamese people. Ho launched the Tet offensive because he knew he was losing the people. But his troops didn't know it; they were told that they didn't need any withdrawal plan because the people would rise and fight with them to drive out the Americans. What happened was just the opposite. Many fought against them like tigers." Some of the Tet offensive's explosion of atrocities probably can be attributed to sheer, vengeful frustration on the part of Ho's terror squads—which Ho may well have foreseen, and counted on.

The full record of communist barbarism in Vietnam would fill volumes. If South Vietnam falls to the communists, millions more are certain to die, large numbers of them at the hands of Ho's imaginative torturers. That is a primary reason why, at election times, more than 80 percent of eligible South Vietnamese defy every communist threat and go to the polls, and why, after mortar attacks, voting lines always form anew. It is why the South Vietnamese pray that their allies will stick the fight through with them. It is why the vast majority of American troops in Vietnam are convinced that the war is worth fighting. It is why those who prance about—even in our own country—waving Vietcong flags and decrying our "unjust" and "immoral" war should be paid the contempt they deserve.

Finally, it is why the communists should be driven once and for all from South Vietnam—and why, if possible, the monsters who presently rule North Vietnam should be brought before the bar of justice.

MEMORIAL TO THE VIETNAM WAR DEAD

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, to date over 38,864 American boys have died in the Vietnam War. Most of these men felt they were dying for a cause—the protection of freedom and democracy throughout the world and the ultimate protection of their loved ones here at home.

One group has seen fit to recognize these war dead through dedication of a

memorial. I wish to congratulate the Vietnam War Dead Memorial Committee of Ocala and Marion County for this deeply felt and humane consideration of fellow Americans who have died in battle for them. The memorial has been built in the shape of a map of Vietnam with the American flag staff standing tall above it. Listed on the monument are the names of the war dead from Marion County. This memorial will be dedicated in Belleview, Fla., on November 9, 1969.

At a time when many are demonstrating against the war, let us pause to remember these dead and to acknowledge this group of dedicated Americans for building the first memorial in the Nation to the Vietnam war dead.

SERVICEMEN'S HONOR ROLL BOARD IN NEW RICHMOND, OHIO

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, since our Nation's proud birth in 1776, American men and women have been honored to serve our country, dedicating their "lives, fortunes, and their sacred honor." Such men founded our Nation, and have always defended it against threat both foreign and domestic with such diligence that the United States of America became known around the world as the land of the free, and the home of the brave.

Now, in the last few years, we have witnessed a new phenomenon. Cowardice and disloyalty have for some become virtues, and love of country has been termed "square."

I am extremely proud that these views are those of a small, but vocal minority. Here in Ohio, a part of what Dwight Eisenhower called America's heartland, Americans still deem it an honor to serve their Nation, and they are in turn honored by a grateful community. This is the real America. This is the America of Washington, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt, and this is why America will pass safely through its present crisis. It will remember and be grateful to its sons and daughters who serve it in our generation, as it does those who have served it in times before. Because, as one of history's greatest philosophers has said:

A man's love of his country is the noblest emotion of all.

In the town of New Richmond, in Clermont County, Ohio, American Legion Post No. 550—John Farina—and the Servicemen's Mothers Club of Clermont County have erected a servicemen's honor roll board. This board will honor the men and women of New Richmond who have served their country in the armed services since 1964. The honor roll board will be dedicated on October 26, 1969.

I wish to commend the citizens of New Richmond and Clermont County for honoring their servicemen. In these times

when misguided youths and even adults publicly disgrace our Nation by praising our enemies, it is heartening and reassuring to be reminded that America's heartland is still firm, and the same spark of patriotism that was first struck at Lexington and Concord still kindles a flame in all true Americans.

Y'KNOW

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a good deal in recent months about the communications gap. Symptomatic of this phenomenon is the line from a recent Paul Newman movie—"What we have here, is a failure to communicate."

All around us people cannot seem to talk to each other—parents cannot talk with their children, students with their teachers, oldsters with youngsters, and so on and so on.

A recent editorial in the Boston Globe, written by David B. Wilson, suggests one of the inputs into this whole communication problem. It is, in his words, "the maddening repetition of 'y'know,' a once delicately meaningful phrase and its simultaneous decline in communicative content." Mr. Wilson calls this one of the "minor annoyances of the age."

I think it is a major catastrophe. How many of us have had even short conversations where the expression "y'know" cropped up five, 10, or more times, with no special relationship to the subject being discussed—with no function in the sentence other than to punctuate it occasionally with this meaningless phrase.

I commend Mr. Wilson's editorial to my colleagues' attention. Y'know, with a little attention to this problem, we might just help save the language.

I include Mr. Wilson's article in the RECORD as follows:

Y'KNOW

(By David B. Wilson)

"Y'know," they say. Y'know?

Maddening repetition of this once delicately meaningful phrase and its simultaneous decline in communicative content are among the minor annoyances of the age.

Sentences begin and end with it, and it surrounds "buts" and "ands" the way "er" and "uh" and "well" once did. Parents are reduced to incoherent mutterings as their young conduct discourse of about one-third "Y'know" and the rest "groovy," "cool" or "blast."

You used to be able to say quite a bit with the phrase, before the hips and kids debased it.

"YOU know" meant "You, Fred, possessed of superior intelligence, know what others do not know."

It could be "You KNOW," meaning, "Don't give me that malarkey, you really agree with me."

Then there was the slower, "Y-o-u-k-n-o-w," with a slight rising inflection, which meant, "You don't know, but I had a terrific idea which I am about to tell you about."

There was the falling, confidential inflection of the "You Know . . ." that meant something like "We both know what she was

up to last Summer with Wilma's husband when she went to her mother's, but we both are too nice to discuss it."

Closer to contemporary usage was the "You know," often delivered with a shrug, which meant, "We both know but the matter is far too tedious and complicated and boring to discuss further."

A young person of my acquaintance, mulling the matter for a mini-moment between telephone calls consisting almost entirely of "Y'knows," guessed she said it a lot in order to reassure herself that somebody was paying attention to what she was saying.

Similarly, according to a friend who once worked in a brass factory in New Haven, the girls on the screw machines there used it in a subconscious attempt to check on whether they were being properly understood. "Y'know" tended to break out where language failed.

Atrophy of the cerebral cortex, inflicted by the mindless din of media, is probably responsible. Defensively, with sanity maintenance our intention, we tune out (turn off, if you will) most of what we physically are required to hear, straining sound of thoughtful content to preserve the integrity of our own thoughts and dreams.

After some two decades of the television set's one-way communication with us, we are unused to answering back. Debate is somewhat out of style in the schools. Students feel they're mostly talked at. The tube dominates conversation.

How many times recently have you been interrupted because you were intruding on someone else's relationship with a television set?

"Y'know" is symptomatic of the dissolution of intellect wrought in our technosphere, of the savagery that awaits when the Word is heard no longer.

To speak in sentences, complete and composed, taking thought for meaning, thrust and overtones, is to be polite and concerned, to respect one's auditor, to care enough about people, ideas, things and, indeed, life, to call them by their right names. "Y'know" evades and abdicates the burden of having a brain.

The phrase used to have a confidential and conspiratorial quality, and, in that sense, was not unaffectionate, assuming that the person addressed did, in fact, know. This sense is almost lost.

Now it is "Nixon, y'know," "the blacks (Jews, WASPs, Irish, Arabs), y'know" or the government, the Church, lawyers, the Army or whatever, the only meaning being an often frustrated hope of mutual understanding that the speaker wishes to convey a negative and almost tropistic response to the subject at hand.

This way lies ultimate meaninglessness and the exhaustion of understanding. There may, however, be a solution.

Next time somebody flashes a vacuous "Y'know" at you, interrupt and explain, politely, that you do not, in fact, know but are interested in finding out. This interest will puzzle the habitual "Y'know" user and require him to ask himself just what it was he did mean. It just might save the language.

#### LEAGUE'S 50TH YEAR

### HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant anniversaries to occur this year is certainly the 50th anniversary of the League of Women Voters. In my district, and undoubtedly in many others, this organization has long been

a leader in the task of educating the public on issues of the day. On many issues I find myself in agreement with the league's stands; and even when I do not, I am impressed with their reasoning and their activity. They serve a much-needed function in this Nation, and I am pleased to offer my congratulations to them on this, their 50th anniversary.

At this time I am introducing into the RECORD an editorial from the Quincy Patriot Ledger, which notes and praises this worthwhile organization:

#### LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

Triumphant in their drive to win the vote, suffragettes gathered in Chicago for a "Victory Convention" 50 years ago.

Mrs. Carrie Catt, president of the American Suffrage Association, exhorted the membership to battle society's ills: "Arise, women voters of East and West, of South and North, in this, your first union together. Strong of faith, fearless of spirit, let the nation hear you pledge all that you have and all that you are to a new crusade."

Thus the League of Women Voters was born. Fifty years after Mrs. Catt's militant address, the League flourishes, one of the most commendable of all public-minded organizations. Through the years, the League has provided forums for political candidates, launched voter registration drives, initiated governmental reforms, and educated more voters than any other group.

Non-profit and non-partisan, the League is undertaking an \$11-million fund drive to modernize and continue its work. We urge support of this fund drive. The League's services to the nation, to Massachusetts and to this community have been significant.

#### SENIOR CITIZENS MUST NOT BE FORGOTTEN

### HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, today a group of my colleagues and I are introducing a measure to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, to enable eligible elderly persons to exchange food stamps for meals prepared and served to them by private nonprofit organizations.

This bill is designed to assist elderly persons who would otherwise be eligible for food stamp aid when measured by age, residency, and income requirements, but who are considered ineligible because they do not have cooking facilities in their households. The beneficiaries of this measure, the crippled and infirm, are physically unable to cook for themselves. Very often, the chronically ill and aged cannot shop or prepare food. Under present law, they are denied the use of food stamps. They are most needful of the benefit extended to them by this measure.

The legislation that I am sponsoring, in concert with some of my colleagues, would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to designate specific church and other nonprofit organizations to accept food stamps in exchange for prepared meals. Although the redemption of the stamps could be made by the charitable organization, the stamps would be issued initially to the eligible individual.

The elderly require proper care and close attention. We certainly cannot permit them to go hungry, and I believe that the measure that I am cosponsoring would minimize such a possibility. I hope that the House of Representatives responds by enacting this legislation.

#### LET IT BEGIN WITH YOU

### HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, many millions of words have been written and spoken concerning the October 15 moratorium. All of the noted commentators and columnists have had their say. However, after having read and listened to a good number of these statements, I find that one that particularly impressed me was an editorial appearing in the Town Crier of Stockbridge, Mich. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and believe it fully deserves to be included as part of the record relating to this event. I insert in the RECORD the editorial, "Let It Begin With You," which appeared in the October 15 issue of one of the fine weekly newspapers serving Michigan's Sixth Congressional District:

#### LET IT BEGIN WITH YOU

Many thousands of college students, university faculty members, and even some government officials are supporting today's "Moratorium for Peace" at various types of meetings all over the country.

Some groups hope to fill huge football stadiums with war protesters while others will be satisfied to distribute leaflets in the community.

Students throughout the country are joining in a national movement to demonstrate their support for an immediate end to the war in Vietnam. However most college and university officials have said there will be "classes as usual" today.

Many Stockbridge residents agree that the war in Vietnam should be ended as soon as possible. But many also stated that they are not certain that mass demonstrations are the answer.

We would agree that what took years for a former administration to do cannot be undone in a few short months by a new administration.

The war in Vietnam is an unpopular one. It has damaged America's prestige more than any other single action in all history. But, as President Nixon recently stated, "It cannot be settled in the streets."

We agree. We also feel that widespread, and often violent, demonstrations, hurt our chances for success at the Paris peace talks. The demonstrations in the streets of our country only serve to convince the North Vietnamese that Americans are not behind their president.

Peace must come. We are behind that one hundred percent. We believe however that the solution must be left up to those persons who were delegated by the President to handle the job. Mass demonstrations in the streets and on the campuses of our universities will only compound the difficulties faced by our negotiators.

We elected a new President last November. We hope and pray that he has the best interests of this country at heart, and is doing everything in his power to settle the war in Vietnam as quickly as possible. We hope

it can be done so that those who lost their lives there will not have died in vain, and that those whom we have been defending from Communism will not be left helpless against a ruthless aggressor.

Peace, so desperately wanted by the people of this country, actually is not a normal state of life. Have we not had more war than peace throughout all of history?

Many of those who have demonstrated for peace have been guilty of reviling law enforcement officials and anyone else who stood in their way. They have claimed to be for peace, yet they have shown hate for their own countrymen.

Only when all mankind comes to love his neighbor, without regard to race, color or creed, will lasting peace ever be achieved.

Where, and with whom, shall peace have its real beginning? Why not let it begin with you.

TASK FORCE HEARS DR. EGEBERG

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population, of which I am chairman, heard testimony last week from Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Dr. Egeberg had some very positive remarks about the need for increased family planning services and better health service delivery systems. The Secretary's comments were very encouraging indeed. His understanding of the organizational problems left a feeling of optimism among the Task Force members.

Mr. Speaker, I offer the highlights of this hearing for the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

HOUSE REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON EARTH RESOURCES AND POPULATION

HEARING HIGHLIGHTS, OCTOBER 9, 1969

(By Dr. Roger O. Egeberg)

Dr. Egeberg stated that if he were starting from scratch, he would have to list population as the most important health problem of today. However, since we have to start with the operational program that is ongoing, we must consider delivery of health services as the number one problem, population second, and environmental quality number three.

A Population Institute of some very visible structure must be our ultimate goal. However, this can not happen over night. Dr. Egeberg stressed this point several times during the discussion. He felt that for starters we needed more basic research within NIH. We need increased education throughout our institutions on the whole range of family planning, fertility, maternal care, and infant care. Also, Dr. Egeberg feels that there should be a Deputy Assistant Secretary to oversee the entire family planning effort.

Dr. Egeberg feels that the biggest job right now is to give the program visibility. The Secretary has legislation of this effect over at the Bureau of the Budget for approval.

However, without a good service delivery system, these programs will not succeed. More cooperation with volunteer organizations is need. It is time for a rallying point.

There are five million women who want family planning services. We must reach these women. The middle class can be depended upon to take care of itself. This it is doing on an expanded basis. But, among

the poor, we just have not had the money or the facilities to really campaign on this. A good first goal would be to satisfy those who want it and do not know how to go about getting the help.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HUMAN DIGNITY AND PATRIOTISM

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of all the turmoil, dissent, protest, disruption, and civil disobedience of the past years, few persons have addressed themselves to the true meaning of patriotism and its ability to help us understand our dreams and ideals and to realize what this Nation stands for. Last month, Dr. John A. Howard, president of Rockford College, Rockford, Ill., outlined to Rockford students his understanding of the relationship between human dignity and patriotism. On Thursday, October 9, the Christian Science Monitor carried excerpts from his remarks. I take pleasure in enclosing them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the hopes that it will provide some understanding of ourselves, our dreams, and our future:

A man without aspirations is not a whole man. A society without a shared and cherished vision of what might be is a desolate society, one lacking in vitality and cohesiveness.

In the Godkin Lectures at Harvard University last March, John W. Gardner asserted, "A high level of morale is essential if a society is to succeed in the arduous tasks of renewal." A high level of morale is exactly what we do not have in the United States.

Some times back, an African student attending Rockford College spoke to a group on our campus. In the question period which followed, he was asked about his long-range plans. He replied that he wanted to get the best possible education so he could return to serve his people and his country. He said this with vigor and pride and conviction. A glance around the room showed admiration and approval on the part of everyone who heard this testimonial of commitment.

Compare, if you will, the probable reaction that the academic community would give to an American student who asserted that his great life's hope was one of patriotism, that he wanted to devote himself to serving his country and his people. I suspect that a large portion of intellectual America would be at the very least, embarrassed by such an outburst of patriotic sentiment, if not actually frightened by the fervor of such "unenlightened insularity." Love of country, that is our country, is now passé, or gauche, or intolerable in much of academia.

IS THERE A DIFFERENCE?

What is this? A double standard? Why is patriotism a glory when it operates in a developing nation which may be plagued with gross inequities and bloody struggles for power, and patriotism in an advanced nation a source of indifference, scorn or alarm?

First, I believe this is not an independent phenomenon, but rather one facet of a pervasive cynicism that has infected every aspect of our own culture. James B. Reston writes of the "new pessimism." He quotes Dr. Arthur F. Burns, a top adviser to President

Nixon, as saying, "What worries me more than all these financial questions—I think a great sickness has gripped our society. I think a great many citizens have lost faith in our institutions."

In an essay in the Saturday Review several months ago, Archibald MacLeish writes of the loss of belief in man and his dignity.

The arts have deadened the soul, or rather they reflect a deadened soul, says Mr. MacLeish.

In times gone by, there were those who thought that great art should enable or exalt. Now, many prize that art which "tells it like it is," not like it could be. We are raising whole nations of young people whose steady musical diet has been the complaints and the protest and the focus on physical gratification of rock music and never even exposed to the exhilaration of Beethoven, or the tranquility of Mendelssohn, or the sheer joy of Mozart.

But philosophy, too, has contributed to what Mr. MacLeish sees as the flatness of life, the loss of a dimension in the world. Thomas Molnar's recent book entitled "Sartre: Ideologue of Our Time" provides a keenly perceptive analysis of this most influential philosophical writer. Mr. Molnar points to the basic Sartrean concept of "a morally neutral world where good and evil have been absorbed and made irrelevant."

Philosophy used to aspire to provide understanding so that man could climb toward the heights. Some large portion of current philosophers, having rejected the concepts of good and evil, of heights and depths, simply assert the flatness of life and analyze man's permanent state of nausea or despair, or else have abandoned the concern for man altogether and have wandered off into semantics.

With no hopes, no dreams, no vision of what could be, man becomes petty and quarrelsome and ruthless.

I think we have some choice in this matter. Man can free himself from this bondage if he chooses to. Our preoccupations are those which we permit to prevail.

As I have indicated, my central concern in this talk is the subject of patriotism. It is a challenge for a speaker to knock on this door in the house of intellect, for the mere word, patriotism, is sufficient to cause many scholars to slam the bolt and fix the latch chain. (And such a reaction is, itself, a sorry commentary on the family that dwells in the home of the open mind.)

Patriotism is not just blind love for a piece of property. Nor is it simply a mutual defense pact that remains in force only as long as there is an external threat. Patriotism, true patriotism, is an eternal and legitimate love affair with a set of principles, with a common vision of the good life.

Listen to the words of Mary Antin from her book "The Promised Land":

"So at last I was going to America! Really, really going at last! The boundaries burst. The arch of heaven soared."

And later in the same book:

"Spirit of all childhood! Forgive me for so lightly betraying a child's dream-secrets. I that smile so scoffingly today at the unsophisticated child that was myself, have I found any nobler thing in life than my own longing to be noble? Would I not rather be consumed by ambitions than live in stupid acceptance of my neighbor's opinion of me?"

Immortal aspirations were what attracted the floods of immigrants to this land, for they saw this land as a place where by public commitment, each person was assumed to have worth and granted equal rights under the law, and where differences of faith and opinion were welcomed.

Having grown up with these concepts as the conditions of our living, we cannot comprehend, we cannot register upon how revolutionary they were when first proclaimed,

nor do we realize how they contrast with what exists in the police-state nations, nor how they differ from contemporary democracies that carry still the deep-rooted psychological mind-set of their monarchical heritage.

The existence of a House of Lords and a House of Commons maintains the message that the common man, even risen to the highest position, remains a commoner. Through much of continental Europe, the peasant, whatever his talents and accomplishments, remains a peasant in his own eyes and in the mind of the people.

The centuries-deep acceptance of class and station continues to mock the concept of true dignity for each man. By contrast, in our country, with our inheritance of assumptions, the phrase "second-class citizen" very rightly stirs indignation, for with us, it is a contradiction in terms.

The most obvious and pervasive disillusionment with our country stems from the war in Vietnam. Here again, I suppose it is only fools who rush in, or even pussyfoot into this subject, since many academic folk have made up their minds on this matter and are far more interested in telling the other fellow than in listening to any other thoughts about this issue. Still, there are some aspects of this grief-bearing chapter that need further probing.

#### REASONS LACK PERSUASION

Has it occurred to you that there are scarcely four presidents in our history who were more dissimilar in their cultural, vocational, emotional, intellectual, and political attributes than Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon? And yet each of them when faced with the responsibilities of the presidency, and when made aware of the full range of information available to that office, has held to the course of supporting the South Vietnamese in their defense against the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese.

On the other hand, there can be no question that all four administrations have grievously failed in a very important obligation. Although our presidents have seen fit to maintain our participation in this conflict, they have not conveyed to our people persuasive reasons to do so.

The vacuum created by this absence of public and persuasive justification has been filled by conjectures and claims and counterconjectures and counterclaims which have intensified to the point of hysteria, to the point that reason gives way before shrill nontought.

The novel, "Catch-22," offers an illustration of what I consider shrill, polemical nontought. This book has had a great vogue and has been one of the most powerful influences in persuading youth that war must be rejected above all. The protagonist of the book, an American airman named Yossarian serving in World War II, equates his commanding officer with the enemy, because, he says, they both want to get him killed. Since U.S. officers must send their troops on dangerous missions, Yossarian considers his superior officer as an effective enemy.

This is distorting history and misreading motives with a vengeance. The sad facts are that while conscientious leaders of France and England were trying every conceivable means to negotiate a reasonable peace with Hitler, his blitzkriegs were capturing the peoples of Czechoslovakia, Austria, and other lands. Finally, it was recognized that it was impossible to negotiate with Adolf Hitler. The only options were to fight or surrender.

And a great many people fought in that war in the belief that they were engaged in trying to prevent a fate worse than death. As the stories have been pieced together about such places as Belsen, Buchenwald, and Dachau, it is clear that to be the captives of a power that could conceive and operate

such inhuman compounds was, indeed, a fate worse than death.

Next, some brief observations on the blacks and the whites. The black-power movement, as its name implies, is founded in a philosophy that perceives the central factor in human relationships to be that of who controls whom, of how much force—political force, economic force, armed force, force by fear—can be exerted by one man or one group upon another. This attitude, it seems to me, is analogous to the philosophical foundations of the governments which ours was established to counteract.

All governments of the past operated in circumstances where the people were permanently split between the privileged governors and the less privileged governed. And their political systems were drawn to exercise power to maintain this situation.

Power was the glue that kept the society together. Some had it, and nothing short of the assemblage of a greater counterpower could change that circumstance. The wars of succession down through the ages provide rueful and ever recurrent proof that governments which are organized upon the assumption that some are to have more power than others will always be subject to internal strife and bloodshed.

In the almost two centuries of the history of our nation, the only massive instance of citizens killing citizens was, of course, occasioned by this same question: Shall one group of people, with governmental cooperation, be maintained in a position superior to another group of people? This was the issue of the Civil War and it also is what has been at issue on all of the civil-rights questions ever since.

#### BOLD DECLARATION

The American Revolution was a bold and incredibly perceptive declaration of the nature and the rights of man and it launched an experimental government painstakingly designed to minimize the principal threats to those rights. One of the foremost threats was perceived to be the instinctive thrust of men to obtain and exercise power over other people. An elaborate mechanism was therefore established to disperse the powers of government. The separation of executive, legislative and judicial branches was instituted precisely for this reason.

Now I want to propose just one more large category of concept and activity which, I believe, is contributing to an attitude of hostility toward the American dream. It is the spreading preoccupation, particularly among the youth, with one's own comfort, one's own physical gratification, one's right to do whatever he pleases as long as he doesn't significantly harm someone else.

The government inaugurated in 1789 was committed to maximizing the dignity of all citizens. However, in attending to all aspects of maximizing human dignity, the whole structure of the government was posited upon the requirement that the citizens, every citizen, would have to make some very great sacrifices.

Against this necessity for sacrifice, the current insistence upon exercising one's own whims with a disregard for the sensitivities of others, the quickening readiness to pronounce one's own particular objectives as uniquely moral and therefore beyond the purview of publicly established limits—all of these attitudes and actions stand in hostility to what this country is all about, and contribute to the disenchantment with America.

We must, I think, recognize that there are two basic ways of conceiving of human life. In one view man is merely an animal of superior gifts and intelligence with no meaning to his existence beyond his own enjoyment, and his only obligation is to get everything he can for himself and let the chips fall where they may.

Given that view of life, there is no hope for peace anywhere, since each person is a predator preying upon everyone else with whatever wiles, stratagems or force he can bring to bear. If one perceives man in this fashion, it will follow that groups will band together observing common limits when it works to their own advantage to do so, but all outsiders are fair game for any cruelties, deceptions or pilfering which can be devised.

The other view of man perceives a dignity—that is, a basic worthiness—in each person and perceives a transcendence in life that gives value to the sacrifices one makes that will benefit others, either now or in the future. Only in this view of life does the term, ideal, take on any meaning.

Of course, each man has his own vested interests, and each group its own vested interests, as does each nation and each philosophy. There will be the pushing and shoving and insults and crime, because man is human. But man also has a sublime spark which stirs the sacrifices of one for another, which gives rise to compassion and consideration and friendship and rejoicing in another's good fortune.

#### HOPE IN HUMAN DIGNITY

To the extent that such consideration can take precedence over the most damaging aggressions of self-interest, man can inch forward in the centuries-long journey toward peace and brotherhood. There will not be any instant answers. International and national and personal cruelties cannot be banished at once by any means.

It seems to me that the long-range hope is to enlist all of mankind in pledging allegiance to human dignity and in devising the ground rules which will enable and encourage each man to express himself and seek his own goals [within the context of] the common good.

And that objective is exactly what the great American experiment is all about. It was and is a commitment, such as no other people has ever made, to devise a means of living together which would most greatly enhance the worth and most greatly involve the participation of each citizen. It was and is a reaching out for the stars.

For those who conceive man as having a soul, a dimension superior to and beyond his own gratification, truly the sky is the limit in the relevance and satisfactions of seeking to find how men can live together in greater justice and harmony and of trying to devote one's life to that end.

#### AMERICA'S VIEW OF INDIA AND NORTH VIETNAM

#### HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the Government of India is considering extending full diplomatic recognition to North Vietnam. This news disturbs me greatly.

While I would not presume to interfere in the internal policy decisions of the Indian Government, I can, I believe, offer some advice about how such a decision would be greeted by the American people.

As every Member of this body is aware, the war in Vietnam is an extremely sensitive issue, very much on the minds of most Americans. Its early resolution is something we all earnestly desire. I believe the American people would take a decidedly dim view of any neutral na-

tion which extends a hand to North Vietnam at this crucial time. Once this tragic war is concluded, such intense feeling almost certainly will subside.

Timing, in a very immediate sense, is also a consideration that should not be overlooked. Over the years the United States has sent some \$9 billion in aid to India, and although some critics might disagree, most fair-minded observers hold that India has used it well.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which is now involved in drafting the 1970 foreign aid request, I cannot help but be aware of the growing mood of disenchantment in Congress toward aid programs generally.

The emergence of a peaceful and stable India, in my view, is vital to the future of Asia and the world. The United States can and must assist in seeing that India achieves that goal. Recognition of North Vietnam by India at this time could only add further obstacles for those of us seeking to follow that path.

#### JERRY KOOSMAN—AN INSPIRATION TO YOUTH

#### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, there was a big surprise party in Baltimore and in New York these past few days when the once lowly New York Mets of the National League defeated the highly regarded Baltimore Orioles of the American League for the baseball world series title.

While normally a fan of the American League, where our Minnesota Twins were the western division champions, I was pulling for the National League in this series because one of my constituents plays with the New York Mets.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay a small tribute to that constituent, a strong boy off one of our Sixth Congressional District farms, Jerry Koosman, fastball pitcher for the New York Mets and a two-game winner in the series.

A native of Appleton, Minn., where his family still farms, Jerry now spends the off season in Morris where he has his home.

Jerry Koosman is a typical Minnesota farm boy. Between his chores on the farm, he managed to find time to become a pretty fair country baseball player. He played high school and American Legion ball and then went into the Armed Forces.

His career with the New York Mets has been phenomenal. He was an instant success, a winner in his rookie year.

Although he won only 17 games this year, a slightly poorer record than in his rookie year, he came through with two big victories in the series and, for a .048 average hitter, did the almost impossible of hitting a two bagger in the final series game.

Mr. Speaker, this countryside boy is now the toast of our Nation's largest city. Where, but in America, is a success story such as this possible?

I salute Jerry Koosman. May he be an inspiration to every young man who aspires to a career in our great national pastime.

#### TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT—CRUCIAL ITEM ON THE NATION'S AGENDA

#### HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, technology is often considered synonymous with progress. And, in fact, our rapid progress during the 20th century has been directly attributable to the technological advancements of this period.

There must come a time to assess the impact of such developments on society as a whole. Anyone who drives an automobile in Washington, D.C., must realize that traffic jams and air pollution are the byproducts of our transportation evolution. We hurry and hurry to produce more effective and efficient conveniences and conveyances, yet little or no thought is given to the effect of our "progress" on our environment.

However, there are a few farsighted individuals who have become concerned with the future impact of today's technology. One of these is the Honorable EMILIO Q. DADDARIO of Connecticut, who I am proud to say is a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, of which I am chairman. In a recent article by William Leavitt, "Technology Assessment—Crucial Item on the Nation's Agenda," which appears in the Air Force and Space Digest, great credit is given to Representative DADDARIO for his outstanding efforts in focusing attention on the need to assess the effect of our technological progress. He deserves a great deal of credit for his tenacity and farsightedness.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Leavitt's article on this subject is most timely and thought provoking. I, therefore, commend it to the attention of my colleagues. The article follows:

#### TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT—CRUCIAL ITEM ON THE NATION'S AGENDA

(By William Leavitt)

America the beautiful? By now thoughtful citizens across the land, bombarded daily with newspaper stories and television programs lamenting the deterioration of our air and water and the approaching paralysis of our cities by auto traffic and the frequent collapse of public services we once took for granted, are asking how much longer we can utter that phrase with any degree of confidence.

The villain, an increasing number of social critics assert, is the technology that has brought higher standards of living to the majority of Americans and has provided mobility, instant communications, convenience foods, stylish ready-to-wear clothes, fancier medical care, and the host of other amenities that mark America in the last third of the twentieth century and that are, in one form or another, aspired to by less-developed cultures around the world.

To blame technology for the threat to the environment may seem unfair and even silly to the casual observer. It is fair to ask the antitechnologists if they would be willing

to go back to the "good old days" of travel by horseback, of kerosene lamps, and deadly epidemics against which medicine was virtually powerless.

But dismissing the critics so lightly is no answer. There are increasing threats to our environment. The air is bad in our cities. The mobility that is so dear to us has begun to strangle our cities and has contributed to an unbelievable sprawl. And there is increasing and terrifying scientific evidence that the ecological cycle on which all of us must depend for our sustenance is being disturbed, perhaps irreversibly in some cases.

What is clearly needed is a new set of approaches to the utilization of technology, without which we cannot survive as a modern society but the consequences of which must be examined much more carefully than ever before. Happily, there are people in important positions facing up to this issue. And if they can make some headway in their campaign for new institutions to analyze the consequences of the utilization of technology, it is at least possible that, at long last, both the private and public sectors can be imbued with a new sense of responsibility in the employment of technology.

One man who nearly single-handedly, as a member of Congress, has been leading a quiet campaign for a number of years to develop such new institutions for what in the jargon is called "technology assessment," is Rep. Emilio Q. Daddario, Democrat of Connecticut. He is a member of the House space committee and is the chairman of the space committee's Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development.

Congressman Daddario, in his years as chairman of the subcommittee, has managed to spark the creation of an effective partnership between Congress and the scientific and engineering community. In tandem with Mr. Daddario, the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering have been working at analyzing the implications of technology for society. In public seminars and by means of special studies of science and technology and their impact on public policy, the savants have finally begun to get some congressional and public attention. This is no mean achievement in a political environment in which the executive branch has for so long had primacy by virtue of its army of "experts" and the natural unity of the executive as compared to the pluralism of a Congress, made up of several hundred individuals of varying views, competences, and susceptibility to pressures.

The latest achievement of the Daddario subcommittee has been the enlistment of a distinguished panel of scientists and engineers, under the aegis of the National Academy of Sciences and chaired by Harvey Brooks, Dean of Engineering at Harvard University. The panel has prepared a wide-ranging report (*Technology: Processes of Assessment and Choice*, available for 75¢ from the Superintendent of Documents, US Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402) on possible approaches to the creation of some kind of mechanism or mechanisms within the federal government that would have the job of analyzing in advance the implications to society of implementing currently available technology or of proceeding along technological paths which seem tempting now but which, if they were examined closely in terms of potentially harmful effects, might seem far less desirable.

In 150-odd pages, the authors of the report trace, philosophically and by way of specific example, the mistakes of the past—the era we have already lived through—during which commercial advantage and often an uncaring fascination with technology for its own sake have ruled policymaking or, put another way, made for virtually no policy. As an example of failures of imagination and the difficulty of long-term prediction of social and environmental effects of proliferative technology, the panel notes, on the sub-

ject of the ubiquitous automobile, that "to predict that such vehicles would chemically pollute the atmosphere more than vehicles driven by steam or electricity would have been simple, [but] to predict that the automobile (of which there were four in the United States in 1895 and some 80,000,000 in 1968) would become the chief source of urban air pollution would have been far more difficult."

As to important peripheral effects, who would have guessed, the panel asks, even twenty-five years ago that one of the main causes of the logjam in our courts would be the enormous number of damage suits by one citizen against another, all growing out of auto accidents?

And the auto is not the only villain. Any number of other kinds of hardware and their supporting systems, the panel points out, have proliferated to awe-inspiring proportions, as have their societal side effects. For that matter, how many people twenty-five years ago could have predicted the pervasiveness of television and the frequent "mind-pollution" of the medium? In its way, TV may be even more dangerous than auto fumes.

The National Academy panel acknowledges but is at least a little hopeful about the commercial-political problems of technological assessment. "Comprehensive efforts to assess the consequences of a technology can often be effective," the panelists note, "even if they are delayed until the initial stages of research and development have been completed and the technology is at the threshold of commercial introduction. So long as one does not wait until very substantial interests have vested in a particular mode of application, one still has a reasonable opportunity to influence the eventual outcome by a careful examination of alternative possibilities and their implications. Recent withdrawals of defective cars by automobile manufacturers demonstrate how public opinion and the threat of possible regulation or legal liability can modify corporate behavior far beyond the early stages of development."

The panelists, throughout their report, dwell on the crucial need for better technology-assessment mechanisms within government on the one hand, while at the same time examining the built-in conflicts of interest created by the present system. They cite the problems posed by the existence of federal agencies like the Atomic Energy Commission or the National Aeronautics and Space Administration or the Department of Transportation, among others, where the prime purpose is necessarily the promotion of a particular set of technologies. Clearly, there are limitations to the degree of detachment such agencies can exercise in their analysis of the social implications of their own technologies. In a different way, the regulatory agencies of government suffer from limitations in that they are often overly sympathetic to the industries they regulate or in other situations unimaginatively rigid in their regulation. This latter fact sometimes prevents the introduction of new technology that might serve the public not only more economically but also with less deleterious effects. The problems are endless.

But, the panel declares, the fact that they are endless and so complex does not obviate the need for the new technology-assessment institutions.

Such new institutions, watchdogs, and analyzers "should operate," the panel urges, "at a strategic level in the political process, close to both the legislative and executive branches, in order to attract the most competent and imaginative personnel available and to enhance the quality of governmental response to the problems and opportunities of technological development."

These are more than words. What the Academy panelists are saying is that wherever in the federal government such new

institutions or agencies might be located—and there are strong arguments for having parallel structures in both the executive and legislative branches—they should have real prestige and influence across the government spectrum. They should most certainly have access to and the support of the President, whose role as chief decision-maker is so crucial to the tone of his entire administration and its technological commitments.

"The primary effort [of any new technology-assessment mechanism or set of mechanisms] would be," the Academy panel suggests, "to project social and environmental effects in the most comprehensive terms possible, with particular attention to dimensions of impact and options for policy that other assessments of the [technological] area have failed to explore fully."

A crucial role of such a new outfit or outfits would be to provide a focus for hitherto unrepresented citizens or citizen groups who up to now have been factored out of technologically oriented decisions, either because they have not known what was up in time to object to, or, conversely, to argue in favor of particular technological proposals. In too many cases, people or groups who ought to be heard have simply not had the money to organize themselves into effective lobbies. There needs to be a place for ombudsmanship or public advocacy for citizens and groups with legitimate gripes about public policy in the field of technology.

The Academy panelists offer a long list of assignments for the new watchdog outfit or outfits: the kind of ombudsmanship alluded to in the previous paragraph; the sponsorship of basic research on technology assessment itself; the review of technology assessment being performed by other government agencies; and the maintenance of an information center on technology assessment "which would in time become a primary source of critical data with respect to pertinent activities carried on in government, in the universities, and in other organizations."

The Academy panel also proposes that the new technology-assessment organization or organizations issue an annual report that would summarize its efforts and "seek to develop a framework for public discussion of . . . issues and . . . seek to publicize matters relevant to technology assessment that seem unlikely to receive adequate public attention through other channels."

Perhaps the most important function of such a public report would be to suggest priorities "as to the most pressing (technological) problems and the most promising opportunities in technological assessment."

Priorities would reflect such factors as urgency of technological issues with respect to the degree to which irreversible consequences could be expected from postponement of decisions or the imminence of large commitments of monies and resources to particular technological proposals.

Also, because of the importance of congressional and presidential understanding of and attention to technological policy issues, a major function of the new mechanism or mechanisms would be, in the view of the Academy panelists, to prepare in-house policy papers "recommending specific actions to the Congress, the President, executive agencies, (and) administrative bodies."

The Academy panel explores a number of ways such new technology-assessment institutions could be organized, ranging from a special staff to be added to the existing presidential Office of Science and Technology to a new and well-staffed Joint Committee of Congress on Technology Assessment. The panel even considered something along the lines of the quasi-independent Federal Reserve Board. Each approach has its promise and its pitfalls.

But, withal, the question is not so much exactly where in the government such a new organization or organizations should be located as it is of making sure that the new in-

stitutions have competence, detachment, and significant influence on the decisionmakers. The military is not left out. The panel acknowledges the need for security and military strength. But at the same time the panel urges that in order for military-based technology to be properly introduced into the civilian environment, some reasonable extension of the "need-to-know" concept be made so that more useful and reasoned criticism can be fed in from the outside when military-technology questions are being decided upon.

"Our study," the Academy panelists report, "has revealed that existing mechanisms, whether they involve government agencies, private industries, or professional groups, possess intrinsic limitations, some structural and others psychological, that leave serious gaps in the spectrum of processes that assess and direct the development of technology in our society."

"In the formulation of issues for assessment and in the attributions of value to alternative outcomes, those processes too often ignore the broader social and environmental contexts in which their effects are felt. In the calculation of costs and benefits, they ascribe too little significance to the preservation of future options. They give too little attention and support to research and monitoring programs calculated to minimize technological surprise and to deal more rationally with the burdens of uncertainty. They frequently reflect the views, interests, enthusiasms, and biases of unduly narrow constituencies and create insufficient opportunities for meaningful public participation in choices having major consequences."

A collection of all-powerful wise men of science to decide what technological choices we should make as a nation is not at all what the Academy panel has in mind.

"We do not contemplate or foresee in the future a highly centralized process of technological evaluation, even for the areas of technology that are largely dependent on federal programs and policies," the panelists assert. "Such centralization would be not only unworkable but unwise, politically unacceptable, and extremely dangerous."

The panel urges, rather, the creation of "a constellation of organizations, with components located strategically within both [legislative and executive] branches, that can create a focus and a forum for responsible technology-assessment activities throughout government and the private sector."

Such organizations, it is advanced, should be clearly separated from "any responsibility for promoting or regulating technological applications," so that detachment and ombudsmanship roles can be played effectively.

The urgency of the requirement for such new institutions is underscored by the Academy panel report's final words:

"The future of technology holds great promise for mankind if greater thought and effort are devoted to its development. [But,] if society persists in its present course, the future holds great peril, whether from the uncontrolled effects of technology itself or from an unreasoned political reaction against all technological innovation."

As we prepare for a second manned landing on the moon, what the Academy is trying to tell Congress about affairs on earth is something the rest of us should be thinking about.

PFC. NATHANIEL BUSH DIES IN WAR

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG  
OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Nathaniel Bush, a fine young man from Maryland, was killed recently in

Vietnam. I wish to commend his courage and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

**PFC. NATHANIEL BUSH DIES IN WAR; WAS DUNBAR ATHLETE**

Another Baltimore soldier has been killed in action in Vietnam, the Pentagon reported yesterday.

Army PFC Nathaniel Bush, 22, of 5119 Queensberry avenue, was killed October 2 when his combat patrol was ambushed in the city of Tay Ninh, 70 miles northwest of Saigon.

Drafted last December, Private Bush was sent to Vietnam four months ago as an infantryman with the 1st Cavalry Division (Airmobile).

A native of Baltimore, he graduated from Dunbar High School in 1966. Private Bush was on the Dunbar basketball and tennis teams and in his spare time worked on old cars.

Private Bush was buried yesterday in National Cemetery after a ceremony at the Waters A.M.E. Church.

He is survived by his mother, Mrs. Gladys C. Bush; two brothers, Hollis L. Bush and Bradley L. Bush; and two sisters, Mrs. Lillie M. Watkins, and Mrs. Carol L. Cofield, all of Baltimore.

**FROM HERE TO OBLIVION?**

**HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, the October 1969 issue of *Field & Stream* carried an excellent article by Michael Frome, entitled "From Here to Oblivion?" So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to be aware of Mr. Frome's provocative views, I insert the text of his article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

**FROM HERE TO OBLIVION?**

The question before the house, and not only the House but the Senate as well, and the President and his Cabinet too, is how to get the reins on a headstrong, runaway national environment and turn it in the right direction before it goes completely, everlastingly, irreversibly haywire.

The answer may be difficult to come by, but the facts of the case are now clearly known. I hear them stated again and again in sundry Washington quarters. The nation is always catching up with crises after the damage is done, they say, whether from pesticides, pollution, oil slicks, or other abuses of the once beautiful earth God bestowed upon us. Unless we can get out front, with long-range plans, including firm restraints and disciplines over industrial production, resource use, and human population growth, then the country will prove unworthy of its natural blessings; it will pass the point of no return on the course of ecological disaster before we know it.

There is no doubt of a growing sense of awareness and concern. One gets the feeling of it in contacts with some quarters of the Nixon Administration. An appreciable number of Congressmen of both parties, especially among the young members, are eager to get going with constructive legislative action. Even spokesmen of large corporations in Washington are reporting on the establishment of "environmental control committees" within their firms. These signs are all to the good.

Unfortunately, we are still falling behind in the race with the environment. The clean air and clear water calamities are worsening, not easing, because of the niggardly appro-

priation of funds and weakness of Federal regulations. Congress as a whole persists in weighing the desires of the special economic interests above the needs of the people, and of survival. It is little wonder that we are about to permit the unleashing of a whole new generation of supertankers on the spurious grounds of "economy" without reckoning the ultimate cost to society of potential superdisasters many times larger than the *Torrey Canyon* or *Santa Barbara*.

Besides which, no force on earth can command the whole Federal Government to "Go save the environment," and expect it to be done. At least eleven executive departments and sixteen independent agencies are involved in environmental programs, but too many are self-propelled and inbred, working at bureaucratic cross-purposes with each other, tied to powerful economic constituencies which lobby for expanding budgets. At best, personnel are limited in perspective by the tunnel vision of their specialized training. As Ralph McMullan, the Director of Natural Resources in Michigan and an outstanding state leader, declared in recent testimony before a Congressional Committee, "The air pollution specialist who thinks that replacing the soot-throwing, fossil-fueled electric generating plant with a nuclear-powered monster is going to eliminate environmental contamination has his head in the sand. He is forgetting that thousands of cubic feet per minute of hot water discharge isn't exactly a minor environmental problem."

Nevertheless, the President has taken promising steps toward charting a unified new course. His establishment of an Environmental Quality Council, composed of himself, the Vice President, and six Cabinet members, marks a milestone in Federal attitudes toward natural resources. For the first time, at the highest level, the executive departments will have the means for developing and coordinating a comprehensive and continuing effort. Certainly the President's participation as chairman adds a new dimension and sharpens the focus of his Cabinet members on the issues.

Functions assigned to the Council in the President's executive order include the assessment of new and changing technologies for their potential effects on the environment; encouragement of timely public disclosure by all levels of Government and by private parties of plans that would affect the quality of environment, and stimulation of public and private participation in programs and activities to protect against pollution of the nation's air, water and land, and its living resources.

Mr. Nixon has a long way to go to prove himself a conservation President. He must back these words with strong medicine on specific issues and go to Congress for money to fund critical programs like the Clean Water Restoration Act, even though it may mean cutting another billion dollars of fat from the Pentagon budget. He must ask members of the Environmental Quality Council: "Shall we look back at what we have accomplished, or at what we have talked about?"

Still, the Administration gives reason for hope. For example, Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe came through by establishing a new office in his department to coordinate environmental problems, headed by the former mayor of Seattle, J. D. Braman; and, better yet, by backing its recommendation to deny Federal funds for the proposed New Orleans expressway because it would impair the quality of the historic French Quarter. This is the more remarkable considering Mr. Volpe's background in private contracting, serving then as a tried and proven member of the highway lobby, and that he is surrounded now by a crowd in the Bureau of Public Roads used to having its way. But his decision opened the path for rescuing parklands threatened by roads in

Memphis, San Antonio, in the middle of the Potomac River outside of the nation's capital, and for yet aborting the Everglades jetport in Florida before that ugly monster is born.

The President himself came through in his message to Congress on July 18 in which he recommended establishing a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future specifically to avert an over-impact on natural resources and the quality environment. "Pure air and water are fundamental to life itself," Mr. Nixon declared. "Parks, recreational facilities, and an attractive countryside are essential to our emotional well-being. Plant and animal and mineral resources are also vital. A growing population will increase the demand for such resources. But in many cases their supply will not be increased and may even be endangered. The ecological system upon which we now depend may seriously deteriorate if our efforts to conserve and enhance the environment do not match the growth of the population."

These momentous issues are much before both houses of Congress. If I am not mistaken, more than forty bills were introduced early in this session to create a national environmental council in one form or another, and one bill alone carried the names of forty sponsors. I believe a lot of this action was triggered by the persistence of Senator Gaylord Nelson, of Wisconsin, who came to Washington a few years ago as a proven conservation governor of Wisconsin with new ideas about the need of ecological research and surveys. Then last year Senator Henry Jackson, of Washington State, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, took the lead by conducting an earnest discussion program involving Cabinet members, Congressmen and chosen outsiders, which led to his "National Environmental Policy Act of 1969."

The Jackson Bill has already been approved by the Senate; it varies in some ways with those bills in the House, but essentially they would all require Congress and every Federal agency to fully demonstrate ecological responsibility and would also establish a board of environmental advisers to evaluate and criticize the work of the agencies and to advise the President. "In both Federal and state governments, we have often indulged ourselves in the illusion that we are doing a grand job, but the facts don't support it," Senator Jackson told his colleagues. "Our responses have been too narrow, too limited, and too specialized. We have established programs without clear enough perception of objectives and goals."

During the recent summer, two progressive subcommittees of the House conducted hearings on environmental bills, providing a forum for warnings by scientists, citizen organizations, and public officials on the current ecological collision course. Representative John Dingell, of Michigan, noted that the basic jurisdiction of the subcommittee over which he presides relates to fisheries and wildlife. "However," he declared, "we can no longer hide from the fact that fish and wildlife are affected adversely by many other factors, including air pollution, water pollution, and the increasing misuse of pesticides. We must consider the interrelationships of these problems in formulating legislative policy." On this basis he introduced an amendment to the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act that would establish a Council on Environmental Quality in the office of the President, and then fought hard to get action on it.

The other environmental hearings were held on a bill before the Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, a group that has not hesitated to tackle tough and broad-gauged issues. Representative Henry S. Reuss, the chairman, and his colleagues have also conducted hearings on the dangers of open-air testing of chemical poisons and on pollution and extensive fill-

ing of San Francisco Bay (as part of an intensive investigation into destruction of estuaries and waterways), and the last time I looked they were readying for new hearings on population problems. They courageously blocked a smelly landfill scheme on the Potomac River; criticized the Navy as the worst pesticide polluter in the Potomac Basin; and succeeded in getting the Interior Department to deny intrusive rights-of-way across Indian lands. The Democratic chairman has been blessed with the bipartisan cooperation of three energetic young Republicans—Gilbert Gude, of Maryland, Guy Vander Jagt, of Michigan, and Paul McCloskey, of California—all of whom have been pushing worthy conservation projects of their own. The latter, in fact, had fifteen interns in Washington during the summer studying national land-use policy and population problems.

The Republicans in the House have a Task Force on Earth Resources and Population, and the Democratic Study Group (an informal alliance of the young-in-spirit) has a Task Force on Natural Resources and the Environment. Representative Richard Ottinger, of New York, has gone further by forming an Ad Hoc Committee on the Environment, composed of 119 members of both houses; through the nongovernmental offices of the Environmental Clearinghouse, they exchange communications with leading scientists and conservationists.

But not all of Congress is tuned in. Although young members are ready for action, the leadership of both parties, in both houses, skirts the issues and continues to miss the big picture. The little done for the conservation cause in recent years is like a bone thrown to the dogs; it demonstrates the scope of the backlog of inaction piled up by Congresses, Democratic and Republican alike, for thirty years.

This is illustrated in the recent House Appropriations Committee report on the budget of the Interior Department and related agencies. After lamenting that inadequate attention is being given to conservation of natural resources, the committee proceeded to allocate less than one and a half percent of the total Federal budget for this purpose and sought to place the blame on the executive department. It specifically deleted funds for the President's Environmental Quality for Council, charging it to be a patchwork approach, "little better than nothing"—which is precisely how one might interpret the Appropriations Committee's actions and attitude on these issues.

The day of lip service is done. The people must have an accounting of the management of our little biosphere. No Federal agency can be exempt from scrutiny, for the opportunity to wreak lasting damage is now much too great. I fear the course of the Atomic Energy Commission, which is scheduled this fall to explode a massive "calibration shot" in the Aleutians as the prelude to bigger and better things, climaxing in the "full yield final device." Not only here but in other operations AEC is playing a dangerous game. There is no time to lose in getting a firm public fix on H-bombs, germ warfare, pesticides, and the rest of the deadly threats to the environment. Or the question of saving it will become purely academic.

#### LET US NOT DESTROY THE PRESIDENCY

**HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, at this time when there is so much discussion taking place on the issue of the war in Vietnam, I think the following editorial

that appeared in the Wichita Eagle, of Wichita, Kans., on October 13, 1969, is of great significance:

#### ACHESON MAKES SENSE ON THE PRESIDENCY

Perhaps it's too much to expect that the United States of 1969 or 1970 will have the patience and intelligence to follow the advice of Dean Acheson, who was Secretary of State under President Truman.

Mr. Acheson wishes the country would stop trying to destroy its presidents. He pointed to the viciousness of attacks on President Nixon, which repeat the pattern of criticism of Lyndon B. Johnson.

"I think we're going to have a major constitutional crisis if we make a habit of destroying presidents," said Acheson. "We'll have the situation we had after the Civil War when the presidency practically disappeared—from Andrew Jackson to McKinley."

This country must have a chief executive who will make decisions and carry them out. Otherwise it will dissolve into anarchy. Many Americans don't understand this basic fact of life. No President can possibly please everybody. And Americans increasingly are prone to turn upon the hapless chief executive and try to tear him to pieces the minute he doesn't please.

This does no good. It hampers the man in his work. Either he becomes more obstinate in pursuing his own course because he can see that much of the criticism reaches the point of irrationality; or he becomes so confused by the whirlwind of criticism that he cannot make good decisions.

Anti-authoritarianism has always been a facet of American character, but it wasn't until the administration of Lyndon Johnson that anti-presidential criticism reached such heights that the President no longer could appear in public. If criticism of Nixon continues, he'll be in the same sorry predicament.

No executive—be it college president, mayor, or the father in the home—can keep things running smoothly when subjected to constant irrational and vindictive opposition and criticism.

It's time America learned to quit destroying its presidents. Many a country which fell into such vicious anti-authoritarianism has ended with the worst authoritarian of all—a dictator, for only a dictator can rule an unruly mob.

#### THE NEED FOR A MARITIME PROGRAM

**HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, you have often heard me speak of our need for a new, efficient maritime program. Again, I will remind my colleagues of the complete lack of order and innovation in shipbuilding and transporting.

No nation has ever stayed a world power without a competent, productive merchant marine. Yet, we are almost totally dependent on other countries for our ocean transport. This not only loses billions of dollars for the United States every year in payment for freight carried, wages lost to American citizens, and taxes lost from large corporations that own the ships, but also endangers American cargoes and crews since many foreign builders do not comply with our safety standards. What is worse, we are insuring that the future will be the same,

since we are not encouraging skilled manpower in this field.

In relatively peaceful times, the inconvenience of not having a strong merchant marine of our own may not be obvious. However, in emergencies, it is evident that our supply of ships and needed cargoes will be dominated by the whims of other countries. This, of course, could cut us off from many desired products.

The first step to remedy this situation would be to improve our shipbuilding efforts. Edwin M. Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, before a summer seminar on shipbuilding at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, stated that our shipyards have the ability to produce the needed ships, but the inconsistencies and fluctuations in our national policy stops all improvements in this field. There is a definite lack of order and aim in our present program. It seems as if no one in the administration is certain of what should be done. This uncertainty leads to confusion, and, thus, nothing is being accomplished. While we, Americans, are dropping behind in this field, other countries, realizing the importance, are forging ahead and have more than caught up to our once "first rate" sea program.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Hood's remarks to my colleagues:

#### THE NEED FOR A MARITIME PROGRAM

(By Edwin M. Hood)

It is a pleasure to be among such a gathering of experts on shipbuilding and related disciplines. You know far better than I that the technology of ship construction has been steadily advancing throughout the world. You know as well as I that from a purely technical standpoint, the opportunities for further advancement are infinite. In the years ahead, you and your counterparts elsewhere will have a substantial role in the application of technology to the construction of needed ships at lowest possible costs and in keeping with reasonable delivery schedules.

The technological advances, to which I refer, are found and will be found, in shipyards large and small—old and new. They are not limited by geographical boundaries; no one has a monopoly on ideas or ingenuity, and few, if any, technological leads are ever held for long. But, it seems to me that the potentials for continually expanding gains in shipbuilding technology can be circumscribed by one very definite consideration—national purpose. This comment, I am sure, has meaning to all in this audience whether they come from the United States or abroad.

The affairs of government affect technology just as do the influences of the market place. It can be argued which takes precedence—government or economics—but, in this country, shipbuilding is, and has been, very much a pawn on the chessboard of governmental policy making. Ups and downs, starts and stops, backing and filling, in the past two decades, can be traced to the vagaries of national policy pertaining to U.S. sufficiency on the oceans.

Levels of ship construction, in that period, have failed to offset the impediments of age which have plagued our naval fleet and merchant marine simultaneously. This situation results from the continued reliance on vessels built during World War II: nearly two-thirds of the active naval fleet and three-quarters of the active American-flag merchant marine are today composed of ships 20 years of age or older.

Because of these deficiencies, it has variously concluded that the strategic, foreign policy and merchantile interests of the

United States have been inhibited: not fully exploited. Statistics pertaining to the relative balance of ocean strength between the United States and the Soviet Union, as well as those portraying the steady decline, by volume, in the carriage of U.S. commerce in American flag bottoms, lend credibility to such a conclusion.

With a transfer in the reins of government such as has taken place in Washington during the past seven months, there is expectation that a change—something different from the past—will develop. President Nixon has appointed experienced and competent people to high posts which bear, either directly or indirectly, on the shaping of national purpose and the formulation of national policy affecting shipbuilding. Among these should most surely be included Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans, Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard, Secretary of the Navy John H. Chafee, Under Secretary of Commerce Rocco C. Siciliano, Maritime Administrator Andrew E. Gibson, Helen Delich Bentley as Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, and others. At The White House, too, unlike in days gone by, there are those who are genuinely interested in the improving posture and strength of the United States on the oceans.

But, to bring order out of what has heretofore been a vast array of disorder, these officials in the Executive Agencies—and the Congress as well—have no easy task. Since shipbuilding has long been regarded as the "nub" of the nation's sea power problem, the present frame of mind of the shipbuilding industry illustrates my point.

The principal shipyards of the United States remain confident and optimistic about their ability to produce needed ships—both naval and merchant—to assure a continuity of U.S. sea power. They are, however, concerned by the lingering absence of a national policy to encourage stability in the industry and to produce the kind of procurement environment necessary to marshal the combined capabilities of American shipyards effectively and efficiently. This situation derives from factors and influences beyond the control of the shipbuilding industry.

It is becoming increasingly evident that if the nation's shipyard capabilities, resources and potentials are to be utilized in an optimum manner, uncertainty and confusion must be quickly replaced, to the maximum degree possible, by rational direction and reasonable order.

At this very moment, there is uncertainty as to the dimensions of the naval shipbuilding program next year and in succeeding years.

There is uncertainty as to the dimensions of the Nixon Administration's much-awaited maritime program for the next five to eight years.

There is uncertainty as to whether the funds needed to correct the high degree of physical obsolescence in the U.S. Navy and the American Merchant Marine will survive present budgetary stringencies.

There is uncertainty as to whether new appropriations for merchant shipbuilding under Federal auspices in the present Fiscal Year will be zero, \$15.9 million, \$145 million or \$200 million.

There is uncertainty as to whether 100,000 dwt., 250,000 dwt. or some other size tankers—smaller or larger—will be required in the 1970-1975 period to transport oil from the North Slope of Alaska to U.S. refineries, the location or locations of which have yet to be decided.

There is uncertainty as to whether these new tanker routes will involve 20, 40 or more tankers, and as to when construction contracts will be placed with the shipyards.

There is further uncertainty as to whether a pipeline or oceangoing tankers will, in the final analysis, be employed to move oil from Alaska to the "lower 48" states.

There is uncertainty as to whether one,

three or more shipyards will share in the construction of "more than 30" advanced design destroyers (DD-963 formerly DX) for the U.S. Navy; meanwhile at least three shipyards are tentatively reserving their capabilities pending award of a production contract (or contracts) in November—4 months hence—at the earliest.

There is uncertainty as to the reality and scope of various shipbuilding efforts now under consideration by commercial shipping lines.

There is uncertainty as to the availability of skilled manpower.

There is uncertainty as to whether cost-additive contract conditions and specifications will at long last be eliminated as a step toward the creation of a more effective procurement environment.

There is uncertainty as to whether naval and merchant shipbuilding requirements—both of substantial magnitude—will be considered and treated on a coordinated basis so that the nation's productive capacity will be used efficiently and strengthened for the future.

Separately and jointly, consciously or subconsciously, these uncertain circumstances are constraining actions of individual shipyards. Confusion has surely been compounded. Restoration of order lies not so much in the existing or latent capabilities of the industry to construct ships or to respond to particular requests for bids but in the urgency of a prompt and concise statement of purpose and policy by the Nixon Administration.

It might therefore be useful and timely to attempt to define national purpose in the context of shipbuilding.

By his 1968 campaign statements, President Nixon has indicated that the United States should, and must, be a first-rate sea power with a naval fleet second to none and a modern maritime fleet capable of carrying 30 percent of U.S. exports and imports by volume, instead of approximately 6 percent as at present. Presumably, the national purpose in terms of ocean strength for the next four years—or possibly the next eight years—will be dedicated to the assurance of the availability of naval and merchant ships in adequate numbers and appropriate quality for commerce, a favorable balance of payments, and support of our country's overseas interests and commitments.

That ships are essential to our national security and our commercial interests is a proven historical fact. That our Navy must be adequate to our global commitments should be self-evident. That our merchant marine must be adequate to our standing as the world's most powerful and leading trading nation should be self-evident. That our shipyards must be among the best in the world there should be little question.

However, the President's statements leave unclear the national purpose with respect to modern, efficient shipbuilding and ship repairing facilities as a basic foundation block of first-rate sea power. A similar void persisted in the enunciation of priorities by previous Administrations.

From a purely military standpoint, the Department of Defense has consistently held that a shipbuilding capability is essential to the national interest. In like manner, the military establishment has consistently supported the concept that a combined government-owned and commercially-owned ship repairing capability is essential to maintain the naval fleet in a constant state of readiness. These justifications derive from the valid—and time-proven—postulates that, in times of emergency, in an ever-changing geopolitical world, shipyard facilities on foreign soil will not necessarily be available. These justifications have thus gained virtually absolute acceptance.

As to a shipyard capability to support merchant shipping, a controversy has frequently developed. The Congress, the labor

movement, and others, have held that the criteria for justification should be no less than for naval ships. Shipbuilders and shipowners alike have argued, with the logic of past experience favoring them, that a ship repairing capability is not possible without a shipbuilding capability. Generally speaking, the latter precedes the former.

The relationship of shipyards, especially those geared to the construction of merchant vessels, to the national interest has an even more exacting significance when viewed from the perspective of contributions to the nation's economic strength.

For example, many merchant ships are today registered under the flags of Panama, Honduras and Liberia, but it could never be claimed that these countries are maritime powers, let alone sea powers, for they lack a supporting maritime industrial base, including shipyards. Though providing accommodations to international economics to citizens of other countries at minimal fees, these small nations leave to other powers the function of providing world order.

It is highly improbable that the Pan-Hon-Lib countries would ever come within the traditional definition of sea power:

... the ships nominally identified with them have no intimate association to their internal well-being,

... they have no particular economic strength to project into the oceans in times of peace, and no defense mobility to project in times of emergency, and

... shipyards, for them, are thus unnecessary.

On the other hand, any fair assessment of history leads to a conclusion that a balanced industrial maritime base is no less important an element of effective sea power than the naval and merchant fleets themselves. History also illustrates that the nation which builds the ships, carries the cargoes, and collects the revenues therefrom has generally been internationally powerful and economically affluent.

Japan has long held to the policy that programs to expand domestic shipping resources as well as export opportunities should be pursued for the specific purpose of promoting domestic shipbuilding as a function of national affluence. This policy has been formulated and executed with a degree of cooperation between government and shipyards which does not now exist on the same scale elsewhere in the world.

Accordingly, shipbuilding has become a substantial factor in Japan's national economy and balance of trade. Shipbuilding in Japan is regarded as a prestige industry. It is considered essential to the public good. The marketing of shipbuilding capabilities with considerable governmental stimulus, encouragement and support has been effectively developed to the point that Japanese shipyards today lead the balance of the world in the construction of merchant ships.

The Japanese cannot be totally wrong in their policies of emphasis on shipping and shipbuilding. Judging from their records of success, it would appear that they are very much on the right course. They are clearly assigning a high priority to this effort. They clearly possess the will to preserve and expand their own national and mercantile interests, as well as their own shipyards.

It is likewise clear that the Japanese understand another historical truth: a merchant marine and a maritime industrial base are the parents—not the offspring—of effective sea power.

Moreover, the national policy of Japan envisions that while capturing a steadily increasing share of the world shipbuilding market, all ships for the Japanese flag merchant marine will be constructed in Japanese shipyards. Over the last decade, not a single vessel for Japanese registry has been built outside of that country. This national purpose is in sharp contrast to the call for foreign construction of certain U.S. mer-

chant ships which has been voiced from time to time by government officials and others in the United States.

These same persons have frequently cited Russia's sometime practice of procuring merchant ships from shipyards of other countries as a justification for their position. But, in so doing, they have ignored or minimized a basic fact: the Soviet Union has been obliged to rely on alien shipyards because of insufficient domestic shipbuilding capacity to fulfill the demands of a 5-year merchant ship buildup.

More recently, however, Soviet leaders have revealed that this practice is to be reversed and soon discontinued. Three reasons are given:

To avoid the excessive commitments of foreign exchange which are involved.

Russian shipyards have been modernized and expanded, and must be operated at the greatest possible utilization, and

A high level of reliance on foreign yards is incompatible with the elevation of the Soviet Union to the status of a world maritime power.

The Soviets thus seem to recognize—and properly so—that a modern, efficient maritime industrial base, properly coordinated, is a fundamental ingredient of effective sea power.

It should be noted that the relative balance between U.S. and Russian strength at sea has altered significantly since the end of World War II. In the short span of 10 years, the Russians have perceptibly narrowed the margin of U.S. sea power superiority. The Soviet Navy is today second only to that of the United States, and the Soviet merchant marine will shortly be larger than the American maritime fleet in both numbers and tonnage.

All evidence points to a conclusion that Soviet Russia is mounting at sea a new challenge with which the United States will have to deal long after American troops are withdrawn from Vietnam. It would seem clear that the Russians have grasped the full meaning of sea power: the judicious allocation of production and financial resources to produce naval and merchant ships for the exploitation of economic, psychological and political objectives. By contrast, the Japanese, with strictures on the magnitude of their self-defense forces resulting from post World War II agreements, use the oceans exclusively for economic purposes.

The fixed national purpose with respect to shipbuilding which the Japanese and the Russians have seen fit to adopt and pursue in their own national interest might well serve to remind the United States of the basic truths of sea power. No similar national purpose, or declaration of national intentions, has been voiced in this country since the World War II days.

The function and adequacy of U.S. ship-

building will therefore in large measure be determined by a variety of factors: (1) the ability of the Nixon Administration to establish and articulate a conceptual unity of purpose toward restoration of the United States as a first-rate sea power, (2) the ability of the Nixon Administration to dissipate lingering and momentary uncertainties, (3) the ability of the Nixon Administration to coordinate the substantial requirements for naval and merchant shipbuilding so that the productive resources of the country will be effectively employed, and (4) the ability of the shipyard industry to respond to these substantial requirements. On the final point, I harbor no doubts or reservations. On the other three, only time will tell, but I for one stand optimistic.

#### HIGH AIR POLLUTION—HIGHER DEATH RATES

### HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the declining quality of our environment constitutes a problem which merits the continuing attention of my colleagues.

While industrial and bacterial waste poisons our rivers, lakes, and streams, the pall of air pollution hangs heavy over city and countryside alike. The urban centers, however, have been most drastically tainted by the scourge of air-borne pollutants.

Because of my distress about air contamination in our Nation's cities, I invite my colleagues' attention to a recent article which describes the probability that high air pollution areas of Chicago also have higher death rates than areas with lower pollution. The article by Donald M. Schwartz, which appeared in the September 17, 1969, issue of the Chicago Sun-Times, follows:

#### DEATH RATE, AIR POLLUTION LINKED

(By Donald M. Schwartz)

A Stritch School of Medicine researcher has found that high air-pollution areas of Chicago have higher death rates than areas with lower pollution.

Prof. Julius Goldberg, in a report he will make to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, found, for example, that deaths of white males in high pollution areas averaged 1,949 per 100,000, while deaths among a comparable group in low pollution areas was 1,389 per 100,000.

Goldberg, in his work at the Stritch school, which is part of Loyola University, put together air pollution data collected at 20 stations around the city, census information on persons living in the affected areas and Board of Health death reports.

Goldberg is cautious about drawing conclusions from the results, but he observed: "When we look over deaths from all causes, there is a very decided decline in favor of low-pollution areas."

He said his findings parallel those in other cities.

Goldberg was interviewed in his office at the Stritch school, 2160 S. 1st, Maywood.

The first results, on death, are part of a continuing series of studies. Goldberg has embarked on an investigation of pollution and illness, for which he is trying to get the cooperation of families, of children attending nursery schools and day-care centers.

For the study already completed, 29 different causes of death are included, plus a 30th catch-all category.

The statistics for pneumonia show that for the moderate socio-economic group, deaths per 100,000 averaged 95 in the high pollution areas and roughly half that rate—or 46—in low pollution areas.

Goldberg said death totals are annual averages for the 1960-1962 period.

The Loyola professor noted that in many of the cause-of-death categories the decline in mortality rates from high to low pollution areas was more consistent in the moderate socio-economic group than in the high or low socio-economic groups.

Statistics for the low group are more erratic, Goldberg said, and the high socio-economic group appears to be much less affected by differing pollution exposures than the other two groups.

Goldberg observed, however, that simply living in the area of high or low pollution may not be the whole story—the affluent, for example may spend more time in air-conditioned rooms protected from surrounding pollution.

That is one reason why Goldberg wants to make further studies of social factors in the health effects of pollution.

The fact that the well-to-do are exposed to high pollution is shown graphically by a map on Goldberg's office wall. The map indicates that the highest of 20 pollution areas in the city begins at about Navy Pier and runs north to about Fullerton, covering N. Lake Shore, the Near North Side and Old Town.

A pollution area for purposes of the study was a circle with a radius extending 1¼ miles from a city air pollution collection station.

Pollution statistics were limited to particles suspended in the air, but Goldberg said figures for compounds of sulphur, such as sulphur dioxide, probably would be similar.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, October 20, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*The fruit of the spirit is in all goodness and righteousness and truth.—Ephesians 5: 9.*

Our Father, who art in heaven, we wait upon Thee with receptive minds and responsive hearts that the uplift of Thy spirit can be ours as we face the beginning of a new week. May we take up the work of these days with courage and confidence knowing Thou art with us and believing Thou art endeavoring to lead us in great and good ways. Grant that what we do may fulfill Thy

purposes for us, for our Nation, and for our world.

Deepen the minds of men in truth and justice and mercy that order may prevail, laws be obeyed, good will be followed and people learn to live together with reverence before Thee, with respect for each other, and with a real faith in our beloved country.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 16, 1969, was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 338. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of hearings on Science and Strategies for National Security in the late 1970's by the Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments, and of additional copies thereof.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is